North Carolina Central University
Faculty Senate Meeting

AGENDA

Friday, February 1, 2013
2:00 PM, Criminal Justice Bldg. Auditorium

I. Call to Order: Prof. Sandra Rogers, Faculty Senate Chair

II. Announcements and Distributed Notes—(via email)

III. Approval of Minutes of January 11, 2013

IV. Administrative Update – Associate Provost Bernice Johnson

V. UNC-FA Report/Strategic Plan Update/Resolutions – Prof. David Green, Dr. Minnie Sangster

VI. Faculty Senate Handbook Report/Voting – Dr. Jarvis Hargrove

VII. Senate Standing Committee Reports:
    a. Academic Policies
    b. Campus Relations & Welfare
    c. Faculty Governance
    d. Faculty Research & Professional Development
    e. Honorary Degrees, Memorials and Special Awards

VIII. Registrar’s Report – Dr. Jerome Goodwin

IX. Chancellor Search Committee (Update) – Prof. Mary Wright

X. New Business
   a. Human Resources – EEO Presentation Faculty Meeting (Dates/Time)

XI. Adjournment
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, February 1, 2013 – Criminal Justice Auditorium

MINUTES

Those Present: Associate Provost: Bernice Johnson; Associate Vice Chancellor: Frances Graham; Dean CAS: Carlton Wilson; Dean Library & Information Science: Irene Owens; Director, Office of Extended Studies: Kimberly Phifer-McGhee; Director, James E. Shepard Library: Theodosia Shields; Registrar: Jerome Goodwin

Senators & Alternates: Criminal Justice: Tonya Hall; Public Health Education: Belinda Jones; Human Sciences: Wadeeah Beyah; Phy. Ed & Recreation: Hsin-Yi Liu; Andrea Woodson-Smith; Political Science: John Kuzenski; Public Administration: Patricia Wigfall; Dohyeong Kim; Psychology: Vinston Goldman; Sherry Eaton; Sociology: Sandra Rogers; Biology: Delores Grant; Mildred Pointer; Chemistry: Fei Yan; Dept. of Language & Literature: Marco Polo Hernandez-Cuevas; Lisa Carl; Kimberly Hernandez; John Prince; History: Terry Mosley; Jarvis Hargrove; math & Physics Dept.: Gaolin Milledge; Igor Bondarev; Xinyu Huang; Alade Tokuta; Envir, Earth/Geospatial: John Bang; Mass Communication: William Robinson; Pharmaceutical Science: Alfred Williams; School of Business: Kofi Amoateng; School of Education: Nancy Reese-Durham; Harvey Hinton III; Nursing: Ernestine Lassiter; School of Law: Kevin Foy; Kia Vernon; School of Library & Information Sciences: Deborah Swain; J.E. Shepard Library: Vanessa Lennon; Victoria Silver

Guest: Gertrude Jackson; Minnie Sangster; Dorothy Singleton; Vickie Lamb; Jennifer Schen; Michele Ware; Chairmaine McKissick-Melton; Archa Debele; Pauletta Bracy; Stephanie Freeman; Harvey McMurray; Jeanette Banker; Rosa Anderson; Patricia Leaf-Prince; David Cerwan; Emmanuel Oritsejafar

I. Call to order: Prof. Rogers called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm and thanked all for attending. She remarked that this would be a very intense meeting because of the voting that would be occurring. She stated that the issue of proxy vote has been raised since the senator and the alternate from one department are unable to attend the meeting today.

Vice chair Dr. Deborah Swain stated that according to the handbook Article II. Section 3c states, “The privilege of voting, either on parliamentary proposals or in elections of officers, is reserved to Elected Members of the Senate or, in their absence, to their designated Alternates. Voting by proxy is not permitted.” Prof. Rogers stated that this could be changed in the constitution.
Prof. Rogers reminded the faculty that the Nomination committee would be presenting a slate of officers for next year at the March meeting.

II. **Announcements:** Announcements were provided in email.

III. **Approval of Minutes from the January 11, 2013 meeting:** Minutes prepared by Dr. Nancy Reese-Durham, Senate Secretary, were distributed electronically before the meeting. When quorum of 26 was reached, it was moved by Prof. Kia Vernon and seconded by Dr. John Kuzenski to accept minutes. Minutes were approved (all ayes; no nays or abstentions).

IV. **Administrative Update – Associate Provost Bernice Johnson (See Appendix A)**
Dr. Johnson thanked all faculty members for staying abreast of issues. She shared the Strategic Priorities of the University and stated that what we are doing in teaching, service and scholarship should relate to the priorities. The strategic priorities are:

- Retention and Graduation
- Enhancing academic distinction and distinctiveness
- Outreach to the Community
- Strengthening internal communication/QSI
- Achieving and sustaining excellence in teaching, learning and service

Dr. Johnson referred to her six Faculty Senate assignments from last month. She assigned the following dates to the assignments of which Prof. Rogers later assigned to the respective committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a policy statement on paying for distance education courses and on-campus courses.</td>
<td>Academic Policy</td>
<td>March 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine specific ways to retain more students in the upper division, i.e. juniors and seniors</td>
<td>Academic Policy</td>
<td>March 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan to engage faculty more in fund raising at the department, school, and</td>
<td>Campus Welfare and Relations</td>
<td>April 3, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop a plan to assist the Provost in choosing the Faculty Marshal.
Honorary Degrees  Feb. 21, 2013

Determine ways to get more faculty to participate in Faculty Teaching Awards
Professional Development and Research  April 3, 2013

Determine ways to increase the enrollment of Hispanic students at NCCU
International Committee  April 3, 2013

Associate Provost Johnson commented on the 104-page draft document outlining the UNC Strategic Directions for 2013-2018. She stated that we should all read it and should send any comments that we have to Chair Rogers. Those comments would then be sent to Chancellor Becton. The Chancellor has already reviewed comments from other institutions in the system about the document.

