### Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

**Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House**

**Wednesday, April 2, 2014**  
3:00 – 5:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>ENCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3:00 | Welcome: *Patricia Sink, Chair of the Faculty Senate*  
Review of Agenda  
Approval of Minutes: February 5, 2014 Meeting (See 3/05/14 Agenda Packet)  
Approval of Minutes: February 20, 2014 Special Meeting (See 3/05/14 Agenda Packet)  
Approval of Minutes: March 5, 2014 | No | |
| 3:05 | 2014-15 Provisional Budget Reduction Plan:  
- Overview & Principles of University Wide Allocation of Cuts, *Chancellor Linda Brady*  
- Potential Impact of Structured Cuts to Academic Affairs, *Provost David Perrin* | No | A |
| 3:30 | Update on Study of Department Chairs/Heads Policy and Practice  
Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee | No | |
| 4:00 | Resolution #FS-04022014-01:  
To Express the Senate’s Opposition to the Proposed Recommendations of the UNC Post-Tenure Review Working Group  
Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee; and  
John Lepri, Executive Committee of the UNC Faculty Assembly | Yes | B |
| 4:00 | Resolution #FS-04022014-02:  
To Revise the Withdrawal from the University Policy  
Susan Shelmerdine, Chair of the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee | Yes | C |
| 4:25 | Resolution #FS-04022014-03:  
To Permit Active Duty Service Members and Students, Released from Active Duty for a Specific Amount of Time to Attend College through a Military Degree Completion Program, to have Priority Registration Ahead of the Undergraduate Registration Window for their Class  
Susan Shelmerdine, Chair of the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee | Yes | D |
| 4:25 | Resolution #FS-04022014-04:  
To Permit Students with Declared Online Majors to Have Priority Registration Ahead of the Undergraduate Registration Window for Their Class  
Wade Maki, Chair of the Online Learning Committee; and Susan Shelmerdine, Chair of the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee | Yes | E |
| 4:35 | Report from the Budget Committee  
*Wayne Journell, Chair of the Budget Committee* | No | |
| 4:40 | Future Directions of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons  
*Steve Roberson, Dean of Undergraduate Studies* | No | |
| 4:45 | Faculty Senate Elections  
Patti Sink, Senate Elections Committee | Yes | |
| 4:50 | Areas of Focus for the 2014-2015 Academic Year  
Faculty Senate Calendar: 2014-2015 Academic Year  
Spoma Jovanovic, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect | No | F |
| 5:00 | Announcements & Adjournment | Yes | |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Refreshments will be available from 2:30-3:00 pm. Please come early to socialize if your schedule permits.  

**NOTE:** Senators & Officers sit at the table according to their name cards; non-voting members and gallery sit in the chairs around the perimeter of the room.

General Faculty Meeting will be on Wednesday, April 23, 2014  
*(Agenda Items Due: 5pm on Wednesday, April 9, 2014)*
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
March 5, 2014  
3:00, Virginia Dare Room  
Patti Sink, Chair

Draft Pending Approval at the April 2, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</th>
<th>Discussion/Motion</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Welcome & Review of Agenda: Senate Chair Patti Sink | The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. The agenda was presented for review. The Chair asked for any changes. Senator Deb Bell requested that a resolution be added to the agenda "to recommend that the UNCG Faculty Senate asserts the right to evaluate if the UNCG administration's final budget cut plan indicates that, to the best of their ability, they have protected and ensured the integrity and quality of the academic program at UNCG." The complete resolution was distributed to Senators prior to the beginning of the meeting (Attachment A).  
Motion to add the new resolution to agenda: Deb Bell. Second: Veronica Grossi  
Chair Sink asked if there was any discussion of the resolution. A discussion ensued about the meaning of the term, "evaluate", of the focus of the evaluation, and of changing the term, "evaluate" to "review and respond." Bell indicated that the resolution provides opportunities to make a formal, collective response to the budget cuts. She also stated that we do not know what will be evaluated because the Senate has not seen the plan, and stressed that we know that Academic Affairs is threatened by the budget cuts. Bell emphasized that the resolution simply asserts our right to respond to whatever develops as a result of the budget cuts. With no additional discussion, Sink indicated that a secret-ballot vote would be used to vote on the motion to add the new resolution to the agenda. The ballots were distributed, and were collected upon completion. The votes were counted by Past Chair John Lepri and Administrative Assistant Mary Lea Wolf.  
Secret ballot vote: 21 Yes; 7 No; 2 Abstain  
Motion approved by the majority  
Following approval of the motion to add the resolution to the agenda, Deb Bell asked that consideration of the new resolution and the Resolution #FS03052014-01 (Attachment B) be moved to an earlier time in the agenda. Sink indicated that the new resolution would be labeled as #FS03052014-02 (Attachment A), and asked for a motion to change the order of the agenda items. Consideration of moving both resolutions earlier in the agenda was moved and seconded by Deb Bell and Bill Young, respectively. Sink asked if there was any discussion of the motion. A discussion about why consider the resolutions earlier in the agenda rather than the designated time. Bell emphasized that we may not get the action items in the agenda if they are considered at the end of the meeting. Sink recommended that the resolutions be considered at approximately 4:00pm, after hearing remarks by the Panel members. Bell responded affirmatively. The motion was approved unanimously. To save time, Sink moved approval of February minutes to the end of the meeting. Jovanovic seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Sink asked if there was additional discussion of the agenda; hearing none, the agenda was approved unanimously as modified. | Agenda Approved Unanimously as modified. |
Report & Recommendations: Study of Department Chair/Head Policies and Practices

Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee

Bruce Kirchoff reported on the Faculty Government Committee (FGC) study of "Department Chair/Head Policies and Practices." He projected that recommendations in the form of a resolution would come before the Senate in April. Kirchoff continued. "Current findings and recommendations are:

1. There is confusion about the difference between department chair and department head because UNCG has both titles that represent the same duties. We recommend using the term 'chair';
2. We want increased accountability of department chairs/heads to faculty with annual reports to faculty as one option, or a review of the chair by the faculty as another;
3. We also want chairs/heads evaluated as faculty members—that doesn’t seem to happen consistently at UNCG, although it is a university policy; and
4. Faculty should have access to reviews of department chairs, and although state law prohibits such access, there is at least one university in the system that provides access. Alan Boyette will check on how that is accomplished. This is as administrative issue, but the administration is working closely with the Faculty Government Committee."

Kirchoff indicated that the FGC recommendations may be activated when a resolution is submitted for Faculty Senate consideration during the April 2nd meeting. Sink thanked Bruce Kirchoff and the Faculty Government Committee for their work on this study and on a future resolution addressing the recommendations, based on the results of the study.

Panel Discussion with Faculty Senate

Chair Patti Sink introduced the Panelists, and indicated that the panel discussion evolved from the special Faculty Senate meeting of February 20, 2014. She indicated that the purposes of the panel discussion are listed on the agenda. The Chair stated that, because of limited time, the focus will be on topics that may inform actions on the resolutions being considered, including UNCG's financial framework and budget planning by Vice Chancellor Reade Taylor, and on the principles of the 2014-2015 budget reduction plan by Chancellor Linda Brady.

Using a Power Point presentation (Attachment C) Vice Chancellor Taylor talked about all sources of the $399 million received by UNCG, and about the items associated with the expended $366 million. Taylor indicated that the differential of $33 million consists of restricted funds. He emphasized that the inconsistency of accounting codes and terminology from institution to institution renders comparison of budgets problematic, if not virtually impossible without a great deal of item by item analysis. Taylor indicated that funds identified as agency funds, institutional trust funds, foundation funds, and capital improvement funds are restricted. Taylor continued. "The university cannot use these funds as flexible funds. The $238 million in state funds, of which academic affairs gets 76% (i.e., $169 million), appear to be reduced over the past ten years, because other expenses have increased; however, these funds have remained fairly stable. Since 2007-2008, we have experienced $39 million in budget cuts to state-appropriated funds; yet, we also have received $41 million in enrollment change and campus-initiated tuition increases, so we have $2 million more this year than last year. Much of these funds have been distributed to financial aid, and the remainder have gone to benefits. Since 2007-2008, Academic Affairs broke even, but other divisions lost 5% to 20% of their budgets. The projected 2014-2015 cuts are $12.8 million, and the guiding principles for the 2014-2015 budget reduction plan are posted on the web site." Vice Chancellor Taylor reported on UNCG's performance, as described and compared within the document, entitled UNC-
System Operational Efficiency Efforts (Report 2013-08). UNCG is cited as being low performing in terms of efficiency numbers on http://www.ncleg.net/PED/Reports/documents/UNC/UNC_Report.pdf Principally, the low-performing results are due to how UNCG was classified and compared with respect to other UNC institutions. Sink noted that we have arrived at 4:00pm, but to further inform our consideration of the action items, Chancellor Brady will speak about the principles of the 2014-2015 budget reduction plan.

Chancellor Brady commented that many of budget-cut issues are very complicated. The Chancellor continued. “Since meeting with the Faculty Senate on February 20th, I also have met with the Deans Council, Department Chairs, Students, and Staff Senate Leadership, and tomorrow, I will meet with the Budgeting Sounding Board and with UNC President Tom Ross. As a result of these meetings, my thinking has continued to be refined and revised. Final budget-cut allocations will be discussed on Monday with the Executive Staff.

