## Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

**Wednesday, February 6, 2013**

**Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House**

**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: *John Lepri, Chair of the Faculty Senate*  
Approval of Minutes: December 5, 2012 Meeting  
Review of Agenda  
Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty Senate | Yes | A |
| 3:10 | Remarks: *Chancellor Linda P. Brady* | Yes | B |
| 3:20 | Remarks: *Provost David Perrin* | Yes | C |
| 3:30 | Resolution #FS-02062013-01: *To Recommend Candidates for the Faculty Representative to the NCAA*  
*John Lepri, Faculty Senate Chair* | Yes | |
| 3:40 | Resolution #FS-02062013-02: *To Support the UNC Faculty Assembly’s Resolutions regarding the Strategic Directions proposal for the UNC System*  
*John Lepri, Faculty Senate Chair and Member, UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation* | Yes | |
| 4:10 | Report: Faculty Assembly Report of the January 18 Meeting  
*John Lepri, Faculty Senate Chair and Member, UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation* | No | D |
| 4:20 | Report/Presentation: UNCG’s Climate Action Plan (Draft)  
*Trey McDonald, Sustainability Coordinator for Operations* | No | |
| 5:00 | Adjournment | Yes | |

### NOTES:

- **Refreshments will be available from 2:30-3:00 pm in the Byrd Parlor of the Alumni House**

- **FACULTY SENATE FORUM**  
  Wednesday, February 13, 2013, 3:00 to 5:00 pm, Virginia Dare Room  
  - UNC President, Tom Ross, will speak on the UNC Strategic Directions Process & Implementation and answer questions from faculty

- **Next Faculty Senate Meeting:** *Wednesday, March 6, 2012*, Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House  
  - **Agenda Items Due:** *Wednesday, February 18, 2013*
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
December 5, 2012  
3:00-5:00 pm, Virginia Dare Room  
John Lepri, Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</th>
<th>Discussion/Motion</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome: Senate Chair John Lepri</td>
<td>The Senate Chair opened the meeting at 3:04. Two Senators were absent because of exams. Chancellor was absent due to a concurrent Board of Trustees meeting; the Provost was expected to arrive late due to the Board meeting as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/Approve Minutes of November 7, 2012: Senate Chair John Lepri</td>
<td>Minutes of the November 7, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting were presented for review and approval.</td>
<td>Minutes approved by Unanimous Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Agenda: Senate Chair John Lepri</td>
<td>The agenda was presented for review and modification; no changes were made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UNC Faculty Assembly Report Patti Sink Chair-Elect | The Provost not having yet arrived, Lepri proposed that Patti Sink present her report from the UNC Faculty Assembly meeting. All Senators present were referred to the summary of the November 30, 2012 meeting as presented in a handout while Sink emphasized the key points:  
• Academic aspects of strategic planning, i.e., an agreement between the North Carolina Community Colleges and the UNC System to have a common core in place by 2014;  
• Common general education competencies across UNC universities facilitating ease of transfer of course work from North Carolina’s Community Colleges to UNC Universities  
• Setting and reaching degree attainment goals – to achieve 32% baccalaureate degree attainment by 2018, emphasizing increasing the success and timelines of UNC students’ graduation as well as meeting North Carolina workforce needs;  
• Update on state and federal legislators including a push to invite state legislators to campuses to attend classes and interact with faculty and students rather than solely with administrators in an effort to increase their awareness and appreciation of the academic environment, goals, and competencies  
• Cathy Rigsby summarized at the end of the day the work of six Faculty Assembly committees, which resulted in three resolutions having to do with general education, minimum general education competencies, and optional retirement program employer contribution rate. |                                                                          |
| Remarks: Provost David Perrin | The Provost arrived from the Board of Trustees meeting and was asked by the Senate Chair to give his remarks:                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                          |
Update on the three Dean searches

- School of Health and Human Sciences -- 7 semifinalists interviewed; narrowed to 3 finalists interviewed further:
  - Celia Hooper, Dean, School of Human Health and Sciences
  - Jay Graves, Dean, College of Health, University of Utah;
  - Kelli Brown, Interim Dean, College of Health and Human Performance, University of Florida
  Anonymous Feedback has been received from all stakeholders;
  Search Committee will meet on 12/5; Committee Chair will meet with Provost on 12/7/12.

- School of Music, Theater, and Dance — 9 semifinalists interviewed; narrowed to 3 finalists interviewed further:
  - John Richmond, Director, School of Music, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
  - Jonathan Santore, Chair, Department of Music, Theater and Dance, Plymouth State University
  - Sara Baird, Chair, Music Department, Auburn University
  Anonymous feedback has been received from all stakeholders; Search Committee will meet on 12/14; Committee Chair will meet with Provost TBD.

- School of Nursing — 3 semifinalists interviewed; 2 finalists interviewed further:
  - Patricia (Trish) Morton, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, University of Maryland School of Nursing
  - Robin Remsburg, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Director, School of Nursing, George Mason University.
  Anonymous Feedback has been received from all stakeholders; Search Committee will meet on 12/12; Committee Chair will meet with Provost TBD.

The Provost noted that over 500 people were contacted for each search in all, including those who recommended candidates; great effort was expended in gathering individuals from diverse backgrounds, including outreach to HBCUs as well as a number of national associations.

Update on the Downtown University Campus:

- **General Background** — The Provost gave general background of the effort as an initiative of Opportunity Greensboro. A planning team began their work in September 2011; a second phase of planning has just been initiated, which will deliver facility financing and site options in April/May 2013, along with feasibility studies for the potential programs.

- **Programs** — The Planning team has identified the most likely programs for a shared downtown campus:
  - Health Sciences and Nursing
  - Executive Education and Leadership
  - Degrees Matter (a program to encourage area residents with partial degrees to complete their degrees)
  - Global Opportunities Center (Higher education institutions and Community partners working to expand global opportunities for individuals and businesses. The Center would include both academic programs and business support services.)

- **Financial Rationale** — If we move some programs from the colleges and universities to a shared space, we give expansion space to programs that
are currently constrained on their home campuses; provide space for new programs that do not have a home; compliment nearby undergraduate programs; create space efficiencies, for example classroom space and executive education space have the same the same features). Specifically for nursing, if we combine some nursing programs, they can share lab space and equipment; the program can take engaged nurses and nursing students at almost every level: RN to BSN, Doctoral nursing study, and continuing education. We thereby have an opportunity to meet a national need for nurses, and more importantly, do it in a unique way. It makes financial sense.

