THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, October 10, 1997, 3:00 p.m.

*** * * * Assembly Room, 2nd Floor, Wilson Library * * * ****

Chancellor Michael Hooker will preside. Attendance of elected Council members is required.

AGENDA

Type	*Time*	*Item*
INFO	3:00	**Remarks by Chancellor Hooker.** [The Chancellor invites questions or comments on any topic.]
INFO	3:10	**Announcements:** Richard N. (Pete) Andrews, Chair of the Faculty.
INFO	3:15	**Reports:** a. **Faculty Grievance Committee:** Evelyne Huber, Chair.* b. **Faculty Hearings Committee:** Elizabeth Gibson, Chair.*
DISC	3:20	**Report of The Chancellor's Task Force On Intellectual Climate****

The primary agenda item for this meeting of the Faculty Council and General Faculty is to receive and discuss the report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate, which was appointed at the request of the Faculty Council, and to determine the sense of the faculty as to its recommendations and priorities and further steps for acting upon them. Copies of the report have been sent to all deans, directors, department heads, and Faculty Council members, and are available in the principal libraries and on the UNC Internet home page (http://www.unc.edu, under "Office of the Chancellor"). Copies of the transmittal memo and executive summary have been distributed to all faculty as well.

3:20	Background and context – Professor Andrews.
3:25	Introduction to the report – Professor Pamela Conover.
3:30	General discussion of report.
3:50	First Year Initiative proposal.
4:10	Recommendations on Intellectual Climate in the Classroom.
4:25	Recommendations on Faculty Roles and Rewards.
4:40	Recommendations on Intellectual Climate Outside the Classroom.
4:50	Recommendations on Education for Civic Responsibility.
5:00	Recommendations on Common Spaces.
5:10	General Discussion: Priorities and Further Steps.
5:30	Adjourn.

(Time indications are only estimates and are not intended to forestall free discussion.)

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY:

ACT = Action
INFO = Information
DISC = Discussion

* Copies of these documents are being circulated to members of the Faculty Council and to Chairs and Deans, who are encouraged to share them with other faculty. Council members: please bring your copies to the meeting and discuss with your constituents ahead of time.

** Copies of this document have been distributed separately.

The Agenda Committee will meet on October 27 for the November 14 Faculty Council meeting.

September 1997

Faculty Grievance Committee

(Appointive Committee -- Chair of the Faculty)

Annual Report

Members: Evelyne Huber (1996-99), Chair; Frayda Bluestein (1997--98); Jean DeSaix (1997-2000); Reginald F. Hildebrand (1995- 98); Vanessa Hodges (1997-2000); Ernest Kraybill (1997-2000); Erika C. Lindemann (1995-98); Megan M. Matchinske (1996-99); John Rubin (1997-99); Dorothy Verkerk (1997-2000). Members leaving committee during the past year: John Charles Boger, Outgoing Chair; Terence V. McIntosh (1994-97); Lee G. Pedersen (1994-97); Patricia Z. Fischer (1996-99); Cary M. Grant (1995-98).

Meetings during past year: 9-25-96; 10-29-96; 4-25-97.
Report prepared by: Evelyne Huber (Chair) and John C. Boger (Outgoing Chair).
Committee charge: "The Committee is authorized to hear, mediate, and advise with respect to the adjustment of grievances of all persons designated as members of the Faculty." (The Faculty Code of University Government)

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None

Report of activities: In the 1996-97 academic year, the previous chair, John Charles Boger, received eight inquiries about possible initiation of a faculty grievance. All those who inquired were sent a copy of the procedures of the committee, along with a preliminary form calling for a brief explanation of the grievance. Two of the seven filed formal grievances. Subcommittees composed of three members heard those grievants and respondents during formal hearings. Reports and recommendations were presented to the full Committee, which adopted the reports. The reports were transmitted to the relevant parties and school/department authorities. The recommendations in one case were accepted by the relevant parties, and the parties have subsequently reported partial or complete satisfaction with the process. In the other case, the grievant was not satisfied with the Committee's recommendations and took the case to Chancellor Hooker. Chancellor Hooker upheld the Committee's recommendations that had been accepted by the other parties.

The 1996-97 subcommittee that heard one formal grievance made two procedural recommendations on the administrative review of sexual harassment allegations; those recommendations were forwarded in due course to appropriate administrative officials.

During the 1997-98 year, the present chair, Evelyne Huber, is following up on one inquiry about a possible grievance that was made at the very end of the 1996-97 academic year. No new inquiries have been made to date.

Recommendations for action by Faculty Council: None

October 10, 1997

Faculty Hearings Committee

Annual Report

Members: Stephen Allred (alternate for Marion Danis, 2002); Dirk Frankenberg (alternate for Marie Bristol, 1998); S. Elizabeth Gibson (2000), Chair; Robert E. Gwyther (alternate for Genna Rae McNeil, fall 1997); Genna Rae McNeil (1999) (on leave, fall 1997); Beverly W. Taylor (2001).

Members leaving committee during past year: John V. Orth (1997) (expiration of term); Marie Bristol (1998) and Marion Danis (2002) (resignation from University).

Meetings during past year: January 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 24, 25, 1997.

Report prepared by: S. Elizabeth Gibson (Chair) with review by full committee

Committee charge: According to *The Faculty Code of University Government*, the Faculty Hearings Committee "is composed of five faculty members with permanent tenure, serving five-year terms. The committee performs functions assigned to it in the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*." Those duties include conducting hearings (a) on the request of a faculty member who has been notified before the end of his or her tenure or term of appointment that the University intends to discharge him or her, and (b) on the request of a faculty member for review of a decision not to reappoint him or her upon expiration of a probationary term of appointment. In the case of a discharge hearing, the committee's duty is to determine whether one of the following permissible grounds for discharge has been established: "misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the faculty member is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, incompetence, and neglect of duty." (*Trustee Policies* section 3.a.). With respect to review of nonreappointment decisions, the committee is limited to determining whether the grounds for such action are impermissible under section 4.a. of the *Trustee Policies* or whether the decision was "affected by material procedural irregularities." (*Trustee Policies* section 4.c.).

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of activities: Pursuant to section 3.b. of the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*, the committee conducted a hearing at the request of a tenured faculty member who had been informed by the Chancellor of his intent to discharge him. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee recommended against discharge of the faculty member. The committee subsequently received notification that this recommendation was not accepted by the Chancellor.

Recommendations for action by Faculty Council: None.

INSIDE THE CLASSROOM

RATIONALE

- The ideal educational environment is one rich in student-faculty, student-student, and faculty-faculty interactions.
- In creating such an environment, we should draw heavily on the strengths of our faculty — its scholarship and research capabilities.
- The educational tools which draw most intensely on such research skills include active learning approaches, inquiry based methods, critical thinking activities and interdisciplinary studies.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish an *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* to provide a prestigious forum for an ongoing analysis and advocacy of undergraduate educational issues.
- Create an undergraduate educational research office to promote research opportunities with as many interested students as possible from all years.
- Expand the *Inquiry Track Program* to provide a bottom up advocacy and information sharing unit for active learning in the classroom.
- Develop a system for evaluating and supporting cohort educational experiments.
- Provide support for the ongoing effort to increase the number and quality of classrooms suitable for active learning practices.

OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

RATIONALE

- The intellectual vitality of students and faculty depends upon and reflects a whole network of co-curricular activities that are as important to the University community as its formal curriculum.
- People cannot be compelled to join intellectual discussions or to enter the rich cultural life of this community, but they can be encouraged to participate in existing cultural conversations (and help to create new ones) if they see how these conversations connect to issues in their own lives.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish a *Central Clearinghouse for Intellectual Events* to consolidate information about events at the University and distribute this information efficiently to students, faculty and staff. The *Clearinghouse Director* will link groups and activities around the University, and play a creative role in fostering cultural exchanges among diverse groups.
- Create a permanent, standing *Committee for Intellectual Life* to work with the Clearinghouse; its Subcommittee on Events will oversee two funds to foster student-faculty exchanges — one for special activities outside the classroom and the other for faculty-student lunches.
- Reform the Advising system.
- Provide more and better space for intellectual exchange by creating new coffee lounges, eating places, performance spaces and by expanding the *Daily Grind*,
- Create more connections between in-class and out-of-class activities.

THE FIRST YEAR INITIATIVE

RATIONALE

- Students' first year experiences set the tone for their academic careers.

- The typical first-year experience at UNC-CH, though varying from student to student, often stops short of the introduction to intellectual life that the university should provide because of weaknesses in three interrelated areas: Orientation, Academic Programs, and Residential Life.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop a three-year pilot project, the "*First Year Initiative*" (*FYI*), to model innovations that will invite first-year students into a more intense and satisfying relationship with the intellectual life of the University. A *Program Coordinator* will work with student affairs and academic affairs to coordinate the three components of the *FYI*:

    - A *summer reading project* to improve orientation.

    - A *first year seminar* to improve the academic program.

    - An *enrichment program* to improve residential life.

- Re-Open Discussion of Greek Rush.

SERVING TO LEARN, LEARNING TO SERVE: EDUCATION FOR CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

RATIONALE

- Service learning provides students with the intellectual tools necessary to solve, rather than simply ameliorate, pressing social problems.

- Service learning cultivates in students the capacity for civic judgment that is essential to responsible citizenship.

- Students engaged in service learning bring to the classroom first-hand experiences that invigorate intellectual inquiry and direct it into vital new channels.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish a public service center to coordinate the placement of students in service opportunities and to facilitate community access to the intellectual resources of the university.

- New funds for permanent and fixed-term public service professorships, course development grants, public service awards, and student summer fellowships to reward and encourage faculty, staff, and student involvement in service learning.

- Increased financial support for the transportation, training, and staff needs of existing service and community-based learning programs.

- Create a Bachelor's Degree with Distinction in Public Service.

COMMON SPACES

RATIONALE

- To sustain a vibrant intellectual life, university members must be able to interact freely and frequently in the common spaces of the university.

- The spatial features of intellectual life have been neglected far too long by this university.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- The creation and maintenance of good space for interaction should be a priority.

- Interior and exterior spaces should be designed to create more opportunities for personal reflection and for informal small-group interaction.

- Protect the Greater Pit Area as a critical common space, and develop Gerrard Hall and its surroundings as inviting common space with food, public talks, and student music performance.

- Those responsible for facilities and grounds should take a more creative role in improving outdoor ambiance for community interaction.

- Students and departments should have active input into designing and creating their common space, and money should be made available on some timely basis for them to do so.

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

RATIONALE

- Through their research, teaching and service most faculty engage in numerous activities that contribute to the University's intellectual environment.
- But teaching and service activities often get too little recognition when department Chairs make decisions regarding salary, teaching load, leave time, nomination for awards, and recommendations for promotion and tenure.
- Rethinking the reward structure to take account of the full range of activities that many faculty already do will allow individuals to be appropriately rewarded for all of their contributions to the university.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Modify existing reward systems to recognize better activities that enhance intellectual exchange.
    - *Faculty teaching portfolios*: report activities that contribute to intellectual growth of members of the University and reflect on one's practice of teaching. Chairs will use in distribution of resources.
    - *Departmental teaching portfolios*: replace part of Annual Report; describe department's efforts to enhance intellectual climate. Deans will use in distribution of resources.
- Establish new reward systems
    - *Intellectual Climate Fund* to support faculty initiatives to improve education; preference given to interdisciplinary projects departments might not support.
    - *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*

final

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE

AUGUST 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....iii

CHAPTERS

I. Introduction.....1
II. Intellectual Climate Inside the Classroom.....5
III. Intellectual Climate Outside the Classroom 11
IV. Intellectual Climate and the First Year Initiative.....18
V. Intellectual Climate and Education for Civic Responsibility.....23
VI. Intellectual Climate and Common Spaces.....30
VII. Faculty Roles and Rewards.....36
VIII. Implementation and Funding.....44
IX. Conclusions.....49

APPENDICES

1.A. Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate.....50
II.A. UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars.....51
VI.A. Starting References on Common Spaces.....52
VIII.A. Implementation Recommendations by Committee.....53
VIII.B. Charges to the Chancellor.....64
VIII.C. Charges to the Provost.....65
VIII.D. Charges to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.....66
VIII.E. Charges to Departmental Chairs.....67
VIII.F. Charges to Faculty.....68

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document represents the work and deliberations of nearly 100 faculty, students and staff who have given generously of their time for over a year. All of the members of the Task Force committees and their diligent chairs deserve thanks. Functioning as a Steering Committee, the Committee Chairs — Marshall Hall Edgell, Leon Fink, Lloyd Kramer, Donna LeFebvre, Laurie McNeil and Melinda Meade — merit special thanks for the countless hours they contributed, their good humor, creative ideas, and unfailing optimism. Over the past few years, a number of other people have also contributed to the work of this Task Force. Chancellor Michael Hooker took the step of creating the Task Force; he has provided support since its inception. Executive Vice-Chancellor Elson Floyd saw to the budgetary needs of the Task Force, and provided advice at a critical juncture. Ann Dodd was generous with her time and advice in helping the Task Force define its mission and organize its work. Sue Estroff provided valuable input in identifying the problems and articulating the need for a task force. Under the leadership of Jane Brown, as Chair of the Faculty, the *Executive Committee of Faculty Council* incubated the idea of a task force, and then provided critical feedback on initial drafts of the report. Aaron Nelson, as Student Body President, and the staff of the *DTH* worked hard to involve students in our deliberations. Todd Ellinwood, Ange-Marie Hancock, and Rachael Murphey assisted in the committee work. Jenifer MacGillvary provided adminstrative assistance and helped keep the project on track. Jon Wallace contributed excellent editorial assistance under substantial time constraints. Without the ongoing support of these campus leaders, faculty, students, and staff the work of this task force would have been impossible.

Pamela J. Conover
Task Force Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The essence of a University is defined by its intellectual life. For a variety of reasons, the current intellectual climate at the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* needs improvement if we are to maintain our excellence as a public university. Towards this broad end, the *Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate* created a dialogue with the university community about the future of our university. We asked faculty, staff, and students what kind of intellectual life is suitable for a university of the 21st century, and how can we generate it?

Our report answers this question with a vision of a better educational experience at UNC for the 21st century and a plan for implementing it. Three key elements characterize this vision: the educational experience should be student-centered with an emphasis on learning how to learn; intellectual exchange should be woven seamlessly into the fabric of everyday life; and education should be linked to life outside the University.

Unfortunately, moving towards these goals is hindered by problems of coordination and commitment. Many coordination problems can be solved by institutional reforms that facilitate better communication and collective activity. Coordination problems aside, people might not pursue our ideal of a shared intellectual life because they lack the commitment. But commitments can be encouraged by reshaping the reward system or cultural ethos for both faculty and students. Thus implementing our vision will require basic changes in the institutional structure of the university, and the cultures of students and faculty alike. Though no set of recommendations can magically transform institutions and cultures to produce immediately a vibrant intellectual community, we believe that over time the cumulative effect of our recommendations can and will transform the university, making us the model public university for the 21st century.

To improve intellectual life at UNC-CH, we have recommended many changes in six, related domains. To set priorities among them, we have divided our recommendations into three broad categories — transforming students, faculty and the university — and set priorities within each category. We recommend strongly that University pursue recommendations *simultaneously* in each of these areas, and that it begin by implementing the recommendations of highest priority in each category and continue until the plan for change is fully executed.

Change will fail if students are not involved. The best way to alter student commitments is to engage students in an intellectual life when they first step on campus. This can be accomplished through the institution of a first year socialization experience, proposed here as a pilot program: the *The First Year Initiative*. *This is the single most important recommendation in our report.* Improving the college advising and departmental advising systems is a necessary complement to any first year experience. Of somewhat lower priority than the *First Year Initiative* and advising reforms are three equally important proposals for institutional innovations that will transform student culture by expanding and coordinating opportunities for: mentored, research-oriented, learning experiences; connecting in-class and out-of-class activities; and service and community based learning. Specifically, we recommend the creation of an *Office for Undergraduate Research*, a *Central Clearing House* to coordinate activities and a "*Committee for Intellectual Life*" to work with the Clearing House staff, and a *Center for Public Service*.

Change will fail without the students, but it will never begin without the commitment of the faculty. *Accordingly, the second most important recommendation in our study is the proposed change in the faculty reward structure which is intended to reshape faculty culture and motivations.* Specifically, faculty change can be instigated by employing individual teaching portfolios, departmental teaching portfolios, altering the evaluation of research, improving rewards for service learning experiences, and for research excellence. Of lower priority, faculty change can also be facilitated by improving access to information about active learning methods, encouraging interdisciplinary research, and establishing an *Intellectual Climate Fund* to give faculty opportunities to develop their own ideas.

Finally, change depends on transforming the University as both an institution and a place. *To transform the university as an institution, we make our third most important recommendation: the establishment of the UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars (ADTS).* The *ADTS* will be an institutional vehicle for the continuous appraisal of the educational enterprise at UNC, while simultaneously providing a means of recognizing outstanding teaching scholars. The culture and commitments of administrators must also evolve if institutional change is to occur. Therefore, we recommend orientation sessions for Deans and Chairs. Finally, to transform the university as a place, the classroom and common spaces of the university must be altered so as to improve the opportunities for intellectual exchanges. Here, recognition of the importance of the creation and maintenance of interaction space by university leaders, those involved in the design and planning of public facilities, and the faculty is a priority.

If this plan for transforming intellectual life at the *University of North Carolina Chapel Hill* is to be a success, all members of the university community must assume some responsibility for change. Active leadership must come from the Chancellor and the Provost. Deans will have a central effect for they have the authority to pursue many of the initiatives that we are recommending. The *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences*, in particular, will play an especially critical role in implementing our recommendations. Chairs and unit heads will also play a key role for they stand at the intersect between individual faculty and the university administration; they communicate the institution's expectations to faculty members. The cooperation of individual faculty members is also crucial for they must embrace this opportunity to redefine their roles. Finally, and most critically, the participation and cooperation of students is essential if this plan is to succeed. Together, we can reshape the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* and make it the leader among public universities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Intellectual climate defines the essence of a university. It is both a source of energy for and a reflection of the engagement of faculty and students in intellectual life: an intellectual life broadly conceived to include wide-ranging discussions about ideas, the nature of the world and society in which we live, personal aspirations and individual beliefs, as well as the many courses, organizations, public events, and artistic performances that foster such conversations. Our conception of intellectual life thus presumes that the exploration of ideas is much more than classroom assignments; it is also a lively, pleasurable, and often unsystematic discovery of new perspectives on problems of our own lives, our immediate community, and the larger world. Intellectual life, therefore, is nurtured in many venues both inside and outside the classroom at UNC-CH.

In the ideal university, all faculty would contribute to the richness of the intellectual climate through cutting-edge research that would inform their teaching and with enthusiasm that would naturally exhilarate their students. Students would learn to develop confidently their own ideas and view their education as of the utmost importance. The intellectual excitement generated by faculty and students would not stop at the classroom door, but would deeply permeate the public life of the University — the interaction between faculty and students outside the classroom, the cultural and social activities pursued by students and faculty together, the interactions of students and faculty with the community. Faculty and students alike would be engaged with public issues and with citizens of the broader community. Intellectual exchange would be woven seamlessly into the fabric of everyday life, rather than partitioned into fifty-minute segments doled out three times a week in the classroom.

BACKGROUND: CHANGE AND THE PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE

Currently, the intellectual climate at the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* does not satisfy this ideal. It varies considerably in intensity and direction across the campus — from exciting cross-disciplinary collaboration, student engagement and public service in some areas to repetitious discourse, student indifference and isolation in others. There is, then, a real need for concrete effort aimed at improving the intellectual environment. In addition, there are fundamental changes in society and the immediate external environment of the University that are propelling us toward change. The information revolution, the management revolution, the cost crisis, greater pressures for public accountability — these are all forces compelling us to reexamine our goals and methods if we are to maintain our excellence as a public university. To ignore these forces is to risk the future of our University. The outside pressure for the University to change and adapt to its rapidly evolving environment is real and substantial.

Unfortunately, publicizing these needs may not be sufficient to motivate faculty, students, and administrators to change. Too many faculty fail to appreciate the power of outside forces. Too many students are heavily influenced by a popular culture that devalues intellectual life. Too many administrators are wedded to traditional ways of governing the University. For change to take hold, it must be driven by an internally constructed argument about who we are as a University — by a self-generated change in our basic identity. By looking *within* the University, we can articulate together a new vision of our common identity that is powerful enough to generate the kinds of changes necessary to maintain our excellence in the 21st century.