Clearly, I support and understand that we need to preserve our core academic mission, especially as related to restoring enrollment to 18,000 students, and to providing enough courses for students to stay on track and graduate. As a research and graduate institution, we also need to reinforce support for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Any decision that UNCG would make to address the budget cuts through the release of tenured or tenure-track faculty would damage the reputation of the institution, and would negatively impact on research and on attracting and retaining faculty and students. If tenured and tenure-track faculty are off the table, that has consequences for other areas, but we think that is the right thing to do. A disproportionate share of cuts will be allocated to those units that do not report to the Provost. This is the seventh year of cuts to divisions outside of academic affairs. Future cuts, for examples, will negatively affect our grounds, as well as Institutional Technology Service and fundraising. We want administrative efficiency, so there may be some reorganization. Some academic units will have to address faculty workload. Selective adjustments will have to be made to offer students the classes they need. As a one-time payout, UNCG Investment has approved adding .25% to 4.25% of the funds for use from the endowment for investment in university initiatives. By the end of March, the provisional budget reduction plan will be completed, and will be presented to the Faculty Senate on April 2, 2014. A reduction in force (RIF) process will follow the completion of the budget reduction plan. On May 9, the General Assembly convenes, and by the middle of June, we should know of any other changes we need to absorb to implement the new budget on July 1, 2014. Sink thanked Vice Chancellor Taylor and Chancellor Brady for their remarks, and thanked all panelists for their participation in the remainder of the meeting as the Faculty Senate acts upon two resolutions and may have questions.

Resolution #FS-03052014-02 To Recommend that the Faculty Senate Affirm the Right to Evaluate the UNC Administration’s Final Budget Plan Senator Deb Bell (MTD)

Deb Bell read into the record Resolution #FS03052014-02 "to recommend that the UNCG Faculty Senate asserts the right to evaluate if the UNCG administration's final budget cut plan indicates that, to the best of their ability, they have protected and ensured the integrity and quality of the academic program at UNCG" (Attachment A).

Motion to approve: Eric Ford
Second: Elizabeth Van Horn
Chair Sink asked if there was any discussion. An extended discussion of the Resolution occurred. Questions were asked and comments were made concerning what information we likely would acquire from the activation of Resolution Tabled by the Majority
the Resolution if approved. Other comments were directed toward the fact
that unit deans typically decide where cuts will be taken in academic units,
and it doesn't seem that the Faculty Senate could evaluate the budget. Such
evaluation and budget decisions depend upon the Deans and Department
Chairs/Heads. John Neufeld commented that there are lots of ways that
numbers can be analyzed and imagined. Deb Bell indicated that we will look
at the big picture, as related to the budget and budget cuts, and not at the
minutiae.

Ellen Haskell expressed concern about the second WHEREAS phrase in the
Resolution. Haskell indicated that if the we do not fulfill our academic
mission or charter, that could be a double-edged sword. Rebecca Adams
moved and Kathy Crowe seconded that the phrase be amended by removing
all words after the comma before "threatening". The amendment was
approved unanimously, and as amended read as follows.

WHEREAS, Academic programs are already strained from previous budget
cuts, threatening UNCG's ability to fulfill its academic mission or charter
from the state;... 

Donna Nash emphasized the need for additional consideration of John
Neufeld's comments regarding how decisions are made at the unit level. Eric
Ford maintained that there is a pattern of failure to anticipate budget cuts and
enrollment shortfalls, that Department Chairs had no input prior to six months
ago, and that we need substantive changes by the time we get a plan.

In reference to the concluding "BE IT RESOLVED" statement, Bill Karper
moved to amend the Resolution by removing the phrase, "to the best of their
ability." Fabrice Lehoucq seconded the motion. The amendment was
approved by the majority, and as amended read as follows.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate, as representatives of the faculty
from the aforementioned units, affirm and endorse the recommendation the
UNCG Faculty Senate asserts the right to evaluate if the UNCG
administration's final budget cut plan indicates that, to the best of their ability,
they have protected and ensured the integrity and quality of the academic
program at UNCG.

Deb Bell commented that the Faculty Senate can only advise, and that the
Resolution says that we will give our opinion; it puts the administration on
alert. Some Senators commented that the Resolution is well-intentioned, but
we do not need a resolution to express our opinion, and the administration
already knows that we are "watching". Rebecca Adams asked if the
resolution could be reworded so that we can influence the decision.

The Chancellor offered the following. "The role of the Senate is advisory. We
have interacted with the Faculty Senate, Deans, Department Chairs and
Heads, Staff Senate, and students. If I see that budget reduction plans are
endangering students, I will ask the plans to be revised. If you don't believe
that the budget reduction plans achieve your goal, then I would encourage you
to take steps as you deem appropriate on April 2nd. Think carefully about what
you are trying to do with the phrase, 'to the best of their abilities.'"

Eric Ford asked the following questions. "What is happening at the
administrative level? When do we see cuts to administrative bloat?"
Chancellor Brady responded. "Every division of the university will work on
making the necessary cuts. We will be able to report on how many
administrative positions have been cut. At some point, a decision must be
made. As the CEO, I must present a plan to President Ross." The Vice
Chancellors also responded by providing information about reclassified
positions, about administrative positions not funded by the state, and about positions cut across the divisions. Bell and Ford commented about needing access to information, and about not having confidence when we do not have access to the information, respectively. Veronica Grossi said that the resolution is intended to be a symbolic statement. Karper indicated that we want the Chancellor to follow our advice, and the **BE IT RESOLVED** statement should be amended.