Dr. Johnson commented on Professional Development activities and stated that Dr. Richard Townsend would be making his presentation again on Feb. 26. She also spoke about several conferences that are being supported by grant monies through the Professional Development area. She stated that the application deadline for the Board of Governor's award was today (Feb. 1st). NCCU also gives 3 faculty members teaching awards.

In terms of the University moving forward in 2013, Dr. Johnson spoke about the issues of Faculty Tenure and Promotion, a continued culture of caring and student success, and several accomplishments this year. She shared that there were a total of 29 requests for tenure and/or promotion with 2 faculty requested tenure only. Five faculty requested promotion only and twenty-two requested promotion and tenure. She further shared that there would be electronic submissions of faculty portfolios for 2013. The tenure and promotion materials would be due to department chairs by August 6th and to the Dean’s Office not later than August 28, 2013. Faculty receiving negative decisions would be notified between November 4th-8th, 2013.

Assoc. Provost Johnson shared several accomplishments:

- 93% of Nursing students passed the NCLEX
- 204 students dismissed- Academic Progression Policy- (this is down by 80 students)
- Dr. Faye Calhoun has been named director of the GlaxoSmithKline STEM Program.
- The Teach Out Plans are on target for 2014. Dr. Johnson stated that someone questioned how many students changed their majors because of the closing of the programs.
Sixty students changed their majors in the Sociology Department
Thirty-five students changed their majors in Public Administration Department
Five students changed their majors in the Art Department
Twenty-nine students changed their majors in Computer Information Systems Department

- NCCU has agreed to participate in the UNC-GA China Project
- Dean’s Global Speaker Series – Business School - Jan 28th
- Dean’s Search in the College of Business and Social Sciences – Three candidates are coming on campus
- Dr. Romocki – Director, Health Careers Program

Associate Provost Johnson spoke about our preparations for Spring 2013

- Managing Class Rolls
- Incomplete (“I”) Grades/Contracts
- Moratorium on grade changes – She stated that this is not her rule but she supports it. She remarked that she would not change a grade because of “input error”.
- Grade appeals
- Students must receive grades they earn in a timely manner
- Students’ grades must be accurately calculated.
- Change in procedures – students must not remain in class if they are not financially cleared. Dr. Johnson praised faculty members for not allowing students to sit in class if they have not been financially cleared. Students have been sent to the Eagle Service Center to make financial arrangements for paying bills.

Dr. Johnson commented that she realizes faculty members are upset with her but it was OK. She stated that many have complained about letters received. She shared that she is the Associate Provost and in the absence of the Provost she is Provost. She stated that there would be another professional development session in March and if she sends a request for faculty to attend the meeting, she expects faculty to attend.

Dr. Johnson shared issues about assessment and accountability. She stated that Mr. Stewart has sent Deans and Department Chairs a roster of the projected number of students for Fall 2013. The numbers are needed to receive funding from the Federal Government. The four questions addressed are:

- How do we measure student success?
• How do we quantify student success?
• Who is accountable for student success?
• What are the qualities/attributes of a successful student?

Lastly, she shared information about a successful student. Namely,

• Has achieved the competencies and acquired the skills needed to perform well in career markets.
• Is competitive for graduate and professional programs and employment in the discipline.
• Speaks Well, Writes well, and Presents well.

Prof. Rogers asked Dr. John Prince, parliamentarian, to present what faculty wanted to share about the Letters of Reprimand. The concerns were as follows:

• Timing of Email -- received after 3 pm on Jan. 3rd
• Workshop not designated as “mandatory”
• Scheduling of workshop and contract dates
• Implications of a letter of reprimand in faculty personnel file
• Accusatory and belittling tone of letter
• Timing of the letter of reprimand
• Negative effects on faculty morale

Prof. Rogers asked if there were any additional concerns.

• Dr. William Robinson stated that he felt threatened and concerned that tenured faculty did not make a “big to do” about it. He felt that this was negligent and he was upset. He furthered stated that in the QSI training he learned that we should treat students with respect. He commented that the letter shows that we were not treated with respect.
• Dr. Kofi Amoateng stated that he was out of the country because of the death of his father. He stated that letters should have special circumstances.
• Dr. John Kuzenski questioned whether sending out the letters was negligent and whether the letter had been sent to General Counsel.
• Dr. Prince stated that the faculty senate executive board made a suggestion that Deans could schedule a meeting with HR to make the presentation to faculty in their respective schools/colleges.
• Ms. Stephanie Freeman commented about receiving the notice so late. She stated that she needed in writing something that explains what the letter actually means. She asked
why the same level of effort (letters addressed to each person and placed in envelopes and delivered) was not put in place to let the faculty know about the meeting. She stated that the letter could not stay in her file.

- Dr. Hernandez stated that we have SLOs (student learning outcomes) and he would like to know what the faculty learning outcomes were for not attending the meeting.

- Dr. Charmaine McKissick-Melton stated that letters for faculty in the Mass Communication area were sent to the Language & Literature area. She said she needed to know the dates for the March professional development workshops as soon as possible.

- Prof. Kia Vernon stated that the wordings on the letter (omission of the word non-tenured) brought the most complaints in her area. She stated that the announcement about the meeting should have been sent in a separate email. She said that she would like to know which meetings are mandatory.