The *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* conceives of itself as a "*leading public university*," one that takes seriously its teaching mission. In the changing external environment described above, maintaining this identity compels us to sustain our standing as a "leading public university", *as defined by others*, while simultaneously altering the educational experience we create for our students. Most faculty are strongly committed to the education of their students; they are devoted to fulfilling their roles as both educators and researchers. But many faculty often experience these as conflicting roles. Already pressured and overworked, many see no way to devote more time and effort to teaching and service while maintaining productive research programs. From our current perspective, change appears too difficult and unnecessary; maintaining the status quo is an easier path to follow. As long as we think of ourselves in terms of the past, there will be little commitment to real change among faculty and students.

To make change more feasible and attractive, we appeal to all members of the University community to rethink their roles and activities. Instead of thinking of ourselves as a "leading public university", let us conceive of ourselves as *"the leader"* among public universities, thereby freeing ourselves to remake our University. What would this mean? Instead of judging ourselves by the standards developed to assess universities in the 20th century, we should strive to create the standards by which universities will be judged in the 21st century. Instead of asking faculty to fulfill what sometimes feel like contradictory roles, we should redefine what it means to be a faculty member in a way that removes these contradictions. Instead of allowing students to opt out of an intellectual life, we should create an environment in which the value of that life is so clear that students will choose to join it. Instead of shying away from administrative innovations, we should be willing to take risks and make mistakes. We should conceive of ourselves as "the" innovator among public universities, pursuing uncharted paths and breaking new ground. The *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* should be the definitive model of a public university in the 21st century. By consciously reconstructing how we think of ourselves, we can foster a common identity in which change and innovation are defining features of our self-understanding.

GOALS: A VISION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Towards this broad end, the *Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate* sought to create a dialogue with the University community about the future of our University. The Task Force was charged with exploring "innovative mechanisms for facilitating student-faculty interaction both inside and outside the classroom, and for improving student involvement in the community." To meet this challenge, we sought input from all sectors of the University community — from faculty, students, staff and administrators. We asked the basic question: how can we best generate a University community whose work — its intellectual focus — involves students in education that excites them and prepares them for life after the University, addresses the needs of society, fulfills our important service obligations as a public university, and invigorates faculty and engages them in the University community? Put simply, what kind of intellectual life is suitable for a university of the 21st century, and how can we generate it?

Evolving out of the work of nearly 100 people in the committees of the *Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate*, this report seeks to answer that question with a vision of a better educational experience at UNC and a plan for implementing it. Three key elements characterize this vision. First, the educational experience should be *student-centered,* with an emphasis on learning *how to learn* — the development of *inquiry skills* that enable students to locate information and learn through self-guided investigation, beginning in their first semester on campus and continuing throughout their lives. Second, the educational experience should permeate the whole of University life; *intellectual exchange should be woven seamlessly into the fabric of everyday life*. Thus the barriers — intellectual, cultural, social and physical — between inside and outside the classroom and between faculty, graduate students and undergraduates must be broken down. Third, to enhance its relevance, *the educational experience should be linked to life outside the University* through stronger curricular commitment to community and service-based learning.

How can we best move toward these goals? By recognizing first that what we are proposing is at its core a fundamental cultural change. Implementing this vision will require basic changes in the cultures of students and faculty alike, and in the institutional structure of the University. Transforming the student culture involves examining the way the University socializes and educates students, and improving their opportunities for intellectual exchange. Transforming the faculty culture suggests a rethinking of faculty roles and rewards. And transforming the University will necessitate institutional innovations and attention to the physical character of the campus. Unfortunately, moving toward these goals is hindered by several barriers to change.

BARRIERS TO CHANGE

Though many factors reduce our ability to work together to achieve the ideal of a collective intellectual life, the central issues can be summarized as problems of coordination and commitment; fortunately, both kinds of barriers are amenable to change. First, members of the University community often find it difficult to work together to create a richer intellectual climate because it is difficult to coordinate their activities with related activities in other areas of the campus. Coordination problems are inevitable given the University's diverse constituencies with different interests, different needs, and different locations. But two of the most important obstacles to cooperative, overlapping activities can be improved: namely, a lack of information and a lack of adequate physical space. Many coordination problems can be solved by creating better information channels, centralized clearinghouses, and more public spaces conducive to coordinated, collective activities; therefore, a number of our recommendations seek to enhance intellectual exchanges through such institutional reforms.

Second, coordination problems aside, members of the University community might not pursue the ideal of a shared intellectual life because they lack the commitment. Such commitment will always reflect individual choices and interests, but it can be encouraged by reshaping the reward system or cultural ethos for both faculty and students. Although faculty may lack the time, energy and knowledge to pursue new types and mixes of teaching, research and service, they are more likely to change their familiar patterns when they are rewarded for doing so. Similarly, students may not embrace a more encompassing intellectual life because they lack adequate socialization. A rigorous first year experience can reshape students' norms and alter their expectations. Thus a number of our recommendations are addressed to reshaping the cultural ethos that conditions the commitment of faculty and students to a shared intellectual life.

No set of recommendations can easily remove well-established barriers and magically transform cultural habits to produce suddenly a vibrant intellectual community. Changing intellectual life at UNC-CH will involve fundamentally transforming the student culture, the faculty culture, and the University itself. Moreover, even if we succeed in these changes, success is not assured; we caution that the University exists in a wider culture that often ignores or even ridicules the pleasures or commitments of intellectual activity. Many of the obstacles to intellectual exchanges at UNC-CH are typical of all large universities, of inevitable differences in generations or interests, and of student life since the earliest history of universities. We do not place the blame for shortcomings in our intellectual life on familiar scapegoats such as the Greek system, athletics, or student drinking. Our goal is to build creatively on current strengths and thus weaken many of the existing obstacles to a more active intellectual life both inside and outside the classroom. None of our recommendations can, alone, change the climate; but taken together, we believe that their cumulative effect can and will transform the University, making us the model public university for the 21st century.

TASK FORCE DELIBERATIONS

The *Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate* developed its proposals through a highly inclusive committee structure that examined the factors affecting intellectual life in six domains: inside the classroom, outside the classroom, the student's first year, service and community-based learning, the common spaces of the campus, and the structure of faculty roles and rewards. Functioning as a Steering Committee, the Task Force Chair and the six committee Chairs met throughout the summer of 1996 to design a plan of action for the full Task Force. In September of 1996, the Chancellor appointed the remaining members of the Task Force (see Appendix IA for a full list of members). The six Task Force committees conducted their discussions through the fall, soliciting input throughout the University community. During the Spring of 1997, the committee reports were reviewed by the Steering Committee. In some cases, committee recommendations were rejected or substantially revised. In all their deliberations, the Steering Committee worked toward a goal of consensus; there were a few instances where that was not possible. In every case, however, the recommendations of the Task Force represent a collective effort to develop our vision of UNC-CH as "the leader" among public universities, our future strategies for enhancing intellectual exchange across all the current boundaries of University life, and our shared commitment to the vital intellectual debates that must sustain our teaching, learning, research and service in the 21st century.

II. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE INSIDE THE CLASSROOM

OBJECTIVES

We assert that the goal of education at the University of North Carolina should be to promote an educational enterprise that draws heavily on the unique strengths of a research university, and that such an enterprise should be rich in student-faculty and student-student interaction.

BACKGROUND

Educational systems across the country are dominated by information transfer and passive learning. A research university, populated by a faculty of scholars, is uniquely placed to understand how each discipline comes to generate new information and how the disciplines assess that information in the context of controversy. Research is, at its core, an active learning experience. As a consequence, the faculty at a research university are positioned to provide an educational environment in which students can learn not only the information created by the various disciplines, but also the skills required to process that information, to evaluate assertions, to participate in the resolution of controversy and to create new knowledge. These are skills best learned in an environment rich in faculty-student and student-student interactions — an *active learning environment*. Such an environment can be fostered both within and outside the classroom through mentoring relationships.

At the current rate of information generation, the half-life of information is short. It is unlikely that we can provide our students with even a large fraction of the information they will need during a lifetime. We have a much better chance at providing an environment in which our students can learn *how to learn* and can gain experience at evaluating new information, solving problems, dealing with uncertainty, dealing with controversy, understanding the fundamental tools used by the various disciplines, and working together. It is with these higher levels of intellectual activity that we, as a research faculty, have the real opportunity to include in the educational experience those features which flow so naturally from our research experience.

BARRIERS TO ACTIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM

Why has active learning not come to dominate the educational process in our universities? Every study of educational methodologies indicates that active learning far outperforms passive approaches. Certainly the faculty at UNC is highly motivated in terms of interest in education. Certainly the students at UNC are highly interested in an educational system that can prepare them for the realities of life after UNC. Barriers must exist.

1. Lack of Supportive Culture. The University culture as a whole is insufficiently involved in creating an active learning environment. There is no coordinated, high-level institutional involvement in promoting active learning.

2. Misperceptions about Active Learning. There is the perception that active learning methods are time-consuming and resource intensive; that research and education compete for faculty resources and that active learning methods will require more faculty time spent on educational matters at the expense of research; and that active methods cannot be effectively employed in large courses or in introductory courses. . Finally, there is the perception that both students and faculty are reluctant to participate in active learning.

3. Lack of Information about Active Learning. Most faculty have not had much exposure to active learning approaches in their own education and hence have little experience with the approach and few, if any, role models.

4. Inadequate Resources for the Support of Active Learning. There are serious physical constraints on our capacity to use active methods in existing classrooms.

Any change has its cost. But we contend that active learning approaches consume no more time or resources than passive approaches. We believe that active methods are efficient and much more intellectually compelling for both students and faculty. In addition, there is considerable evidence that active learning approaches can be applied successfully even in large, introductory courses. As a consequence, we are convinced that, in a supportive atmosphere, a significant increase in the level of active learning could be achieved by relatively straightforward mechanisms designed to increase access to information, opportunities and resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe that relatively modest changes could lead to large increases in the amount of student-faculty and student-student interaction in the classroom. Our recommendations are based on trying to reduce the barriers, both perceived and real, that stand in the way of using active learning methods and to generate an environment that encourages the use of active learning methods. We focus on methods for providing access to information about what works and what doesn't, and on the expansion of student-faculty opportunities for active learning experiences.

1. Establish a process to provide continuous appraisal of the educational enterprise at UNC.

Major Recommendation:

1A. To perpetuate the process of educational reform from the top down, we recommend the creation of a new entity, the *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*, modeled after the National Academy of Sciences and similar entities at the University of Texas, Austin and The Ohio State University. This new institution would provide advice to the administration on educational matters. It is critical that some entity have a long-term mission to make assessments and recommendations concerning the educational system at UNC-CH. It is also important that such an entity have some authoritative basis for those recommendations. We see this authority coming from the mission of the organization and the stature of the members chosen. In addition, like the National Academy, we imagine that such an institution would draw into its deliberations many outside faculty members and students. That is, we do not see the existence of such an organization as absolving the rest of us from our educational responsibilities; rather the organization would serve as the center of activism in the push for educational excellence. (See Section VII, 2B; see Appendix IIA for a suggested charter based on the Austin Academy.)

Additional Recommendation:

1B. Following the decision to go forward with these recommendations, we suggest that a significant effort be made to involve the faculty, students and community at large in the process of welcoming change. In part, this can be done by holding a meeting on educational issues here on campus that would be open to UNC faculty, students and legislative representatives. We envision this meeting bringing UNC faculty, students and legislative representatives together with distinguished scholars from other institutions to examine the future of the educational enterprise and our own plan for positioning ourselves in a leadership role in that future.

2. Expand opportunities for mentored learning experiences.

Major Recommendation:

2A. Establish an *Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program* to promote greater participation by students, particularly those in their first and second years, in faculty mentored research, scholarly inquiry, and artistic creation; and establish an *Office of Undergraduate Research* to provide administrative support.

The quality of student-faculty interaction in large part determines the intellectual vitality of a university. Yet, as a recent UNC Student Government report noted, "Many students graduate never knowing a professor on a personal level, never benefiting from the advice, never tapping the inspiration that faculty can offer." Rich opportunities for intellectual exchange exist at UNC, including honors seminars, independent projects, research opportunities, and informal dialogue; many students, especially seniors, already avail themselves of these resources. But because of obstacles both real and perceived, far fewer students in their first and second years undertake research projects.

Research in its broadest sense cannot be considered an extracurricular activity. It is an integral part of the University's mission. The *Office of Undergraduate Research* and the *Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program* will help the University make full use of its potential by expanding opportunities for all undergraduates to conduct independent study and research. The Program will provide organizational assistance necessary to place students in research activities; identify and implement novel means for students to become involved in the professional activities of the faculty; promote cooperation and information sharing among existing departmental programs; create courses to provide exposure to the intellectual tools underlying the disciplines; facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration; publicize the research accomplishments of undergraduates and their faculty or graduate student mentors; and, finally, provide a unified voice to seek financial support for undergraduate research from the public and private sectors.

Additional Recommendations:

2B. We recommend allowing undergraduate students to receive an additional credit hour for true mentored independent study associated with a three-credit course. This fourth credit hour would be reserved for activities dominated by student-faculty interaction. For example, a fourth credit hour should not be allowed for a project involving a student's doing library research and writing a paper unless the activity is structured to involve extensive interaction between the student and a faculty member. This change should be effected at the administrative level.

2C. We recommend the creation of a system that would allow faculty to create, propose, and submit for evaluation special educational experiences that would carry a cohort of students, whether graduate or undergraduate, through a shared educational experience either within the existing system or within a system tailored to the educational objectives defined for that cohort. The benefits of keeping a group of students together for a portion of their educational experience are well known. Educational experiences targeted to particular cohorts offer a powerful mechanism to explore a broad array of educational opportunities without undergoing the risk or expense of trying them out for the entire undergraduate student body. A cohort system provides some of the advantages of a small college without sacrificing the benefits of a large research university. Such a system could be used for both small and large changes in educational opportunities. For example, we can imagine its being used to allow faculty to explore educational opportunities by organizing cohorts of students in the same dormitory. We can also imagine faculty putting forward more complex proposals, like the 1969 faculty initiative to establish a New College. What we seek here is the sanctioning of the use of cohorts and the establishment of a mechanism to evaluate faculty proposals.

3. Increase access to information about active learning approaches.

Major Recommendation:

3A. We recommend an expansion of the *Inquiry Track Program* to serve as a faculty based organization to promulgate active learning. The *Inquiry Track Program* would promote active learning strategies, seek out additional faculty to try active learning methods, and provide a forum (the *Inquiry Colloquium*) for faculty to discuss active learning strategies. As such, it would serve the need for a bottom-up component in the coordinated effort for change.

Additional Recommendations:

3B. We recommend the creation of various databases that would serve the faculty and student communities by providing access to information about active learning in general and about what is being done at UNC-CH in particular. Given that many faculty and students have had little exposure to active learning methods, it would be valuable for both groups to have more access to information about what is being done on campus, where resources might be found, and what works and what doesn't. In particular, we recommend:

- I. a computer database that lists the various courses offered at UNC and explicitly describes the pedagogical approach used in each course.
- ii. a computer database that contains the experiences of UNC faculty using active learning approaches. We would also like the *Center for Teaching and Learning* to expand its collection of videos illustrating the successful application of active learning methods in the classroom.
- iii. a computer database containing student success stories, in their own words, concerning educational experiences at UNC.

3C. We recommend that a significant effort be made to increase exposure of faculty, students and the public to the active teaching approaches being employed at UNC. For example, we could:

- I. report on UNC teaching success stories in UNC publications. In particular, it would be good to see some articles in *Endeavors* about teaching that stress the relationship of teaching and research.
- ii. run annual symposia on student research with significant coverage in UNC media.
- iii. publish articles on active teaching approaches in UNC media. This recommendation could be carried out through initiatives by the various UNC publications, by the proposed *Office of Undergraduate Research*, and through articles generated by the *Center for Teaching and Learning* and the *Inquiry Track Program*.

4. **Reduce classroom constraints affecting the use of active learning approaches.** These recommendations complement those in Section VI (Intellectual Climate and Common Spaces).

4A. A significant barrier to faculty-student and student-student interactions in many classrooms, particularly large ones, is *acoustics*. Students cannot hear the comments of others who sit in front of them. This undermines opportunities for student-student interaction in a large room and reduces the value of student-faculty interactions. This simple barrier makes it almost impossible to have a discussion in a large class. Active learning is extraordinarily difficult in a room with poor acoustics. At minimum, in large classrooms sound systems are needed that support several microphones without generating feedback from speakers in the room. If we are going to continue large attendance classes, more classrooms should be organized with tiers of chairs in a "U" to bring students closer to each other.

4B. Many small classrooms have chairs bolted to the floor in the traditional all-face-the-teacher configuration. Active learning approaches often suggest alternative arrangements to facilitate student-faculty and student-student interactions. More emphasis should be placed upon addressing the need for *flexible seating*. We should at least use chairs which do not need to be bolted to the floor.

4C. One way to increase student-student and student-faculty interactions in courses with large enrollments is to employ *breakout sessions*. These sessions require space either within the main classroom or nearby. The location and arrangement of the large classrooms on campus seldom allows this. As new classrooms are designed, access to multi-use spaces which could serve this need should be considered. The possibility of electronic breakout sessions should also be entertained. Smaller classrooms could be linked electronically with video to provide large class capabilities as well as proctored breakout capacity.

4D. *Computers and multi-media technology* have provided new access channels to information. These technologies have been extensively touted as new tools for use in passive learning paradigms. However, they can also be used to provide support for active learning. Powerful information access tools in the hands of students can free up class time for interactive activities. Computer technology can also provide, through simulations and role playing, support environments within which students can play an active role in the learning process.

  I. To take advantage of these new opportunities, the University needs to provide ample access to electronic technology for students outside the classroom in order to provide a more powerful environment inside the classroom for interactive learning. This means much more access than is currently available.

  ii. We recommend an expansion in the number of classrooms within which computer centered instruction can take place. These classrooms would have from 10 to 20 computers, with seating for three or four at each computer and a central location for the instructor. Here, student groups would tackle exercises using computer simulations or role-playing software and the instructor would be available to provide on-the-spot mentoring as well as class direction.

CONCLUSIONS

Meaningful change is unlikely to come about because a directive, or even a whole list of directives, mandates it. Change will occur when we take a personal interest in it and work towards it. With a faculty eager to do their best in an environment of competing pressures and a student body eager to prepare themselves for a rapidly changing world, what we all need are tools; tools to make it easier to bring active learning roles into the classroom, tools to support more student-student and student-faculty interactions, tools to provide more mentored educational opportunities, and tools to keep these issues under continual examination. What we as departmental Chairs or faculty or students should look for in this report is not a directive that tells us what to do but, rather, tools we can use to make environmental changes that will help us increase the intellectual content of the classroom experience.

III. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

OBJECTIVES

We are guided throughout this report by the strong belief that activities outside the classroom do not stand in opposition to the classroom experiences of students and faculty at UNC-CH. Instead, we see constant (though often unacknowledged) connections among our diverse intellectual exchanges inside and outside formal course work. We assume that social and cultural experiences beyond the classroom are an integral part of the intellectual life of students, faculty and staff alike. In short, we recognize that the intellectual vitality of individuals and institutions depends upon and reflects a whole network of co-curricular activities that are as important to the University community as its formal curriculum.

BACKGROUND

We have an excellent foundation for future intellectual exchanges in the many departmental activities, student-faculty conferences, artistic performances, publications, and student organizations at UNC-CH. It is impossible to list all of the areas of non-classroom exchanges here, but we note typical examples to indicate a wide range of dynamic intellectual activities: undergraduate student associations in numerous academic departments; the undergraduate business symposium in the School of Business Administration; the Lab Theater in Dramatic Arts; field trips in Marine Biology; the speakers' series at the Black Cultural Center; the "Faculty Unplugged" and "Youth Angst" meetings at the Bullshead Bookstore; and student publications such as *The Daily Tar Heel*, *The Catalyst*, *Extimacy*, and *The Carolina Review*. Students and faculty also exchange ideas at various events of the Honors Program, the Johnston Scholars Program, Residence Halls, and Greek organizations. Other discussions occur regularly in the Womentoring and N.C. Fellows programs, religious centers, and student conferences of the University Program in Cultural Studies. The Great Decisions series of lectures on current issues and foreign affairs is one of the largest in the nation.

There are concerts, artistic exhibitions, visiting speakers, and special conferences throughout the academic year. At popular, important meeting places such as the Daily Grind coffee shop, students, faculty and staff gather for informal conversation every day. Finally, many students apply for prestigious awards and outside grants with the help of faculty advisors and mentors. Students at UNC-CH perform exceptionally well in national competitions for awards such as the Luce, Marshall, Rhodes, and Truman Scholarships — all of which enhance and reflect the quality of the University's intellectual life.