Based on the comments that have been made since the beginning of the discussion, Sink commented that voting on the motion to approve the resolution without additional work seems unfounded at this time.

- Motion to Table Resolution #FS-03052014-02: Patti Sink
  - Second: Wade Maki.

Sink called for a secret ballot vote, and the ballots were distributed. John Lepri and Mary Lea Wolfe collected the completed ballots and counted the votes.

  - Resolution Tabled by Majority: 27 Yes; 4 No

John Neufeld asked if the Faculty Senate had to vote to bring the tabled resolution back to the floor of the Senate. Parliamentarian Daniel Winkler indicated that the tabled motion to approve the resolution may be pulled from the table with a majority vote by the Faculty Senate, or it could be revised and submitted as a new resolution.

Resolution #FS-03052014-01
To Affirm and Endorse the UNCG Academic Unit Deans’ Recommendation for a Campus-Wide Strategy to Protect UNCG’s Academic Mission (February 8, 2014)

*Senate Chair Patricia Sink*

Because of misinformation in recent email discussions in association with Resolution #FS-03052014-01, Chair Sink called on Tim Johnston, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, to provide preliminary information about the three priorities in the **BE IT RESOLVED** statement of the resolution. Dean Johnston commented as follows. "The Deans Council does not have a plan, despite emails that circulated that said we did. We only had three guiding principles that we suggested as priorities as we worked with the Chancellor and Provost. Sink thanked Dean Johnston for his explanation. She read into the record Resolution #FS-03052014-01 "to affirm and endorse the UNCG Academic Unit Deans' recommendation for a campus-wide strategy to protect UNCG's academic mission" (Attachment B).

- Motion to approve: Bill Karper
  - Second: Kathy Crowe

Sink asked if there was any discussion. Bill Young asked if credit producing is in contrast to non-credit producing. Sink replied, yes. Young also asked if the Deans’ recommendation include information on how cuts are allocated across units.

Provost Perrin replied as follows. "We started these conversations last May. What we’re working on is an allocation of cuts that may be done in a vertical fashion, with higher cuts to non-academic units and non-student success and enrollment areas. The guiding principle is protection of student credit-hours and enrollment.”

David Ayers stressed that we should include information on how cuts are allocated across units. Provost Perrin reiterated that protections of student credit-hours and enrollment are essential. He continued. "As the chief academic officer, I would love a cut that is less than the proportion to academic affairs. But having watched my colleagues, and witnessed the deterioration of services to students and faculty, we simply cannot do that anymore.”

John Neufeld asked what programs are not in one of those three priorities?

*Kelly Burke, Associate Dean of the School of Music, Theatre and Dance*

Resolution approved by majority.
(MTD), expressed understanding that we need quantity, but there are units that have limits on enrollment due to accreditation standards. Anthony Taylor emphasized that he wanted to find terms to use other than credit-producing programs or courses. Provost Perrin emphasized that enrollment and credit-producing programs and courses must be protected. He further indicated that credit-producing will be defined by the number of students that can be handled according to the caps or requirements associated with the programs and courses.

Ford asked how the resolution is actionable. Sink replied that, if the resolution is approved, we unify with the Deans on a set of priorities directed toward protecting UNCG’s academic mission.

Rachel Briley (MTD) asked if decisions were going to be made using information from the Academic Program Review—a flawed process. Provost Perrin indicated that the APR should be used to help successful programs, not to cut programs or faculty.

Sink asked if there was additional discussion; hearing none, she called for the vote, and secret ballots were distributed, collected and counted by John Lepri and Mary Lea Wolfe.

Resolution Approved by the majority: 24 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstain.

Adjournment

Sink indicated that the February minutes will be approved during the April meeting, and thanked all for their participation. Adjournment was moved and seconded, and was approved unanimously.

Adjournment approved unanimously

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carmichael
Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2013-2014
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
Faculty Senate  

Resolution #FS03052014-02  
To Recommend that the UNCG Faculty Senate Assert the Right to Evaluate if the UNCG Administration's Final Budget Cut Plan Indicates that, to the Best of Their Ability, They Have Protected and Ensured the Integrity and Quality of the Academic Program at UNCG  

Submitted by Deborah Bell, Senator, Department of Theatre (MTD); and Susan Dennison, Senator, Department of Social Work (HSS)

WHEREAS, enrollment management and forecasting during the 2013-14 academic year failed to meet its stated goals and projections for 2014-15 leading to a multi-million dollar budget shortfall; and

WHEREAS, academic programs are already strained from previous budget cuts, threatening UNCG's ability to fulfill its academic mission or charter from the state; and