Prof. Rogers asked Dr. Johnson to respond to the concerns of the faculty. Dr. Johnson stated that one good thing had happened. She now knows how to get the faculty to respond. She made the following remarks:

- **Timing** - The **timing** of the announcement. The announcement about the professional development workshop was made in December. The Dean’s and Department Chairs received the information in December.

- **Mandatory** - The workshop did not say “**mandatory**”. However, HR does have workshops that are mandated by the federal government of which all faculty members are required to participate.

- **Reprimand** – The word “reprimand” was not mentioned in the letter. The purpose of the letter was to allow us to gather data for our system of accountability and assessment. It helps us to be able to report the number and percent of faculty who attended. She has received emails from faculty and has answered them all.

- **Accusatory**- She stated that all she stated was whether a faculty was there or not.

- **Legal Counsel**- Legal counsel and the Chancellor saw the letter.

- **Date** – Jan. 2nd was a day for all employees to be at work if they received a check from NCCU. Special cases were taken into consideration.

- **Letter in file**- This shows accountability and has been requested by faculty. This was not a letter to get at anyone. It was a statement of fact.

- **Future workshops**- The first two days of Spring Break (March 11th and 12th) are being considered as future dates for professional development workshops. Spring break is a break for students and not for faculty.
Ms. Stephanie Freeman asked where the written notice of how things are changed could be located. Dr. Johnson stated that the information did not go out to everyone. It went out to Deans. She stated that she would be meeting with Deans next week and would talk with them about it. She stated further that in March there would be information about the Spring Break policy.

Dr. Tokuta asked Dr. Johnson about the Teach Outs Plan. He stated that students should not be forced to enroll in other programs at NCCU if they enrolled here for a specific program. He stated that we should tell them to go to another school that has the program. He stated that he was upset.

Prof. Rogers stated that the Assoc. Provost and the Academic Policies would address the issues.

V. UNC-FA Report/Strategic Plan Update/Resolutions – Prof. David Green, Dr. Minnie Sangster

Dr. Sangster provided minutes to the secretary and stated that she would give her speaking time to Prof. Green. (See Appendix B)

Prof. Green stated that there was only one faculty representative on the Strategic Planning Committee. He stated that he serves on the Faculty Advisory Council, composed of members from all UNC campuses, who are not part of the discussion about the Strategic Planning Committee. He further stated that the 104-page Draft Strategic Plan document is not a strategic plan as we would think of a strategic plan, but is a business plan. There is limited student, faculty, and administrative input. The majority of input is from the business community. February 8th is the last day to make comments about the document.

Prof. Green stated that the Faculty Advisory Committee presented a 30-page document (See Appendix C) to the Strategic Planning Committee and only 2 points were included in the 104-page document. It has been a battle to get faculty input into the document. He remarked that we must comment even if we say we don’t like the document.

He stated that if the measuring tool will be that English and Humanities will not get students a job and we don’t speak against it, we would be in trouble over the next 5 years. It seems that the Strategic Planning Committee is only dealing with STEM issues. He feels that each school should be individual in the funding it receives and that faculty input should be considered on these issues.

Prof. Ross stated that all schools are getting together to make individual statements that we reject the Strategic Plan. He stated that we should go on record that we don’t
approve the plan. He commented that Pres. Ross is in a battle as well. The present working plan does not have input from people who do this type of work for a living.

Dr. Dorothy Singleton stated that if input is needed by Feb. 8th then we should vote on the resolution today. She stated that we should look at the scope politically and see that the Governor is choosing people who do not support the UNC system. She further stated that the make up of the Board of Governors would see a change.

Dr. Kofi Amoateng asked Prof. Green which resolutions he did not like. Prof. Green discussed the following: 1) E-learning tools presented by Catherine Rigsby (See Appendix D); 2) the proposed General educational requirements for all UNC campuses; 3) duplicate courses with low enrollments at UNC campuses being eliminated; and 4) how even though priorities (mostly STEM area) are being looked at, it does not make a program safe.

Dr. Debela stated it is crucial that we know about the mandates and how those in charge will cut costs by all means. We need to think about the needs of our students. Dr. Pointer asked about the survey. Prof. Green stated that there would be a survey sent to all faculty senate chairs today about the support or non-support of their respective senators on the proposed resolutions. Dr. Tokuta thanked Prof. Green for his advocacy for us.

Prof. Green presented the three resolutions (See Appendix E) and the faculty voted accordingly:

Resolution 1 – Resolution in Response to the January 16, 2013 Draft Strategic Plan
Resolution 2 - Resolution on faculty Responsibility for Assessment
Resolution 3 - Resolution on Concerns with e-Learning as presented in the Draft Strategic Plan

It was motioned Dr. William Robinson and seconded by Dr. Debela to endorse all resolutions Thirty-two faculty voted yes to approved the resolutions. There were no nay votes or abstentions.

VI. Faculty Senate Handbook Report/Voting – Dr. Jarvis Hargrove

Dr. Hargrove presented information about the changes that had been made to the faculty handbook. He received very few suggested changes. There is an appendix that has been added which lists the names of the previous faculty handbook committee. He shared the
various changes by chapter. Many changes were grammatical in nature. It was also necessary to update email addresses, websites, and phone numbers.

- Chapter 1 - grammatical changes, no major changes.
- Chapter 2 – rotation of senators and alternates
- Chapter 4 – no major changes
- Chapter 5 – links updated
- Chapter 6 – no major changes
- Chapter 7 – websites updated
- Appendix – past committee members

Dr. Swain spoke about the importance of Chapter 2 on the topic of Shared Governance. There is a statement about the faculty role in the Chancellor search process. Dr. Kofi Amoateng asked about faculty leave and sabbaticals that should be in Chapter 5. He stated that we need a statement about Sabbaticals for faculty.

