



CHARTING THE FUTURE OPEN FORUM – APRIL 13, 2004

DISCLAIMER - The text below represents a best attempt to capture the essential content of the forum. The statements are not quotes. The accuracy of the material can not be assured.

Introduction

An Open Forum was scheduled to provide an opportunity for dialogue about Draft Two of the CTF comprehensive plan, and Draft One of the Transition Plan. The members of the Design Team were introduced, and general information regarding the operating procedures for the Open Forum discussion was provided. President Norton gave a brief welcome. She stated that the Design Team appreciated all the input given about Draft One and noted that the input was seriously considered in the preparation of Draft Two. She noted that the upcoming academic year will be a transition year for the purpose of delineating implementation plans. The President emphasized that faculty, staff, and students will be involved with the implementation of the plan and that it will be an intensive year of collaboration.

Comments and Questions from Faculty & Staff

Comment - Draft Two, Page 5 - *Organizing for Greatness* - a philosophical concern was expressed regarding the content, which appeared to emphasize professional education over liberal arts; also it seems to emphasize the role of college rather than learning. The text implies that a professional school concept drives the plan – that the liberal arts are subordinate to professional education.” Request that the Design Team reconsider or restate their intent and respond to “why someone goes to a university.”

Response – It has been clear since the initial draft that there is a division of opinion, even hostility, between the proponents of liberal arts and the providers of professional education. The Design Team has devoted considerable time to the issue and discussed how best to create structures that would support the concept of liberal learning throughout the curriculum. The Design Team continues to believe that integrating liberal and professional education is important for our future. The goal is to combine, not to have one dominate over the other. The purpose is to infuse the liberal arts throughout the academic experience at UNC, whether a student chooses to major in history or nursing, each major should have an important liberal component to it. UNC has an obligation to help a history student connect to what he or she might do in life.

Comment – The text seems to suggest that all preparation for work is in professional fields, not liberal arts. That is the slant that faculty find troubling. For example, the text

states that professional education is where students prepare for the world of work – a student majoring in History or English is also preparing for a career in those disciplines.

Comment - The liberal arts and professional preparation programs are not antagonistic toward one another, we respect differences. Suggest that if you really want to integrate, think of a different statement, rather than the one that is vague and not progressive.

Response – The comments are helpful, the Design Team will try to refine the statement

Response – The Design Team would appreciate your suggestions for a statement that you believe is not vague and is progressive, please forward to chartingthefuture@unco.edu

Comment – Faculty continues to be disappointed that they are not part of the Design Team, despite the motion of the faculty and expressed concerns. As the documents claim, UNC's aspirations will involve faculty in the implementation. It is important to have faculty involved. There is an unbalanced nature of the Design Team, no faculty are represented. There are a number of areas for investment but they seem to be entirely in administrative areas. There was a budget cut last year and as a result many of us have higher teaching loads, I don't see it stated in the plan to get faculty back to be effectively working with students. Don't see investments in academics, research, only see additional academic structures; how is money going to be saved? It appears that we balance the budget on backs of faculty. Concern about the proposal re centralization in information technology; department faculty fear this approach. Centralized support is not where faculty want to go.

Response – There is a misunderstanding of what the plan says. It has been communicated from the onset that the planning process resulted from the budget reduction that increased teaching loads. We want to plan to avoid quick decisions in response to a budget cut. We determined it was best to take time to inventory the functions we perform, try to build structure to enable us to get where we want to be, funding functions in a cost effective manner. Currently, we do not have detail on how many people are needed to perform specific functions. For example, if a faculty member is performing 6 different functions and these functions can be reduced by 3, then that faculty will have more time to work with students. With the proposal, we won't get big savings right away, it will take time. Savings will come in terms of operational efficiency to perform the functions we do, with expertise more focused. Money will come from looking at degree program areas, majors and minors, etc. Some degree programs, we cannot afford to continue. These decisions take time and collaboration, next year we will work with deans and faculty to determine what degrees can be phased out, what ones can be merged, etc.

Response – It is clear that CCHE's financial support is unclear, dealing with curriculum; savings could occur if we reduce redundancy in programs, work with deans and programs to make these decisions. Investment in faculty and staff development is needed and is stated. Next year, faculty task forces to be appointed to identify key areas for development, e.g. grant writing, research, teaching, etc. These decisions will be defined

through campus wide input. Have some ideas from deans. Research can we consolidate some research classes? Takes time and expertise.

Comment - In the first draft there were so many concerns about the academic side, I didn't have time to address the non academic side; it seems there are more AVP positions and not many cuts in administration.