WHEREAS, additional cuts to academic programs would further reduce course offerings, programs, and sections; thus negatively impacting student enrollment, retention, and graduations; and

WHEREAS, Academic Affairs is the most central division to the University's mission and the chief revenue-generating unit on campus; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Linda Brady has welcomed and requested input about the budget reduction plan from the different constituencies at the University, including the Board of Trustees, Deans, Department Chairs/Heads, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations; and

WHEREAS, the voting members of the Faculty Senate represent eight units essential to the academic mission of the University, including the College of Arts and Sciences, Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoeengineering, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, School of Education, School of Health and Human Sciences, School of Music, Theatre and Dance, School of Nursing, and University Libraries; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senators in fulfilling their fiduciary duty to the state and its citizens, UNCG's students and alumni assert that the budget plans presented thus far fail to preserve the integrity and vitality of the University's academic mission during the development and finalization of the 2014-2015 budget reduction plan; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate, as representative of the faculty from the aforementioned units, affirm and endorse the recommendation that the UNCG Faculty Senate asserts the right to evaluate if the UNCG administration's final budget cut plan indicates that, to the best of their ability, they have protected and ensured the integrity and quality of the academic program at UNCG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Action/Date:</th>
<th>Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Action/Date:</td>
<td>Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed and 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 or BOG Action/Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS03052014-01
To Affirm and Endorse the UNCG Academic Unit Deans’ Recommendation for a
Campus-Wide Strategy to Protect UNCG’s Academic Mission (February 8, 2014)
Submitted by Patricia Sink, UNCG Faculty Senate Chair,

WHEREAS, because of enrollment decreases during 2013-2014, unprecedented budget cuts face the UNCG Community; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Linda Brady has welcomed and requested input about the budget reduction plan from the different constituencies at the University, including the Board of Trustees, Deans, Department Chair/Heads, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2014, the Academic Unit Deans submitted a recommendation for a campus-wide strategy to protect UNCG’s academic mission to Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor David Perrin for consideration by Chancellor Linda Brady; and

WHEREAS, the voting members of the Faculty Senate represent eight units essential to the academic mission of the University, including the College of Art and Sciences, Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, School of Education, School of Health and Human Science, School of Music, Theatre and Dance, School of Nursing, and University Libraries; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senators believe in the unification of UNCG constituencies engaged in preserving the integrity and vitality of the University’s academic mission during the development and finalization of the 2014-2015 budget reduction plan; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate, as representatives of the faculty from the aforementioned units, affirm and endorse the recommendation for a campus-wide strategy to protect UNCG’s academic mission, particularly related to:

1. Credit-producing programs and positions,
2. Support services that truly enhance student recruitment, retention, and academic success, and
3. Support for research and graduate mission.

Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.
Faculty Senate Meeting
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

An Overview of Financial Reporting and Budget Framework

Where Does the Money Come From?

2012-13 ($399 Million)

- Tuition and Fees: 22.55%
- State Appropriations: 38.51%
- Investment Income: 5.84%
- Contracts & Grants: 7.87%
- Financial Aid: 12.12%
- Auxiliaries: 9.52%
- Sales and Services of Educational & General Activities: 1.65%
- Private Gifts, Grants, and Contracts: 1.69%
- Other: 0.25%

Other revenues not included above total $16 million. Source: 2012-13 UNCG Financial Statements, Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position

Where Does the Money Go?

Operating Expenses By Category

2012-13 ($366 million)

- Salaries and Benefits: 63.76%
- Supplies and Materials: 5.69%
- Services: 14.98%
- Scholarships and Fellowships: 8.83%
- Utilities: 2.48%
- Depreciation: 4.25%
- Non-operating expenses not included above total $8 million. Source: 2012-13 UNCG Financial Statements, Note 10

Other non-operating expenses included above total $8 million.
Where Does the Money Go?
Operating Expenses by Purpose (Functional Classification)
2012-13
($366 million)

- Instruction: 35.91%
- Research: 4.26%
- Public Service: 2.50%
- Academic Support: 12.27%
- Student Services: 4.69%
- Institutional Support: 9.20%
- Operations and Maintenance of Plant: 7.35%
- Student Financial Aid: 8.21%
- Auxiliary Enterprises: 11.35%
- Depreciation: 4.25%

Non-operating expenses not included above total $8 million. Source: 2012-13 UNCG Financial Statements, Note 10.