Dr. Swain stated that there would need to be a vote to change the constitution by adding the three committees - Beautification, Intellectual Climate Committee and the International Affairs Committee. It was motioned by Terry Mosley and seconded by Lisa Carl to add the three committees to the constitution. Motion passed unanimously. This constitutional change will need to be presented to the general faculty for approval at the March meeting.

The faculty voted to accept the change to the Bylaws reflecting the revision of the rotations of general faculty as senators and alternates. It was motioned by Dr. Mildred Pointer and seconded by Prof. Kia Vernon to accept the change. Motion passed unanimously.

It was further motioned by Dr. Mildred Pointer to accept the Faculty Senate Handbook. No second to the motion was needed. Motion passed unanimously. The next step in the process would be to present the handbook to the General Faculty in March and then to the Board of Trustees.
Prof. Rogers asked faculty to give her comments and suggestions for securing the next faculty marshal. She will share comments with Dr. Johnson.

VII. Senate Standing Committee Reports:

A. Academic Policy – Dr. Tokuta stated that Dr. Grant, committee chair, was unable to meet today. He stated that the committee would look at assignments that are very challenging and robust. He requested suggestions from faculty. He further stated that they needed fund raising ideas and ideas about ways to retain more students in upper divisions. Lastly, he stated that there seems to be a variance in the cost of distance education courses on campus and this needed to be investigated. Prof. Rogers spoke about how the distance education issue is already being discussed. Ms. Phifer-McGhee, Director of Distance Education, stated that she wants to meet with those interested in the distance education issue and want to invite Claudia Hager, Associate VC for Finance and Process Improvement, to attend.

B. Campus Relations & Welfare- no report

C. Governance – Dr. Goldman presented a report for information only. (See Appendix F). Dr. Goldman stated that the committee discussed several issues of which one was what should be done when faculty do not comply with attendance at expected meeting. Dr. Goldman stated that faculty should be held accountable for carrying out the duties of one’s position/contract. He further stated that carrying out such duties is in keeping with the main reason that we are here, which is the promotion of student success. Dr. Sherry Eaton asked what the next step would be. Dr. Goldman stated that the next step would be to send the recommendation from the faculty senate to the Office of the Provost. Dr. Debela stated that we need the recommendation in a written format for faculty to see it, get feedback back from the faculty, and then bring it to the next faculty senate meeting. He stated that then we would need to take action on the issue. He suggested that the faculty senate office send out the information to the faculty to be ready to vote on at the next meeting.
Dr. Wadeeah Beyah reported on the proposed gala. The gala is planned for Friday, April 12, 2013 from 6-8pm in the Alfonso Elder Student Union building. There will be a certain level of attire. Significant others are welcome. The committee is open for suggestions for the theme and categories for awards. One suggested speaker is Dr. Dudley Flood. Other suggestions are needed. Invitations will be sent out to the faculty. It was suggested that the music department provide music or we could have jazz music piped in.

[It was 4:00 pm. It was moved by Dr. Swain, seconded by Dr. Angela Woodson-Smith and approved that 15 minutes be added to the meeting.]

D. Faculty Research and Development – Dr. Pointer stated that the committee has not met since the last meeting. They are presently addressing the task of collecting data.

E. Honorary Degrees, Memorials and Special Awards – No report.

VIII. Chancellor Search Committee (Update) – Prof. Rogers – Prof. Rogers stated that the committee has finished its task and the names of three candidates have been sent to President Ross. Dr. Tokuta asked if names of the candidates could be shared with the faculty. Dr. Johnson stated that this particular search committee and Dr. Ross agreed that the names would not be released. She further stated that Pres. Ross has the discretion to say if names can or cannot be released.

Prof. Rogers shared that 13 faculty did have the opportunity to share lunch with the candidates. Dr. Johnson stated that policy or not, in the past it was a practice for the names of the finalist be released. Dr. Oritsejafor motioned that a request be made to the Chair of the Search Committee (Harold Epps) and to the Chair of the Trustee Board (Dr. Dwight Perry) to release the names of the candidates. Dr. Tokuta seconded the motion. Motion carried with all voting yes except one “no” vote. Dr. Goldman raised the question, “What if candidates are under the impression that their names were not going to be released?” Dr. McMurray stated he felt that we should express to the Search Committee and Board of Trustees to release the names of the three candidates.

Dr. Debela asked if we still have access to legal council. It is the job of legal council to protect the university or faculty. He stated that in the past we had legal council to come to the Faculty Senate.
and advise us on issues. Prof. Rogers stated that we will get answers which would be distributed to all senators.

IX. Registrar’s Report – Dr. Jerome Goodwin (See Appendix G)
Dr. Goodwin asked faculty to help in clearing the Spring 2013 graduates. He stated that Commencement exercises are scheduled for Friday, May 10th and Sat., May 11th. Applications for graduations are due in the registrar’s office by Friday, Feb. 15th. Faculty should tell students to complete “I” grades sooner than later. In the past, most grades came in on the day before graduation that made the certification of graduates challenging. Dr. Goodwin suggested that grade substitutions, transfer of credit evaluations, and waivers be completed by Feb. 15th stating next semester.