Response - The University has moved a lot of money over the past five years from administration to academic instructional support. For example, we have cut the administrative budgets to free money for instruction, we have moved from 40% of our funds being allocated to instruction to the current 55%. These dollars came from administrative efficiencies. Many changes were made on the non-academic side before Charting began. Example; when the controller left the university; we combined that position with budget director; combined affirmative action with human resources; continue to look at savings. In the comments you expressed concern about centralized vs. decentralized technology. We believe this model is more cost effective; take best from both – centralized more efficient and decentralized more responsive. For technology support personnel located in college, if that person is not there, college left with no support. Idea is to have model where a trained person can back up support... Much more cost effective to have IT tech support be centralized and assigned to specific college. Back up support will be available. Regarding your statement about investment in faculty - in the document you will find a paragraph titled Investment in Personnel. We recognize that workload issue is paramount to the faculty. That is why we are doing this comprehensive planning process. Investment in personnel is key area for this plan.

Response - Faculty workload issue is important. University faculty teaching, advising, research and services are all important components within workload. Our intent is to see the workload issue addressed more fully and at the college level. Workload decisions are difficult to be implemented by provost office, "one size does not fit all", and thus decisions need to be made at the college, school levels. Workload issues should be addressed at dean's level.

Comment – There are many improvements from the first draft. However, the faculty senate is concerned about lack of involvement with faculty; what is the future of the design team?

Response – The Design Team is out of business at the end of this year. In the Transition Plan there is reference to the creation of a President's Planning Council to replace the Design Team. The Council will have representatives from faculty senate and other governance groups; it will be representative, like the involvement used with the Leadership Summit process. Your suggestions for the configuration of the group are welcome; a lot of work will be coming faculty's way.

Comment – It is important to have the Faculty Senate prominent in the future.

Comment – There is a need to state a level of specificity, specifically within the colleges about the administrative assignments. It seems that, essentially, structure is colleges and schools. For a handful of schools, some will be unchanged and with some changes are from current departments to schools. There are many unknowns, what level of specificity will you bring to the Board?

Response - Because the Board is the policy making body, we need to take the plan to the Board for its action. If in a box, and board approves it, is it set in stone? Answer is no. We want the Board's approval on the essence of the plan, not the details. Many changes could be made without Board's input. Major outlines will be presented and the transition/ implementation plans refined. We will clarify for the Board what they are approving and what discretion the administration will have.

Comment – There is one matter of concern, the question of schools being formed by now independent departments, we need more specific information about process to accomplish this.

Response – I don't believe the board intends to micro manage. Board will pass on the essence of the plan. Each school will have different make up, intention to protect the right of the faculty to be involved in the specifics of the schools.

Comment - You may want to specifically say in document that BOT is approving just a framework. Faculty and students will be involved in the implementation process. I'm pleased to see implementation has been delayed. If portrayed to the Board, that with many changes, governance groups will have usual approval process, I'll feel better.

Response –We will try to address the future planning better in the Transition Plan, also we will refine what is stated regarding Board approval. As a Design Team we realized that we couldn't make decisions about certain academic issues and we brought the deans in to discuss items, such as the roles of deans, directors, the need for asst. or assoc deans, future of degrees, emphases and minors, etc. It was clear that such topics as faculty evaluation, workload assignments are specific to colleges and can not be the same across disciplines. I have used the term “comprehensive plan;” it is a framework not the zoning.

Comment – My concern are the timelines in the Transition Plan for appointments in management and leadership, AVPs, Deans, Directors, etc. Will we have enough time for units to conduct searches and finalize appointments? It seems too short for normal, national search processes. Also, wouldn't a person being hired as Provost, want to know that he or she had the opportunity to hire their own Deans?

Response – Appointments for some schools are simple, there are already people in place and they won't need a search. Some schools are large, some small, and the determination of interim persons can be made without a search. Perhaps a search for permanent positions will be delayed past 2005. In the transition period, we will need a national search for provost. That search can take one year. Some deans currently sitting deans,

some need national search. Ideally, we might be able to finish in one year, but if more time is needed the timelines can be changed.

Response - The Design Team will revisit time lines to be sure they are realistic. Draft Two of the Transition Plan will need to be refined.

Comments and Questions from Students

Comment - Thanks for the second draft, you were listening. You have said that the process is based on trust; understand trust is given to faculty over General Ed. There are not a lot of students here and maybe they have lost trust after the release of the first draft. The current transition plan doesn't show how dialog will occur; hope in second draft of Transition Plan you will address this. Hope that students are represented, show inclusive dialog and accountability. Otherwise, you can expect adversarial flares to fire up. Diversity was an issue at last forum; probably the adversary that was the tone was not the best way to impact change. We need to work together instead. Current plan calls for decisions made over summer; but students aren't here in the summer. Process must be inclusive for faculty and students. Make sure parties are present. Summer is not a good time because many students not here. Diversity task force was a good idea – thank you for implementing. This represents trust and working together. Many students discouraged, don't feel this avenue. May find another way to find a way to voice opinions. I want to bring two things, 1) Are you willing to sit down with a group of students and faculty to work together? And 2) In the future can students have a legitimate voice, not just an advisory voice or input through open forum/panels? The same way as the Design Team sits down to work, can you sit down with students and discuss?