Fund Source

- State Funds
- Agency Funds
- Foundation Funds
- Capital Improvement Funds
- Institutional Trust Funds

2013-14 State Operating Budget
Permanent Budget by Account
($238 million)

- Faculty: 36.53%
- Temp Wages: 0.48%
- Equipment: 2.49%
- Benefits: 18.32%
- Financial Aid: 5.72%
- Utilities: 3.73%
- EPA: 9.76%
- SPA: 15.82%
- OTP: 5.83%

Source: Departmental Budgets 2013-14
Institutional Trust Funds

- Contracts and Grants
  - SERVE
- Auxiliary
  - Housing
  - Bookstore
  - Food Service
  - EUC
  - Parking
  - Other
- Student Fees
- Facilities and Administrative (Overhead Receipts)
- Discretionary – Chancellor Approves
- Other Institutional Trust Funds

Planning for 2014-15

Budget Cuts
2013-14 Budget Impact

- 390 Fewer Course Sections
- 16,100 Fewer Seats
- Loss of $400,000 in graduate assistants
- Employment of students and temporary employees on a part-time basis will be reduced
- Could compromise UNCG’s efforts to meet retention and graduation goals
- Practical experience opportunities for students will be reduced
- Training opportunities will be impacted across campus

Since 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Change</th>
<th>$22,594,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITI</td>
<td>19,659,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Budget Cuts</td>
<td>-39,466,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$2,787,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other net changes of $19 million were also received during this time period (includes salary and benefit increases $18 million; building reserves $2 million; JSNN $5 million; less $6 million E&T Fees moved to Trust Funds. Institutional category represents Financial Aid (CITI) and benefits on net new positions from CITI, Enrollment Change, less Cuts.

Since 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Cut + CITI + Enr Change</th>
<th>% of 2013-14 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>-$855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>-1,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Adv</td>
<td>-291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>-449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>-1,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>-130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>-175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORED</td>
<td>-139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>6,231,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,787,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components of a Cut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Reduction</td>
<td>$7,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly Approved</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBM Directed Dec 2013</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Positions for OEP</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (including Title IX)</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,796,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Principles

- Strategies must not negatively impact enrollment
- Consider strategic plan initiatives
- Hold Financial Aid harmless
- Reassess policies and procedures; costs vs. controls
- Consider reallocation of resources
- Consider centralizing or outsourcing services
- Others regarding lapsed SPA salaries, practices that impose additional costs, cost comparisons with other campuses, service levels, non-state funds

Classroom & Lab Use

[Chart showing classroom and lab use data]
Enclosure A: Attachment C

Percent Change in Student FTE and Campus Operations Staff

Institutional Support Per Student FTE vs. National Peers

Percentage difference from 3-Year Average of Institutional Support Spending per Student FTE of Public Peers

Source: IPEDS
Institutional Support Expenditures per Student
FTE 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS Data

Percentage Change in positions at UNCG from 2007-08 to 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>2007-08 to 2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Draft Joint Working Group on Employment Analysis dated December 1, 2013

Other Considerations

- Consider “vertical” cuts
- No “across the board” cuts
- Look forward, not backwards
- What is mandated, how can those services be most effectively delivered
Ideas and Suggestions

• Students
• Faculty
• Deans’ Council
• Staff
• Budget Sounding Board
• Board of Trustees

Questions and Discussion
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS04022014-01

To Express the Senate’s Opposition to the Proposed Recommendations of the
UNC Post-Tenure Review Working Group

Submitted by the Faculty Government Committee
Bruce K. Kirchoff, Chair

WHEREAS, UNC General Administration’s Post-Tenure Review Working Group has asked for feedback on their recently completed proposals for revisions of Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (Attachment), and

WHEREAS, these revision include, among other provisions, proposals that would increase faculty and administrative workloads at a time when the system schools are barely able complete their core missions, and

WHEREAS, the problematic proposals include

1. The requirement that the campus must bring their policies into compliance with the new Guidelines by October 1, 2014—a deadline that precludes meaningful shared governance review of this issue;
2. The added workload of producing and tracking directional goals on a five-year basis, a plan that seems to provide no real benefit and subverts the intention of post-tenure review as a cumulative review of past performance;
3. The requirement that the deans provide evaluative reviews of every post-tenure review, a requirement will add to the workload of the deans, especially in units with large numbers of faculty members;
4. The requirements for training of all post-tenure review evaluators, including administrators; a requirement that places an undue financial and regulatory burden on the campuses, and lacks clear justification;
5. The requirement for the use of three assessment categories (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations) with the intention of forcing the campuses to reward exemplary performance, but without the provision of the resources with which to make these rewards; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the UNCG Faculty Senate strongly opposes the above listed changes, and asks President Ross to send the report back to committee for revision.
Post-Tenure Review Working Group
Recommendations

The University of North Carolina General Administration
April 2014
This report summarizes the work and recommendations of the post-tenure review working group. Membership of the working group consisted of the following, Mr. GA Sywassink, Chair of the working group and Vice Chair of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Mr. Therence Pickett, member of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Chancellor David Belcher of Western Carolina University; Chancellor Harold Martin of North Carolina A&T State University; Dr. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at East Carolina University; Dr. David Barlow, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Fayetteville State University; and Dr. Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs acted as staff to the committee.