- **Differentiates Greensboro**
  - The Center would showcase Greensboro as a college town; bring visibility to a thriving downtown; show innovative thinking (capitalizing the strength of our colleges and universities to create new and better jobs in Greensboro) and demonstrate that Greensboro is developing our future workforce in a proactive way.

- **Possible Sites**—the team is currently reviewing 4-5 different sites. It will identify a list of important criteria and then go through an objective process that will determine the best location for such a facility.

- **Facility Size**—at present, the team anticipates a facility in the 80,000-100,000 sq. ft. range.

- **Facility funding**—the financial model will likely include revenue from leased space and grants. The Planning Committee will develop these details over the next 5-6 months.

- **Funding the Planning Effort**—the funding for the next phase of planning is approximately $225,000. Action Greensboro foundations have committed $75,000; the companies and institutions of Opportunity Greensboro have committed $75,000; the city of Greensboro has been asked to commit the remaining $75,000.

- **Next Steps**—over the next 5-6 months, the planning committee will complete the needs analysis; examine best practices for this type of facility; visit University Executive Education and Conference Centers; research health sciences simulation labs; and commission a downtown Economic Impact Study.

- **Leadership for this Effort**—Opportunity Greensboro: A Business and Collegiate Partnership is a consortium of business and higher education leaders who are working to further the connections between businesses and our colleges and universities (Provost represents UNCG on a Campus Implementation Team)

**Tuition Increases**
Tuition increases were passed by the Student Affairs Committee of The Board of Trustees:

- 4% increase for in-state undergraduate and graduate students, which will amount to $153 and $175 respectively;
- 1% increase for out-of-state students resulting in the same respective dollar amounts ($153, $175) being added to their tuition bills
- $2.6 million in revenues to be generated – 25% for need-based financial aid, 3% for graduate student tuition waivers, 66% for faculty retention with the remainder to be used for academic advising and career advancement
- The increase will be voted on by the full Board and then be sent forward to the Board of Governors and General Administration to go into effect
for the 2013-2014 academic year.

**Questions/Comments**

What other uses are contemplated for the Downtown University Campus?
- The team is looking at a Spokane collaborative model of where to expand.

Concern expressed over the impact of tuition increases on students
- The Senate was reminded that the Board of Trustees approved a 4% increase last year, and deferred a second 4% increase until this year to see how the economy panned out. The $153 approved last year is matched by the $153 this year with 25% of the money going to our neediest students.

### Resolution #FS12052012-01
To Allow for the Participation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in The UNCG Faculty Senate

Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee, was called forth to present Resolution #FS12052012-01: To Allow for the Participation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in The UNCG Faculty Senate.

Bruce read the resolution and Susan Collins, also a member of the Faculty Governance Committee, offered points of clarification:
- voting members of the General Faculty include Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF), who already elect Faculty Senators; they want to be able to serve as well as vote for others
- concerns were raised by the Graduate Studies Committee that NTTF serving on Faculty Senate would be in position to vote on matters involving graduate courses/programs/matters – it was pointed out that not all Senators on Faculty Senate are members of the graduate faculty;
- in response to the concern about filling the position of a member whose appointment is not renewed, mechanisms are already in place
- the University P&T committee membership self selects those who are eligible to serve - there is no need to change the membership guidelines;

Josh Hoffman made a motion to add the following language in the Be It Resolved statement: “…who are voting members of the General Faculty… the motion was seconded by Beth Barba and the vote to accept the wording change was approved by unanimous vote.

After more discussion, Patti Sink called the question to end the discussion; the Senate voted 19 (yea), 7 (nay) and 0 (abstain) to end discussion. Following, a vote was taken to approve the resolution as amended: 27 (yea), 0 (nay), 1 (abstain). The text of the amended section of the resolution is as follows:

> Be it Resolved, that the Senate endorses the development of eligibility guidelines for non-tenure track faculty, who are voting members of the General Faculty, to stand for election to the Faculty Senate and instructs the Faculty Government Committee to submit to the Senate a resolution implementing these guidelines, with any necessary changes to the Constitution of the Faculty.

### Resolution #FS12052012-02
To Endorse UNCG’s Selection of Topics for its Quality Enhancement Plan

Vidya Gargeya and John Sopper, Co-Chairs of the Quality Enhancement Plan, presented the resolution To Endorse UNCG’s selection of Topics for its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Options.

Ben Ramsey called the question to have the resolution put before the Senate;
Steve Yarborough provided the second to the motion and discussion ensued:

- can forums be reopened? yes
- how were the proposals selected? Vidya gave a review
  - 25 proposals received in one-month period including additional revisions; proposals were ranked from one to ten; there were three meetings in all to consider which proposals were most worthy, and ran these by SACS leadership team (Chancellor, Provost, Reade Taylor)
- what purpose does the Faculty Senate vote/approval serve? – to endorse the proposals
- is this stamp of approval given to all five proposals or, do we keep going with process? – the vote is for process,
- what happens after the Faculty Senate vote? --there will be a referendum for the main proposal
- will these be voted on by students too? -- Yes.

A vote was taken on the resolution:

Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate endorses further development and consideration of the five following QEP topic ideas leading to the determination in Spring 2013 of a single topic idea for UNCG’s QEP:

- Proposal C: Community Engagement
- Proposal E: Global Engagement
- Proposal D: Communication Enriched Curriculum
- Proposal W: Informed and engaged Citizenship
- Proposal Z: Interdisciplinary Problem Solving

Vote to endorse: 22 (yea), 2 (nay), 4 (abstain)

Resolution #FS 12052012-03 To Revise the Charge of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Removing Overlap with Responsibilities of the General Education Council Chair John Lepri

Senate Chair Lepri read the resolution and explained the need for it, i.e., to remove language within the charge of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee that refers to activities for which the direct responsibility now falls under the purview of the General Education Council, specifically:

- serving as the oversight committee for administration of all aspects of the General Education Core (GEC), including oversight of the ten GEC category committees and the GEC Assessment Committee and final designation of courses for GEC credit.
- Overseeing the adherence to the General Education Program (GEP) by the units, and providing for the required annual and five-year reviews of the GEP an the GEC committees

The vote was taken amend the charge to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with the following result: 27 (yea), 0 (nay), 1 (abstain)

Resolution #FS12052012-03 was approved by majority vote

Report/Presentation: Data Management Policy Christina Rodriguez, Chair, Research Policies Committee

Christina Rodriguez, Chair of the Research Policies Committee, shared with the Senate the importance of the newly established data management policy and asked that it be widely distributed to faculty (http://policy.uncg.edu/research_data) The bottom line is that any data collected, products produced, etc. while on campus belong to the University and ownership extends to disposal. The following are excerpts from the Policy on Access to and Retention of Research Data that was presented to the Senate:

- the intent of this policy is to provide for the creation of an environment that maximizes the ability of investigators and the
institution to ensure that research data are stored, retained, made accessible for use and reuse, and/or disposed of, according to legal, statutory, ethical and funding bodies' requirements.