He reminded the faculty about the following dates:
Feb. 15th – Applications for graduation due
March 22nd – Deadline to file for Master’s Written Examination
April 6th – Written Examination

Registrar Goodwin made the following recommendations to the faculty:

1- Get “I” grade removed quickly
2- Recommend to the Academic Planning Council to approve early due dates for graduating seniors to clear “I” grades
3- Recommend for earlier dates for graduating seniors to Feb. 15th for transfer of credits, waivers, and substitutions (these recommendations would be applicable for upcoming semesters).

Prof. Rogers stated that the third recommendation above should be sent to the Academic Policies committee to consider. Any changes will need to be put in the catalogs. Dr. Debela stated that if we suggest that students go out and get more courses from community colleges to increase the GPA and then not allow them to add the courses as transfer courses that this might be a problem.

Dr. Anderson stated that today (Feb. 1, 2013) is National Wear Red Day in support of making people aware of how heart disease still kills more women than all cancers combined.
X. New Business

Human Resources – EEO Presentation Faculty Meeting

Prof. Rogers stated that the executive committee agreed that Deans of Schools/Colleges would take care of arranging for EEOC presentations.

[It was 4:15 pm. It was moved by Dr. Swain, seconded by Dr. Reese-Durham and approved that 15 minutes be added to the meeting.]

Dr. Kofi Amoateng stated that we should couch our own sabbatical leave statement.

Dr. McKissick-Melton asked Dr. Johnson about the Teaching Excellence Committee and how the composition of the committee had changed. Dr. Johnson stated that the Faculty Award Committee is chaired by Ms. Sarah Reives. She is the Directory of Faculty Professional Development. She does not make any decisions. Dr. Johnson commented that when Dr. Ware resigned as chair of the committee, deans selected members to be on the committee. In the past, persons who were recipients of the award were on the committee. Dr. McKissick-Melton stated that we should look at the difference between a person being selected or elected to be on the committee.

Dr. Debela stated that we should look at faculty senate procedures. When changes happen we should look at them. The faculty senate gives us a voice to do so. He stated that things have happened in the past were changed because it was felt that it needed to be with a certain committee.

Professor Rogers stated that we would discuss this in the executive committee.

XI. Adjournment: It was moved and seconded to adjourn. So approved, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Reese-Durham, Ph.D.

Secretary, Faculty Senate and Member of Executive Committee
Associate Professor, School of Education
Strategic Priorities of the University

- Retention and Graduation
- Enhancing Academic Distinction and Distinctiveness
- Outreach to the Community
- Strengthening Internal Communications/QSI
- Achieving and Sustaining Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Service
Faculty Senate Assignments

• Develop a Policy Statement on Paying for Distance Education courses and on-campus courses. March 1, 2013

• Determine specific ways to retain more students in the Upper Division, i.e. Jrs, Srs

• March 18, 2013
Faculty Senate Assignments

• Develop a Plan to Engage Faculty More in Fund Raising at the Department, School, and College Level. April 3, 2013

• Develop a Plan to Assist the Provost in Choosing the Faculty Marshal. February 21

Honorary Degrees
Faculty Senate Assignments

• Determine ways to get more faculty to participate in Faculty Teaching Awards - April 3, 2013

Prof Dev + Reo

• Determine ways to increase the enrollment of Hispanic students at NCCU. April 3, 2013

Internationally Committee
Strategic Directions 2013-2018

- Strategic Directions for 2013-2018

Set Degree Attainment Goals ...To State Needs
Strengthen Academic Quality
Serve the People of North Carolina
Maximizing Efficiencies
Ensuring an Accessible and Financially Stable University
Faculty Professional Development

- Dr. Richard Townsend and Mathematics Faculty Course Redesign Presentation for BOT
- Nine faculty are attending a Course Redesign Conference in Baltimore, today, Feb. 1
- Fourteen faculty to attend Teaching Effective Conference in Greensboro in February 15.
- Sixteen faculty will attend an Assessment Conf. Feb. 24
Moving Forward in 2013

A Culture of Caring and Student Success

• Quality Service and Teamwork
• Preparation
• Knowledge of Policies/Implementation
• Faculty Roles and Responsibilities
• Teaching and Learning
• Assessment and Accountability
Faculty Tenure and Promotion Tally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Only</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic Submissions for 2013
Due to Chairs August 6 and Dean’s Office – August 28, 2013
Negative Decisions will be Provided November 4-8
A Culture of Caring and Student Success

Preparation

- Five Ps-Prior Preparation Prevents Poor Performance
- Preparation is key to effective teaching and learning.

- QEP Theme: Communicating to Succeed
Accomplishments

- 93% of Nursing Students Passed the NCLEX
- 204 Dismissed-Academic Progression Policy
- Dr. Faye Calhoun Named Director of the GSK STEM Program
- Teach-out Plans are on Target for 2014
Accomplishments

- Agreed to Participate in the UNC-GA China Project
- Dean’s Global Speaker Series – Business 1/28
- Dean’s Search CBSS on Target
- Dr. Romocki- Director, Health Careers Program
Preparation for Spring 2013

- Managing Class Rolls
- Incomplete ("I") Grades/Contracts
- Moratorium on Grade Changes
- Grade Appeals
- Students must receive grades they earn in a timely manner
- Students grades must be accurately calculated.
Preparation for Spring 2013

• Change in Procedures – Students must not remain in class if they are not financially cleared.
• Send students to the Eagle Service Center to make financial arrangements for paying bills.
Assessment and Accountability

• How Do We Measure Student Success?
• How Do We Quantify Student Success?
• Who is Accountable for Student Success?
• What are the Qualities/Attributes of a Successful Student?
A Successful Student