Students, faculty and staff take the initiative to create innovative programs and opportunities for intellectual exchange. We believe that the kinds of activities we have noted here (and many others throughout the University) offer a starting point for future intellectual life at UNC-CH. People cannot be compelled to join intellectual discussions or to enter the rich cultural life of this community, but they can be encouraged to participate in more of the already existing cultural conversations (and help to create new ones) if they see how these conversations connect to issues in their own lives. At the present time, however, the obstacles to joining the conversation may be as great as the opportunities.

BARRIERS TO INTELLECTUAL LIFE OUTSIDE CLASSROOMS

The University consists of different constituencies who know little or nothing about what others in their community are doing. Social and cultural barriers separate undergraduates from graduate students and most students at all levels from faculty; professors are separated by departmental boundaries; and neither faculty nor students have much knowledge of the staff. Students are divided according to whether they live on or off campus, and they often separate along the lines of race, ethnicity, and social group. They are also scattered in very different activities — from sports to the arts to the sciences. Such divisions are, of course, typical and perhaps even desirable in a large public university, but they also create obstacles to a shared intellectual culture.

Among these obstacles, the following issues must be addressed in any comprehensive plan to improve the co-curricular intellectual life of the University. Some of these obstacles contribute to problems of coordination; others reflect problems of commitment; and still others exemplify both.

1. **Lack of information about public events and special activities.** Students, faculty and staff all report that they are often unaware of events or uncertain about the purpose or themes of events they hear about. Campus publications regularly announce forthcoming events, but organizers complain that they must struggle to get their programs noted or described. There is no central clearinghouse for information about upcoming events. Students often feel uninformed and unwelcome at campus programs.

2. **Lack of time for co-curricular activities that do not seem to contribute directly to grades, rewards, or pleasure.** Faculty, students and staff complain of too many obligations that prevent them from attending public events. Time is allotted to classroom work and to social life, but the intellectual sphere that connects intellectual life in the classroom to social life and other activities does not make the list of priorities.

3. **Lack of encouragement for students, faculty or staff to participate in co-curricular activities.** Students see no payoff in attending performances, speakers' series, or concerts; faculty see no incentives for participating in student/faculty activities that do not gain them recognition or appear in personnel evaluations. True, many faculty and students do join such activities for their own intrinsic rewards, but there are few methods to encourage participation.

4. **Lack of appropriate advising opportunities for students to discuss their overall personal and academic goals with a faculty adviser.:** Although the current undergraduate advising system focuses effectively on meeting course requirements, it does not provide enough time for discussions of serious intellectual concerns or personal aspirations.

5. **Lack of space for special activities, performances or meetings.** Centers that currently sponsor special events (e.g., the *Black Cultural Center*, the *Honors Program*, theater groups) are all in need of more space for their work. There are also too few lounges, cafes, and comfortable eating places that can provide space for informal conversation. People need space outside of formal classroom settings or offices in which to meet, debate, or perform.

6. **Lack of connections between in-class and out-of-class activities:** This contributes to an attitude of indifference among students and faculty. Student and faculty lives are divided between what they do in the classroom and what they do in other areas of their work and leisure. Few faculty draw attention to what happens outside the classroom or stress its possible links to issues they discuss in their courses. Students are thus confirmed in their own attitudes — which stress the great distance between course work and what they do for pleasure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following proposals are designed to encourage expansion of the intellectual culture at UNC-CH, though we recognize that many of the factors which limit intellectual exchanges are beyond the reach of our recommendations. We have no solution for the fact that most students, faculty and staff have little or no time to participate in more activities. It is not easy to foster student-faculty interactions, for example, because students must juggle the demands of their course work, their jobs, their social lives and their families, and faculty must juggle the demands of their teaching, research, committees, professional service and family obligations. We cannot add hours to the day. We nevertheless believe the University can encourage more participation in the kinds of exchanges, debates, and events that characterize a vital intellectual community.

1. Provide better information about events.

Major Recommendations:

1A. Create a *Central Clearinghouse for Intellectual Events* that will receive information about all events at the University and distribute this information efficiently to students, faculty and staff. The office should be located in the new *Center for Undergraduate Excellence* because the Center will become an important meeting place for people from all over the University. Placing the Clearinghouse in this location will enhance its visibility, link it to intellectual activities, and make it accessible to undergraduates. The new Clearinghouse will consolidate information and announcements that are currently scattered in student publications, the University *Gazette*, Student Union and museum brochures, and the newsletters of various departments and academic centers. It will facilitate the work of the University News Service and help coordinate activities among groups that are currently unaware of their shared interests and programs. It will also serve the *student-centered* objectives of the University by promoting more social and intellectual connections between students and faculty.

1B. Create a new administrative position (*University Director for Intellectual Life*) to manage the new Central Clearinghouse for information on University events. This person will link groups and activities around the University, publicize events by every possible means, and play a creative role in fostering cultural exchanges among diverse groups. This person will work closely with an *Advisory Committee for University Intellectual Life* (see recommendation 3A in this section). The University Director for Intellectual Life should have an assistant or secretary and should also work to bridge the gap between curricular life and student affairs. This position should be located in the *Center for Undergraduate Excellence*, which will become a new center for the intellectual life of all undergraduates. The University Director for Intellectual Life would report to the Provost.

Additional Recommendations:

1C. Establish video kiosks in the Student Union, Student Stores, Student Dining Centers, and in the Pit, all of which would list forthcoming speakers, performances, exhibitions, concerts, and public meetings. This information would also be accessible by computer through the campus network. Listings and maps should be posted through the Central Clearinghouse computer system (see 1A in this section).

1D. Create a central office to distribute information about all intellectual awards and scholarships that are available to students; this office would encourage student applications for such awards and provide systematic support for applicants. It should be located in the *Center for Undergraduate Excellence* and it requires at least a 3/4-time staff position to operate.

1E. Create departmental and special-interest e-mail groups and listserv networks that would send information about relevant events to all persons — faculty, graduate students and undergraduates — who share common intellectual and cultural interests.

1F. Include more information about the theme or purpose of events that are listed on calendars in campus publications.

1G. Create better communication among organizers of student and departmental activities (through e-mail networks and other contacts), so that the leaders of various organizations know what others are planning and when the events of other groups will take place.

2. Encourage participation in co-curricular activities and conversation.

Major Recommendations:

2A. Create a permanent, standing *Committee for Intellectual Life* that would include students, faculty and staff (approximately 12 members). This committee would be appointed by the Chancellor (its chair should be member of the faculty) and would work closely with the new University Director for Intellectual Events (see 1B in this section) to encourage intellectual activities of all kinds. Members of this committee will serve three-year terms (with some flexibility for student appointments), and the committee will report to Faculty Council. This group will serve as an advisory group for the Clearinghouse at the *Center for Undergraduate Excellence* and its Director. It will have two subcommittees, one for Events and the other for Common Spaces (see Section VI.1C). The subcommittee on Events will oversee two related funds to foster student-faculty exchanges:

I. A *Fund for Special Activities Outside the Classroom.* Faculty would use this fund to pay for events, such as plays, concerts or films, that they would like to attend with their students. Faculty could also apply for money from this fund to organize special faculty/student events.

ii. A *Fund for Faculty-Student Lunches.* Faculty would use this fund to meet groups of students for meals at a campus dining facility. Faculty would request vouchers that could only be used for meals with students. Each faculty member would be allowed to draw on the fund up to a fixed amount per year (e.g., $50 or $100). We note that many colleges currently have such a system in place. Similarly, a percentage of student activities fees might be set aside for students who invite professors for a meal in a campus facility.

Additional Recommendations:

2B. Urge each department to set aside funds to sponsor undergraduate/graduate student associations that will organize events outside the classroom; help students develop a community within departments; and involve students in discussion of curriculum. Information about student associations should be available from the *Central Clearinghouse for Intellectual Events* (see 1A in this section).

2C. Develop new forms of recognition and reward for faculty who serve as advisors to student organizations. Publicize faculty advisors in University publications. Count involvement with student groups, colloquia, and activities as a form of service to the University, profession, and state (see Section VII, 1A).

3. Reform the Advising System.

Major Recommendation:

3A. Enable the central Advising Office to set up a computerized "major audit" system that students will use to see which courses they need to complete requirements for their major and for graduation. Using technology to check on course requirements will free up time for students to talk about more substantive issues (e.g., personal goals, intellectual interests) with advisors in the Advising Office and with their departmental advisors. In this way, the routine accounting aspect of student advising will be separated from the counseling aspect. As part of the advising process, we further suggest that students maintain a "learning portfolio," which would constitute an ongoing record of students' educational objectives and evaluations of their experience at UNC. This would provide the advisor with starting material for an advising session.

3B. We strongly recommend that the *College of Arts and Sciences* adopt one of the following strategies to strengthen the advising service for undergraduate students:

I. Increase the stipend for faculty members who serve as College advisors (there has been little increase in this stipend for over two decades), and provide better training for these advisors.

OR

ii. Hire a new staff of professional advisors who would have full-time responsibility for advising undergraduates (a method of advising adopted at other universities, including North Carolina State University).

Additional Recommendations:

3C. Reform departmental advising in the following ways, thereby altering the motivations of students and faculty alike (see Section VII, 1A and 1B):

I. Allow undergraduates to affiliate with a department as early as their first year in order to develop closer connections to a faculty advisor from the beginning of their career at UNC. This should be part of wider revision of the first-year experience.

ii. Urge and enable faculty advisers to meet with their advisees as a group at least once a semester — perhaps for lunch or in a coffee lounge (see proposal 2Aii in this section).

iii. Recognize advisers in new ways (awards, prizes) that publicize and reward advising as a crucial part of what faculty do. Advising should be recognized as a form of teaching outside the classroom; all faculty should be encouraged to perform their fair share of advising.

4. **Provide more and better space for intellectual exchange.**

Major Recommendation:

4A. Create new coffee lounges, small cafes and eating places around the campus (see also Section VI, 4A). The Daily Grind is our model for the kind of meeting places that should be available. We strongly recommend *expansion of the Daily Grind* so that more tables will be available in the UNC Student Store; we also propose that this facility be open more hours per week. The coffeehouses on Franklin Street cannot provide the same convenience and accessibility for students and faculty, who need a place to meet on campus. We also urge the creation of smaller, quieter eating areas at Lenoir Hall and the development of small coffee lounges in other buildings, where people could congregate after classes or performances for conversation. Renovation of the *Undergraduate Library* should include plans for a coffee lounge, and a public coffee lounge should eventually be created in *Davis Library*. All food service planning should include strategies to foster intellectual community and exchanges.

Additional Recommendations:

4B. Create new spaces or adapt current spaces for student performances, concerts, or programs. These spaces should be flexible-use areas which might serve as lounges or meeting places as well as centers for performances. We look forward to the creation of such spaces in the new *Black Cultural Center*, the *Center for Undergraduate Excellence*, and the *Institute for the Arts and Humanities*. We also strongly urge the renovation of Memorial Hall and the creation of new spaces for the exhibition of art.

4C. Find or create new office spaces for student organizations and interest groups that sponsor intellectual and artistic events on campus.

5. **Create more connections between in-class and out-of-class activities.**

Major Recommendation:

5A. Set aside some funds to develop courses that include attendance at co-curricular, outside-the-classroom events. Such funds would provide for tickets, field trips or special activities beyond the typical classroom setting. (These funds would be separate from the *Fund for Special Activities Outside the Classroom* described in 2Ai in this section.)

Additional Recommendations:

5B. Strongly urge faculty to announce relevant events in their classes and to give extra credit for attending talks, performances or artistic events that could be relevant to the themes of the course. Some events might even become part of a course (equivalent to an assigned reading or other course activity).

5C. Create departmental and special interest e-mail networks that would maintain daily on-line discussion of various issues in each discipline or academic field.

5D. Encourage and facilitate more out-of-class service learning, field trips, and student/faculty travel. The *University Department of Transportation and Parking* should provide information on buses and vans for student/faculty trips, and insurance coverage for groups that need to travel on a

University field trip (the model here would be drawn from the trips that athletic teams now routinely make). Off-campus experiences strongly enhance intellectual exchanges outside classrooms.

5E. Find ways to place more graduate students and mentors (including foreign students) in residence halls or Greek houses, thus bringing undergraduates into contact with people who have strong intellectual commitments and interests (see Section IV, 3B). We also urge the *University Housing Office* to place foreign students in various undergraduate residence halls in order to foster more cross-cultural interaction among all students.

CONCLUSIONS

We believe these proposals respond to many of the obstacles to intellectual life outside the classrooms at UNC. Although money will be required to improve communications, establish and staff a new Clearinghouse in the *Center for Undergraduate Excellence*, transform some public spaces, and expand faculty/student participation in campus events, we strongly believe that such expenditures are justified as part of the core educational mission of the University.

IV. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND THE FIRST YEAR INITIATIVE

OBJECTIVES

The transition from high school to college during the first year of enrollment shapes the undergraduate's relationship to the intellectual climate at UNC-Chapel Hill. Drawing both on our own experiences and on initiatives underway at other colleges and universities, we propose a three-year pilot project, the "*First Year Initiative*" (*FYI*), to model innovations that we hope will invite first-year students into a more intense and satisfying relationship with the intellectual life of the University. Our plan is based on a cohort model and envisions an initial recruitment of 500 students per year, to be housed on designated floors of Hinton James Residence Hall. To guarantee the broadest possible cross-section of participants, entry into the program — like the current allocation of residential assignments — will be based on a random selection from among all students who check the FYI option on their residency forms. Participation in FYI will be offered as a voluntary contract between the student and the University. FYI will offer a new commitment to first-year students and expect a similar commitment from students in return.

BACKGROUND

The UNC first-year experience varies greatly from student to student. After a common orientation program, including the three-day summer C-TOPS and a four-day Fall Freshman Orientation of residence area meetings and activities, first-year students filter into diverse social and academic settings. Except for a de facto bunching in South Campus residence halls (due to the seniority principle governing room assignments) and similar concentration in General College introductory courses, first-year students enter into the larger life of the University on their own. There is no special College planning for the first-year experience.

By way of contrast, other colleges and universities in recent years have focused special attention on first-year students. These programs incorporate some or all of *three components*: summer reading projects tied to orientation programs (e.g., Penn Reading Project; Harvard-Radcliffe Summer Readings); first-year academic seminars (e.g., Lawrence University; Macalaster College; University of California, Berkeley; University of Michigan; University of Pennsylvania); and enrichment programs, both academic and extra-academic, aimed at connecting the classroom and the college residential experience (e.g., Duke University; University of Colorado; University of South Carolina; Emory University).

BARRIERS TO INTELLECTUAL LIFE DURING THE FIRST YEAR

The typical first-year experience at UNC-CH stops short of the introduction to intellectual life that we believe the campus can provide. There are weaknesses in the three interrelated areas: Orientation, Academic Programs, and Residential Life.

1. Orientation Has Insufficient Intellectual Content. Orientation programming (C-TOPS and Fall Orientation) is strong on getting out needed information to students and making them feel comfortable in their new setting, but it is comparatively weak in inducing a taste for academic adventure and the play of ideas.

2. The First-Year Academic Program Is Unchallenging and Impersonal. Because they are often dominated by large, introductory lecture courses, the academic programs of many first-year students are unchallenging academically, particularly with regard to development of expressive and analytical skills, and provide little contact with UNC faculty members.

3. Residential Life Is Divorced from Intellectual Life. University residence halls are a key site for the juncture of the student's intellectual and social life, a place where the character of the University is forged. The residential life of most first-year students does not realize its potential to prepare them to take advantage of the University's academic resources and to build a diverse community drawing on their own strengths and varied backgrounds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We have incorporated each of the three components discussed above — summer reading projects, first-year academic seminars, and residentially based enrichment programs — into a pilot project for the Carolina campus.

A *Program Coordinator* will bring together the orientation, academic, and residential components of *FYI* (recommendations 1, 2, and 3). The Coordinator will administer FYI in collaboration with other University departments. Responsibilities include: planning; marketing and recruitment; selection, training, and supervision of graduate students; and program evaluation. The Program Coordinator will be aided by an *Advisory Committee* of faculty, students and staff (chaired by a faculty member); both Coordinator and Committee will be named by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the Dean of Student Affairs.

1. Improve the Orientation Program: The Summer Reading Project.

The committee strongly recommends an intellectual uplift of the freshman orientation experience. The orientation program should begin to teach students to value an active intellectual life. To this end, the Pilot Program will initiate a Summer Reading Project connected to the fall orientation experience.

Each year, the Program will designate a book for incoming students to read and be prepared to discuss. The book will be matched to an appropriate film: either a treatment of the book itself or a closely related work.[1] A faculty member will offer brief remarks prior to the movie.[2] Afterward, students will gather in small groups led by graduate mentors (see Recommendation 3B in this section) to discuss the themes raised by both works. This exercise will encourage active learning among first-year students and offer a common intellectual experience as a starting point for student-to-student interactions.

---

[1] Suggested pairings include: any of several Shakespeare plays and movies, *Heart of Darkness*, and "Apocalypse Now"; *Race Matters* and "Birth of a Nation"; *Autobiography of a Face* and "The Mask"; *House of the Spirits* and "Antonia's Line".

[2] The faculty member giving this talk might be given the title *Matriculation Speaker*, and the opportunity to give the talk could be made an honor. This would enhance the significance of the event for faculty and students alike.

2. Improve the Academic Program During the First Year: the First-Year Seminar Program.

In order to foster essential critical thinking and communication skills, an intensive and challenging exposure to ideas and texts that stimulate the intellectual appetite, and lasting contacts with UNC faculty members, FYI will offer each participant access to a new First-Year Seminar Program. **Limited to twenty students** and taught by regular faculty (insofar as possible), the seminars will develop students' powers of analytical thinking, written and oral communication skills, and research abilities. The seminars will emphasize inquiry-based learning; the instructor's role will be more that of facilitator of student learning than classic knowledge provider. Modeled on — and complementing — the current Honors Program Seminar courses, the FYI Seminar Program will be open to all participating first-year students and would fulfill a General College Perspective requirement. First-year students who perform well in these FYI seminars might qualify to enroll in Honors Program seminars as sophomores and upperclassmen.

Faculty members in any school (including professional schools) of the University will be invited to submit course proposals for FYI Seminars. The Pilot Program will call for approximately **thirty** seminars altogether in both the fall and spring semesters. Participating schools and departments will be offered modest compensation in order to meet their staffing and curricular obligations.

In establishing a new seminar option for first-year students, we acknowledge that there will be a drain on faculty resources currently devoted to other efforts. In particular, we express our concern that this initiative not disrupt or threaten the health of the Honors Program and its ongoing seminar offerings. Such potential side effects must be carefully monitored; consideration should be given to funding the Honors Program seminars at a compensation level similar to that suggested for FYI seminars or supplementing the Honors Program budget through private endowment funds.

3. Improve the First-Year Residency: Graduate Mentors, Weekly Dialogue Groups, and Communal Involvement.

FYI's residential component will enhance the intellectual climate by closely linking academic and extra-academic activities. This change will be centered in a residence hall life for first-year students providing small group communities that receive transition support, academic and co-curricular campus options, skill assessment and development, and mentoring relationships.

Recommendations:

3A.. Designate five residential floors, housing approximately 100 students each, in Hinton James residence hall as housing for FYI students.[3] To facilitate the program, we make two further recommendations:

I. Renovate the building. This includes upgrading all basic facilities, including study lounges, kitchens, and lobby areas; creating adequate dialogue/meeting rooms containing a seminar table, blackboard, and computer/Internet connections; and constructing an aesthetics room with a stage area, tables and chairs, piano, and other furnishings needed for various artistic activities and performances.

---

[3] Hinton James has been selected for three reasons: its size; the fact that it is already overwhelmingly a first-year residency site, and thus locating FYI there will dislodge fewer students around campus; and renovation there is both possible and necessary.

ii. Do not provide televisions in common areas within the program. A newspaper budget should provide a daily *New York Times* in every lounge.

Activities of the residential program will be structured in three ways:

3B. *Graduate Mentors*: Twenty-five graduate students (nominated by their academic departments) will serve as daily mentors, living in the FYI residence hall. Each will mentor twenty students and be responsible for leading weekly dialogue groups.[4]

3C. *Weekly Dialogues*: The graduate mentors will be trained to lead small weekly dialogue groups focusing on academic and life skills. Specifically, such weekly dialogues will deal with:

- Team building (ropes course, art projects, community service, etc.).
- Stress and time management.
- Study skills (tests and note-taking, computer literacy, etc.).
- Critical thinking skills.
- Individual skill assessment and development.
- Sex, alcohol, and race relations awareness.
- Campus resources and student organizations.
- Scholarly topics and speakers.
- Campus issues.