- The Policy on Access to and Retention of Research Data applies to all University faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows, students and any other persons, including consultants, involved in the design, conduct or reporting of research performed at or under the auspices of the University regardless of the funding source for the project.

- The Principal Investigator (PI) of a research study is the primary custodian/steward of Research Data and Materials generated in the context of that study. The PI provides scholarly leadership and bears primary responsibility for technical, programmatic, fiscal, and administrative requirements of the project, working in partnership with the department, division, and university administration to manage and protect the Research Data and Materials produced at the University.

- Any violation of this policy by faculty or staff may be considered "misconduct" under EPA policies (faculty and EPA non-faculty) and "unacceptable personal conduct" under SPA policies. Violations of law may also be referred for criminal or civil prosecution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report/Presentation: Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Patrick Lucas</th>
<th>Patrick Lucas gave a brief report of the newly constituted Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons, which reflects the university’s learning-centered approach and embraces innovative teaching, collaborative opportunities and creative ways for faculty to reach out to each other and to others through their work: development &amp; training as it impacts students; development &amp; training as it impacts faculty and staff. He shared that the faculty mentoring program is expanding to NTT faculty and Graduate students; Faculty Fellows under Nell Thacker, now has scanning services. (see attachment) Hot button issues are online learning and experimental learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment: Senate Chair John Lepri</td>
<td>The Chair called for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:00. Motion to Adjourn: Ramsey Second: Carmichael The Chair called for a vote. All in favor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carmichael
Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2012-2013
Faculty Teaching & Learning Commons

[a working definition]
...a place for those who bring teaching to life
...a space to meet, discuss, act, and reflect
...a site for lifelong learning.

Newly constituted in 2012 within Undergraduate Studies, the Faculty Teaching & Learning Commons [FTLC] reflects the university’s learning-centered approach and embraces innovative teaching, collaborative opportunities, and creative ways for faculty to reach out to each other and to others through their work.

FTLC recognizes the value of good teachers. They bring a myriad of experiences to and from the classroom, studio, laboratory, and community. From a wide range of disciplines, training, and perspectives, they constitute UNCG’s greatest asset.

The FTLC provides a place for those who bring teaching to life.

FTLC honors the spirit of engagement. Human interaction and engaging conversations provide the foundation for positive change at UNCG. Centered on the practice of teaching and learning, we open a space for dialogue and meaningful exchange at the heart of campus, a crossroads where faculty, staff, and community partners gather to discern and resolve issues for each other, for the university, and for the community.

The FTLC serves a space to meet, discuss, act, and reflect.

FTLC believes in transformation. We recognize that learning takes place in many ways and impacts many people – our colleagues, the students we teach, the agencies and organizations that we assist in our work, and the community in which we live. By focusing on quality programs and efforts that help teachers become better at their craft, we believe we can meet the high demands of the twenty-first century head on.

The FTLC stands as a site for lifelong learning.

DEVELOPMENT + TRAINING
as it impacts students

DEVELOPMENT + TRAINING
as it impacts faculty + staff
Faculty Teaching & Learning Commons
services + programs for anyone who brings teaching to life

- workshops on blackboard + a wide range of other electronic media
- seminars on pedagogy, teaching strategies, research topics
- multi-disciplinary conversations about life as a faculty member
- opportunities to share excellence in research + teaching + service
- other programs of interest to faculty + professional staff

- one-on-one consultation: classroom, online, experiential
- observation in the classroom + coaching
- pin-up/critique of teaching materials

- long range planning + visioning for departments, groups
- consultation on curriculum revision

- grants for innovation in the classroom
- Oak Foundation/College Star participation
- university-wide teaching awards
- Lilly Conference

- new faculty orientation
- faculty mentoring program
- faculty fellows

- faculty + staff learning communities: service learning, future faculty, digital media, universal design for learning, integrated pedagogy, and more

- online resources for teaching...Blackboard, blog, website, other media

who’s on staff...
patrick lee lucas, interim executive director
bryant hutson, associate director
michelle solér, senior director (on loan from DCL)
rob owens, trainer + consultant
amanda schipman, trainer + consultant
judy johnson, office manager
leslie brown, graduate assistant
faculty fellows
faculty + staff who help with our programs

on the ground...256 McIver : 140 McIver : 321 McIver : Faculty Center
online...uncgftlc.blogspot.com + www.uncg.edu/tlc
on the phone...336.334.5080
by email...ftlc@uncg.edu

FTLC
24 sept 2012
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS-02062013-01

To Recommend Candidates for the Faculty Representative to the NCAA

Presented by John Lepri, Faculty Senate Chair
on behalf of the Committee on Committees, Julia Hersberger, Chair

WHEREAS, the position of Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association is being vacated, and

WHEREAS, the charge to the Committee on Committees includes recommending to the Chancellor, upon approval by the Faculty Senate, the names of three tenured faculty members from which the Chancellor may select UNCG’s Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following three names be approved by the Faculty Senate and subsequently recommended to the Chancellor to select UNCG’s Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, whose duties shall also include serving as Chair of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics:

- David Wyrick
- Ambrose Jones
- Craig Cashwell

Faculty Senate Action/Date: 
Chancellor 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

Resolution #FS02062013-02

To Support the UNC Faculty Assembly’s Resolutions regarding the Strategic Directions proposal for the UNC System

Presented by John Lepri, Faculty Senate Chair and Member of the UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly of the 17 constituent campuses of the University of North Carolina has met and considered the January 16, 2013 draft report of the five-year strategic plan, Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly and President Ross constituted a Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) which submitted a set of recommendations in the document, Our University, Our Future: A Faculty Vision for UNC Strategic Directions, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly resolved that the Faculty Advisory Council recommendations and Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03 be incorporated into the final strategic plan, and

WHEREAS, the faculty and administration of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, through shared governance, are best positioned to choose, implement, and evaluate the appropriate curricular and co-curricular activities, service, engagement, and economic development activities in pursuit of its mission, and

WHEREAS, our regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and other professional accrediting bodies, require that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty, and

WHEREAS, SACS and other accrediting bodies periodically and comprehensively examine and affirm the quality of educational programs, and require that the faculty lead the assessment of the academic programs of the University, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the strategic plan must reflect that the faculty, in their role as educational experts and as those charged with ensuring the highest academic quality programs, are the primary body to select course content and design, method of delivery, and to assess all academic programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the recommendations articulated in the FAC response report of January 13, 2013, and in Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03, be incorporated into the final Strategic Directions proposal.