Response – I think it is important for students to believe they have a voice, how do we do it? Students are not here. We will talk more as the Transition Plan is being developed on how to provide student input into the process. How we make decisions, we haven't gotten to that discussion at this time, thus we can't make commitments as to how Design Team will proceed. One difficulty to discuss and determine is how are students appointed? Who serves? At this time we have been working with SRC, the official representative body for students.

Comment – Will you commit to sit down with design team and students? Perhaps students from each college to give all students a voice.

Response - Student voice is important, design team intent to be inclusive from all points of view on campus.

Response - I would like to summarize what I have heard to be certain we have an understanding of your requests. 1. You are suggesting that the Design Team involve students in the implementation process. 2. You are asking if the Design Team would be willing to engage in discussion with students. Perhaps through a Student Leadership

Summit, including SRC? 3. You want us to look at timeline with dates over summer to be deferred to the fall. 4. You are suggesting that student involvement needs to take a role with a legitimate voice, not an advisory voice.

Comment - Why is there no representatives from staff, faculty or students on the Design Team? Why is Ms Gilfoyle there when she hasn't worked at UNC?

Response – Ellie Gilfoyle functions as a consultant and facilitator. She keeps the discussion going, works with administration to develop and implement the process, and helps the group stay on task. She is not a voting member of the Design Team. Regarding staff representation, all design team are staff at UNC. Leadership Summit members have addressed major issues, gave guidance, ideas, advice, etc. This has been a representative process throughout the planning.

Response - One of the reasons we designed a representative process was to provide opportunity for everyone to have input, through the development of unit reports, through their representative at the Leadership Summits, through open forums, through meetings with units, and through established email channels. The input from the campus has been seriously considered. The process has provided more opportunities for everyone's direct input, than would be possible with one representative from staff, one faculty, and one student on the Design Team.

Comment - Thank you for listening, the second draft is better, but still some major issues. In Draft 2 it states that the AVP of Finances will be meeting to develop policies and procedures with the Budget office and Institutional Research. When is the AVP of Financial Services meeting with budget office; what is that, do they prepare the budget? Are they going to develop and find ways to produce information and services that we already have? Over the summer is the budget developed for new programs?

Response - The budget process typically begins with all units providing information to the budget office in December; then in March, we begin the budget meetings and prepare a draft budget for the Board to discuss at their May Meeting, to act on at the June meeting. This year the process was changed because the budget for 2004 – 05 will essentially be the same budget as last year, 2003-04 due to the Charting process. We are looking at an abbreviated process this year; in fact the process begins tomorrow. The budget will go to the Board in May with the final budget to the Board in June. Primarily, this budget is a roll forward of last years budget. There usually are some minor budget clean up that is done over summer but nothing major. Starting next fall we will look to the units to propose their new budgets for 2005-06.

Comment – Do you need to know which students to meet with? Most students on campus would know who those students are, what students would be interested.

Response – I like the idea of a student leadership summit. It would be very difficult to get a summit organized before semester ends. Regarding students having a legitimate

voice, that is a Board of Trustee decision. There is opportunity to have input, however power is not delegated to any governance groups. Students do not have power or authority, but they do have input.

Comment – Students are not asking for power but input by sitting down with the Design Team. I am just asking for students to have discussion with design team, I am asking for your commitment.

Response - Are you asking to sit down with the Design Team prior to submission of the final draft to the Board at their May 4 meeting? If so, we will take that into consideration and will contact you with our decision. I can't speak on behalf of the total Design Team, it is an item that we need to discuss, and thus we can't make that commitment today.

Comment – If you are concerned about putting a group together, I would be totally committed to doing this if it is possible.

Comment - Draft 2 has improvements; but UNC has 11,000 plus students, not all have input, if went to a 146 leadership summit, that is not representative of all. I am wondering if the reason the cultural centers, women's resource centers, GLBT, be allowed another year, is so that they can quiet down and by next year we are faced with the same situation of losing cultural centers?

Response - No

Comment - What is the audit; will there be a public report?

Response - The Design Team appreciated the cultural centers input, the task force made the recommendation to have an audit. No decisions have been made regarding the person or persons to do the audit. The report will be made public.

Comment – There are programs already on campus where changes don't really need to be made. For example, student services and career services are already functioning. Why are they being changed?

Response – The changes are being proposed to enhance services. Intent is to analyze functions; talk about how structure used to make those functions by putting similar functions together, investing in their greatness. Career services is currently functioning well but could be enhanced by adding other functions, for example, career services could provide support to colleges with the scheduling of internships. The changes are to enhance rather than replace.

Comment – In the text state that Dr. Barbara Tatum was speaking of students of color, not all students in general.