

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Special Meeting
February 20, 2014
4:00, Virginia Dare Room
Patti Sink, Chair**

Approved

Agenda Item & Presenter	Discussion/Motion
<p>Welcome & Review of Agenda: <i>Senate Chair Patti Sink</i></p>	<p>Senate Chair Sink called the meeting to order at 4:00pm. She thanked the large crowd of the UNCG Community for attending the special Faculty Senate meeting. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, Sink expressed appreciation to Chancellor Linda Brady for working with the Senate and for discussing her perspectives on the upcoming budget cuts for 2014-2015. Sink also thanked the Faculty Senate for their diligent work, and said that she was honored to be a part of shared governance at UNCG. On February 10th, Sink indicated that she received a request for a special Senate meeting with Chancellor Brady, signed by 25 Senators. The meeting agenda evolved from collaborations among Faculty Senators, Senate Officers, the Immediate Past Senate Chair, the Chancellor, and the Provost. The Senate Chair said that, in the main foyer of the Alumni House, a signup sheet was available for Senators and other attendees signup to speak during the question-answer period, following the Chancellor's presentation. Sink asked Senators to review the agenda, and to offer any comments regarding the agenda; there being none, the meeting proceeded.</p>
<p>Remarks: <i>Senators Sue Dennison and Deb Bell</i></p>	<p>Sink asked Senators Susan Dennison and Deborah Bell, who facilitated the request for the meeting, to provide additional information about the purposes and rationale for the meeting. Senator Dennison thanked everyone for their presence at and contributions to the meeting. She said that the Senators know each better today than two weeks ago; everyone worked to come up with solutions to our university budget cuts. Dennison continued as follows: "In the end, 27 senators agreed that we needed a special meeting after the Provost announced at the February Senate meeting what seemed like a disproportionate amount of the budget cuts coming from Academic Affairs. We understand that we operate in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor, but our role in the academic programs is very important."</p> <p>Senator Bell stated the three objectives of today's meeting as: (1) to understand the Chancellor's rationale for the current proposed budget cuts; (2) to ask questions, offer suggestions, and entertain alternatives solutions; and (3) to recommend a maximum amount of the budget cuts that should come from Academic Affairs. We also want clarification about when a decision will be made since delaying a vote until the March senate meeting may be too late. Senator Dennison asked if the Senate could vote on the recommendations during the meeting. Chair Sink indicated that we need to distribute the recommendations within the agenda packet five working days before voting so they could be contemplated by and discussed with the Senators' constituencies. Sink said that the recommendations may be submitted for consideration during the March 5th Faculty Senate meeting.</p>
<p>Relevance of Report on Joint Working Group on Employment Analysis to Budget Cuts <i>John Lepri, Immediate Past Senate Chair</i></p>	<p>Immediate Past Senate Chair John Lepri presented information about the relevance of the report on the Joint Working Group Employment Analysis (JWGEA) to UNCG's future budget cuts. The JWGEA report was included as Enclosure E in the February 5th Agenda Packet (http://facsen.uncg.edu/Content/AgendaPackets/f.Faculty%20Senate%20Agenda%20Packet%2002-05-2014.pdf), and as Attachment B in the February 20th Agenda Packet (http://facsen.uncg.edu/Content/AgendaPackets/e.Faculty%20Senate%20Agenda%20Packet%2002-20-2014.pdf). Lepri indicated that the report is the result of more than six months of work. He continued as follows: "The more complicated work of detailed analysis is still to come. The report covers a four-year period of expenditures from 2007 to 2012. During that time period, enrollment increased 5.8%; fulltime faculty increased 10.5%; executive-professional-staff increased 26.6%; and support staff decreased by 8.3%. The total number of UNCG employees increased 7.4%. We compared ratios of fulltime students per fulltime faculty, executive-</p>