Faculty Senate 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.
January 19, 2013

Dear President Ross,

The UNC Faculty Assembly met on Friday, January 18th, to discuss and formulate a response to the draft of the strategic plan, “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina,” that was distributed on Thursday, January 17th. The Faculty Advisory Council met the previous evening (January 17) for the same purpose. Our formal response is contained in the attached documents. Please note that the faculty worked hard to provide the requested response as quickly as possible. The faculty remain committed to continuing to work with you as we move into the final stages of this planning process.

Our major recommendations for and concerns with the draft strategic plan can be summarized as follows:

- The Faculty Assembly endorses the Faculty Advisory Committee Response Report and requests that the recommendations in that report be incorporated into the strategic plan.

- The Faculty Assembly is very concerned about the insufficient acknowledgment that faculty have primary responsibility for design, delivery, and assessment of the curriculum – no matter how or where that curriculum is delivered. Our accrediting bodies require us to actively demonstrate this faculty oversight. Our campuses risk losing accreditation if this faculty oversight is lacking.

- The Faculty Assembly is alarmed by the recommendation for the use of a single instrument to assess student learning. Single measures, such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) or other standardized exams, are inadequate measures of the depth and breadth of general education programs. In fact, institutional average scores on the CLA and similar exams are highly correlated with the institutions’ average SAT scores; hence these instruments provide no new information (and add to the cost of our students’ education). The strategic plan must endorse the expertise and control of the faculty in selection of the appropriate method for assessment of academic programs.

- The Faculty Assembly is concerned that the e-Learning section of the draft does not adequately address effectiveness and efficiency issues; assessment of e-learning instructor qualifications; means of determining appropriate e-learning student populations; and development of an investment policy that can leverage system-wide expertise and efficiencies in software deployment, instructional and information technology infrastructure cost and support, and other infrastructure considerations.

- The draft plan fails to capture the variety of research and scholarship underway on our campuses and the impact of such research and scholarship on student learning. The plan would be enhanced if the experience and expertise of existing UNC faculty were given greater influence in determining the direction of the individual campuses and if the specific mission of each of those campuses was a central presupposition in any decisions that result in prioritization of research areas. Research and creative activities in all fields – including the sciences, liberal arts, social sciences, humanities, creative arts and professional disciplines – are essential to a healthy University and to well-educated students.

The emphasis in the draft plan on a very few new hires, regardless of the terminology used for those hires (rainmaker, national leader, etc.), is misplaced. Increased support for existing faculty would be a much more effective use of state dollars.

- Finally, the draft document contains many inconsistencies that could make implementation difficult:
  - The most valuable asset of the University, as stated on page 5 of the draft, is the knowledge and expertise of the faculty. Nevertheless, the plan spells out an educational future that is determined without sufficient faculty consultation and consideration.
Although the plan suggests that the proposed strategies are data-driven (page 2), it is full of preconceptions. The facts do not drive the outcomes. For example, what current or historical data support the assertions that we need more on-line Liberal Arts majors; that e-Learning is less expensive than face-to-face, on campus delivery of curriculum; that MOOCs are effective ways to ensure student learning; or that the business community is the appropriate authority for determining our University’s research agenda?

The plan notes that there are 17 constituent institutions, but it fails to recognize the unique mission of each of the universities. For example, the plan discusses research priorities for the UNC system, but it does not establish how each of the universities, consistent with their missions, will benefit from these priorities. Nor does it establish the role the faculty on each campus will play in identifying the priorities.

Although there is much focus on increasing attainment goals, the plan does not realistically resource the expansion of enrollments necessary to meet its long-term goals. Many of the students in this expanded pool of matriculants will be less qualified and less prepared than current students, thus will require additional support services and advising – because they will likely be drawn from the lower ends of the admissions pool. Retention and graduation rates may be adversely affected if the additional resource needs are not met. Furthermore, a potential conflict with current MAR policies that may affect the number of these students that can be admitted.

The plan acknowledges the constitutional mandate to keep costs as low as possible, but it does not address how the financial needs of the students will be met. The combination of recent budget cuts and increased attention to efficiency means that any further increases in efficiency will be relatively small. The need for increases in financial aid, particularly grants-in-aid and fellowships, must be addressed to ensure that UNC can meet its constitutional mandate without overly burdening our students with debt. Any increase in student loan debt will act as a drag on the economic growth benefits derived from the additional graduates.

These concerns are more fully explained in the Faculty Advisory Council Response Report and Faculty Assembly Resolutions (attached). I will also provide, separately, a compilation of the faculty feedback I have received as of today, January 19th. Additional faculty feedback will be forwarded as it becomes available.

Faculty around the state know that you value their hard work and commitment to assuring the best university system in the nation. The Faculty Assembly recognizes that strategic planning is an ongoing process and we look forward to working with the General Administration and with the Board of Governors as we continue to refine and implement the 2013-2018 strategic plan.

On behalf of the UNC Faculty Assembly,

Catherine A. Rigsby
Professor of Sedimentology and Chair of the UNC Faculty Assembly
Department of Geological Sciences
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC  27858-4353

Enclosures:  Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-01
            FAC Response Report
            Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-02
            Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-03

cc:  UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates and Alternates
Resolution in Response to the January 16, 2013 Draft Strategic Plan
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly
January 18, 2013

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly of the 17 constituent campuses of the University of North Carolina has met and considered the January 16, 2013, draft report of the five-year strategic plan “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina;” and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly and President Ross constituted a Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) which submitted a set of recommendations in the document “Our University, Our Future: A Faculty Vision for UNC Strategic Directions;” and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly affirms the goals of the strategic plan to increase the population of college educated North Carolinians; to provide excellence in teaching, research and service; and to serve the people in North Carolina by ensuring access to the University for all qualified students while maximizing efficiencies and effectiveness; and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly endorses the commitment to North Carolina as articulated in the “UNC Compact” section of the draft Strategic Plan; and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly asserts that the commitments of the UNC Compact require the experience and expertise of faculty in determining the direction of the UNC system’s constituent institutions to ensure that administrative decisions reflect the missions of each institution; and