3D. *Communal Involvement:* Involving students in the broader University community and the local community has two aspects.

i. University Citizenship: Formal and informal opportunities will be provided to connect students with the larger resources of the University. Connections will include dinner conversations with faculty and staff and peer-led activities regarding student organizations and campus leadership opportunities.

ii. Service Learning: Participants will be introduced to and participate in service learning activities designed to promote group unity as well as community service (Habitat for Humanitiy, food/clothes collections, Campus Y, Human Relations Week, etc.).

4. Evaluate the FYI Program.

Because FYI will be a pilot program, evaluation must be an integral component. We recommend four kinds of evaluation:

i. Student Questionnaires will be collected twice a year.

---

[4] The Graduate Mentors are not intended to supplant existing personnel. Resident Assistants will be involved in the program to assist with additional community building, counseling, crisis intervention, programming and discipline. And the Area Director, who is responsible for the entire residential area, will cooperate with the Program Coordinator.

ii. Focus groups will obtain evalution information from all groups — students, faculty, and staff — participating in the program.

iii. Long-term performance comparisons will be made between FYI participants and selected non-FYI peer group members.

iv. Annual reports will be requested from academic departments and curricular centers (e.g., the Honors Program) evaluating the effect of FYI seminars on other college programming.

5. Re-Open Discussion of Greek Rush.

The close relationship between classroom and residency affects the overall intellectual climate for first-year students; it is important that the University do everything possible to encourage a variety of social and intellectual interaction among students. *To this end, we urge that the Chancellor re-open discussion of the scheduling of Greek Rush, with an eye toward deferral of rush until the fall of students' sophomore year.* We are aware that the *Chancellor's Committee on Greek Affairs* recently advised against such a postponement; but we believe that the matter warrants discussion by a more widely representative body. In recommending a deferral of rush, we note the many contributions of Greek organizations to the life of the University; but it is our hope that during their first year, Carolina students will be encouraged to create strong and intense social links on the basis of common intellectual interests and curiosity as well as tolerance among a richly diverse set of peers.

CONCLUSIONS

Students' first year experiences set the tone for their academic careers. As many other universities have come to recognize, the importance of socialization during the first year demands that special attention be given the process to ensure that the full potential of an intellectual life can be attained. The recommended Pilot Program is a first step towards bringing UNC-CH up to the standards of other leading universities.

V. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND EDUCATION FOR CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY: SERVING TO LEARN AND LEARNING TO SERVE

OBJECTIVES

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has an opportunity to create a national model in the field of service learning[5] and community-based learning by building on its proud tradition of public service. Earlier in this century, UNC-CH President Edward Kidder Graham proclaimed that the boundaries of the University are coterminous with those of the state, which means that the practical problems of North Carolina are the problems of the campus. Faculty, students, alumni, and staff, over the years, have studied those problems and have worked to solve them — often inspired by campus leaders like President Frank Porter Graham — and their efforts have yielded impressive results. At the same time, however, formidable barriers have prevented Carolina from fulfilling its potential for meaningful and enduring service.

This committee believes that a relatively modest investment in service learning will eliminate many of those barriers and produce enormous benefits for students, staff, faculty, and the state. Thus we seek to improve the intellectual climate by recommending ways both to increase the number and quality of opportunities for service learning and community-based learning and to encourage faculty to integrate community-based learning into their teaching, courses, and research.

BACKGROUND: THE IMPORTANCE OF SERVICE IN BUILDING THE ENGAGED CAMPUS

A new generation of University leaders has urged its constituents to become engaged in the lives and problems of their communities — to address more vigorously the issues surrounding campus and community collaboration. While universities nationally have been "reaching out into their most troubled neighborhoods with initiatives that involve faculty, graduate students and undergraduates,"[6] Triangle universities have been criticized for not working on social issues significantly affecting the future success of our community. Carolina's responsibility to the community begins at its front gate, and our front gate is the entire state.

UNC-CH should take its place at the front of this national service movement. A core group of students, staff, and faculty is prepared to lead the way if given the necessary encouragement and support. Many of the service learning programs at universities have been started by undergraduates, who forged partnerships between campuses and communities.[7] Student organizations at universities also sponsor many other types of community service activities. At UNC-CH, for example, the Campus Y, a department of Student Affairs and a recognized student organization, has provided a range of service opportunities for students in successfully carrying out its mission — "the pursuit of social justice through the cultivation of pluralism." But as a student-based organization, there are limits to the support Campus Y can provide for a growing service program intended to integrate faculty and curriculum into the provision of service learning experiences. Now is the time for this University to make a sustained and transforming commitment to improve North Carolinians' lives by working in their communities.

---

[5] Service learning is defined as students' learning through direct service that takes place in the external community, meets needs identified by the community, and is integrated into the students' academic coursework. Other community-based learning includes a range of volunteer service to the community that is not part of academic coursework. As used in this report, public service and community service mean service by faculty, students, staff, and alumni to the *external community* rather than the University community.

[6] N. Peirce and C. Johnson, The Peirce Report, *The News & Observer*, Sept. 26, 1993, at 13. See Appendix.

Evidence demonstrates that service learning and other community-based learning benefit the intellectual lives of students and the communities in which they serve. A 1995 survey in Academic Affairs conducted by the Public Service Roundtable found that UNC-CH faculty incorporated service learning into their courses because it:

- allows students to make meaningful contributions to the community.
- enhances learning by enabling students to apply real-life experiences to the classroom, and classroom learning to real-life problems.
- solves problems identified by the community through partnerships with faculty, students, staff and alumni.
- promotes civic duty and builds citizenship.
- enhances self-knowledge and self-esteem.
- develops career goals and creates career options.

The Public Service Roundtable survey also revealed that community-based learning carries benefits for faculty. It enables them to take down the classroom walls that divide the University from the community; provides them with rich opportunities for new research; encourages interdisciplinary partnerships; and permits direct collaboration with communities needing faculty members' expertise. North Carolina expects UNC-CH to help solve its most pressing problems — poverty, racism, illiteracy, violent crime, drugs — and it is our moral and legal responsibility, as the state's premier public university, to do so.

BARRIERS TO SERVICE AND COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING

Faculty, students, and staff are generally enthusiastic about expanding opportunities for service at Carolina. They recognize the need and they understand the benefits for themselves and for the state. At the same time, there are barriers that prevent us from increasing service learning and community-based learning and from building effective partnerships that meet community-identified needs.

1. Fragmentation and Lack of Coordination. Faculty, students, and staff are already engaged in various kinds of service, but there is no mechanism for coordinating those activities. Consequently, service activities at UNC-CH are fragmented. For example, at least 45 UNC-CH faculty offer service learning courses, but they are not listed in any one place. Similarly, many departments offer credit internships, but there is no system for tracking which departments have them or what the internships involve. Faculty, students, and staff find it difficult to initiate interdisciplinary collaboration involving service because they have no reliable means of knowing what others are doing. Student organizations face similar barriers. Although there are examples of pan-University coordinated service (such as the clean-up effort after Hurricane Fran), student organizations seldom coordinate service activities with each other, often resulting in duplication of effort. We need to provide a centralized resource center where all members of the University community can learn about service activities, service learning courses, and public service initiatives.

---

[7] The a.p.p.l.e.s program at UNC-CH, founded by students in 1990, is an example: this program remains entirely student-funded and organized, and undergraduates tax themselves through student fees to fund the program and its full-time service learning coordinator.

2. Lack of Information. Lack of information is especially frustrating for the broader community. Community members know that faculty and organizations on campus can help them, but they generally have no idea what services are available. Community leaders have identified the main problems as lack of a centralized gateway to the University and lack of continuity by campus groups in providing service. The director of an important community service agency described the University as "very confusing" to community agencies in need of help. ("Who do you talk to? Who's in charge?") In any given semester, some community agencies that need volunteers have none at all, while other agencies are inundated.

3. Incentives and Rewards. Campuses that are most successful in integrating service with academic study are those where service is a "broadly understood and accepted mission"; the least successful are those where "there is not a commonly ... accepted mission," or "where the plan is inconsistent with the [perceived] mission."[8] At UNC-CH, we have the stated triple missions of research, teaching, and service. It is an unfortunate reality, however, that service — to the University, to students, to the community — too often seems to be the least valued of the three.

The University culture rarely rewards service, particularly in Academic Affairs, and service is unlikely to be an important consideration in hiring, promotion, tenure and salary decisions. In fact, departments routinely discourage junior tenure-track faculty members from pursuing service until tenure, because it may interfere with research productivity. A number of our colleagues would like to develop service learning courses or other service collaborations with the community, but they do not do so because the professional risks are simply too great. The faculty will continue to view service as an "invisible mission" until the University treats service as a serious and tangible counterpart to teaching and research; conversely, faculty members will become involved in community-based learning activity "if such activity is rewarded in promotion and other personnel decisions."[9] UNC-CH must recognize, reward, and encourage contributions to public service just as it rewards and encourages good teaching and good research. Similarly, students need greater support from the University to expand their involvement in service learning courses and in community-based learning. They need a variety of support services, including transportation, training, access to telephones and copying machines, computers and supplies, and fellowships and awards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Create a Pan-University Center for Public Service.

Along with teaching and research, service is a key element in the mission of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Support for both teaching and research is already institutionalized at UNC-CH; institutional support for service learning has lagged behind. Other universities have adopted a range of community-based service models, from public service centers to specialized projects focusing on one aspect of community-based learning. The committee is familiar with these models, and we have visited a few of them, including those at Stanford, University of Utah, and Providence College. Based on our investigations, we conclude that a pan-University public service center is superior to other possible structures for service; it is by far the best model to reduce the problems associated with fragmentation and isolation, to improve coordination, and to broaden access to service learning and community-based service. Its creation will visibly demonstrate a serious commitment by the University to transforming its service mission; it will enable us to increase, expand, and support service, service learning, and community-based learning at UNC-CH.

---

[8] Campus Compact, *Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study: Fourteen Findings,* 1994.

[9] M. Levine, "Seven Steps to Getting Faculty Interested in Service Learning," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 1, 110-114, at 113, 1994.

The core features of a public service center — clearly defined responsibilities, a centralized location, a full-time staff capable of coordinating and developing new and tested opportunities, and its service as a gateway between the community and all divisions and schools on campus — will enable UNC-CH to remove many of the barriers to effective collaboration with the community. A public service center will:

- Coordinate existing activities and programs.

  The center will coordinate and facilitate existing public service activities at UNC-CH, including service learning, internships, and other community-based learning activities; provide a comprehensive database of community-identified service needs, campus service activities, and interests of students, faculty, staff and alumni; serve as the entry point and gateway for community members seeking public service collaboration with students, faculty, staff and alumni through a toll-free telephone number, an Internet website, a comprehensive database, and coordinated, screened referrals; continually assess the need for support services, such as transportation, access to technical support, and training, and provide them to faculty, students, and staff in existing service programs; and provide a home, with administrative and technical support, for campus organizations whose primary mission is community service.

- Develop new service learning opportunities.

  The center will serve as an incubator for new service projects, innovative partnerships, and interdisciplinary collaborations; provide a facility for the training of students, faculty, community members, and staff; develop new public service financial programs and administer service fellowships, awards, and grants; and develop inter-university collaborations with Duke, NCCU, other area universities, and other universities in the UNC system to address community-identified problems, both locally and statewide.

- Publicize and promote service learning.

  The center will promote public service through seminars, workshops, conferences, and community events and advocate for community-based initiatives and volunteerism; develop public service peer and career counseling, in coordination with existing career counseling services, for students interested in careers in public service; produce service-related publications and encourage research and writing in the area of service; and provide support to faculty, giving validity and credibility to service initiatives and thus increasing community-based learning endeavors by faculty.

A public service center that supports and coordinates these functions will strengthen student intellectual growth, scholarship, and the quality of student life. It will combine academic learning with service, provide an environment that supports student initiatives and leadership, and teach students the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective participants in community affairs.

The committee strongly recommends that the public service center serve both graduate and undergraduate students, and it is vital that Health Affairs play a strong role. Without graduate students, many collaborations with communities, especially those addressing health issues, will not be possible. In addition, there are exciting opportunities for partnerships between faculty in Health Affairs and undergraduate students in Academic Affairs. Successful collaborations among Health Affairs, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs, as well as within divisions, are crucial to long-term partnerships that will benefit the entire state.

Proposed Administrative Structure

1A. We recommend immediate establishment of the center with the recognition that it will develop and expand in the years to come. To facilitate the establishment of the center and the design of its administrative structure, the Chancellor should appoint a *Planning Committee*, to be chaired by a faculty member and composed of alumni, community members, students, staff, and faculty. Relationships of existing service organizations with any new public service center will be complex and should be determined initially by the Provost upon the advice of this Planning Committee.

1B. Based on the recommendations of the Planning Committee, *the Director of the Center should be appointed by the Chancellor* and should report directly to the Provost; the Director should have academic credentials. This reporting relationship offers an opportunity to develop the center as a bridge connecting Academic Affairs, Health Affairs and Student Affairs for purposes of service learning and community-based learning.

1C. One of the Center's purposes is to enhance communication between the different divisions and schools and to encourage collaboration. The Center staff should therefore include a secretary and three coordinators to facilitate cross-campus interactions: a *half-time coordinator for Health Affairs*, who would work with the Director of Interdisciplinary and Community Based Learning in Health Affairs; *a coordinator of service learning for Academic Affairs*; and *a coordinator of community-based learning for Student Affairs.*

1D. An *Advisory Board* chaired by a faculty member and composed of faculty, students, staff, and community members should also be created, and appointed as soon as practicable by the Provost. This Advisory Board will provide ongoing oversight of the Center and advice to the Director.

2. Increase Support for Successful, Existing Service and Community-Based Learning Programs.

As stated in UNC-CH's Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Re-Accreditation Report in 1995, the University must increase support for existing programs and organizations that have successfully provided needed service to communities. There are a number of organizations across the University, from the SHAC Medical Clinic (staffed by Health Affairs volunteers) to CommUniversity, a.p.p.l.e.s, and the Campus Y, that need support in the form of transportation, training opportunities, staff, and technical assistance, etc. The University should adequately support existing programs that have a track record of excellence in providing community service.

3. Restructure the Current Reward System.

The committee advises restructuring the reward system for faculty, staff, and students, and creating new incentives that will encourage service and community-based learning. In order of priority, we make these recommendations:

3A. Make the service mission at Carolina a serious and tangible counterpart to the teaching and research missions, including in hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

3B. Encourage departmental commitments to service and community-based learning (see Section VII, 1B).

3C. Restructure and monitor departmental reward systems for faculty to recognize service to students. Insure that faculty are rewarded through annual salary increases for service to students and to student organizations; for student advising; for supervising student internships; for acting as faculty advisers to student service organizations; for serving on boards or committees of student, community, or University organizations that seek to promote student service; and for teaching service learning courses, as well as other similar activities (see Section VII, 1A).

3D. Create service learning course development awards; provide grants for service learning courses to cover student transportation and technical support costs; and provide teaching assistant support and stipends for service learning courses, with teaching assistants to be trained by the Public Service Center. (These grants would be similar to the Cultural Diversity Course Development grants available now.)

4. Create New Service Incentives.

4A. Create *Chancellor's Public Service Awards*. These awards, to be given annually, would be similar to the Tanner and other teaching awards, but the stipend to faculty would become a permanent increase to their base salary, a system adopted at the University of Georgia to honor service.

4B. Create *Public Service Fellowship Awards*. These awards, to be given annually to students, would provide them with financial support to pursue an innovative public service placement anywhere in the world, which they would create and arrange with support from the Public Service Center. (These awards would be similar to the Burch Fellowships awarded through the Honors Office.)

4C. Create a *student organization public service grant fund* for innovative group service proposals.

4D. Create *Chancellor's Public Service Staff Awards* to honor staff for extraordinary service to student service organizations or for extraordinary work in promoting student service at UNC-CH.

4E. Create a category of *Distinction in Public Service* for Bachelor's Degrees, to be administered through the Public Service Center and awarded to students who meet certain public service requirements, including service learning courses, a service project, and a set minimum of service hours to the community.

4F. Create permanent and term *Public Service Professorships*. The permanent professorships would be modeled after those at Stanford; and the term professorships, attached half-time to the Center for three to five years, would be similar to the newly created Honors Program Term

Professorships.

CONCLUSIONS

At UNC-Chapel Hill, enormous energy is directed toward community service. Thus far, a small number of stalwarts have taken the initiative in organizing service learning, and student organizations such as the Campus Y, a.p.p.l.e.s, and the SHAC Medical Clinic have done great work under challenging circumstances. They illustrate the philosophy of Margaret Mead, who said, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world: indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Students, faculty, and staff are passionate about service learning and community-based learning; we must provide the resources to support that enthusiasm. Now is the time for a sustained, pan-University commitment to make UNC-CH the best public university in the area of service and community-based learning by focusing the energy of its many talented constituents. This committee sees our recommendations as an exciting chance to improve how our students learn, how communities get help from us, and how we deliver on our mandate to serve the citizens of North Carolina. We believe that a public service center at UNC-CH, coupled with improved support, rewards and incentives for service, can accomplish those important objectives.

VI. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND COMMON SPACES

OBJECTIVES

The stimulation of communicated ideas, the synergism of human energy and creativity, the most evocative teaching, the subtle expression of confusion: these activities take place among people interacting with each other in space. Faculty activities outside the classroom, student group learning and participation, mentoring, learning across departmental boundaries: these dimensions of intellectual climate require space in which to flourish. This University has neglected the husbandry of its common space.

The intelligent design of buildings and external spaces can enhance opportunities for informal interactions among all groups of our University community. Interior and exterior spaces containing benches, walls, and public interaction spaces should be created to promote an environment of improved communal gatherings. Lobbies should become more than airlocks; rock walls should more often become benches. These spaces should set an ambiance and provide an opportunity for both isolated personal reflection and informal small-group interaction.

Campus interaction space should be designed with the insight and ideas of the people who will use it. Students, staff, and faculty, in departments and associations and as individuals, must help to identify needs, generate ideas, contribute to design, and review implementation.

BACKGROUND

Our committee defines *space* as places where people can gather and exchange ideas and information. We make a distinction between, on the one hand, the kinds of spaces which promote human interaction, and, on the other, ceremonial or utilitarian space. Interaction spaces foster spontaneous human exchange (see Appendix VIA.). The key attributes of these interactive spaces are that:

- They are open ended in their use.
- They are open to all (non-exclusive).
- They are open beyond the normal work day.
- They support a range of activity, from loud to quiet, from large groups to small
- They are easily accessible.
- They are comfortable to the climate (shady, sunny, or heated as appropriate).

Historically, the public square did not serve everyone; its exclusionary nature reflected class, race, and gender differences. Now the situation has changed but not necessarily improved. Public spaces are less exclusionary but more divided, as different groups have created their own "civic" spaces. And, frequently, public space is used only for entertainment rather than intellectual, philosophical, or even personal interaction. Often public space exists as a big mall (even in student centers) or is effectively exterminated by television. National tendencies toward the atomization of space can be further exacerbated on a college campus by the inherent divisions of discipline, age, and role. Constant budgetary pressures toward lowest-cost maintenance do not help foster quality or grace. It will take constant engagement and active planning to counter these processes and enhance the intellectual climate on campus.

BARRIERS TO THE MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF COMMON SPACE

1. **Lack of Sufficient Interaction Space.** The campus lacks a sufficient number and variety of spontaneous interaction spaces. There are a few good examples, such as the "Pit" and assorted stoops and walls, most notably the wall at the north end of McCorkle Place along Franklin Street. The instant popularity of the space created around a fountain in Bynum Circle and the universal acclaim this committee heard for the Daily Grind attest to the hunger and need for such space.

Specifically, there is a great need for space in which small groups can gather and talk. This is most strongly felt with regard to eating, as there is little space in which faculty can talk with graduate students or with colleagues in other departments. There are few places faculty can meet with students after class to continue a conversation. It is difficult for students to find a spot to develop a group presentation or just to engage in extra-class discussion sessions. There is no place for small professional meetings. There is no place for faculty to meet their colleagues outside of committee work. Students, staff, and often faculty do not feel welcome to enter specialized space. Even the rooms of the student union are largely assigned to organizations, and little is left in common. When new buildings are constructed, among the first things reduced or eliminated by budget constraints are lounges and non-classroom meeting rooms.

When interaction space is available, there are sometimes impediments to using it. The problem of parking at night was frequently cited as a hindrance to faculty engagement with student groups or presentation of evening videos or other extra-class activities.

2. **Lack of sufficient space for display, performance, and other forms of communication**. There is little encounter with the poetry, art, or music of the faculty and students of this campus, in part because there are so few public spaces devoted to these activities. Old, new, and renovated buildings all suffer from dead space, cold lobbies, institutional color, lack of display areas, few bulletin boards, and lack of other space in which information, opinions, or achievements can be posted. There is little organized printed communication about colloquia and other talks given on campus. Faculty, staff, and students find little invitation to be around campus outside of work, and little space in which to do so.