The Committee was charged with examining current system and campus post-tenure review policies and practices to identify ways in which they can be strengthened with an emphasis on consistency, rigor and accountability. The working group was tasked with submitting recommendations to the President on the inclusion of practices to strengthen the guidelines governing post-tenure review and recommend any changes to UNC Policy.

The Committee conducted a series of in-person and teleconference meetings between January 24, 2014 and March 11, 2014. During these meetings and subsequent discussion the working group reviewed 400.3.3.1[G] and identified several changes or clarifications which would strengthen the post-tenure review process while also increasing the effectiveness of performance evaluations. These include, greater alignment between annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, clarification of the process of a second level of review beyond the department chair or unit head, providing training opportunities for those involved in the post-tenure review evaluation process, auditing of compliance with training and process regulations, and the creation of three assessment categories.

Appendix A is a red-line version of the policy showing the suggested edits.

**Greater Alignment Between Annual Performance Reviews and Post-Tenure Review**

The current guidelines direct campuses to ensure their policies show a relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review and specifies that annual performance reviews are not substitutes for the “comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review.” To better align annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, the working group recommends that the post-tenure review be based on a set of directional goals proposed by the faculty member at the beginning of the review cycle. These directional goals should act as a guide for the professional growth of the faculty member over the coming five-year period. Milestones created in these goals will act as the basis for annual reviews. Directional goals should be approved by the department chair. The working group felt it was important to recognize that changes in circumstances could necessitate changes in these directional goals and therefore included language in the proposed guideline edits which allows for annual modifications as deemed appropriate.

**Clarification of the Process of a Second Level Review**

The current guidelines currently require that post-tenure review outcomes be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. To increase consistency throughout the system, the working
group proposes that the Deans must provide an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the peer review committee and the department chair. The Provost will be required to certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policy and guidelines. Department chairs/unit heads are often in difficult positions when it comes to evaluating faculty within their departments. They are organizationally situated immediately beside faculty colleagues and often return to faculty ranks to later be evaluated by someone whom they once had the responsibility to evaluate. The recommended change not only provides greater consistency across the system regarding who is involved in the post-tenure review process but also provides an opportunity to the review process to be more meaningful for the faculty member undergoing the review and builds in additional support for department chairs and unit heads. Under the proposed revision, faculty will be receiving feedback from a peer review committee but also department chairs/unit heads and the Dean.

Providing Training Opportunities

As the working group discussed the goals of the post-tenure review process as noted in the policy, to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions. The working group feels strongly that post-tenure review should be a positive and useful process that both recognizes strong performance and provides constructive criticism to strengthen the performance and provide professional growth of the faculty. The current guidelines neglect to include a mechanism by which evaluators are prepared to provide such feedback. The working group recommends that institutions be provided ongoing support and training for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer committee members, department chairs/unit heads, and deans. UNC General Administration will be responsible for preparing digital training modules for campus use. The modules will focus on the essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review: how to prepare, conduct and manage a meaningful review process and how to provide constructive criticism in a positive manner. The Provost will be charged with certifying that training is being conducted.

Auditing Compliance

One of the pieces of the charge to the working group was to identify ways in which the post-tenure review process could be strengthened by identifying areas where greater consistency could be achieved across the system. One such area is compliance reporting. The current guidelines offer an unstructured form of compliance reporting and therefore is conducted differently across the system. The working group recommends implementing a compliance audit to ensure that training and processes are being conducted according to policy. UNC General Administration will be responsible for conducting training and process audits of all campuses during the 2015-2016 fiscal year. In subsequent years, process audits will be conducted of all campuses on a three-year rotating cycle unless irregularities are identified.
**Assessment Categories**

The current policy notes recognition and reward of exemplary faculty performance as one of the three purpose of post-tenure review. The working group therefore recommends that each campus utilize three levels of assessment for their faculty, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and does not meet expectations. These three categories will not only provide consistency across the system in terms of evaluation metrics, but also satisfies one of the main goals of the post-tenure review policy, to recognize exemplary faculty performance. Without the three assessment categories, faculty with exemplary performance are not identified and therefore cannot be recognized. The working group recognizes that absent funding, recognition of exemplary performance can be challenging but felt there were other avenues of recognition outside of salary increases. Examples of these alternatives include, course-release time, professional development funding, and public recognition.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the post-tenure review working group sought to identify areas in which the post-tenure review policy and guidelines could be strengthened. Specifically, the working group wished to identify areas where greater consistency could be achieved in implementing policy across the system. These recommendations seek to achieve this outcome by creating three assessment categories and including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer within the post-tenure review process. An additional outcome of this review was to increase the rigor and accountability of the process. Recommendations for the inclusion of an auditing process, including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer, and providing training opportunities all contribute to strengthening the rigor of the post-tenure review process. Additionally, the post-tenure review working group felt strongly that the post-tenure review process should be positive in nature and allow for recognition of exemplary performance as well as a constructive evaluation process by which faculty could continue to grow professionally. Providing training for all individuals involved in the post-tenure review process assists reviewers in strengthening their evaluation skills. Training also increases the probability that faculty will receive the types of feedback that is most helpful and valuable to their individual growth and contribution to the institution.