Whereas, the Faculty Assembly understands that strategic planning is an ongoing process and looks forward to faculty and student involvement in the implementation of the strategic plan’s programs and initiatives;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the recommendations articulated in the FAC response report and in Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03 be incorporated into the final strategic plan.
Faculty Advisory Council\(^1\) Response to  
*Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina*  
Strategic Directions for 2013-2018 (January 16, 2013 Draft)

“When the state has made investments in the quality of its Universities - generation after generation - it has made the single most important contribution that a state can make to the creation of an economic engine.”  
-- President Molly Corbett Broad

“The irony of it is, that now that we have done this, been so productive and produced this kind of economy, that same level of support has not been accorded these institutions in the last ten years. We have got to open our eyes now and get back to work.”  
-- President William Friday\(^2\)

In the short timeframe provided for feedback to the draft UNC system 2013-2018 strategic plan – *Our Time, Our Future: the UNC Compact with North Carolina* – faculty on the UNC system campuses have worked to understand and thoughtfully consider the goals and action items posed in the plan and whether those goals and action items would assist in our UNC system mission to discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society\(^3\). Whereas many of the values and goals in the plan resonate with faculty, we recommend some specific alternatives to the plan’s action items. Our recommendations will improve the plan.

This Response Report is a product of the *Faculty Advisory Council* (FAC) and is intended to fulfill the Council’s charge by providing input to President Ross and the UNC Strategic Directions Committee. Faculty recognize The University of North Carolina system as a transformative organization that brings national and international recognition to North Carolina. We conscientiously work as faculty to fulfill the constitutional mandate that “education be as free as practicable.”\(^4\) We are pleased that the draft strategic plan also recognizes this important goal.

While this Response Report focuses on points of critique with the draft strategic plan, we acknowledge that the plan also contains initiatives that would move us forward as a system and are of critical interest to faculty. We agree with many points of the plan:

- We are aware of the pressures on state budgets and their effects on the delivery of educational content and the traditional approach to support higher education.
- We agree that the increasing cost of higher education negatively impacts the degree attainment goals of both students and the system.
- We likewise agree that our responsibility to the citizens and taxpayers of North Carolina is to maintain and improve access and to add value to the students’ education.
- We recognize that technology can have a positive effect on the role of faculty and their delivery of educational materials.

With renewed faculty commitment, we are poised to meet the needs of the state and the challenges of cost and access to higher education while delivering the highest quality curriculum to our current and prospective students. We are a

\(^{1}\) Susan Cannata, UNCP; Georgie Donovan, ASU; Vidyaranya B. Gargeya, UNCG; David A. Green, NCCU; Scott Imig, UNCW; Trudy F. C. Mackay, NCSU; Purificación Martínez, ECU; Erin McNelis, WCU; Catherine A. Rigsby, ECU and committee chair; Brian Sims, NCA&T; Eddy M. Souffrant, UNCC; Rachel Willis, UNCC; and Linda Wilson-Jones, FSU

\(^{2}\) From interviews examining the unique partnership between universities, industry and government that has transformed the entire state. In “North Carolina’s Research Triangle Park: An Investment in the Future,” documentary by John Wilson, 1999, [http://vimeo.com/11199745](http://vimeo.com/11199745)

\(^{3}\) [http://www.northcarolina.edu/about/mission.htm](http://www.northcarolina.edu/about/mission.htm)

\(^{4}\) North Carolina Charter, Section IX, Article 9, 1789
faculty with diverse research interests and a wide and deep range of disciplinary expertise, committed to meet the mission of our respective institutions and the region. In this context, we offer feedback intended to help inform and improve the draft plan and ensure constituent buy-in and effective implementation.

Response to Goal 1: Degree Attainment Goals

The FAC believes in the value of higher education and agrees that everyone deserves access to higher education. We especially hope that the Board of Governors and the state legislature will commit to the substantial resources necessary to sustain enrollment and meet the attainment goals described in the plan.

As North Carolina envisions its future, planning for an educated citizenry is a necessity. However, simply filling current market demand without a strategic discussion about building a sustainable education future for this state will short-change the citizens. While the state must position itself to take advantage of developing fields, markets, and technologies; educators must aspire to develop students who are creative, versatile, adaptable, holistic, and ever-learning.

The FAC asserts the need to ensure that adequate resources are available to make possible achieving these goals. The current draft of the plan inadequately addresses this resource need, which must include both state financial support and continued strong collaboration with the K-12 and NCCC systems to ensure the development of a strong pipeline of academically prepared students.

The previous strategic plan, UNC Tomorrow, placed emphasis on both teacher preparation and global-readiness. The FAC urges a renewed commitment to these two important promises to the state, which remain unmet.

The UNC system must have actionable plans to make higher-education attainable for all citizens of North Carolina. Those plans must reflect the cultural diversity present in North Carolina’s student, staff, faculty, and administrative populations. Attention to facilitating success for our culturally diverse populations is not addressed in the current draft of the strategic plan.

Response to Goal 2: Strengthening Academic Quality

The FAC asserts that academic quality should be the primary focus of our efforts in higher education. We reject the notion that the industrial education complex can devise better assessment tools than faculty. We reject the idea that a single standardized test will provide better assessment of student learning or better transparency. We reject the adequacy of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to assess general education. We have serious concerns about the aggressive e-learning/MOOC agenda described in the plan, especially in regard to how academic quality, efficient use of resources, and faculty responsibility for the curriculum will be sustained. We assert the uniqueness of each of the 17 campuses in the UNC system and the need to respect their individual missions when considering general education programs, program duplication, and assessment methods.

Assessment

The plan recommends development of a “robust competency-based general education learning outcomes assessment strategy,” and “quantitative measures of...student learning” in collaboration with Educational Testing Service (ETS) and focuses on the CLA as a pilot project which may be expanded to other campuses. We assert, as we did in our original
report to the UNC Strategic Directions Committee, the primacy of multiple methods of assessment to capture the complexity of student learning on our campuses.

The CLA is an inadequate measurement of students’ critical thinking skills and an inappropriate tool for measuring other general education strategies. It correlates directly with SAT scores, thus provides no new information about students – at a high cost to those students. Moreover, the raw data from the CLA are not directly available to campus instructors. This lack of transparency makes it especially difficult to use CLA results to improve the curriculum.