- Has achieved the competencies and acquired the skills needed to perform well in career markets.
- Is competitive for graduate and professional programs and employment in the discipline.
- Speaks Well, Writes well, and Presents well.
Questions?
The End

Presented by Bernice Duffy Johnson
Associate Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
February 1, 2013
REPORT TO THE NCCU FACULTY SENATE ON
THE JANUARY 18, 2013, MEETING OF THE UNC FACULTY ASSEMBLY

HMI Caucus (Historically Minority Institutions)
- Met over Lunch Hour
- Concern expressed over “Rainmaker” proposal in draft Strategic Plan and its impact on HMIs. Belief that faculty in place have untapped talent and potential and that these faculty and campus programs would experience a reduction in financial support in order to meet costs of “superstar rainmakers” brought in to attract students and grant money
- Discussion of College Access Challenge Grant. Federally funded pilot to promote success of minority male students, 40 on each of 5 UNC campuses, including NCCU.
  Goal to expand to all UNC campuses with line-item funding by state of NC. Legislature will be lobbied.
  Pilot shows significant academic results.
- Discussion of changes in admissions requirements.
  Proposals for campuses to submit requests for modifications has not been approved by BOG. Research needs to be done using data and analysis. President Ross held proposal for further discussion before sending it to the BOG, which meets on Feb. 8.
- Concern expressed over identifying students who take online courses and determining if they have met certain criteria.
  Result could be that limiting resources will lead to restriction of access.

Updates from FA Chair Catherine Rigsby
- Chair of Faculty Assembly and Chair of Staff Assembly have been invited to sit at the table with the BOG. Rigsby is also sitting on the BOG Educational Policies and Planning Committee, and Staff Assembly Chair sits on the BOG Personnel Committee. At last BOG meeting, there were 5 presentations on Tenure. Rigsby gave one of these and included information on shared Governance. Feels this is educational process for board.
Discussion of FA feedback to Strategic Plan

- Results are documents that Chair Rogers forwarded to us all earlier this week.
- Letter from FA Chair Rigsby to President Ross
- Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-01: Resolution in Response to the January 16, 2013 Draft Strategic Plan
- Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-02: Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Assessment
- Faculty Assembly Resolution 2013-03: Resolution on Concerns with e-learning as Presented in the Draft Strategic Plan
- Also included in the documents Chair Rogers forwarded to us all is the 6-page “Faculty Advisory Council Response to Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina, Strategic Directions for 2013-2018 (January 16, 2013 Draft)

Other Committee Reports

- Faculty Welfare and External Communications Committee
  A Legislative Day is being planned for late March to mid April. Faculty will work with state legislative relations person on each campus.
  SGAs will be included.
  Purpose is to build relationships.
  Betsy Brown has done a study on adjunct issues, including study of titles, hiring and promotion criteria, status evaluation, work and salary linkage.

- Chairs group (Will Chair Rogers give this report?)
  Met at 8 AM, prior to opening of FA
  Many campuses are currently addressing SACS issues.
  Non-tenured faculty have been admitted to the Faculty Senate at UNC-G.
  General Education documents have been passed on 5 campuses and addressed on 5 additional campuses.

- Budget Committee
  State funds will support Pell Grant students for summer school to keep them on track for graduation.
A reform will reward efficiencies by increasing permissible carry forward from 2.5% to 5%.
A study of adjuncts done in 2002 is on the GA website under Policies and Publications.

Report prepared by Minnie B. Sangster, PhD
For Presentation at February 1, 2013, Faculty Senate meeting
Faculty Advisory Council 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 Brod

"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

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. 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.” 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
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1 Susan Cannata, UNCP; Georgie Donovan, ASU; Vidyaaranya B. Gorgeya, UNCC; 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
3 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), 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
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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 that 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
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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/
UNC Faculty Assembly

Thomas W. Ross, President
The University of North Carolina
General Administration
Post Office Box 2688
Chapel Hill, NC 27515-26888

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 (innovator, 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,

[Signature]

Catherine A. Rigby
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.
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.
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.
February 1, 2013

Re: Governance Committee Report on a Specific Matter

Good Afternoon Members of the NCCU Faculty Senate:

The Governance Committee was assigned the task of making recommendations of what should be done when faculty do not comply with attendance at expected meetings, etc. The Governance Committee, in its meeting on yesterday, January 31, discussed some ideas which I am sharing with you now. Please note that my presentation today has not gone through the usual approval of minutes process.

Firstly, on behalf of the Governance Committee, I would like to thank Dr. Bernice D. Johnson, Associate Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for requesting Faculty input regarding this matter, and for her dedication to enhancing service delivery to our students.

You may find that some of the Committee’s presentation below is in ways “preaching to the choir,” however, we hope that you find that we have provided below a foundation for our recommendations. I also note that the Committee emphasizes using a “looking forward stance”, focusing on finding ways that we can work cooperatively to address the matter at hand.

The Committee maintains that Faculty should be held accountable for carrying out the duties of one’s position/contract. Carrying out such duties is in keeping with the main reason that we are here, which is the promotion of student success. And we are getting paid.

A couple of examples of the importance of attending assigned meetings are:

- Attending graduation to communicate to the student that we acknowledge her/his accomplishments.
- Attending Faculty Institute or other meetings to receive information that helps us be in compliance with various legal requirements (e.g., being informed regarding what constitutes sexual harassment and documenting attendance in such a meeting in which the information was presented).

Recommendations:

Send out a notice of the importance of attending various meetings.

Send out notification of what action will now be taken, or procedure that will now be followed, if Faculty do not attend required activities. Such procedure will include an oral warning, documented at the departmental level. Should nonattendance continue, then the usual steps in accord with The UNC University System policy would be followed.