These recommendations have been shared with faculty assembly and are currently being reviewed by Chancellors and their executive leadership. Following receipt of their feedback, a final version of these recommendations will be provided to President Ross for approval.
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
Faculty Senate  

Resolution #FS04022014-02  

To Revise the Policy on Withdrawal From the University  
Submitted by the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee  
Susan Shelmerdine, Chair

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors’ Regulations 400.1.5[R] on “Fostering Student Success” necessitated the creation of a new Course Withdrawal Policy, with a 16 s.h. limit for course withdrawals; and,

WHEREAS, the current Policy on Withdrawal from the University is not in alignment with the new Course Withdrawal Policy; and,

WHEREAS, it is in the students’ interests for the 16 s.h. limit not to include withdrawn courses from a semester in which the student withdraws from the University; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Policy on Withdrawal from the University statement in the Undergraduate Bulletin be replaced with the following:

Undergraduate students who find that they must withdraw from the University can do so by withdrawing from all courses through the UNCGenie website. Undergraduates who withdraw from all courses are considered to be withdrawn from the University and must seek reactivation or readmission through Undergraduate Admissions to return to school in subsequent terms.

Students withdrawing from the University within the first 8 weeks of the term will be indicated on the transcript with a grade of “WT”. All “WT” courses count as attempted hours and are subject to Academic Standing, financial aid, and Satisfactory Academic Progress rules and calculations; they do not count in GPA calculation or tuition surcharge calculations.

If a student withdraws from the University after the 8 week deadline, WF grades will be recorded. WF grades are calculated in the student’s GPA as F (failing) grades.

Faculty Senate Action/Date:  
Chancellor Action/Date:  
General Faculty Action/Date:  
Board of Trustees Action/Date:  
UNC GA or BOG Action/Date:  

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.  
Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.
Resolution #FS04022014-03

To Permit Active Duty Service Members and Students Released from Active Duty for a Specific Amount of Time to Attend College through a Military Degree Completion Program to Have Priority Registration Ahead of the Undergraduate Registration Window for Their Class

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors’ Regulations 700.7.1 on “the Admission of Active Duty Services Members and Veterans”, recommends that all campuses provide priority enrollments to “active duty students using Armed Forces Tuition Assistance (TA) as well as those students who are released from active duty for a specific amount of time to attend college through a military degree completion program”; and,

WHEREAS, scheduling challenges and limitations often occur for these students; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that Active Duty Service Members using Armed Forces Tuition Assistance and students who are released from active duty for a specific amount of time to attend college through a military degree completion program are permitted to register ahead of the general undergraduate population within their class.
Resolution #FS04022014-04
To Permit Students with Declared Online Majors to Have Priority Registration Ahead of the Undergraduate Registration Window for their Class
Submitted by the Online Learning Committee in Collaboration with the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee
Wade Maki, Chair; and Susan Shelmerdine, Chair

WHEREAS, students in online degree programs must enroll in online course sections to graduate; and

WHEREAS, students who complete their degree programs on-campus often choose to complete courses online, leaving minimal, if any, seats for students pursuing online degree programs; and

WHEREAS, there are typically fewer online course seats than on campus course seats; and

WHEREAS, many online degree-seeking students cannot graduate on time because required online courses and online-course sections are filled by on-campus degree-seeking students; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that students who have declared online majors are permitted to register ahead of the general undergraduate population for their class.

Faculty Senate Action/Date:  
Chancellor Action/Date:  
General Faculty Action/Date:  
Board of Trustees Action/Date:  
UNC GA or BOG Action/Date:  

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.
Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.
# Faculty Senate, Forum and General Faculty Meetings

## Fall 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date*</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s State of the Campus Address</td>
<td>August 13, 2014</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Aycock Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate New Year Reception</td>
<td>August 20, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Senator Orientation</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 2, 2014</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>September 3, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Faculty Meeting/Faculty Convocation</strong></td>
<td>September 17, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 1, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate Forum</strong></td>
<td>October 15, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>November 5, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate Forum</strong></td>
<td>November 19, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 3, 2014</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date*</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 14, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate Forum</strong></td>
<td>January 21, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>February 4, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate Forum</strong></td>
<td>February 18, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>March 4, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate Forum</strong></td>
<td>March 18, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 1, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Faculty Meeting</strong></td>
<td>April 22, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 6, 2015</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Virginia Dare Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated: MLW: March 19, 2014
http://facsen.uncg.edu/SenateCalendar.asp
http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/index.htm
http://provost.uncg.edu/Academic/EPA_Personnel/Docs/PT_Calendar.pdf*

*All dates are on Wednesdays, except the **New Senator Orientation**.*