We urge a revision of the draft to support useful assessment that is aligned with the missions of the constituent institutions (as reflected through their General Education program), is conducted by the respective faculty of those institutions, and uses multiple methods and instruments. We agree with the plan’s emphasis on the need for clarity about our student learning measurements and accountability for student learning outcomes. However, to reduce the complexity of student learning in college to the scores on a standardized test is to inaccurately portray the nature of learning to stakeholders. Moving toward standardized testing for assessment and investing in the education industry to assess students is a devaluation of the faculty expertise in student learning throughout the system and an inadequate way to clearly portray student learning.

**General Education**

In our original report, the FAC pointed out commonalities among general education programs, as well as the importance of honoring the unique missions of each university.

**The most crucial change needed to the strategic planning draft is a clear assertion that faculty must drive the effort to create and develop curriculum, including the general education curriculum and our e-Learning agenda.**

In Goals Two and Four of the draft strategic plan, there are competing versions of how the system-wide general education programs should be revised. **Those conflicts must be resolved.**

The plan’s action steps must ensure that campus faculty retain responsibility for the creation and delivery of our General Education programs; including program requirements, specific courses, and assessment. As we have previously pointed out, and as has been endorsed by both Faculty Assembly and campus resolutions, faculty should frame these efforts within the three foundations upon which public higher education in North Carolina is built: 1) the requirements of our regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC); 2) the UNC Statement of Mission; and 3) the complementary missions of each of the constituent institutions. We respectfully demand a faculty-led process to consider shared General Education competencies and transferability and a revision of the general education section in Goal Four that removes references to specific General Education program requirements and the suggestion that the General Education programs on our campuses be “standardized.” This faculty-led process would alleviate many of these deep concerns.

**Response to Goal 3: Serving the People of North Carolina**

The FAC affirms the significance and ongoing import of serving the state and being responsive to the needs of its people. The FAC is concerned about the emphasis in the draft plan on hiring new superstar faculty in “priority” research areas. Instead, we assert that research in the UNC system will be better served by nurturing in-place faculty researchers by

---


providing adequate support (release time, laboratories, equipment, etc.) and hiring new, young, creative, entry-level faculty through our standard and very rigorous process.

Furthermore, new star faculty are extremely costly and their hire often results in dysfunctional departments where the emphasis is on new faculty earning grants rather than collaboration and student success. Simply put, it is more expensive to hire and support new star faculty than to enhance support those we already have. We recommend the plan eliminate the action item to create these new highly-paid positions and use that funding to build structural resources and support for faculty more globally and to continue to recruit entry-level faculty through the normal, rigorous hiring process.

Another shortcoming of the plan is the very limited set of research areas highlighted for priority funding and the lack of faculty input used to determine those fields. These shortcomings limit the flexibility of the system and the campuses and diminish our ability to respond to the need to create graduates who can build fields of knowledge that are not even on the current horizon. While we embrace the ideal of promoting priority research areas, we assert that research priorities should include innovative, creative, and flexible initiatives developed by faculty and should be consistent with each university’s mission.

The plan should support basic research for its own sake, as well as for the more practical benefits of knowledge, profit, and training. Basic research sustains and fosters development in a wide range of fields, trains students to develop solutions in areas of inquiry, and creates networks of thought. Basic research attracts the innovators of the future.

We must also acknowledge that research in the arts and humanities goes hand-in-hand with scientific inquiry. Without strong support of research in these areas, students will not learn critical awareness and will not develop historical and political consciousness, social sensibility, and aesthetic perception. Scholarship in the arts and humanities also directly enhances our economy and our communities. Hence, the FAC urges the specific inclusion of the creative arts, the liberal arts, the social sciences, professional disciplines, and the humanities as “game-changing” endeavors.

Response to Goal 4: Maximizing Efficiencies

The FAC found many points of agreement in the efficiencies section of the draft. We agree with the idea of centralizing common financial information review. Sharing IT infrastructure and resources among smaller campuses has also been useful, but only when the sharing does not harm fast turnaround on needed, location-specific IT services and when it does not impede the engines of innovation on our campuses that aid in developing online programs and technology-based curricula. Most importantly (and greatly needed), we applaud the recommendation for carry-forward budgeting reform which will incentivize savings practices.

However, some specific recommendations for centralization are problematic, especially when they affect the curriculum. Not only is it best practice that faculty take ownership of the curriculum, our accrediting bodies require that “the institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty.”

When efficiency standards affect curriculum, faculty must lead the process.

Active portfolio management
Management of frequency of specialized classes and class sizes in disciplines for purposes of efficiency is best done at the department level with oversight by the dean. Centralized principles and data are desirable and should be provided to the campuses and deans. As expressed in the plan, section size considerations target need to “respect campus and

7 SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation (http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp) Comprehensive Standard 3.4.10 (responsibility for curriculum)
program perogatives to set course schedules” and the need to take into consideration the capacity of the physical classrooms. The main consideration should be maintaining high-quality instruction.

Setting more consistent expectations for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) is desirable if it is connected to a set of minimum competencies expected from all General Education programs. This would enhance portability of courses. But, both SLOs and the “framework of coursework” must be developed by faculty. Administrators should not be involved in the development of SLOs, unless they are active and credentialed instructors in the specific courses.

Common instructional resources have only limited practicability. The development and selection of course materials by individual instructors enhances the quality of instruction. This is because instructor-prepared course materials coincide with both the expertise of the faculty member and the approach that faculty member takes in presenting the course content.

The expansion of online instruction should not be based solely on anticipated savings. The calculations of savings should be linked to the assessment of the SLOs of online courses. Savings should only be considered real when the respective online courses have equal or greater SLOs than traditional classes.

Because UNCW’s Predictive Analytics Project is being currently designed and constructed, it should be studied and evaluated in operation before being considered for implementation at other campuses or throughout the system.

As stated above, inconsistencies between Goal Two and Goal Four with regard to a common core or a shared General Education set of courses and requirements must be addressed. Sharing general education competencies, developing those shared competency expectations with a faculty-led group, and assessing those competencies with a variety of assessment methodologies and strategies is a goal that the FAC Council can support. The FAC cannot support a shared curriculum developed by non-faculty, the use of a single standardized test for assessment, or an administrator-led initiative that fails to place primary responsibility for the curriculum in the hands of the faculty.

Response to Goal 5: Ensuring an Accessible and Financially Stable University

The FAC supports the draft plan’s acknowledgement of the constitutional mandate of low cost to students for higher education. The goals within this section to enhance private fundraising, sustain robust support for need-based financial aid, and benchmark tuition rates with other states could help us provide access to education for all.