3. **Insufficient Oversight of the Use of Internal Space**. Those who will inhabit buildings needs to have input into the design process. Levels of consultation vary; most goes to new buildings designed for special purposes, such as dramatic art, and increasingly less to other new buildings, renovated buildings and reallocated space, until there is none at all for old buildings continuing in their use. There should be processes through which campus communities can make improvements to promote the intellectual climate.

4. **Insufficient Respect for Common Spaces.** So much needs to be done to save and enhance the magic and spirit of the campus as its population increases and its use intensifies that this report could be consumed by that subject alone — as was most of the committee's time. The loss of common space caused by removal of the Scuttlebut has already been sorely felt.

The University must protect existing common spaces from encroachment. Certainly the most important, successful, and critical common space on campus is the Greater Pit Area.[10] Its character is currently endangered by changes to the buildings around it: Lenoir Hall and the student union are already under contract and the Daniel Building should follow. Care must be taken not to destroy the essence of this common space.

---

[10] The Pit offers flexible space in which people can paint and chalk and shout and sit at tables. The steps, especially in front of Lenoir, offer a vantage for people-watching. The Daily Grind offers one of the few spontaneous "let's break and talk" places where one can read a paper before class or meet a friend, but it disappears in inclement weather and is rather small. The nearby arcade of

At the same time, there is a pressing need for new common spaces. There is especially a need for indoor space where faculty can meet, hear talks from outside their own research interests, and hear each other's creative work, ideas, and experiences. This intellectual activity should of course be easily accessible to students and staff. Campus music groups need space to perform or jam informally. People need space to gather for lunch or a snack when unplanned minutes are available. There is great need for sundry space that is not overly structured and that is flexible, inclusive, open, and held in common.

Similarly, outdoor space is underutilized. The space on North campus, for example, is too great and beautiful a resource to be used mainly for transit. Outdoors sitting features there are almost entirely linear (like walls) rather than inviting to small groups and clusters of people talking with each other. There are few benches and fewer tables.

There are only a few sites where a small class can meet outdoors or where a student project group can assemble. The beautifully fenced enclosure between Saunders and Hamilton, for example, would be used much more often if there were a few wrought-iron tables, benches and seats. Zigzag or parallel groupings of benches on the sides of the quads could provide places for discussion groups, readers and studiers, outdoor classes and consultations, etc. One suggestion is for a series of mini-amphitheaters as a motif around campus. Some could be clustered between sidewalks; other benches could descend the steep banks around some buildings; others could cluster in corners of terraces.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Increase the amount and quality of existing interaction space, and the ease of access to it.**

1A. The University should publicly establish the importance of the creation and maintenance of good interaction space as a priority.

1B. In planning both for new campus facilities and for renovations of existing buildings or spaces, designs that will improve the campus' intellectual climate should receive high priority. This priority should receive regular attention through an institutionalized procedure, as does planning for handicapped access, custodial accommodations, or telecommunications infrastructure. When architects are hired, they should routinely be charged to design buildings and surroundings that are attractive and conducive to human interaction.

1C. Establish a subcommittee of the new *Committee on Intellectual Life* (see Section III, 2A) to focus on common space considerations. Members of this subcommittee could also serve as core members of ad hoc committees created to address particular buildings, areas, or community needs. The *Subcommittee on Common Space (SCS)* should be charged to:

Davis Library and the sculpture pedestals and brickwork in front of it have never been developed for the interaction promise of their location.

i. Work with the *Building and Grounds Committee* to develop a master plan for public space and clear design principles to guide architects in the creation of inviting, flexible, accessible, and inclusive common space.

ii. Oversee the creation of an inventory of existing public space resources. Such a system could be the basis of an interactive, visual query system or other clearinghouse to locate available space. For example, a Geographic Information System might include both interior rooms and external benches, lobbies and lounges, landscape vegetation, stoops, and crosswalks.

iii. Assess current and future needs.

iv. Encourage faculty/staff/student creativity and engagement in campus design by creating a web site, *Campus Vision*, with material suitable for use in capstone courses, workshops, and service learning, and by creating and judging various competitions for funding (see 4D in this section).

1D. *The Department of Parking and Transportation* should find a remedy for the parking needs of faculty returning to campus at night for academic activities.

2. Increase space for display, performance, and other forms of communication.

The *University Director for Intellectual Life* (see Section III, 1B) should explore ways to increase common space for artistic displays and musical performances. For example, the Employee Forum has suggested placing poetry placards in buses and cafeterias. Such a practice would provide a suitable venue to celebrate the winners of students creative writing and poetry awards. Departments or faculty/students/staff could purchase or lease the best of student and faculty art and use it in offices, dormitory rooms, and department conference rooms. There might be an annual art sale, or a permanent collection on lend lease might be developed as is done at other universities. A covered arcade (between Hill Hall parking lot and Franklin Street, behind the art school) could provide a place for art or book sales, music, street theater, or a graffiti wall.

2A. The *SCS* should provide authority and oversight for work/study positions as "space cadets". One position, an art gallery attendant (hopefully in a future Student Union gallery), could disseminate poetry and art as well as update and maintain files on art leasing and display. Another position, a music coordinator, could bring more student performances to common spaces.

2B. Multiple structures (walls, kiosks) for posting or painting should be constructed in suitable areas, such as the Student Union, theaters, the Campus Y, bus stops for dormitories, and/or an arcade.

3. Improve Oversight over the Use of Existing Internal Space.

3A. The *SCS* should immediately develop protocols for the composition and work of ad hoc committees, which could then be used by *Facilities Planning and Design* to survey, assess, and provide user input into design of new and renovated buildings. The imminent changes to the Student Union should be the first case.

3B. Extend the charge of the *Classroom Committee* to include an ongoing inventory of interaction space in buildings and to identify the unfriendliest areas. Regions of campus should be targeted on a rotating basis so that space is continually upgraded.

3C. Through reallocation of money targeted for building maintenance and capital improvements, a fund should be created to finance proposals by departments and other groups to use dead space and lobbies, modify lounges, buy paint, chairs, curtains and other simple amenities, install display cases and bulletin boards, etc. Such proposals could be judged and funded competitively by the *Subcommittee on Common Space* and the *Director for Intellectual Life*, just as the University Research Council judges small grant applications. *Facilities Planning and Design* should provide such groups basic help in estimating costs.

3D. The *SCS*, working with *Campus Security* and others, should investigate the feasibility of using the UNC ONE Card for access to secured ground floors or sections of buildings. This could open up much space for night meetings or study.

4. Protect the Integrity of Common Spaces and Develop New Spaces.

We propose immediate measures in several critical areas, and procedures and means to address the broader topic.

4A. The role of the Greater Pit Area as the preeminent place for interaction must be protected and enhanced. As renovations proceed on the surrounding buildings, the architects must consider the effect of their renovations on this special space.

4B. Develop Gerrard Hall and the area around it as an open, inviting common space. Three elements are critical to this endeavor: events, food, and space. We make recommendations for each.

I. *Events*: Open Gerrard Hall to a daily event (e.g., cross-disciplinary talks, discussions of pressing campus topics, speeches or debates by candidates in election season, poetry readings, tales of unusual travel) where people could drop in and expect others to be there. Initially, the *Director for Intellectual Life* should develop a program of faculty presentations for one fixed day each week; an open, informal sign-up could be used to reserve time to speak. Musical and dramatic presentations might also be arranged.

ii. *Food*: In the immediate future, food could be brought from the Y; in the longer run, simple food such as pretzels, coffee, or frozen yogurt could be available in the courtyard.

iii. *Space*: Small platforms, benches and walls could provide a variety of venues for music, eating or contemplation in the sunshine. We do not know how well the immediate plans to use Gerrard Hall as a food venue while Lenoir is being renovated would fit into this; but they are not long-term impediments, and enhancement of the area could start now.

4C. The Chancellor should ask the *Facilities Planning and Design Committee* to take a more creative and active role in improving outdoor ambiance for community interaction. *Physical Plant* design personnel should give regular attention to creative planning and work more closely with faculty and students. Minimum maintenance cost should not always be the preeminent criterion in design decisions.

4D. Outdoor seating for small groups of people should be quickly increased as well as included in the master plan for public space.

  I. The University should annually fund and build the best proposal for outdoor seating.

  ii. The *SCS* should solicit funds from class gifts and other sources for its projects.

  iii. The *SCS* should develop contests and course opportunities for the development of proposals to redesign common spaces.

  iv. The *SCS* should develop a format similar to service learning projects that would enable students to imagine a project to improve outdoor space for interaction, and then to work with faculty and *Facilities Design* to implement it.

4E. Noise pollution should be surveyed across campus in order to create a traffic and parking plan that minimizes disturbance to the intellectual activities of campus.

4F. The *Director of Intellectual Life* should identify and develop better ways to use Forest Theater.

CONCLUSIONS

To sustain a vibrant intellectual life, university members must be able to interact freely and frequently. Such interactions take place in the common spaces of the university. But the spatial features of intellectual life have been neglected far too long by this university. To renew our intellectual life, we must create spaces that invite intellectual exchange. The participants in those exchanges must be a vital part of the process of design.

VII. FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

OBJECTIVES

While faculty are not the sole influence on the intellectual climate, we cannot expect the climate to change without changes in faculty activities. We therefore need to change the expectations of faculty members, the way their performance is evaluated (both individually and as departments), and the recognition and rewards they and their departments receive for that performance.

BACKGROUND

Being human, faculty members will tend to expend most of their efforts in activities that are most rewarded. Rewards may come from within, such as the intellectual satisfaction of finding the answer to a scholarly problem or the joy of seeing a student finally grasp a difficult concept; or they may come from outside the University community, in the form of recognition by the professional organization of one's discipline or invitations to speak at prestigious institutions. Such rewards are not influenced by the University and its policies. But others, which the University does control, can be used to encourage faculty to engage in activities that contribute most to a vibrant intellectual environment at UNC-CH.

BARRIERS TO CHANGE

Faculty activities that contribute to the University's intellectual environment often get too little recognition when department Chairs make decisions regarding salary, teaching load, leave time, nomination for awards, and recommendations for promotion and tenure. We have therefore sought ways to encourage Chairs to reward faculty members who make substantial contributions to the intellectual life of the University and the intellectual growth of students. In addition, new reward and incentive structures would encourage faculty to engage in activities that may benefit the overall intellectual climate and enhance the intellectual life and growth of the University community, but do not directly benefit the unit to which the faculty member belongs. These activities include interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching, working with students in non-classroom settings, participation in and leadership of campus-wide initiatives to advance the University's mission, and public outreach.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations include both modifying the existing reward system and establishing new incentive structures. In the first category, we make three interrelated recommendations: preparation of individual teaching portfolios by faculty members, incorporating these into departmental teaching portfolios, and modifying the evaluation of scholarship. In the second category, our recommendations are fourfold: establish an *Intellectual Climate Fund* and an *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*, expand criteria for endowed chairs, and expand the *Institute for the Arts and Humanities*.

1. Modify the Existing Reward System

1A. *Individual teaching portfolios*: We recommend that faculty members prepare a teaching portfolio describing the educational activities in which they have engaged in the last year. Preparing the portfolio would give faculty members an opportunity to reflect on their practice of teaching, identify goals, and describe the methods used to reach them. In assembling the portfolio, *teaching* should be broadly construed to include all activities that contribute to the intellectual growth of members of the University community. In addition to classroom teaching, this could include:

- supervision of student research and honors theses.
- academic advising.
- participation in or advising of student organizations.
- participation in enrichment activities such as the Johnston Scholars program or freshman orientation.
- informal contact with students (in residence halls or elsewhere).
- mentoring of graduate teaching assistants.
- supervision of internships.
- participation in interdisciplinary programs and curricula.

Faculty members should report various actions taken to enhance the intellectual climate and the educational experience of students, and assess the success of those actions. These might include:

- the use of innovative teaching methods.
- participation in activities intended to improve teaching skills, such as workshops or "teaching circles."
- efforts to integrate out-of-classroom activities and events into the syllabus.
- involvement of students, especially undergraduates, in research.
- development of service learning opportunities for students.
- contact with the larger community, such as public lectures or visits to elementary and secondary schools.

The portfolio would be considered by the department Chair, salary committee, or other unit head when distributing rewards such as salary increases, leave time, reduced course load, nominations for endowed chairs and other awards, individual recognition, and other resources. The aggregate portfolio over several years would also be used to assess faculty members' teaching when promotion decisions are made, and would form an important part of the post-tenure review process now under consideration by the General Administration.

Particular weight should be placed on mentoring interactions such as supervision of research, theses and internships, as these are both time-consuming for faculty members and highly significant for students. The portfolio should include concrete measures of faculty members' effectiveness as teachers, as well as records of their efforts. Student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching would certainly be a part of the portfolio, but additional measures should be included to evaluate non-classroom teaching. Each unit would devise appropriate and creative methods of assessment, such as:

- results of student research and prizes or distinctions won by students supervised.
- results of departmental surveys of graduating seniors inquiring about which professors were most influential or with whom they had the most meaningful contacts.
- surveys of advisees to gauge effectiveness as an advisor.

In evaluating the contents of the portfolio to determine the distribution of rewards, Chairs should remember the "faculty life cycle;" that is, expectations for participation in a wide variety of student contact activities should normally be lower for untenured junior faculty than for senior full professors. However, it is crucial that all such activities be regarded as important parts of teaching. A faculty member who is heavily engaged in time-consuming mentoring, such as effective advising and thesis supervision, should whenever possible be compensated by a reduced classroom load or reduction in other departmental demands (such as weighty committee assignments). Faculty members not so engaged should be expected to take up the slack as necessary. In order for the portfolios to serve their intended purpose, it is crucial that they become an organic part of the faculty's professional practice. They must not be an additional bureaucratic burden that takes time away from teaching, research, and other interaction with students, but rather a tool for enhancing and evaluating such activities. All faculty members have had experience with reporting systems that are ends in themselves. Nothing will be gained, and much time will be wasted, if preparation and scrutiny of the portfolios becomes a pro forma administrative exercise. The portfolio itself is not the important product, but rather the reflection and feedback that the act of preparing and assessing it will produce. It is up to the faculty and the department Chairs to find creative ways to use the portfolios, and open discussion within the unit will be a critical part of the implementation process. Care must be exercised in the scrutiny of faculty members' descriptions of their activities so that rewards do not go disproportionately to those inclined to be immodest about their accomplishments.

These challenges have already been addressed in various departments in our peer institutions. On our own campus, the experience of the schools of *Public Health* and *Education* will undoubtedly prove valuable in constructing a system that serves the intended purpose without imposing an undue bureaucratic burden. Guidance in the constructive uses of teaching portfolios can be had in available publications[11] and from our own *Center for Teaching and Learning*.

Chairs' success in distributing rewards in accordance to the contents of faculty members' portfolios would be evaluated by their Deans. This would be done in part through the departmental teaching portfolio (see 1B in this section); but such assessment should also form part of the periodic review of the Chairs' performance and the annual review of the performance of the department. The cautions about careful scrutiny are even more important at this level, since the Dean is less likely to be directly aware of faculty members' actual contributions.

Although much of the preceding has been devoted to the distribution of concrete rewards such as salary, we would encourage Chairs to remember that faculty also value recognition of their efforts even if that recognition has no tangible value. Simply acknowledging that faculty members are engaged in important work, and thanking them publicly or even privately, can encourage them to continue such efforts or even to expand them.

1B. *Departmental Teaching Portfolios:* We recommend that a portion of the budget granted each unit be determined by the contents of its departmental teaching portfolio, which would form part of the unit's Annual Report. In this portfolio, the unit would describe the activities it has undertaken to enhance the intellectual growth of students. These would include actions by individual faculty members (reported in individual teaching portfolios) as well as efforts undertaken by the unit as a whole. As for individual faculty, concrete measures of the effectiveness of these efforts should be included. Examples of unit efforts might be:

- reducing class size to teach more effectively.
- improvements to student advising.
- development and nurturing of student groups devoted to intellectual activities (such as majors' clubs or public service groups).
- participation in interdisciplinary course offerings (particularly courses team-taught by faculty from more than one unit).
- support of undergraduate research.
- offering of new freshman seminars, honors courses, and other high-quality educational

---

[11] The Association for Higher Education, *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching* (1991); Peter Seldin, *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions* (1997).

opportunities.

- mentoring of junior faculty and graduate teaching assistants to enhance their teaching skills.
- contact with past graduates to assess the currency and usefulness of the training offered to majors, and modifications of the unit's curriculum as appropriate.
- public outreach.

The departmental teaching portfolio should be evaluated not only annually by the appropriate Dean but also at intervals by an independent body charged with advising on educational matters, such as the *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* (see section II1A., and 2B in this section). Consideration should also be given to the unit's effective use of its resources and to the constraints, such as limited personnel, under which it operates. Units that have used their resources effectively to enhance the educational experience for their students should be rewarded with additional resources, which might include lapsed salary funds or even additional faculty budget lines, as well as other increases to the unit operating budget. Particular attention should be paid to matching the budget to the needs of the unit to accomplish its educational goals. Examples might include:

- lapsed salary funds to support the teaching of smaller classes.
- supply money to support photocopying of student essays for class distribution.
- equipment money to make use of information technology to enhance teaching.
- travel funds for students to present their research at conferences.
- operating funds for public service and outreach activities.

Departments should also be rewarded if their members contribute to the broader goals of the University by serving on important pan-University committees and engaging in other activities that are important to the University's intellectual environment but benefit the unit only indirectly. This evaluation of the portfolio should not be viewed as an invitation for micromanagement, as Chairs and faculty are the most informed about the activities in their own units. However, if a shift in the distribution of resources is to be made with the intent of enhancing the intellectual climate, it will be necessary to identify and encourage those units which are most engaged in such activities.

In creating the departmental teaching portfolio, we seek not to increase the unit's pro forma reporting burden but to tie that reporting directly to the allocation of resources to the unit. To the degree possible, the total effort involved in preparing the unit's Annual Report should not be increased; rather, the departmental teaching portfolio should replace a portion of the current report. This portfolio is a way to identify the real contributions a unit makes to the intellectual climate of the University. To be useful, it must therefore have a concrete and direct influence on the unit's budget. The availability of resources for activities that enhance the intellectual climate will serve as an incentive to the unit and will motivate the Chair and the faculty to increase their efforts in this direction. Resources granted to a department on the strength of its teaching portfolio should be used to encourage faculty to engage in activities that enhance the intellectual life of students; thus, to the degree that they flow to individual faculty, they should flow to faculty heavily engaged in such activities. Accountability is crucial to this process. Deans must hold Chairs accountable and praise and reward them for their success in enhancing the intellectual climate, not only for the scholarly reputation of their department. Care must also be taken to assure that units that are already making substantial efforts to improve the intellectual climate are not penalized for failing to improve upon greatness. Once again, open discussion among Chairs and Deans regarding the best and most creative uses of the portfolio will be necessary. Deans should be held accountable in the same way, and this should be a part of their review process. A firm and lasting commitment by senior administrators is therefore vital if the departmental teaching portfolio is not to be simply an additional burden on Chairs and faculty.

1C. *Evaluation of Scholarship*: As is appropriate in a major research university, the quality of faculty members' scholarship and their scholarly productivity are among the primary determinants of the rewards they receive. However, it is important that a balance be maintained among the various aspects of the University's mission, including the maintenance of a high-quality intellectual and educational environment. We therefore recommend that each unit be required to examine the ways in which scholarship is evaluated in promotion and tenure and salary decisions. In particular, emphasis should be placed on quality rather than quantity. The nature of scholarship and its evaluation varies among disciplines, but some possibilities include:

- limiting the number of publications that can be considered for promotion and tenure.
- placing greater weight on the distinction of an article or book.
- determining the influence of a publication in a way appropriate to the discipline, e.g., by citations of the work by other authors (although care must be taken that numerous citations do not indicate a work refuted by many authors!).
- considering a variety of kinds of scholarship that contribute to enhanced teaching and other goals.

The generation and dissemination of new knowledge is one of the fundamental missions of a research university, but maintaining a scholarly effort of the highest quality does not require the production of a large number of unread publications. While the involvement of undergraduates in faculty members' scholarly research may reduce their productivity in the traditional sense, it greatly enhances the intellectual growth of the student — and, often, that of the faculty member. This should be given greater weight in promotion, tenure and salary decisions than is presently the case.