	<p>professional staff, and support staff at UNCG to other schools in the UNC System. Between 2011-2012, the whole UNC System averaged 14.2 students per faculty member. During this time, UNCG averaged 18.3 students per faculty. Only UNC Charlotte had a higher average student to faculty ratio of 19.6. Three UNC schools have a higher ratio than UNCG. We have a 1:1 ratio of faculty to executive-professional-staff. Twelve of the schools in the system have more faculty per executive-professional-staff. Compared to the comparison data for our national peers, we are not that far out of line, maybe a bit high on executive-professional-staff compared nationally, but not within the UNC system. The question is what kind of institution do we want to be—an institution with instructional support or one where instructional support is not needed?"</p>
<p>Perspectives on Upcoming Budget Cuts: <i>Chancellor Linda Brady</i></p>	<p>Chair Sink asked Chancellor Brady to speak about her perspectives on the upcoming UNCG budget cuts. The Chancellor stated that she was delighted to see the excellent turnout, and only wished we had this much for every Faculty Senate meeting; she indicated that we have senators to represent units, but direct interaction among all of us is beneficial.</p> <p>Chancellor Brady expressed concern about the effects of recurring cuts by the state on the quality and reputation of the university. She continued as follows: "All of us across the state need to do everything we can to encourage elected officials of the importance of sufficiently funding the UNC Universities. If we don't, it will only get worse. Students must remain our top priority. Rebuilding graduate and undergraduate enrollment must be paramount. We must graduate students who function successfully as productive citizens.</p> <p>In August 2008, when I arrived at UNCG, the faculty described themselves as "teacher scholars." That is very special and unique to UNCG; great scholars make great teachers. That distinctive feature of our faculty distinguishes us from our peers. We need to preserve that identity. I've had a number of conversations with the Executive Staff about the importance of developing a strategy to approach the budget cuts that does the least damage to the university. The initial projected budget-cut allocation to Academic Affairs was not designed to be a slight to the faculty. Nor did it mean that I do not respect the academic mission of the university. I apologize if that was the impact. What I was trying to do was to catch the attention of the campus, to generate a sense of urgency, and to fuel conversations on campus.</p> <p>Earlier in the week, I met with the Deans Council and made several points: (1) making across the board cuts cannot continue; (2) we need to protect enrollment to the maximum extent possible; (3) we need to look at administrative efficiencies first, for example, by using the report of the Joint Working Group; (4) we need to explore the importance of shared services, especially among academic departments. I have encouraged the Provost to work with Department Heads/Chairs and Deans to explore quality, productivity, and market demand.</p> <p>I am prepared to reassess the cuts and lower the percentage of budget cuts to Academic Affairs, but only if I see a plan consistent with the above principles. I will review each plan with the Provost. I want to emphasize the need for consultation with faculty. We need to see engagement across academic units. My sense is that in the past, cuts have been allocated across the board with each department being put in the position of having to fend for itself.</p> <p>A cut to Academic Affairs need not mean cuts to faculty. That will be difficult, but we need a discussion that is broad ranging within academic affairs to protect students' access to classes, and to help us rebuild enrollment over the next two years. Vice Chancellors also are proposing plans for cuts within their units.</p> <p>Over the next several weeks, I want to have a series of conversations that began on Monday with Deans Council. This conversation will continue with the Board of Trustees, with the Senate, and again with the Deans Council on February 26th and Senate on March 5th, and with students. I'm looking forward to having a meeting with Students and the Student Government who can share with me and the Board of Trustees. The students do not believe their concerns are being heard, as evidenced by their attendance at the Board of Trustees meeting.</p>