Overall Concerns with the Draft Plan

There are several overarching issues in the draft strategic plan about which both the FAC and faculty on campuses across the UNC system have expressed concern:

- Accreditation standards from SACSCOC mandate that each institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with the faculty. SACSCOC mandates that the curriculum and programs offered correspond directly to each of the campuses’ mission. We affirm the need to understand the SACSCOC standards, requirements, and mandates, and ensure that the UNC Strategic Plan does nothing to negatively affect individual institution’s accreditation status. Accreditation affects federal (and state) funding, the ability to attract and retain students, the ability to transfer credit among institutions, and the reputation of the university.
• A liberal arts education has the power to create graduates ready for the jobs of the future. The draft plan focuses too specifically on a narrow range of fields that seem to be of importance in current economic forecasts. However, we reassert that the faculty in the UNC system educate students for jobs that may not exist yet with skills that cannot yet even be imagined. This education provides a transformative experience, increasing students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities to adapt to the widest possible scope of societal and personal needs. A liberal arts education is a true driver of innovation.

• The ongoing work of students and faculty in the UNC system is about more than immediate economic benefit. We offer opportunities to gain knowledge and insight into the human condition of our time and to find what sustains us intellectually and inspirationally while we are in the midst of all the complexity of human experience.

• Innovation, as any business leader knows, is almost entirely a process driven by “bottom-up” thinking and creativity. The draft plan had a markedly top-down approach. This approach can quash the type of innovation, creativity, and “entrepreneurial spirit” that the plan aspires to engender. The plan misses the opportunity to inspire creativity and innovation by focusing away from the students, the faculty, and the diversity that is embodied in the varying missions and constituents of our campuses.

• The most valuable asset of the University is its people. The knowledge and experience of faculty at Appalachian State University, East Carolina University, Elizabeth City State University, Fayetteville State University, NC Agricultural and Technical State University, North Carolina Central University, NC State University, UNC Asheville, UNC Chapel Hill, UNC Charlotte, UNC Greensboro, UNC Pembroke, UNC Wilmington, UNC School of the Arts, Western Carolina University, Winston-Salem State University, and the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics is tremendous. These faculties have worked – alongside students, staff, and administrators; community members and alumni; state legislators and business people; members of non-profit organizations; and others – to make the UNC system an international leader in higher education and to offer transformational experiences to students. Consult and collaborate with these professionals, and the system will find a world of innovation which will drive student achievement and success and offer a return on investment to the state’s citizens which is unmatched by any other.

“...the one thing that the University has gotten right over its long history is this value equation. ... We have not only provided an education as free from expense as practicable, but we have also provided a high quality education. I have always believed that low tuition without high quality is no bargain for anyone. Not a bargain for the student. Not a bargain for the taxpayer. To [get the value equation right] in the future ... the General Assembly and taxpayers of North Carolina are going to have to realize what a critically important asset the University is to the future of our citizens. ... I hope that you will ask us, as time goes on, to do anything we can to help you get the resources you need to make sure we keep this value equation right.”

-- President Erskine Bowles

8 Erskine Bowles in An Evening with Five Presidents, Wednesday, November 9, 2011, Memorial Hall on the UNC-Chapel Hill campus. Available at http://video.unctv.org/video/2184200899/
Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Assessment
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly
January 18, 2013

Whereas, the UNC Board of Governors is proceeding through the strategic planning process for 2013-18, defining current and future priorities, examining resource allocation, and seeking efficiencies; and

Whereas, the faculty of the UNC system embody the University’s commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges; and

Whereas, our regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), requires that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty; and

Whereas, the University already applies a robust, diverse and mission appropriate set of student learning outcomes; and

Whereas, the faculty are leaders in the development and utilization of technology and new teaching pedagogies; and

Whereas, single measures such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) or other standardized exams have been established as inadequate measures of the depth and breadth of general education programs; and

Whereas, institutional average scores on the CLA and similar exams are highly correlated with the institutions’ average SAT scores, hence provide no new information; and

Whereas, SACS and other accrediting bodies periodically and comprehensively examine and affirm the quality of educational programs, and require that the faculty lead the assessment of the academic programs of the University;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the strategic plan must endorse the expertise and control of the faculty in selection of the appropriate method of delivery and assessment of academic programs; and

Be it Further Resolved That that the strategic plan must reflect that the faculty, in their role as educational experts and as those charged with ensuring the highest academic quality programs, are the primary body to select, design, and assess all academic programs.
2013-03
Resolution on Concerns with e-Learning as Presented in the Draft Strategic Plan
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly
January 18, 2013

Whereas, the UNC Faculty Assembly has serious concerns with the understanding of e-learning in the January 16, 2013, draft of the UNC Strategic Plan; and

Whereas, it is faculty who are responsible for curricular content and its delivery;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That the Faculty Assembly requests that the final version of the 2013-2018 UNC Strategic Plan explicitly address the concerns listed below.

1. Concerns about effectiveness and efficiency of e-learning:
   
   We are concerned that the strategic plan be well-grounded in the extant evidence and research on the effectiveness of e-learning practices and the cost-effectiveness of those practices, as compared to traditional instructional delivery modes.

   Although course learning outcomes must be consistent regardless of delivery mechanism, measures of that learning must be tailored to course structure and delivery mechanism. The use of appropriate measures for determining desired learning outcomes is crucial to successful assessment of e-learning courses. These measures should produce robust evidence for assessing learning outcomes in comparable institutional and discipline-specific settings, disaggregated by e-learning, traditional, and (where appropriate) hybrid (or 'blended') modes of instructional delivery.

   It is essential to evaluate the time and financial costs, to both students and the University, of alternative instructional delivery methods. Such evaluations must employ appropriate, institution- and discipline-specific measures for assessing the cost effectiveness of alternative delivery methods.

2. Concerns about instructor qualifications:

   The quality of e-learning opportunities is primarily a function of instructor skills. Expertise in the substantive intellectual content of course material is essential. Support for training and use of instructional technologies can also be important for successful delivery of e-learning opportunities.

   Appointment to e-learning teaching positions requires demonstrated discipline-specific expertise and a capacity for effective management of instructional technologies. This expertise and instructional capacity must be assessed by appropriate disciplinary faculty using appropriate departmental policies.

3. Concerns about appropriate target groups:

   There is an extensive literature demonstrating that success and completion rates for e-learning opportunities vary widely by the demographic characteristics of student populations. Extant studies also suggest that targeting e-learning opportunities to populations of students who have limited resources for pursuing other educational alternatives can maximize the potential usefulness of e-learning arrangements.