2. Establish New Incentive Structures.

2A. *Intellectual Climate Fund*: We recommend that a fund administered by the Provost's office be established to support faculty initiatives that would enhance the intellectual climate. Requests for proposals would be issued periodically, inviting individual faculty and small groups to apply. The precise nature of the projects solicited would not be specified, but the following criteria would be used in evaluating proposals for funding:

- *Impact on Undergraduate Education*: Preference would be given to proposals that promise to have a substantial influence on improving the quality of undergraduate education.

- *Interdisciplinary Nature*: Preference would be given to proposals that would enhance connections among disciplines, as such projects are less likely to receive support from individual units. Projects that would help students see the connections among various facets of the liberal arts, or between the liberal arts and the professions, would be favored, as would projects that bring together participants from both Academic Affairs and Health Affairs. Projects to develop new areas of interdisciplinary scholarship, especially those that involve participation by graduate and undergraduate students, would be encouraged. The development of new cross-disciplinary courses to address the goals of the General Education Program would also be sought.

- *Model programs*: Preference would be given to projects that could serve as models for other areas of the University and beyond. New approaches to classroom teaching (especially those involving team- or peer-teaching), new ways of using information technology for education, methods to integrate service learning and out-of-the-classroom activities into the curriculum, collaborative ways to enhance research and graduate instruction, and other kinds of broadly applicable efforts would be favored.

Assessment: Proposals would be expected to incorporate clear goals for the project and methods to assess the degree to which the goals are met.

Whenever new resources are made available, the creativity of the faculty at UNC leads to an explosion of proposed projects. It would therefore be inappropriate to try to describe the various kinds of projects that might be supported by the *Intellectual Climate Fund*. However, the existing a.p.p.l.e.s. program would certainly have fit these criteria.

The fund would make between twenty and forty grants per year, with typical project periods of one to two years. Matching funds from departments or external sources should be encouraged, including in-kind matches such as release time for faculty. Grants would normally range from $500 to $25,000. The fund should total approximately $300,000 per year. In procuring these funds, care must be taken that the resources necessary to maintain strong departments (upon which high-quality interdisciplinary projects would rest) are not unduly diminished.

Since the fund is to be available to all portions of the academic community, it must be administered from the Provost's office. The selection of proposals to be funded should be made by a committee of faculty which would include representatives from a wide variety of units and disciplines. A final report would be submitted for each project, assessing its success in meeting its goals and outlining how the results are to be disseminated. The report would also include material that could be used to publicize the successful projects as part of the University's efforts toward public awareness, and enhanced public support, of its activities.

2B. *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*: We recommend that UNC-CH establish an *Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* (*ADTS*), modeled on the National Academy of Sciences (see Section IIIA.). This entity would serve two purposes: recognition of outstanding faculty and enhancement of the quality of education. First, it would recognize and reward members of the faculty who make sustained contributions to the intellectual life of the University. Election to the *ADTS*, as to the National Academy of Sciences, would be permanent. (We note that UNC-CH has at present no permanent recognition of excellence in teaching). Members would be chosen in recognition of their distinction in teaching, where *teaching* is broadly construed to include not only classroom teaching but also supervising student research, advising individual students and student organizations, mentoring younger faculty and postdoctoral scholars, and other activities that contribute to the intellectual growth of members of the University community. Faculty chosen for the *ADTS* should not merely display excellence in the fulfillment of their classroom responsibilities, but should engage in reflective practice and be true campus leaders as scholar-citizens.

Second, members of the *ADTS* would be expected to contribute to the quality of education at UNC-CH. They would do so by providing advice to the administration on educational issues, organizing and participating in activities to nurture young faculty as teacher-scholars, assessing the efforts of individual units to enhance the educational experiences of their students, speaking publicly on issues in higher education, and generally serving as both the symbol and the embodiment of the University's commitment to excellence in education.

A draft charter for the *ADTS* can be found in Appendix IIA, which delineates the process of appointment, the stipend, and the expectations for Academy members. In addition to the funds used to supplement the salaries of Academy members as a tangible reward and as compensation for the duties required of them, additional funds would be made available to the

ADTS to enhance the educational life of the campus. These funds could be used to offset the expenses of mentoring groups, workshops and the like. They could also be used to bring distinguished teacher-scholars from other institutions to UNC-CH as "Visiting Members" of the *ADTS* for extended periods (one or two semesters), most likely as a sabbatical leave. Persons chosen for such visits would be expected to interact broadly with faculty and students across the campus, bringing a fresh perspective on various educational issues. The Chancellor and the *Development Office* would be encouraged to seek private and corporate funds to help support the *ADTS* as a highly visible aspect of the commitment to high-quality education at UNC-CH.

2C. *Expansion of Criteria for Endowed Chairs*: We recommend that some of the existing endowed chairs (permanent and term), which are not designated by their donors to a particular unit but are presently awarded for scholarly excellence of any kind, be used to recognize faculty who display excellence in interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching. In some cases, this may require an expansion of the selection criteria used, where allowed by the terms of the original donation. Nomination by more than one unit would be required for a faculty member to be chosen for such a chair. We further recommend that as new funds for endowed chairs become available, some be designated as *University Professorships* to recognize faculty members whose educational leadership extends well beyond the boundaries of their units. Such recognition is made for outstanding faculty members at institutions such as Harvard and M.I.T.

2D. *Expansion of the Institute for the Arts and Humanities*: In order to encourage and facilitate scholarly and educational activities that enhance the intellectual environment of the University, there must be many opportunities to bring faculty together on common projects. We therefore recommend that the fellowship program of the *Institute for the Arts and Humanities* be expanded to include faculty from the physical, biological and social sciences, and from the professional schools, who wish to engage in scholarship and teaching that crosses the boundaries between their disciplines and the humanities. This is part of the strategic plan of the Institute, and it has already begun with the selection of a few Fellows from the professional schools. The *Fellows Opportunity Fund* of the Institute can also be taken as a model for the Intellectual Climate Fund in providing seed money for projects developed by the Fellows.

3. Provide an Orientation for Deans and Chairs.

For these efforts to be successful, Deans and Chairs must be actively involved. For that to occur, they will need comprehensive information about the University's overall approach to improving the intellectual climate. Clear communication from the administration to Deans and Chairs concerning what is expected of them will also be a vital ingredient in the process. Therefore, to implement the recommendations contained in this report, we further recommend that the administration conduct an orientation for Deans and Chairs. This would have two purposes: to provide a comprehensive description of the University's overall approach to improving the intellectual climate, and to clarify for Deans and Chairs their role in achieving its goals.

CONCLUSIONS

Members of the faculty, individually and collectively, will be key to changing the intellectual climate within the University. However, an increase in the activities that enhance that climate is unlikely to occur by mere exhortation within the current environment. Faculty do what they do because they perceive it to be their best personal response to the existing expectations (personal and institutional) regarding faculty behavior. While we do not presume that behavior will change only if faculty are tangibly rewarded, it seems reasonable to believe that some would change their behavior in desired directions if they could be sure that their situations would at least not worsen in some way. Such changes would be facilitated by clear communication of expectations and consequences.

VIII. IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING

To transform intellectual life at UNC-CH, we have recommended many changes in six, related domains. Some of our proposals require substantial funds and major institutional changes; others cost nothing besides time and the sacrifice of traditional ways of doing things. No single recommendation will instantly change intellectual life; but taken together, they will fundamentally alter the intellectual climate of the campus.

To facilitate the implementation of these recommendations, we provide in Appendix VIII.A. a complete listing of each committees' recommendations. Each separate recommendation is accompanied by an assignment of responsibility for implementation, and where feasible, a rough cost estimate. We anticipate that some of our proposals will be funded through the reallocation of current resources. Others will require new funds; indeed, some of our proposals should be attractive funding opportunities for private donors. Most of our proposals can be phased in so as to spread their cost out over several years.

Still, some administrators and faculty may worry that the overall price tag for our package of proposals is prohibitively high. We disagree. To fund fully *all* of our proposals *immediately* (which we are *not* proposing) would likely cost less than $4,000,000. This is a substantial amount of money; but in the context of what is spent on other important facets of university life it is not excessive. It is, for example, considerably less than the cost of the renovations of Kenan Stadium. Clearly, the intellectual life of the university must be as important as big-time athletics. A vibrant intellectual life is the core of a university; it warrants the university's attention and money.

FUNDING PRIORITIES

All of our recommendations are important and worthy of implementation, nonetheless it is essential to set priorities among them. Towards that end, we compared related recommendations rather than establishing priorities within committee reports. For comparison, we divided our recommendations into three broad categories — transforming students, faculty and the university — and set priorities within each category. To change intellectual life at UNC-CH, we must pursue recommendations *simultaneously* in each of these areas. Thus the university should begin by implementing the recommendations of highest priority in each category, and continue until the plan for change is fully executed.

Changing Student Culture

Change will fail if students are not involved. Engagement in an active intellectual life should begin when students arrive on campus and grow during their years at UNC-CH. Unfortunately, many students are quickly socialized into an anti-intellectual culture that undermines their intellectual life. Accordingly, we believe that the best mechanism for altering student culture is the institution of a first year socialization experience, proposed here as a pilot program: the *The First Year Initiative* (IV.1-5). **This is the single most important recommendation in our report; it should be implemented in its entirety as soon as possible.** Beyond the first year, deliberate socialization of students occurs most directly through the advising system, and the mentoring relationships that advising can foster under optimal conditions. Improving the college advising (III.3A, III.3B) and departmental advising (III.3CI-iii) systems is, therefore, a necessary complement to any first year experience. Altering the first year experience and improving the advising systems are likely to be expensive endeavors; unfortunately, they cannot be easily implemented in a piece-meal fashion. But such reforms must be at the core of any effort to improve intellectual life on our campus.

Of somewhat lower priority than the *First Year Initiative* and advising reforms are three equally important proposals for institutional innovations that will transform student culture by expanding and coordinating opportunities for (1) mentored, research-oriented learning experiences, (2) connecting in-class and out-of-class activities, and (3) service and community based learning (recommendations II.2, III.1-2, and V.1-2 respectively). Specifically, mentored learning can be promoted by establishing an *Office for Undergraduate Research* (II.2A) and improving institutional support for mentored independent study (II.2B) and cohort learning (II.2C). Similarly, a more integrated intellectual life that blends in-class and out-of-class activities can be fostered by instituting a *Central Clearing House* to coordinate such activities and ensure greater dissemination of information about them (III.1A-G), and by appointing a new "*Committee for Intellectual Life*" (III.2A-C) to work with the Clearing House staff to involve faculty and departments in creative initiatives to bring the curriculum and outside activities together (III.5). Lastly, service learning can be encouraged by creating a *Center for Public Service* (V.1) and increasing support for existing service and community-based learning programs (V.2). When fully implemented, each of these institutional initiatives will command a significant investment of institutional resources. But each one can be developed and expanded over time; in each case, the start-up costs require only modest investments in a core staff and operating budget. Moreover, each of these institutional initiatives will eliminate overlap and redundancy in programs across campus; by facilitating coordination and enhancing communication, they will improve efficiency and thereby make better use of existing resources.

Changing Faculty Culture

Change will fail if students are uninvolved, but it will never begin without the commitment of the faculty. They must be given the means to change and the appropriate motivations for doing so. Accordingly, the most important recommendations for reconstructing faculty culture and motivations are the proposed changes in the faculty rewards structure that can be implemented largely by reallocating existing resources (recommendations VII.1, V.3, V.4, VII.2C). Specifically, faculty change can be instigated by employing teaching portfolios (VII.1A), departmental teaching portfolios (VII.1B), altering the evaluation of research (VII.1C), improving rewards for service learning experiences (V.3 and V.4), and for research excellence (VII.2C).

Of lower priority, faculty change can also be facilitated by two relatively inexpensive proposals: improving access to information about both active learning methods(II.3) and interdisciplinary research (VII.2D). Both these proposals will facilitate innovative changes in the curriculum, and help forge links among faculty in diverse disciplines. Lastly, the process of change can be sped up by offering faculty special opportunities to develop their own ideas: an *Intellectual Climate Fund* (VII.2A) is thus a critical mechanism for triggering innovations. It could be funded initially at whatever level is feasible; but to engage the creative impulses of faculty, it is essential that it be established at some level of funding.

Changing the University

Finally, change depends on transforming the University as both an institution and a place. To transform the university as an institution, we make two equally important recommendations: the establishment of the *UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* (*ADTS*), and the institution of a meaningful orientation for Deans and Chairs. The *ADTS* (I.1A, VII.2D) will be an institutional vehicle for the continuous appraisal of the educational enterprise at UNC-CH, while simultaneously providing a means of recognizing outstanding teaching scholars. Like other institutional innovations we are recommending, its implementation would, by design, be gradual. The initial cost could be minimized by utilizing existing resources for endowed chairs; in the long run, the *ADTS* is a good candidate for support through private fund-raising. In contrast, orientation sessions for Deans and Chairs (VII.3) are not a costly enterprise, but they are just as critical as the *ADTS* to the task of changing the university as an institution.

To transform the university as a place, the classroom and common spaces of the university must be altered so as to improve the opportunities for intellectual exchanges. Recognition of the importance of the creation and maintenance of interaction space by university leaders (VI.1A), those involved in the design and planning of public facilities (VI.1B, VI.3A-B, VI.4C), and the faculty (VI.1C) is of highest priority. Beyond heightening the university's awareness of the importance of common spaces, we make a number of specific recommendations for physical improvements to the campus. Among them, of utmost importance is protecting the integrity of existing common spaces like the Greater Pit area (VI.4A). Of equal priority are improving classroom spaces to render them more hospitable to active learning (II.4A-D), developing new spaces like Gerrard hall and coffee shops (III.4A, III.4C, VI.4B-F), increasing display and performance space (III.4B, VI.2A-B), and improving access to all spaces (VI.1D, VI.3D). Of these, a particularly critical need that could be easily addressed immediately is the lack of adequate outdoor seating for small groups (VI.4D).

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

If this plan for transforming intellectual life at the *University of North Carolina Chapel Hill* is to be a success, all members of the university community must assume some responsibility for change. Active leadership must come from the Chancellor; he must persuasively initiate the process of change. We call upon the Chancellor, therefore, to set the general tone by articulating publically and frequently the importance of devoting university resources to reinvigorating intellectual life. As a symbolic gesture, for example, the Chancellor might commit some of the NIKE revenues to intellectual climate projects. In more specific terms, we call upon the Chancellor to initiate the process of change by establishing the *UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* (II.1A), the *Committee for Intellectual Life* (III.2A), and the *Center for Public Service* (V.1); by taking the lead in the creation of new performance and meeting spaces (III.4B, VI.2); and by making clear to the public and the university alike that service (V.3A) is a key aspect of our mission and that maintaining the university as a "place" (VI.1A) is absolutely critical (see Appendix VIII.B for a list of these responsibilities).

We also request the Provost to play an active role in promoting intellectual life. Specifically, we ask the Provost to, among other things, create an *Office for Undergraduate Research* (II.2A), develop cohort programs of education (II.2C), expand the *Inquiry Track Program* (II.3A), establish the *Central Clearing House* for University activities (II.A-B), create new service incentives (V.4), develop Gerrard Hall as a common space (VI.4B), create an *Intellectual Climate Fund* (VII.2A), and take responsibility for ensuring that all deans and chairs undergo orientation sessions (VII.3.) (see Appendix VIII.C for a list of these responsibilities).

Deans, department Chairs, and other unit heads will have a central effect on the success of efforts to improve the intellectual climate. They either administer or influence directly the various faculty rewards that are available. They are the primary individuals who communicate the institution's expectations to faculty members; they are in positions to describe and model the activities that are desired, and are also the key individuals in position to reassure, encourage, cajole, and even negotiate to obtain them. And they have the authority to pursue many of the initiatives that we are recommending, especially those involving changes to the faculty reward structure (VII.1A-C).

The *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences*, in particular, will play an especially critical role in implementing our recommendations. We ask that Dean to take the lead in implementing our most important recommendations: creating the *First Year Initiative* (IV1.-3) and reforming the advising systems (III.3B-C.). We also recommend that the *Dean of the College* promote changes in the faculty reward structure (VII.1A-C) and establish funds for special activities outside the classroom (III.2Ai), Faculty/Student Meals (III.2Aii), and course development to promote better linking of outside the classroom activities to courses (III.5A) (see Appendix VIII.D for a list of these responsibilities).

Chairs will also play a key role in improving intellectual life. They stand at the intersect between individual faculty and the university administration;. their full cooperation is essential if change is to occur. We ask the chairs to take responsibility for facilitating communication among faculty (III.1E, III.5B-C), creating department-based student organizations and recognizing their advisors (III.2B-C), in changing the departmental advising system (III.3C), promoting service learning (III.5D, V.3B-C), in staffing the *First Year Initiative* (IV.2, IV.3A), and most importantly changing the faculty reward structure (VII.1A-C) (see Appendix VIII.E for a list of these responsibilities).

Individual faculty will also necessarily play a central part in the implementation process. Though we have asked faculty to assume relatively few formal responsibilities, their active participation is, nonetheless, critical to the successful implementation of many of our proposals (see Appendix VIII.F for a list of these responsibilities). Thus transforming the in-class environment depends upon faculty engaging students in their research, and embracing active learning methods and then sharing their experiences with other faculty (II.2, II.3). Strengthening the links between inside and outside the classroom depends upon faculty using new funds to support faculty-student interaction (III.2Ai, III.2Aii); creating stronger links between course content and outside activities through course development funds, regular class announcement of events, support of departmental e-mail "chat" groups, service learning and travel (III.5A-D); and supporting reforms of departmental advising systems (III.3C). Similarly, the success of the *First Year Initiative* pilot program rests upon faculty developing a diverse offering of first year seminars (IV.2.). Creating an educational experience that more tightly links coursework to the community and broader world necessitates that faculty make more substantial commitments to service and community based learning (V.3).

But the greatest requirement of faculty is that they embrace this opportunity to redefine their roles. Creating an individual teaching portfolio will give faculty the opportunity to articulate a personal conception of how their teaching, research and service come together (VII.1A), while contributing to the preparation of a departmental teaching portfolio will afford individual faculty opportunities to define their place in our collective educational enterprise (VII.1B). More clearly defining the reward structures to take account of advising and service activities that most faculty already do will allow individuals to be appropriately rewarded for their full range of contributions to the university. Some faculty and administrators may worry that in creating new incentives for teaching and service, these proposals will upset the current balance between teaching, research and service so much that it will undermine the research mission of the university (e.g. by "requiring" faculty to engage in more non-research activities, time will be diverted from research; high-powered scholars will be more difficult to recruit). We disagree. We do not believe that the stature of UNC-CH as a research university will be subverted by the implementation of our proposals. On the contrary, we are convinced that the mutually reinforcing nature of research, teaching and service will be *strengthened* by rethinking faculty roles, employing active learning methods, forging stronger links between course content and outside, paying closer attention to the socialization of first-year students, and utilizing more service and community based learning. Similarly, we believe that reconstructing faculty roles will make UNC-CH *more*, not less, attractive to the kind of professors we really want — those who wish to be deeply involved both with students and scholarship. But these are debatable matters that the faculty, as a whole, should be discussing. We, therefore, call upon faculty leaders — the Chair of the Faculty, the Executive Committee of Faculty Council, and Faculty Council — to take responsibility for creating a campus-wide conversation around the topic of changing faculty roles as we have recommended.