	<p>Other considerations include UNCG investments in housing, a new recreation center, and intercollegiate athletics. I'm convinced we have to make parallel investments. Our top priority has to be academic quality—to recruit, retain and graduate the best students and faculty, and build quality academic programs. I'm equally convinced, however, that we have to invest in the quality of student life so that we can remain a university of choice. We need to make parallel investments.</p> <p>I'm concerned about the costs of higher education. We all care deeply about this university. I look forward to a continued engagement and suggestions for alternatives of how to move through this difficult situation."</p>
<p>Discussion and Questions and Answers: <i>Senators & Attendees</i></p>	<p>Chair Sink indicated that she would recognize each Senator and attendee who signed-up to speak. Because of time constraints, speakers also were asked to limit their questions or presentation to between 3-4 minutes. Additionally, the Senate Chair also said that, because this is a Faculty Senate meeting, all Senators who signed-up to speak would be recognized first. As reported, the minutes of this period of the meeting provide paraphrased remarks by each speaker and responder.</p> <p>Senator Wade Maki: A purpose of the Senate is to advise the Chancellor, so Eric Ford and I decided to gather data from Department Heads/Chairs (see Attachment A). There are three findings based on analysis of the survey responses: (1) Heads/Chairs anticipate that cut will be made to the least expensive faculty who teach the most students; (2) in response to having to do that, Heads/Chairs expect research, teaching and service quality will decline, delays in graduation, and lowering of faculty morale; (3) some problems will be compounded by cutting faculty, for example, increased class size. We need to limit the "death spiral." The Chancellor said earlier in the semester that we need to look ahead and avoid a circular firing squad. While it is okay to be outraged, I attended the Board of Trustees meeting on February 19th. The Trustees hope to use their contacts to reach out to donors. With shared governance also comes shared responsibility. So I must ask myself the following questions. What can I do? I'm going to try flipping classrooms and increasing students, who I am teaching, by 50%. What can we do? Identify cost savings. What can they, the administration, do? Get faculty involved, and visit departments.</p> <p>Senator Fabrice LeHoucq: I have a couple of questions: Who is responsible for the enrollment miscalculation? How can we avoid this again? What contributes to low faculty morale—stagnation of salaries and resources, no travel money, the rumor of the end of research leave, and faculty leaving. If the budget has increased since 2009, not all parts of the university have faced austerity. I recommend that we not take a narrow approach to a very real budget problem. Fundamentally, I am puzzled as to how we got in this position. The model we use should be reflective of a philosophy of education, and I'm not sure what that means for this campus. What is a realistic plan for us to use over the next six years? The under enrollment is symptomatic of not having a realistic plan based on a philosophy of education. In terms of enrollment projection and the extent to which we can track things; for example, we know that some students who transfer are graduating. Why not here? Why were our enrollment projections wrong?</p> <p>Provost David Perrin: The enrollment projection formula has worked well for us for many years. In fact, in 2010, the NC General Assembly engaged in a review of the enrollment growth funding formulas used by UNC System campuses. UNCG was shown to have among the most consistently accurate projections. The current failure to meet budgeted enrollment projections may have begun in Fall 2010, when we intentionally depressed growth in the Freshmen class to increase admission standards. Nevertheless, we generally met our overall enrollment projections for 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 with gains in distance education. By Fall 2012, it was clear that an enrollment decline for 2013 was likely due to forecasts of fewer continuing students, flat admissions of new and transfer undergraduates, and a significant reduction in graduate students (a trend consistent with many of our national peer institutions and half of the UNC System institutions). If UNCG had projected a significant decline at that time, it would have resulted in a</p>

significant budget reduction for Fall 2013, and we would have been having this conversation last year. Rather, we chose to project relatively flat enrollment for 2013 to buy us time to initiate an enrollment-boosting effort. We were not successful and had a decrease of 500 students in Fall 2013.

Chancellor Brady: Since 2007-2008, there has been more money on campus. We've had \$39 million in budget cuts since 2007; however, we also got enrollment change money as enrollment grew. We also initiated campus tuition increases. As a result we were "up" 2.8 million. Since 2007-2008, every unit across campus lost ground, except for Academic Affairs, which was up approximately \$1 million. The bulk of any new money went to need-based financial aid and instruction. Academic Affairs represents 75% of the university's budget. So any significant cut will have a dramatic impact on the academic units.

Senator Ian Beatty: We're already at the breaking point. When we've received a budget cut in the past, we seem to have found a way to absorb it. To the outside world, it looks like we're managing just fine. That sends the wrong message. My proposal (see **Attachment B**) may sound crazy, but it suggests eliminating the fees for athletics and the recreation center. Cancel or delay the 'rec center' and close down as many athletic programs as possible. Impose a new fee so that net fees won't increase and use them for academics. Take a minimal budget cut everywhere else. Is this legal? It's contrary to the UNC Policy. However, we are not adequately funded, and it actually fits within the "letter" of the policy. We need a united front—even if our request is denied, it sends a strong message about our values.