   We recommend that e-learning opportunities be targeted primarily to student populations with demonstrated likelihood of success in an e-learning environment, and especially those in resource-limited situations.

4. Concerns about infrastructure cost and support:

   Instructional and information technology is in very early stages of development. Rapid hardware and software obsolescence is the rule, not the exception. Institutional investment in these goods can be very risky. A thoughtful investment strategy should, wherever possible, maximize adaptability, compatibility, and serviceability.

   We recommend the development of investment policy that can leverage system-wide expertise and efficiencies in software deployment and development (e.g., utilizing open source programs where appropriate), and which promotes hardware and platform compatibility.
The Chairs of the Faculty Senates met at 8am to exchange perspectives on the current version of the Strategic Directions initiative of the Board of Governors. A particular problem is the rapid pace of the plan’s development, especially as this process has not sought or incorporated student viewpoints. About half of UNC schools’ Faculty Senates have passed support for a Faculty Assembly-produced resolution stating that General Education is the purview of the faculty (rather than the Board of Governors or General Administration). Other concerns, perhaps worthy of discussion in Faculty Senates, suggest inaccuracies about the costs of on-line education as well as administrative expansion at the expense of faculty to deliver classes and perform research. Many felt that SACS oversight issue and accreditation agencies are worthy of faculty discussion. Where and what is the evidence that e-learning is effective?

Tom Ross, UNC-system President, reported on the Strategic Directions efforts, describing the many changes made in the document and the great amount of feedback the academic community has offered in shaping the document. It will be considered by the Board of Governors in early February so that it can be delivered to the NC Legislators and Governor McCrory as soon as possible after that date. In response to faculty questions, he stated that the General Education Program will not consist of specific courses, but will include a set of competencies to be assessed. He was clear that SACS puts primary responsibility for the curriculum with the faculty. He commented that research in every field, and student experience in research, will continue to be valued and rewarded, but that some new fields were represented in the strategic directions document. He recognized the autonomy of the different campuses and stated that the supplemental fees for on-line courses will be halted, and they will revert to regular tuition rates. Regarding a possible increase in the number of administrators needed for the reporting of assessments, etc., it is unavoidable in the current environment. He asked that we keep the feedback coming.

Lesley Boney, UNC-system Vice President of International, Community and Economic Engagement, along with Chris Brown, reported on the results of UNC-system’s “listening tour.” Business leaders were prominent participants, and it was clear that they supported greater educational attainment at the university-level. The Center for Creative Leadership recently published survey results of what employers seek in employees (most important first): communication effectiveness, integrity and trust, self-motivated and disciplined, collaborative, customer-focused, adaptable and versatile. The same survey asked what will be important ten years from now (most important first): adaptable and versatile, communication effectiveness, learning agility, multi-culturally sensitive, self-motivating, and collaborative. They also spoke of an increased drive to translate research to products.

Drew Moretz, VP for State Government Relations, provided some instructions on legal lobbying efforts in NC.

Charlie Preuss, the UNC-system’s Vice President for Finance, provided encouragement that increased contribution by the state to the Optional Retirement Program is part of the upcoming budget request. Funds to realize the goals of the Strategic Directions will also be part of the budget request. Efforts to enhance financial aid from the state continue.

Round table discussions concerned e-learning, assessment and research. The outcomes of those discussions are included in the following text, taken from the plenary part of the session.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION IN RESPONSE TO THE 1/16/2013 DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly of the 17 constituent campuses of the University of North Carolina has met and considered the January 16, 2013 Strategic Directions Advisory Committee draft of the five-year strategic plan “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina,” and
WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly and President Ross constituted a faculty advisory council (FAC) which submitted recommendations in the document “Our University, Our Future: a faculty vision for UNC Strategic directions,” and

WHEREAS, we affirm the goals of the Strategic Plan to increase the population of college educated North Carolinians, to provide excellence in teaching, research and service, and to serve the people in North Carolina by ensuring access to the University for all qualified students while maximizing efficiencies and effectiveness, and

WHEREAS, we endorse the commitment to North Carolina as articulated in the “UNC Compact” section of the draft Strategic Plan, and

WHEREAS, Faculty Assembly asserts that the commitments of the UNC Compact require the experience and expertise of faculty in determining the direction of the System’s constituent institutions to ensure that administrative decisions reflect the missions of each institution;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly understands that Strategic Planning is an ongoing process and looks forward to faculty and student involvement in planning and implementation of programs and initiatives,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, (that) Recommendations articulated in the FAC response and corresponding FA resolutions be incorporated into the final plan.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASSESSMENT

January 18, 2013

WHEREAS, The UNC Board of Governors is proceeding through the strategic planning process for 2013-18, defining current and future priorities, examining resource allocation, and seeking efficiencies, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the UNC system embody the University’s deep commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges, and

WHEREAS, SACS requires that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty, and

WHEREAS, the University already applies a robust, diverse and mission appropriate set of student learning outcomes, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty are leaders in the development and utilization of technology and new teaching pedagogies, and

WHEREAS, single measures such as the CLA or other standardized exams have been established as inadequate measures of the depth and breadth of general education programs, and

WHEREAS, the institutional average scores on the CLA and similar exams are highly correlated with the institutions’ average SAT scores, and provide no new information, and

WHEREAS, SACS and other accrediting bodies periodically and comprehensively examine and affirm the quality of educational programs, and require that the faculty lead the assessment of the academic programs of the University,
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the strategic plan reflect that the Faculty, in their role as educational experts and as those charged with ensuring the highest academic quality programs, are the primary body to select, design, and assess all academic programs, and

ALSO BE IT RESOLVED, that the strategic plan endorse the expertise and control of the Faculty in selection of the appropriate method of delivery and assessment of academic programs.

E-LEARNING CONCERNS:

1. **Concerns about effectiveness and efficiency of e-learning**: Use appropriate measures for determining the realization of desired learning outcomes. Using appropriate disciplinary measures for assessing cost effectiveness of alternative delivery mechanisms.

2. **Concerns about instructor qualifications**: Instructors must demonstrate disciplinary expertise, as assessed by appropriate departmental faculty.

3. **Concerns about appropriate target groups**: Target e-learning opportunities to student populations with demonstrated likelihood of success in an e-learning environment, especially those in resource-limited situations.

4. **Concerns about infrastructure cost and support**: Leverage system wide expertise and efficiencies in software deployment (e.g., utilizing open source programs where appropriate). Promote hardware and platform compatibility.