

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
March 5, 2014
3:00, Virginia Dare Room
Patti Sink, Chair
Approved

Agenda Item & Presenter	Discussion/Motion	Outcome
<p>Welcome & Review of Agenda: <i>Senate Chair</i> <i>Patti Sink</i></p>	<p>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).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Motion to add the new resolution to agenda: Deb Bell. Second: Veronica Grossi</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Secret ballot vote: 21 Yes; 7 No; 2 Abstain Motion approved by the majority</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Agenda Approved Unanimously as modified.</p>

<p>Report & Recommendations: Study of Department Chair/Head Policies and Practices <i>Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee</i></p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 an administrative issue, but the administration is working closely with the Faculty Government Committee." <p>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.</p> 	
<p>Panel Discussion with Faculty Senate <i>Chancellor Linda Brady; Provost David Perrin; Vice Provost Alan Boyette, Vice Chancellors Cherry Callahan and Reade Taylor</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 <i>UNC-</i></p>	

	<p><i>System Operational Efficiency Efforts</i> (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</p> <p>Principally, the low-performing results are due to how UNCG was classified and compared with respect to other UNC institutions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><i>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)</i></p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Motion to approve: Eric Ford Second: Elizabeth Van Horn</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Resolution Tabled by the Majority</p>

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 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 we 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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Motion to Table Resolution #FS-03052014-02: Patti Sink Second: Wade Maki.</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Resolution Tabled by Majority: 27 Yes; 4 No</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>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) <i>Senate Chair Patricia Sink</i></p>	<p>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).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Motion to approve: Bill Karper Second: Kathy Crowe</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Resolution approved by majority.</p>

	<p>(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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Resolution Approved by the majority: 24 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstain.</p>	
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