Finally, we invite *all* students — undergraduate and graduate, part-time and full-time, young and old — to join in reshaping our university. Students will be affected in some fashion by each of our recommendations. And though we do not assign to them any formal responsibilities, their full participation and cooperation is essential. We, therefore, ask student leaders and the *Daily Tar Heel* to help engage students in a campus-wide dialogue around our proposals for reinvigorating intellectual life at UNC-CH. And we challenge all students to examine critically their educational experiences and to begin enriching their own education by: trying courses with active learning methods, seeking out opportunities for student research, striving to connect course content with outside activities, exploring new kinds of outside activities, engaging faculty in discussions outside of class, supporting the *First Year Initiative*, and pursuing opportunities for service learning and involvement in the community.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

The character and quality of a university community ultimately depends upon its citizens — students, faculty, adminstrators and staff. The *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* is blessed with citizens who care deeply about the future of the University. Thus numerous faculty, students and staff have voluntarily worked together to create this plan for energizing intellectual life. Together we have conceived of a vision for *UNC-CH* to pursue in the 21st century: an educational experience that is student-centered, permeates the whole of University life, and is linked to life outside the University. And together we have identified the changes necessary to realize that vision. Now, we ask that the rest of the university, from the Chancellor to the newest student, join us in reinvigorating the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

APPENDIX IA. CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE

TASK FORCE AND STEERING COMMITTEE CHAIR: Pamela Conover (Political Science)

IN THE CLASSROOM: Arlen Anderson (post-doctoral fellow, Physics); Martha Arnold (Center for Teaching and Learning); Deborah Bender (Health Policy and Administration); David Dill (Public Policy); ***Chair: Marshall Hall Edgell*** (Microbiology and Immunology); Howard Fried (Biochemistry and Biophysics); William Glaze (Environmental Sciences and Engineering); Marcia Harris (Student Affairs); Reginald Hildebrand (African and Afro-American Studies); Donald Hornstein (Law); Janet Knight (undergraduate student, Biology); Stuart Macdonald (Political Science); Ellen Peirce (Business); Patricia Pukkila (Biology); Joe Schuch (OIT)

OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM: John Blanchard (Director of Athletic Academic Affairs); Marya DeVoto (graduate student, English); Erica Eisdorfer; Laurel Files (Health Policy and Administration, and Associate Dean of the Graduate School); Miles Fletcher (History, and Associate Dean for Honors); Karla Henderson (Recreation and Leisure Studies); Gerald Horne (History, Communication Studies, and Director of the Black Cultural Center); ***Chair: Lloyd Kramer*** (History); Sheng Lee (undergraduate student); Donald Luse (Director of the Student Union); Sarah Manekin (undergraduate student); Della Pollock (Communication Studies, and Director of the Cultural Studies Program); Marilyn Scott (German); Wayne Thompson (University Housing); Oliver Wagner (Campus Ministries); James Whittle (undergraduate student); Carolyn Wood (Ackland Art Museum); Candice Wooten (undergraduate student)

FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE: Robert Adler (Business); Bobby Allen (Honors Program); Tomas Baer (Chemistry); Margaret Barrett (Student Affairs); Doris Betts (English); ***Chair: Leon Fink*** (History); Helen Hills (Art); Dionysios "Ikie" Kakouras (undergraduate student); Robert Kirkpatrick (English); Mark McCombs (Math); Pip Merrick (Biology); Ed Neal (Center for Teaching and Learning); David Reckford (undergraduate student); Dwight Rogers (Education); Chandra Taylor (undergraduate student); Wayne Thompson (University Housing); Bryan Winbush (undergraduate student)

COMMON SPACES: Phil Berke (City and Regional Planning); Thomas Clegg (Physics and Astronomy); Vincent Kopp (Anesthesiology); Wayne Kuncl (Student Affairs); ***Chair: Melinda Meade*** (Geography); Thomas Sayre (alumnus); Elin Slavick (Art); Robert Vanderbeck (graduate student); Reyna Walters (undergraduate student)

SERVICE AND COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING: Diane Calleson (graduate student, and Public Service Roundtable); Linda Carl (Service Learning Coordinator in the Office of Vice-Chancellor of Health Affairs); Carolyn Cooper (Nursing); Heidi Fleischhacker (undergraduate student); Zenobia Hatcher-Wilson (Director of the Campus Y); Takie Hondros (undergraduate student, co-president of the Campus Y); ***Chair: Donna LeFebvre*** (Political Science); Jim Leloudis (History); Mary Morrison (a.p.p.l.e.s. Director); Erin Parrish (undergraduate student, a.p.p.l.e.s coordinator); Joel Schwartz (Political Science); Mike Smith (Director of the Institute of Government); Rachel Willis (Economics); Cindy Wolf-Johnson (Director of the N.C. Fellows and Leadership Office/Student Affairs)

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS: Carl Bose (Pediatrics); Larry Churchill (Social Medicine); Janice Dodds (Nutrition); Jack Evans (Business); Darryl Gless (English); Berton Kaplan (Epidemiology); ***Chair: Laurie McNeil*** (Physics and Astronomy); Jim Peacock (Anthropology); George Rabinowitz (Political Science); Allan Steckler (Health Behavior and Education); Ruel Tyson (Religious Studies); Judith Wegner (Law); Brent Wissick (Music)

APPENDIX IIA. UNC ACADEMY OF DISTINGUISHED TEACHING SCHOLARS
A DRAFT CHARTER[12]

The *UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars* is intended to recognize and enhance teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level, at *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* through the identification and selection of faculty members who have made sustained and significant contributions to education. Membership in the Academy is permanent (coterminous with the faculty member's appointment at the University). The initial membership of the Academy will be made up of ten appointees. No more than ten new members will then be inducted each year. The total membership is not to exceed 5% of the University's faculty.

Upon election to the Academy, each member will receive a permanent academic salary increase of $5,000. In addition, each Academy member will be designated a *Distinguished Teaching Scholar,* which will entitle the holder to use the title on University stationery.

Academy members are expected to serve as an advisory group to the Provost on teaching excellence, to provide institutional leadership and guidance concerning the quality of education at our research University, and to serve as teaching mentors for new faculty.

The initial members of the academy will be selected by the Provost from recommendations submitted by the Deans. Thereafter, new members will be recommended to the Provost by a committee including current members of the Academy and additional faculty drawn from recommendations of the Deans and others.

Members will be selected from a pool consisting of: (1) the Teaching Award winners from the previous year, and (2) a set of nominees from the various organizational units, which should have a defined number of nominees that they can make each year.

---

[12] Based on UT Austin charter for its academy of distinguished teachers.

APPENDIX VIA. STARTING REFERENCES ON COMMON SPACES

Blomley, N. 1989. Text and Context: Rethinking the law-space nexus. *Progress in Human Geography* 13:512-534.

Blomley, N. 1994. *Law, Space and the Geographies of Power.* New York: Guilford.

Kunstler, James Howard. 1996. Home from Nowhere. *The Atlantic Monthly* 278(3).

Kunstler, James H. 1994. *The Geography of Nowhere: The rise and decline of America's man-made landscapes*. Simon Schuster.

Marcus, Clare 1990. *People Places: Design Principles for Urban Open Spaces.*

Mitchell, D. 1995. The end of public space? People's park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85: 108-133.

Mitchell, Don, editor 1996. Special issue: Public space and the city. *Urban Geography* 17(2) and 17(3).

APPENDIX VIII.A
IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

No Recommendations

II. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE INSIDE THE CLASSROOM

1. Establish a process to provide continuous appraisal of the educational enterprise at UNC.

1A. Establish the *UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*
Likely Cost: $275,000 annually when fully implemented
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor and the Development Office

1B. Educational Conference to involve the faculty, students and community at large in the process of welcoming change
Likely Cost: $25,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

2. Expand opportunities for mentored learning experiences.

2A. An expansion of the undergraduate research program and the creation of an *Office for Undergraduate Research* to provide administrative support for undergraduate research, to be housed within the *Johnston Center for Undergraduate Excellence*
Likely Cost: $40,000 for staff
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

2B. Creation of a process to allow students to get an additional credit hour for mentored independent study associated with a three-credit course.
Likely Cost: unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Educational Policy Committee

2C. Sanctioning of the use of cohorts and the establishment of a mechanism to evaluate faculty proposals to create special educational, cohort experiences.
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

3. Increase access to information about active learning approaches.

3A. Expansion of the Inquiry Track Program
Likely Cost: Unknown; depends on how the program is expanded (e.g., part-time director, course development awards)
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost and Inquiry Track Program Coordinators

3B. Creation of various databases serving the faculty and student communities by providing access to information about active learning in general and about what is being done at UNC in particular.
Likely Cost: $5,000

Responsibility for Implementation: Center for Teaching and Learning

3C. Increase exposure of the faculty, students and public to the active teaching approaches being employed at UNC.
Likely Cost: none
Responsibility for Implementation: UNC Public Relations Office, the proposed Office of Undergraduate Research, Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Inquiry Track Program.

4. **Reduce classroom constraints affecting the use of active learning approaches.**

4A. Improve acoustics in large classrooms by adding sound systems to existing classrooms and building more "U" shaped classrooms
Likely Cost: unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Buildings and Grounds Committee, Classroom Renovations Committee, Facilities Planning and Design

4B. Increase flexible seating in classrooms
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Buildings and Grounds Committee, Classroom Renovations Committee, Facilities Planning and Design

4C. Improve access to spaces for "break-out" sessions, including electronic breakouts.
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Buildings and Grounds Committee, Classroom Renovations Committee, Facilities Planning and Design, OIT

4D. Improve student access to computer technology both inside and outside the classroom.
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Buildings and Grounds Committee, Classroom Renovations Committee, Facilities Planning and Design, OIT

III. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

1. **Provide better information about events.**

1A-B Central Clearing House and Staff
Likely Cost:

Director for Intellectual Life:	$40,000 (salary/benefits)
Assistant to Director:	$20,000 (salary/benefits)
Office budget and equipment:	$6,000

Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

1C. Video kiosks
Likely Cost: $10,000
Responsibility for Installation: Director of Student Union

1D. Scholarships and Awards Office and Position
Likely Cost:

Position:	$26,000 (salary/benefits)
Office equipment/budget:	$5,000

Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

1E. Departmental e-mail groups
Likely Cost: Staff time to establish departmental lists
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs, Directors of Centers

1F. Detailed announcements of events
Likely Cost: No identifiable costs
Responsibility for Implementation: Leaders of organizations or groups posting announcements

1G. Better communication among groups
Likely Cost: No identifiable costs; use existing computer network
Responsibility for Implementation:
New "Director for Intellectual Events" (see 1.B above)

2. Encourage participation in co-curricular activities and conversation.

2A. "Committee for Intellectual Life"
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor for establishment; Faculty Council and new University Director for Intellectual Life for ongoing oversight.

2Ai. "Fund for Special Activities Outside the Classroom"
Likely Cost: $20,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Dean of Arts and Sciences and new University Director for Intellectual Life for establishment of fund; Committee on Intellectual Life for ongoing administration.

2Aii. "Fund for Faculty/Student Meals"
Likely Cost: Pilot Program for 200 professors at $50 each: $10,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Dean of Arts and Sciences and new University Director for Intellectual Life for establishment of fund; Committee on Intellectual Life for ongoing administration.

2B. Departmental Student Associations:
Likely Cost: Modest use of Department budgets for supplies, refreshments or publicity; varies by department
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs

2C. Recognizing Organization Advisors
Likely Cost: No identifiable cost; include in annual reviews of faculty
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs

3. Reform the Advising System

3A. Computerized "Major Audit" System
Likely Cost: No additional cost; included in current plans for new technology

Responsibility for Implementation: Associate Dean of College of Arts and Sciences (Bobbi Owen)

3B. Reform College Advising system
Likely Cost: Depends on the reform undertaken
Responsibility for Implementation: Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

3C. Reform Departmental Advising systems:

3Ci. Allow earlier departmental affiliation:
Likely Cost: No identifiable cost, but more faculty time with advisees
Responsiibity for Implementation: Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

3Cii. Faculty/advisee meetings
Likely Cost: No identifiable cost
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs

3Ciii. Recognizing and Rewarding Active Advisors
Likely Cost:
No additional Costs for recognition; include in Annual Review
Establish awards for Outstanding Advising, $3000
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs, Dean of College of Arts/Sciences

4. Provide more and better space for intellectual exchange.

4A. Expanded Coffee Lounges
Likely Cost: Expansion of "Daily Grind" and other facilities: $30,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Director of Food Services and Food Services Advisory Committeee

4B. New Performance and Meeting Spaces
Likely Costs: Costs should be absorbed in current budgets for construction
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor and Board of Trustees in consultation with Directors of relevant Centers and Programs

4C. Space for Student Groups
Likely Cost: Included in plans for renovation of Student Stores
Responsibility for Implementation: Vice-Chancellor and Dean for Student Affairs

5. Create more connections between in-class and out-of-class activities.

5A. Using Course Development Funds
Likely Cost: Divert some of current course development funds to this goal: $5000
Responsibility for Implementation: Committee that Awards Course Development Funds, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences

5B. Urging Announcement of Events
Likely Cost: No identifiable Costs
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs and Individual Faculty

5C. Departmental e-mail discussion groups
Likely Cost: Staff time to establish departmental lists
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty/students

5D. Service Learning and travel:
Likely Cost: Varies with project; may require more insurance fees
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs in consultation with Faculty; Department of Transportation and Parking

5E. Graduate Students and Foreign Students in Residence Halls:
Likely Cost: The rent of a room in a residence hall or Greek house; cost of keeping more dorms open during holidays to accomodate foreign students
Responsibility for Implementation: Department of University Housing

IV. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND THE FIRST YEAR INITIATIVE

1-3. FYI Program Administration
Likely Cost: $65,000 for FYI coordinator and staff
Responsibility for Implementation: Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Affairs

1. Summer Reading Project.
Likely Cost: Small honorarium for Faculty Speaker; Graduate mentors participate as part of their responsibilities
Responsibility for Implementation: FYI Program Coordinator and Student Affairs Orientation Coordinator

2. First Year Seminars
First-Year Seminar Faculty (30) will be needed to direct the new academic program for FYI students.
Likely Cost: Participating departments will be compensated at a rate of $5000 per course. Estimated cost of 30 seminars: $150,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs in coordination with the FYI Program Coordinator

3. First Year Residency

3A. Renovations to Hinton James
Likely Cost: $100,000 one-time facilities cost
Responsibility for Implementation: Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Affairs in consultation with Facilities Planning and Design, University Housing and the FYI Coordinator

3A. Graduate Mentors
Likely Cost: Free room rent as compensation; approximately $100,000 will be needed to offset rent subsidy.
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs nominate mentors; FYI Coordinator in consultation with Advisory Committee

3B. Weekly Dialogues
Likely Cost: $10,000/year for programs (ropes course, dinners, speakers, etc.)
Responsibility for Implementation: Graduate mentors under the supervision of the FYI Program Coordinator

3C. Communal Involvement
Likely Cost: no cost
Responsibility for Implementation: Graduate mentors under the supervision of the FYI Program Coordinator

4. **Evaluation of the FYI Program**
Likely Cost: $2,000
Responsibility for Implementation: FYI Program Coordinator (data collection); Dean of the College of Arts and Science (data assessment)

5. **Discussion of Postponement Greek Rush**
Likely Cost: no cost
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor

V. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND EDUCATION FOR CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

1. **Create a Pan-University Center for Public Service**
Likely Cost: Primary funding for the structure and the center should come from private donors and foundations, with an endowment sought to sustain its activities
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor

1A. Appointment of Planning Committee:
Likely Cost: none
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor

1B. Appointment of Center Director
Likely Cost: $55,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor with the advice of the Center Planning Committee

1C. Appointment of secretary, one half-time Service Coordinator, and two full-time Service Coordinators
Likely Cost: $75,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Center Director with the advice of the Center Advisory Board

1D. Appointment of Center Advisory Board
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

2. **Increase Support for Successful, Existing Service and Community-Based Learning Programs**
Likely Cost: unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: varies depending on program

3. **Restructure the Reward System:**

3A. Make the service mission at Carolina a serious counterpart to the research and teaching missions
Likely Cost: none
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor

3B. Encourage departmental commitments to service and community-based learning (see Section VII, 1B)
Likely Cost: reallocation of existing resources
Responsibility for Implementation: Department Chairs with oversight by Deans

3C. Restructure and monitor departmental reward systems to recognize service to students
Likely Cost: reallocation of existing resources
Responsibility for Implementation: A percentage of the funds provided to departments should be set aside for this purpose; the proper and equitable disbursement of those funds should be strictly monitored by the Provost. We also recommend that a mechanism be implemented by Chairs and department heads to insure that these activities are in fact considered and given important weight in promotion, salary, and hiring decisions.

3D. Create service learning course support
Likely Cost: (annual)

Six course development awards @ $4,000 each:	$24,000
Six course support grants @ $500 each:	$3,000
3 T.A.'s @ $8,000 each:	$24,000

Responsibility for Implementation: Center Direct with advice of Advisory Board

4. **Create New Service Incentives**

4A. Create the Chancellor's Public Service Awards
Likely Cost: (annual)

Three permanent awards to faculty @ $5,000 each:	$15,000
Six awards to students @ $1,500 each:	$9,000

Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory Board

4B. Create Public Service Fellowship Awards:
Likely Cost: Six awards of up to $6,000 each: $36,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory Board

4C. Create a student organization public service grant fund
Likely Cost: $15,000 annually to be disbursed in grants of up to $2,000 each
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory Board

4D. Create Chancellor's Public Service Staff Awards:
Likely Cost:
Three annual awards of $5,000 that would become a permanent increase to the staff member's base salary.
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory

Board

4E. Create a Bachelor's Degree with Distinction in Public Service:
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory Board

4F. Create permanent Public Service Professorships and term Public Service Professorships
Likely Cost:
Two permanent professorships attached to the Center @ unknown cost
Four term professorships, attached half-time to the Center for 3-5 years and each carrying a $7,500 annual salary supplement
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice of Center Director and Center's Advisory Board

VI. INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND COMMON SPACES

1. Increase the amount and quality of existing interaction space, and the ease of access to it.

1A. Publicly establish the importance of the creation and maintenance of good interaction space as a priority
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: The Chancellor and ECFC

1B. In planning for new campus facilities and renovations of existing buildings, seek designs that will improve the campus' intellectual climate
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Facilities Planning and Design should develop formal language which adapts their present design process to include improved campus intellectual climate as a priority. This standard process should include input from a representative community of campus users of the facility under consideration. This change in process should subsequently be presented to the Buildings and Grounds Committee and then to the Facilities Planning Committee for approval.

1C. Establish a subcommittee of the Committee for Intellectual Life, the *Subcommittee on Common Space (SCS)*.
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Faculty Council

1D. Study and find remedy for the parking needs of faculty returning to campus at night for activities.
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Department of Transportation and Parking

2. Increase space for display, performance, and other forms of communication.

2A. Hire work study students to act as "space cadets" by serving as an art gallery attendant and public music facilitator
Likely Cost: $4,000

Responsibility for Implementation: new Director for Intellectual Life

2B. Construct multiple structures (walls, kiosks) for posting or painting:
Likely Cost: $2,500
Responsibility for Implementation: Director of Facilities Planning and Design

3. Improve Oversight over the use of Existing Internal Space

3A. Develop standard protocols for the composition and work of ad hoc committees to survey, assess, and provide user input into design of new and renovated buildings
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: New SCS

3B. Inventory interaction space in buildings on an ongoing basis and identify the worst, most unfriendly areas to be targeted for improvement
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost and classroom committee

3C. Establish a fund from the Physical Plant budget to finance department and other group proposals to use and renovate internal spaces
Likely Cost: $200,000
Responsibility for Implementation: new Director for Intellectual Life with advise of Director of Facilities Planning and Design and oversight by the new SCS.

3D. Investigate the feasibility of using the UNC ONE Card to access secured ground floors or sections of buildings
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Campus Security and Facilities Planning and Design in consultation with new SCS

4. Protect the Integrity of Common Spaces and Develop New Spaces

4A. Immediately develop a plan to promote and enhance the Greater Pit area as the pre-eminent place for campus interaction
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Facilities Planning and Design

4B. Develop Gerrard Hall and the area around it as an open, inviting common space with structures for interaction
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost for assignment of space for this endeavor; new Director for Intellectual Life for ongoing supervision.

4C. Make improving the outdoor supportive structure and ambiance for community interaction a priority consideration in Facilities Planning and Design
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor should instruct Facilities and Design Planning Committee

4D. Quickly address the need for outdoor seating for small groups of people by increasing the number of such spaces in the master plan for public space
Likely Cost:
· Annual award for best proposal: $10,000
· Class projects and class gifts: unknown
· Course development and websites: $10,000
Responsibility for Implementation: New SCS

4E. Survey noise pollution across campus at various times of day
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Department of Transportation and Parking

4F. Develop ways to use Forest Theater better
Likely Cost: Unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: New Director for Intellectual Life.

VII. FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

1. Modify the Existing Reward System

1A. Individual teaching portfolios:
Likely Cost: Faculty and Administrators' time
Responsibility for Implementation: Individual faculty with oversight by Chairs and Deans

1B. Departmental Teaching Portfolios:
Likely Cost: Faculty and Administrators' time
Responsibility for Implementation: Chairs with oversight by Deans and Vice-Provosts

1C. Evaluation of Scholarship:
Likely Cost: None
Responsibility for Implementation: Chairs with oversight by Deans

2. Establish New Incentive Structures

2A. Intellectual Climate Fund
Likely Cost: $300,000 per year
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost with advice from special faculty committee

2B. Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars
Likely Cost: $275,000 annually when fully implemented
Responsibility for Implementation: Chancellor and the Development Office

2C. Expansion of Criteria for Endowed Chairs
Likely Cost: none
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost

2D. Expansion of the Institute for the Arts and Humanities
Likely Cost: unknown
Responsibility for Implementation: Director of the Institute for the Arts and Humanities

3. **Provide an Orientation for Deans and Chairs**
Likely Cost: $5,000
Responsibility for Implementation: Provost and Vice-Provosts, and Deans

APPENDIX VIII.B
CHARGES TO THE CHANCELLOR

II.1A. Establish the *UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars*

III.2A. Establish the *Committee for Intellectual Life*

III.4B. Create new Performance and Meeting Spaces

IV.5. Discussion of Postponement Greek Rush

V.1. Create a *Center for Public Service*, appoint the Planning Committee, and name the Director

V.3A. Make the service mission at Carolina a serious and tangible counterpart to the research and teaching missions

VI.1A. Publicly establish the importance of the creation and maintenance of good interaction space as a priority.