Faculty sign a form that indicates awareness of the required attendance, unless for extenuating circumstances, at meetings/activities and the dates for a given year; and awareness of the action that can be taken by administrators if one does not attend.
North Carolina Central University
Office of the Registrar
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 1, 2013

1. Spring 2013 Graduation Clearance

   - February 15, 2013 - Applications for Graduation due in the Registrar’s Office

   - Graduation clearance hot button items are:
     ✓ Clearing up ‘T’ grades (all Spring 2012 incomplete grades not changed to a final grade by Spring 2013 will be changed to the final grade of ‘F’)
     ✓ Outstanding substitution and transfer credit evaluation forms
     ✓ Clearing outstanding balances, completing exit interviews
     ✓ Clearing Academic Community Service

   - Graduation Readiness Checklist (see attachments / Registrar website)
     http://www.nccu.edu/academics/resources/registrar/index.cfm

2. Transfer Credits Policy

   - As per the 2011-2013 North Carolina Central University Undergraduate Catalog, page 42 states:

     “The maximum number of transferable credits is 64 semester hours from a two-year college. There is currently no limit for transferring credits from a four-year institution.”

   - Statement of the Problem:

     o Institution has been accepting in excess of 64 credit hours from community colleges
     o Transfer transcript delays (late receiving of transfer courses for evaluations)
     o Duplication of courses
     o Misunderstanding of Transfer Credit Policy
     o Evidence of lack of communication between the advisor and the Transfer Services Office

3. Recommendations for Graduation Clearance

   - All incomplete grades for graduating students to be completed at the due date of the Application for Graduation;

   - All transfer credit evaluations, waivers, substitutions should accompany the Application for Graduation;

   - Final Grade submission for graduating students should be completed by the due date on the Academic Calendar.

4. Attached Documents

   - Graduation Readiness Checklist - Spring 2013
   - Flyer (Jostens)
   - Application for Graduation
   - Request for Diploma Mailing or Pick-up Form
North Carolina Central University
Office of the University Registrar
Graduation Readiness Checklist - Spring 2013

➢ Make an appointment with your academic advisor!!

➢ Critical Dates
  o February 5-7 – Jostens, Inc. at the University Bookstore to take orders for graduation caps and gowns, graduation invitations, and class rings (Josten's Grad Finale Flyer attached)
  o February 8 – Last day to file for master's foreign language examination
  o February 15 – Deadline to submit Applications for Graduation (Please note that late applications will not be accepted). Meet with your advisor to submit all paperwork. Do not submit application to the Registrar’s Office without all signatures and the Academic Approval for Graduation form. (Your advisor will have this form)
  o February 23 – Foreign Language Examinations for master’s degree candidates
  o March 6 – Last day for undergraduates to withdraw from class with a WC grade
  o March 18 – Last day for master’s degree candidates to file Applications for Admission to Candidacy
  o March 22 – Last day for filing applications for Master’s Written Examinations
  o April 6 – Written examinations for master’s degree candidates
  o April 29 – Last day of classes for law students
  o April 29 – Last day to submit thesis/projects
  o April 30 – Reading day for graduating students
  o May 1-2 – Final examinations for graduating students
  o May 3 – Final grades for graduating students due in Banner by 5 p.m.
  o May 6 – Deadline for clearance – student accounts, community service, exit interviews
  o May 9 – Pick up Permit-to-March Cards, 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. BN Duke Auditorium
  o May 9 – Graduate/Professional Rehearsal, 6 p.m., McDougald-McLendon Gym
  o May 10 – Undergraduate Rehearsal, 10 a.m., Annie Day Shepard Bowl
  o May 10 – Graduate/Professional Commencement, 3 p.m., McDougald-McLendon Gym
  o May 10 – Chancellor’s Reception, 6 p.m., Brant Street Plaza
  o May 11 – Undergraduate Commencement Exercises, 8 a.m., O’Kelly-Riddick Stadium

➢ Issues/Items to Remember
  o Consult your academic advisor NOW to be certain of your graduation status and completion of your degree requirements. (Application for Graduation form attached). Do not submit application to the Registrar’s Office without all signatures and the Academic Approval for Graduation form. (Your advisor will have this form)
  o Pay the graduation processing fee ($10.00 for undergraduates, $12.00 for graduate/professional students) by May 6.
  o Check on transfer credits, substitutions, waivers, etc., if applicable.
  o Official transcripts of courses taken this semester at another college/university must be in the Office of the Registrar by 5 p.m. on May 3.
  o Clear up outstanding "F" grades if needed for degree completion. (Outstanding "F" grades will automatically turn to "F" by May 3 if not cleared).
  o Contact Campus Bookstore for academic regalia and invitations (919/530-6445)
  o Clear account balances, complete financial exit interviews (Stafford Loans: online, http://www.studentloans.gov/ or Perkins Loans: 919/530-7122) by May 6.
  o Clear through Community Service office (undergraduates only) 919/530-7076, by May 6.
  o Notify Registrar’s Office in writing if you are not planning to participate in Commencement and pay $10 postage fee to have diploma mailed. (Use attached form)
  o Complete mandatory senior survey (undergraduates only). Survey link and password will be e-mailed to your NCCU e-mail after February 15.