Chancellor Brady: That's an articulate statement and represents the kind of out-of-the-box idea, and thinking we need. Conversations about fees and how they are used have to occur with the Board of Governors. We need to understand that we have more than 200+ student athletes who graduate at high rates. We have been recognized by the NCAA because of the quality of the student athletes who enroll here. Losing them would dramatically impact our enrollment. I do not know what the net impact would be of losing those enrollments and would make it difficult if not impossible for many of those students to attend college and earn degrees. The philosophical concern I have with Ian's approach is it takes the pressure off the state to support public higher education. The more we shift from state funding to fee or tuition funding, the more we shift the burden to students. The state would be happy for us to do that. We have to keep the pressure on the State of North Carolina to rebuild its investment in education.

Senator Veronica Grossi: Thanks to everyone, including administrators, faculty and students who are engaging in this dialogue. First, academics are the core, the heart of this university. Our mission was composed with faculty and must be honored. We cannot change the mission without collaboration. We need a democratic dialogue—consider the centrality of democracy in decision making. Second, it will be very damaging to cut any money from Academic Affairs. This should not happen. It's unethical to go against our mission. Third, look to other units to see their effect on enrollment. Are living-learning communities and other expensive initiatives working? Athletics involves a few students with a lot of financial resources. Also we want access to the budget and allocations. Do not cut Academic Affairs that has to do with the academic mission. Finally again, we do not need a 'rec center.' People are not coming here for a 'rec center.' Please honor the cultural history of our university and our identity—a liberal arts college for a diverse population that is financially fragile.

Senator Deborah Bell: You suggested we have parallel investment to nonacademic quality of life units on campus. What about parallel cuts? Could we imagine a "rec center" smaller by 85%? Have those options been considered? In my 34 years at UNCG, we are facing the most difficult situation ever. Strategies must not negatively impact enrollment and other budget principles cited. Of these strategies, two relate to academics—enrollment is one. Cutting instruction will impact enrollment. Second, hold financial aid harmless. We don't want anyone to be turned away due to financial insecurity. Of the remaining guiding principles, none refer to the value of academics. You might consider a more forthright statement about the academic core mission that

could serve to unite us more. Finally, what about exploring the possibility of reallocating student fees from non-academic areas to academic areas?

Senator Rick Barton: I have questions on points of confusion—the first is between horizontal and vertical cuts. Does vertical mean the elimination of programs? The assumption is that vertical cuts mean elimination of a program or department. We haven't seen that yet now we hear it as a principle. Do we have a misconception of vertical cuts? Secondly, the net increase in academic affairs money is a surprise since we have not seen that in our departments. We've lost faculty lines. So, where is that extra money?

Chancellor Brady: At the level of the university, we might eliminate a particular function in terms of support to students or faculty. That elimination would be a vertical cut. Another vertical cut is imagining other ways of delivering services that we think are valuable. As an example, there are many ways to deliver online and distance education. Some universities have centralized structures to work with faculty to design, market, deliver, and support those programs. Other universities have more decentralized programs. If we believe that it is important for us to provide online options for students, then we have to ask what is the best, highest quality, and most cost-effective way to do that and that could lead to a vertical cut. Horizontal cuts refer to across the board cut. That is a recipe for disaster.

Provost Perrin: Here's an example of a vertical cut. We had a laptop initiative, spending \$750,000. We learned that this initiative wasn't serving us as well as when it was launched. For example, many students were bringing laptops with them to UNCG. As a vertical cut, we eliminated this initiative and I took the \$750,000 cut centrally before allocating the balance of the cuts to the academic units. Let me now address how new resources are allocated across Academic Affairs. When we get enrollment growth money, I allocate that across the divisions, based in large part on the Delaware study. That study compares academic productivity with departmental peers. If your department is not performing well, you may not see any new enrollment growth money. Another example is, during the Deans Council Retreat every spring, we review the goals of the strategic plan and then determine how to allocate available financial resources that come from campus tuition increase, enrollment growth money, etc. in support of the goals of the Plan. I hold very little money centrally, and rather, distribute it across the Division where it will help to advance the mission of the University.