Office of the Registrar
Handout with Attachments, January 18 2013
NC Central University 2013
Grad Finale®
February 5 - 7
10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Hours extended to 7 p.m. on 5th
Law School Students Feb 6 from 5-7 p.m.
Bookstore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deluxe Package</th>
<th>$227.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 Personalized Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Custom Seal Notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Custom Etiquette Seals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Custom Return Address Labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Certificate of Appreciation (with Presentation Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 FREE Tissue Inserts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Package</th>
<th>$126.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Personalized Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Seal Notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Etiquette Seals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Return Address Labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Certificate of Appreciation (with Presentation Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 FREE Tissue Inserts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Package</th>
<th>$104.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Personalized Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Seal Notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Etiquette Seals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Custom Return Address Labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A la Carte Items Prices subject to change without notice
- Personalized Announcements (package of 25) $55.70
- Additional Packs of 5 (after first package of 25) $11.34
- Etiquette Seals (package of 25) $19.50
- Custom Seal Notecards (package of 25) $22.45
- Tissue Inserts (package of 25) $8.00
- Certificate of Appreciation (with Presentation Cover) $25.96
- Certificate of Appreciation w/o Presentation Cover $18.45
- Return Address Labels (sheet of 25) $12.25
- Thank You Notes (package of 25) $15.50
- Souvenir Tassel $3.00

Prices shown are in US dollars and exclude sales tax, shipping and handling charges.

Take care of all graduation needs at this special event:

Special discounted pricing on class rings at this event - up to 40%. Pay in full with cash, credit or check. Jostens Payment Plan allows a $50 deposit with 4 equal monthly installments (this plan incurs a $15 service charge)

- Order personalized announcements. Need your correct major and degree to place the order. Write one check for announcements and class ring. Announcements now printed on premium paper with recycled content.
- New custom etiquette seals and return address labels.
- Announcement Etiquette: Send announcements to spread the good news of your graduation. Send via first-class mail 10 days prior to ceremony.
- Order your cap and gown – pick it up in April.

College Rings Starting at
$169 (WOMENS) $189 (MENS)

Now is the time to purchase your college ring at special discounts!
Promotional price valid for a limited time.

3 easy ways to order:
GO college.jostens.com CALL 1-800-854-7464 VISIT us at our event on campus
APPLICATION FOR GRADUATION
NCCU • OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR • 1801 FAYETTEVILLE STREET • DURHAM NC 27707


This form and the Academic Approval for Graduation Form are due in the Registrar's Office by June 8 for summer 2012 completion, by October 5 for December 2012 graduation, and by February 15 for May 2013 graduation. After the data from this form has been entered into the system, your account will be charged with a DIPLOMA FEE of $10.00 for undergraduate students and $12.00 for graduate and law students. If you apply and do not graduate at the end of this term, you must apply again during the semester in which you expect to finish. The diploma fee is added to your account each time you apply. Please note that students who check summer graduation will not receive their diplomas until the December commencement. You must also obtain clearance from Community Service, Student Accounting, and Scholarships and Student Aid by the Monday before Commencement. Please direct all inquiries regarding invitations and caps and gowns to the University Bookstore.

SECTION I:

STUDENT ID NUMBER

8 2 0 - ___ ___ __

NAME (Please PRINT)

Please PRINT your name exactly as it should appear on your diploma.

PERMANENT ADDRESS

NUMBER AND STREET

CITY STATE ZIP

( ) (AREA CODE) TELEPHONE NUMBER CAMPUS E-MAIL ADDRESS

GRADUATION TERM

☐ December  ☐ May  ☐ Summer  ____ Is this your 1st undergraduate degree?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO (YEAR)

COLLEGE/SCHOOL (check one)

☐ Arts & Sciences  ☐ Behavioral & Soc Sci  ☐ Business  ☐ Education
☐ Law  ☐ LSIS  ☐ Nursing

DEGREE FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING: (check one below — see descriptions on reverse side)

Undergraduate

☐ BA  ☐ BS  ☐ BBA  ☐ BM  ☐ BSN  ☐ BSW

Graduate & Professional

☐ MA  ☐ MS  ☐ MBA  ☐ MAT  ☐ MED  ☐ MIS  ☐ MLS  ☐ MMU  ☐ MPA  ☐ MSA
☐ MSW  ☐ JD

MAJOR

CONCENTRATION

MINOR

Have you applied for graduation before?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO  If yes, please state when: __________________________

IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A DEGREE IN MORE THAN ONE MAJOR, PLEASE SUBMIT INFORMATION ON THE SECOND MAJOR BELOW AND COMPLETE A SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR THE SECOND MAJOR.

2nd MAJOR

DEPT. DEAN (PLEASE PRINT)

DEPT. DEAN'S SIGNATURE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

DEPT. CHAIR (PLEASE PRINT)

DEPT. CHAIR'S SIGNATURE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

ADVISOR (PLEASE PRINT)

ADVISOR'S SIGNATURE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

APPLICANT’S SIGNATURE

DATE SUBMITTED

Revised 1-07-13
REQUEST FOR DIPLOMA MAILING or PICK UP
Non-Participation in Commencement Exercises

Today's Date: __/__/20__

Banner ID #: ____________

I, ___________________________________________ do not plan to 'march' in this coming
(Please PRINT name)

__________________________, 20___ commencement exercises.
(graduation date)

Please mail my diploma to the following address:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

-OR-

☐ DO NOT MAIL, I prefer to pick up my diploma from the Registrar's Office.

Email Address: ____________________________@______________________________

Telephone: (______) _______ - ________________

Student's Signature: X

Payment for Postage

Confirmation #: Confirmation of payment to the Bursars Office

☐ Cash ☐ Check ☐ Money Order

Please call 919-530-6234 or 919-530-6209 to pay $10.00 postage using debit/credit card or staple receipt/check/money order to this document.

Revised 5-8-2012, Office of the University Registrar