Senator Kathy Crowe: The library needs to be considered carefully. We already took a 25% cut in 2012. We will lose lines with the upcoming budget cuts. Last year, we lost 4 lines; based on the percentage of upcoming budget cuts, this year we may lose 5-6 lines. Last year, we had a gate count of 1.2 million people; the Library is a safe gathering place in support of the academic core of the university. We employ almost 100 students, which is a retention feature. We do not get any of the technology fees—that all goes to IT Services.

Senator Susan Dennison: As groups of Senators have met via email, I put together a proposal (i.e., as a last resort, but it's not what I want). With that said, if we have to take a hit, I'd like us to have some agreement about how to do that. We want a template to follow. This proposed template, first, preserves teaching as a priority, and second, reduces the academic programs by 50%, based on Wade's survey. But now, I don't think we should do that at all. Let's collect the data of what we *could* take that would have the least impact on academics. I don't think Academic Affairs should take *any* hit. We need to send a clear message—if we agree academics are the core mission, the cut to us has to be substantially lower than it is. We also have to be able to build back our enrollment.

Senator Kathy Crowe: Last spring, many of us were involved in enrollment management. What we saw is that students do not understand our identity. What has been happening since then? What are the next steps with that?

Dr. Bryan Terry (UNCG Associate Provost for Enrollment Management): We're focused now on tactical issues—getting enrollment up for next year. Identity is a strategic issue. Once we

figure out who's coming and who's leaving, it will be easier to increase enrollment. Can we make UNCG affordable is a focus. Jim Black's report was more strategic, not tactical.

Before recognizing other attendees who signed-up to speak, Chair Sink asked Senators if there were follow-up questions or information.

Senator Fabrice LeHoucq: Academic Affairs has an increase in the last 5-6 years. Like Rick [Barton], I don't see it. Where is it? Related, has it been worth it [or productive]—where the money was put?

Provost Perrin: The state budgets at UNCG have been on line for many years. As difficult as it was, we learned a lot from our Academic Program Review

Chancellor Brady: Over the past several years, UNCG invested more in academic support because students need it based on K-12 education and/or family situations to name just a few reasons. We did make a decision to invest in Living and Learning Communities that attempt to replicate a home/college environment with greater student-faculty interaction. To share common interests. Based on the last four years, our data show that the retention and graduation rates of students from the Living and Learning Communities are more than 10% higher than the typical student. So, we know Living and Learning Communities work. The question, though, has been the return on the investment as compared to increasing the number of faculty. If we had made that investment in hiring additional faculty, what would the impact have been? That's an interesting question and we need to 'drill down' to get answers.

Senator Ian Beatty: What are the concrete alternatives—what will we lose?

Gary Rosenkrantz (Department of Philosophy): From my perspective, it is accurate and true that a horizontal 8% cut across departments will mean disastrous -- erosion of the academic core and enrollment in graduate programs. I'm concerned about the downward spiral in light of the [new] GA-imposed policies on academic good standing and drop/add, and of increasing class size. Since many faculty are involved in research, our non-tenure track folks are needed. If you move faculty to more teaching, research will suffer. The integrity of the "GenEd" core is at stake. Academic departments do not have the ability to make vertical cuts. It would be nice to hear from the administration about alternative vertical cuts.

Chancellor Brady: The Board of Governors is planning the next 4 years of tuition. The last 4 years, we were limited to a 6.5% proposal. One option the Board is considering is that tuition cost may be tied to students making academic progress. We responded by asking, how does that impact students who are working and juggling responsibilities. Those students would pay a higher tuition rate and yet would be least likely to sustain that. We have to mobilize our campus and across campus to take the message to Raleigh that we have to reinvest in public higher education.

George Dimock (Art Department & President of UNCG Chapter of AAUP): My concern is with the vertical cuts. That will open the possibility of the elimination of programs. That leads to the elimination of tenure and tenure track positions. I'd like reassurance that won't happen. With APR, we were promised that it wouldn't lead to cutting programs. How does building the "rec center" square with the student profile we have at UNCG?

Provost Perrin: With a budget cut of this size, I cannot promise programs won't be cut. I can promise that if we must curtail or eliminate programs every effort will be made to take advantage of potential faculty reassignments and retirements. My fear is that with a cut of this magnitude we will not be able to identify an adequate amount of state dollars without considering the 75-80% of money tied up in faculty positions within the 75-76% of the total state budget allocated to Academic Affairs.

Chancellor Brady: I do not want to look at cutting faculty. We must have a strong tenured and tenure-track faculty. To avoid cutting faculty, we're going to have to think creatively. I encourage you not to think first of laying-off instructors. We cannot afford to do that.

Jennifer Nelson (Student): I am a freshman. I came to UNCG to learn. I want to be an academic. My dreams are in jeopardy. I know there is a concern about enrollment. From a student perspective, the first things I think about are the class offerings and program offerings. Uphold the academic core, or students like me who are looking for particular classes and programs will no longer be able to attend to get the degrees we want. To protect the institution as a whole, you have to protect the student. I implore you to hold on to your core values. Please protect students.

In response to Chancellor Brady asking Jennifer about her plans, Jennifer responded "I am an English and Political Science double major, and want to pursue ASL minor. I want to be a writer and change the world! I want to do that through this university." Senators and other attendees applauded robustly.

(Continued)

<p>Additional Discussion and Recommendations</p>	<p>Sink noted that the meeting period for discussion, recommendations, and questions-answers had run past the allotted time, and indicated that the Senate could continue discussions with Chancellor Brady who must leave for another meeting by 6:15pm. The remaining senators responded affirmatively to continue the meeting. Before opening the floor for additional discussion and recommendations, the Chair thanked the Senators and members of the gallery, and reminded the attendees that they did not have to leave.</p> <p>Senator Susan Dennison: Where would we go to check out the legality of our options?</p> <p>Chancellor Brady: Consult with Vice Chancellors Reade Taylor (Business Affairs) and Cherry Callahan (Student Affairs), and also, with Vice Provost Alan Boyette to discuss the proposal about fees. The Board of Governors approved today the tuition and fee structure for 2014-2015 academic year. We still have an opportunity to influence the discussion of tuition and fee process going forward but probably not this year. To talk about an emergency situation, that could suggest financial exigency . . . that has been used to eliminate tenured and tenure-track faculty positions in other states.</p> <p>Senator Jim Carmichael: You have suggested lobbying the legislature, but are they going to listen? That does not appear to be the case with the current roster of officials. Wouldn't our efforts be best placed locally, for example, by encouraging students to vote, and by ensuring that we have easy access to a poll?</p> <p>Senator Ian Beatty: Are fee and tuition schedules locked in stone?</p> <p>Chancellor Brady: Yes, for 2014-2015.</p> <p>Senator Jovanovic: I would like to suggest that we hold budget charrettes where we can all get together to discuss options.</p> <p>Chair Sink: Shall we bring Reade Taylor to the March Faculty meeting if he is free? There was an assent and applause from Senators.</p> <p>Senator Bell: What can we do to make things better? For instance, maybe we should not have tried to do so many living-learning communities? Are they sustainable? I'm not against athletics, but are athletics sustainable? I'm against living beyond our means in a tough economy.</p> <p>Senator Carmichael: There has to be a way to get a deferment in our debt service. There ought to be a way to get a deferment on that for a few years in the current financial crisis.</p> <p>David Sprinkle, (Chair of the Board of Trustees): This has been fascinating to hear the students and faculty. I remind you that in 2008 many major corporations were in big trouble. In a four- to six-year period, they went from terrible situations to being profitable again. They went internally and got rid of everything that wasn't in demand or profitable. We know we're not going to do that, but we can do some of that. Members of the Board of Trustees are trying to use creativity to support academic programs, for example, with grants from and collaboration with major foundations. Only one person looked internally to make change, and Chair Sprinkle [pointed to Wade Maki] who asked—"What can I do?" Chair Sprinkle said, "That's the question we need to ask."</p> <p>Chair Sink indicated that it was 6:15pm, and the Senate could adjourn the meeting and discuss recommendations via email. The remaining Senators agreed. Sink thanked Chancellor Brady, Provost Perrin, Senators, and attendees for participating in and contributing to a productive meeting. The meeting was adjourned.</p>
--	--

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carmichael
 Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2013-2014