APPENDIX VIII.C
CHARGES TO THE PROVOST

II.1B. Educational Conference to involve the faculty, students and community at large in the process of welcoming change.

II.2A. An expansion of the undergraduate research program and the creation of an *Office for Undergraduate Research*

II.2C. Sanctioning of the use of cohorts and the establishment of a mechanism to evaluate faculty proposals to create special educational, cohort experiences.

II.3A. Expansion of the Inquiry Track Program

III.1A - B Establish the Central Clearinghouse for University activities and appoint Staff

III.1D Scholarships and Awards Office and Position

V.1D. Appointment of Center for Public Service Advisory Board

V.4. Create New Service Incentives

VI.3B. Oversee with Classroom Committee an inventory of interaction space in buildings on an ongoing basis

VI.4B. Develop Gerrard Hall and the area around it as an open, inviting common space with structures for interaction.

VII.2A. Create an *Intellectual Climate Fund*

VII.2C. Expansion of Criteria for Endowed Chairs

VII.3. Orientation for Deans and Chairs

APPENDIX VIII.D
CHARGES TO THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

III.2Ai. Establish a "Fund for Special Activities Outside the Classroom"

III.2Aii. Establish a "Fund for Faculty/Student Meals"

III.3B. Reform the College Advising system

III.3C. Reform the Departmental Advising systems by allowing earlier departmental affiliation and establishing awards for departmental advising

III.5A. Divert some of existing Course Development Funds to fund initiatives to improve the connections between inside and outside the classroom

IV.1-3. Establish the *First Year Initiative* and administrative structure

VII.1 Promote changes to the Faculty Reward Structure

APPENDIX VIII.E
CHARGES TO DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRS

III.1E Create departmental e-mail groups to announce event

III.2B. Create Departmental Student Associations

III.2C. Recognize Student Organization Advisors

III.3Cii. Promote change in Faculty/advisee meetings

III.3Ciii. Recognize and Reward Active Advisors

III.5B. Urging Announcement of Events

III.5C. Departmental e-mail discussion groups for substantive topics

III.5D. Promote service learning trips and field travel

IV.2. Facilitate staffing of First Year Seminars

IV.3A. Nominate Graduate Mentors for FYI Program

V.3B. Encourage departmental commitments to service and community-based learning

V.3C. Restructure and monitor departmental reward systems to recognize service to students

VII.1A. Provide oversight for the development of individual teaching portfolios

VII.1B. Develop departmental teaching portfolios

VII.1C. Adjust the evaluation of scholarship

APPENDIX VIII.F
CHARGES TO THE FACULTY

II.2. Expand opportunities for mentored learning experiences

II.3. Increase access to information about active learning approaches

III.2. Use new methods of encouragement for participation in co-curricular activities and conversation:

III.2Ai. Use "Fund for Special Activities Outside the Classroom"

III.2Aii. Use "Fund for Faculty/Student Meals"

III.3C. Endorse reform of departmental advising systems

III.5. Create more connections between in-class and out-of-class activities

IV.2. Teach First Year Seminars

V.3. Support the re-structure of the reward system to recognize service

VII.1A. Individual teaching portfolios

VII.1B. Departmental Teaching Portfolios

VII.1C. Evaluation of Scholarship

VII.2A. Use Intellectual Climate Fund

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Office of the Chancellor

Michael Hooker
Chancellor

103 South Building
Campus Box 9100
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9100
(919) 962-1365 FAX: (919) 962-1647

September 5, 1997

Dear Students, Faculty, Staff, Alumni, and Friends of Carolina:

The Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate has now completed and submitted its report. The report culminates a year-long effort by nearly 100 members of the University community to determine how we can create an even more effective campus learning environment. A copy of the report, complete with executive summary, is available on the University's Internet Home Page (http://www.unc.edu). Hard copies of the report can be found at the Office of Student Government, the Office of the Chancellor, and the Undergraduate, Health Sciences, Law and Davis libraries. Deans, directors, department heads, and student leaders will receive copies in the mail.

The report challenges all of us to define and achieve a higher standard of academic excellence and to make Carolina the leader and model for public higher education in the 21st century. It offers specific and well-reasoned recommendations on how to raise the quality of student-faculty interaction both in and outside the classroom, how to increase their constructive involvement in the community, and how to build a fuller sense of intellectual engagement among all members of the University community. We urge you to read it, discuss it with your associates and friends, and consider ways to promote its effective implementation.

Finally, we offer our deep appreciation to members of the Task Force and its subcommittees for their hard work and creative contributions.

Michael Hooker	Pete Andrews	Mo Nathan
Chancellor	Chair of the Faculty	President of the Student Body

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is a constituent institution
of The University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The essence of a University is defined by its intellectual life. For a variety of reasons, the current intellectual climate at the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* needs improvement if we are to maintain our excellence as a public university. Towards this broad end, the *Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate* created a dialogue with the university community about the future of our university. We asked faculty, staff, and students what kind of intellectual life is suitable for a university of the 21st century, and how can we generate it?

Our report answers this question with a vision of a better educational experience at UNC for the 21st century and a plan for implementing it. Three key elements characterize this vision: the educational experience should be student-centered with an emphasis on learning how to learn; intellectual exchange should be woven seamlessly into the fabric of everyday life; and education should be linked to life outside the University.

Unfortunately, moving towards these goals is hindered by problems of coordination and commitment. Many coordination problems can be solved by institutional reforms that facilitate better communication and collective activity. Coordination problems aside, people might not pursue our ideal of a shared intellectual life because they lack the commitment. But commitments can be encouraged by reshaping the reward system or cultural ethos for both faculty and students. Thus implementing our vision will require basic changes in the institutional structure of the university, and the cultures of students and faculty alike. Though no set of recommendations can magically transform institutions and cultures to produce immediately a vibrant intellectual community, we believe that over time the cumulative effect of our recommendations can and will transform the university, making us the model public university for the 21st century.

To improve intellectual life at UNC-CH, we have recommended many changes in six, related domains. To set priorities among them, we have divided our recommendations into three broad categories — transforming students, faculty and the university — and set priorities within each category. We recommend strongly that University pursue recommendations *simultaneously* in each of these areas, and that it begin by implementing the recommendations of highest priority in each category and continue until the plan for change is fully executed.

Change will fail if students are not involved. The best way to alter student commitments is to engage students in an intellectual life when they first step on campus. This can be accomplished through the institution of a first year socialization experience, proposed here as a pilot program: the *The First Year Initiative*. *This is the single most important recommendation in our report.* Improving the college advising and departmental advising systems is a necessary complement to any first year experience. Of somewhat lower priority than the *First Year Initiative* and advising reforms are three equally important proposals for institutional innovations that will transform student culture by expanding and coordinating opportunities for: mentored, research-oriented, learning experiences; connecting in-class and out-of-class activities (); and service and community based learning. Specifically, we recommend the creation of an *Office for Undergraduate Research,* a *Central Clearing House* to coordinate activities and a "*Committee for Intellectual Life*" to work with the Clearing House staff, and a *Center for Public Service.*

Change will fail without the students, but it will never begin without the commitment of the faculty. *Accordingly, the second most important recommendation in our study is the proposed changes in the faculty reward structure which are intended to reshape faculty culture and motivations.* Specifically, faculty change can be instigated by employing individual teaching portfolios, departmental teaching portfolios, altering the evaluation of research, improving rewards for service learning experiences, and for research excellence. Of lower priority, faculty change can also be facilitated by improving access to information about active learning methods, encouraging interdisciplinary research, and establishing an *Intellectual Climate Fund* to give faculty opportunities to develop their own ideas.

Finally, change depends on transforming the University as both an institution and a place. *To transform the university as an institution, we make our third most important recommendation: the establishment of the UNC Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars (ADTS)*. The *ADTS* will be an institutional vehicle for the continuous appraisal of the educational enterprise at UNC, while simultaneously providing a means of recognizing outstanding teaching scholars. The culture and commitments of administrators must also evolve if institutional change is to occur. Therefore, we recommend orientation sessions for Deans and Chairs. Finally, to transform the university as a place, the classroom and common spaces of the university must be altered so as to improve the opportunities for intellectual exchanges. Here, recognition of the importance of the creation and maintenance of interaction space by university leaders, those involved in the design and planning of public facilities, and the faculty is a priority.

If this plan for transforming intellectual life at the *University of North Carolina Chapel Hill* is to be a success, all members of the university community must assume some responsibility for change. Active leadership must come from the Chancellor and the Provost. Deans will have a central effect for they have the authority to pursue many of the initiatives that we are recommending. The *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences*, in particular, will play an especially critical role in implementing our recommendations. Chairs and unit heads will also play a key role for they stand at the intersect between individual faculty and the university administration; they communicate the institution's expectations to faculty members. The cooperation of individual faculty members is also crucial for they must embrace this opportunity to redefine their roles. Finally, and most critically, the participation and cooperation of students is essential if this plan is to succeed. Together, we can reshape the *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* and make it the leader among public universities.

Please Note: The entire report is posted on the University's Web page under Office of the Chancellor. The complete URL is: http://www.unc.edu/chan/intclim/toc.htm.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Department of Communication Studies

An open letter on the intellectual climate.

The Report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Intellectual Climate should be the occasion for the very sort of discussion that it seeks on foster on campus before the administration decides to implement any of its recommendations. Since the issues it raises have implications for students and faculty for many years to come, such discussion should not be limited to a few public and tightly regulated fora. Moreover, these discussions should be conducted in a climate in which it is taken for granted that everyone, even those criticizing the report, are assumed to be honestly committed to seeking the best solutions to the problems that do and will confront the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in the next decades.

Having said this, let me then state that I believe the report to be seriously flawed at every level, despite all the efforts and good intentions of those who worked on it. The report is predicated on a number of very basic contradictions. First, it claims to offer a vision of the 21st century university, yet no where is any suggestion provided about what that vision might be. Even more disappointing is the lack of serious consideration of the unique situation of UNC-CH as a public and research university. Given the issues this task force was charged to examine, one might have expected the report to start with some definition of the ideal intellectual climate its members wish to see established here. That would be followed by a descriptive diagnoses of the university's actual intellectual climate, and that would lead, quite logically, to a discussion of solutions which would move the university from the latter to the former. Unfortunately, none of this is in the actual report. In fact, there is very little discussion of the actual problem which the report seeks to ameliorate.

As I understand it, some fraction of the faculty has expressed dissatisfaction with the intellectual climate here. My best guess, based on my own experience as a student and a professor, is that that would be true at almost every college and university. Moreover, I think that it probably has been true for many decades, if not longer. Of course the fact that there may not be a crisis to be solved need not deny that improvements can and should be made, and that changes will have to be made as the university enters the 21st century.

The second contradiction is symptomatic. The only definition that is given of the aim of the proposed changes is to "create an environment in which the value of [the intellectual life] is so clear that students will choose to join it." What a wonderful sentiment and ideal! It also relieves the authors of considering the most obvious question that one might pose: given all the resources currently available to faculty and students, why is the level of participation relatively low? The report makes many suggestions to increase the number of opportunities for intellectual activities both inside and outside of the classroom; it makes many suggestions for coordinating such activities and making information available (usually involving hiring more administrators and administrative staff, placing more burdens on an already seriously inadequate internet server, etc.). But it never raises the question of participation itself and it apparently feels that questions of motivation are too crass to consider..

Yet apparently, while the value of the intellectual life will be so obvious to students that they need no additional encouragement, the same is not true of the faculty. On the contrary, the report views the faculty as the enemy and as morally suspect: "Being human, faculty members will tend to expend most of their efforts in activities that are most rewarded." I have rarely seen such cynicism about the faculty from the faculty in my career. Of course, if it were true, then most of us would not have chosen to be professors in the first place.

This same contradiction appears again when the report raises the idea of developing individual and departmental teaching portfolios. On the one hand, the authors claim that these should not be taken as an additional bureaucratic burden which will take up even more faculty and department time. Instead; these should be seen by both faculty and department administrators as valuable opportunities for self-reflection and improvement. Well and good, but the authors also seem to doubt that the faculty will take them seriously unless they are "tied directly to the allocation of resources." But if the faculty are as untrustworthy as the report seems to assume, then the fact that these portfolios will have "a concrete and direct influence on the unit's budget" will no doubt transform them from occasions for honest self-criticism into administrative opportunities for self-promotion. No one is opposed to improving the ability of individuals and units to fulfill their teaching mission, and most people realize that money and resources are involved, and that there have to be mechanisms for assessment. These questions are already being considered on this campus, and at least some units have already entered into these discussions. I think they are important questions which deserve attention. But I believe the discussion must proceed in a way that enlists the faculty's own commitments to education and teaching. If the only motivation we can find for change depends upon an appeal to the economic realities that are and will continue to define some of the demands on the university, then I do not see much hope for improving the intellectual climate, nor do I see any chance that UNC-CH will become a leading force defining the new university. On the contrary, we will have made the university into another corporation seeking to maximize its profits whatever the cost.

One final contradiction is worth mentioning: the report claims that "too many faculty fail to appreciate the power of outside forces." Yet a careful reading of the report demonstrates that the authors were themselves highly selective about which outside forces they were willing to acknowledge and accept. Moreover, I have always assumed that at least part of the function of the university (and especially of the faculty in situations where we cannot assume that the administration will have a sense of its intellectual responsibility) is to stand up to some social pressures and to protect values and commitments and knowledges which might be swept aside by such pressures.

In fact, in the light of this mission, I believe it is particularly odd that the report gives little weight or attention to what I see as some of the major impediments to improving the intellectual climate of the university. Admittedly, there is little or nothing we can do --as a faculty-- about some of these issues insofar as they transcend the university common. I am thinking for example of the national disinvestment in education at every level and the consequent decline in academic preparedness of many of the students. But other conditions involve the structure of the university: for example, despite a continuing rhetoric of the importance and value of interdisciplinary study (a point made in every report on every topic over the past years), there is little acknowledgment of the way budgetary procedures undercut the vital and exciting interdisciplinary endeavors occurring at UNC. And most importantly, there is no discussion of the ways the rhetoric and action of the university administration (and often, the faculty as well) undermines the credibility of any claim to provide an intellectual experience. If we go along --as the administration clearly does--with the view that the purpose of a college education is to train students for jobs, how can we expect our students to enter into the intellectual climate. (I remember Hannah Gray, the ex-president of the University of Chicago, once pointing out that education and training are not the same thing. She suggested that you train dogs, you educate people!)

If the university acts like any other corporation, why should students believe there is anything different or unique about what we are offering them? And don't be mistaken, our students are not dumb; they can read the signs from the administration. They can compare the money invested in the new business school (and the resources for students there) with those in Arts and Science and draw their own conclusions. They can compare the rhetorics used to justify the Nike deal and the firing of a tenured law professor--apparently, the Nike deal raises complicated issues while the firing of an individual does not--and they can draw their own conclusions. They can consider the Administration's response to Professor Michael Eric Dyson's graduation speech last year and realize that public relations is more important than intellectual climate. And they can see that "intellectual climate" is being used as an excuse to further police their behavior and regulate their everyday lives, as in Chancellor Hooker's constant efforts to link the issue to undergraduate drinking. They might reasonably ask how jumping onto this popular moral bandwagon exemplifies a commitment to reasonable discussion and an intellectual climate. (For a compelling albeit flawed critique of the corporate university, see Mark Edmundson's "On the uses of a liberal education" in Harper's Magazine, September 1997).

Let me turn now to some of the specifics of the report itself, for the best that can be said of it is that it is a rather disjointed collection of proposals representing a variety of interests and perspectives, from active learning to service based learning. While I support both of these proposals in part, I wish there had been more discussion of learning which focuses on the gaps in our students' basic knowledge and in their interpretive and critical skills. What is most disheartening is that despite all the rhetoric in the report about establishing UNC-CH as the leading public university in the 21st century, almost every proposal presented here has been or is being tried at numerous other places, often in more interesting forms. And there is no attempt to evaluate how successful they have been (beyond the predictable Hawthorn effects which predict that any change produces an initial positive response), or what their cumulative effects might be. In fact, in the end, I cannot help but feel that this report offers little more than window-dressing so that the university can appear to be responding to the very real social pressure on the university to increase its commitment to and the quality of its undergraduate education, and to do so for a larger student population with diminishing resources.

I wish I could be more supportive of the specific proposals, but I find almost all of them objectionable for different reasons; and moreover, I think the cumulative effects of these proposals undermine the very strengths that define the unique potential of UNC-CH (and provided strong motivation for me to leave one university after almost 20 years to move here) without significantly advancing its pedagogical mission. Of course, there are the predictable calls for better and more coordination and communication, for better and more advising--although how this is to be accomplished is left unspecified, and it is difficult to disagree with such calls. Beyond such common-sensical suggestions, however, the remaining proposals are often presented as if their claim for support were equally obvious. Let me consider some specific proposals:

1. The First Year Initiative will place a small number of students into an experimental college situation. This was a leading model of educational reform in the 1960s and 70s; it had some successes and many failures. It is at best a good option for a small number of students who would like such a specific type of intellectual experience during their college career. It could be a good recruiting tool but it could be a disaster if students are randomly assigned. Moreover, it only reaches a very small number of students, and requires a large investment of money and faculty time.

2. The First Year Seminar eventually will give all freshman one seminar (out of ten classes their first year, forty or more during their tenure as students) with a faculty, and this is supposed to produce some major change in their relationship to the intellectual life. There is no discussion of what the content of such seminars should be or how they should be related to the students own interests, or to his or her major. And there is no discussion of how this is to be paid for. I know of many other universities that have instituted such programs. I don't know of any universities where it has changed the intellectual climate in any significant way.

3. The Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars will recognize no more than 10 faculty members a year and no more than 5% of the faculty. I am all in favor of recognizing outstanding teachers and outstanding contributions of the intellectual life of the university. In fact, this campus has many such opportunities (more than most universities) and perhaps it needs even more. But this proposed Academy does little or nothing other than create another occasion for competition among faculty. Calling it an Academy is at best pretentious and at worst disingenuous.

4. The report also proposes that the university increase the commitment to service and community based learning. In principle this is reasonable but it can be taken to far. The report claims that North Carolina "expects" the university to help solve its most pressing problems." If that is true, I would like to think that we are supposed to accomplish this by producing knowledge of all kinds,

and by educating its citizens, not by turning students into an army of cheap labor to implement the volunteerism necessary in the face of various cutbacks in social services, etc. Obviously, there are some instances where field work and internships can contribute to the educational experience of a class; also, obviously, public service is a responsibility of all citizens (whether they work for a university or a corporation). But that does not mean that public service is somehow a constitutive feature of the intellectual life per se. There are practitioners within many disciplines who bring their experience into the classroom, but it is their knowledge, not their public service as such that qualifies them as professors.

Finally, I want to make three concluding observations. First, the report seriously underestimates the cost of many of the proposals (e.g., the salaries of various new administrators); it also admits that, in many cases, it simply is unable to calculate the cost of its proposals, ranging from the additional teaching hours that are being created for faculty, to the need for more and better teaching, performance and common space, to the demand for more parking, etc. So the various news reports which have put a 4 million dollar price tag on these changes have seriously misrepresented the statements of the Report. But the authors should have been much more forthcoming with statements of the very high cost of the implementation of this Report.

Second, the rhetoric of the report makes it sound like this is an eminently practical set of proposals, and would not place any onerous burdens on the university. But this strikes me as somehow not quite honest. For example, the proposals in the report will radically increase the demands on teaching space at this university, where there is already a shortage of teaching space. And offering every freshman at least one seminar would seem to imply that we have lots of appropriate rooms available. If we do, I wish someone would help me find one for my seminar.

Third, I am really perturbed by what I see as the cumulative effects of this report and the implied trajectory it is suggesting for this university. I assume that we are all agreed that undergraduate education is a primary responsibility of the university and the faculty and that, for a variety of reasons, some fundamental changes are going to have to take place in how this is organized and accomplished at UNC-CH. The authors of the report claim to recognize both that the faculty are "already pressured and overworked," and that the faculty embody "the unique strengths of the research university." But rather than using this as an opportunity to reconsider the meaning of high quality public education, and to consider new and alternative models for educating large numbers of students with a prestigious research oriented faculty, all of their proposals amount basically to radically changing the balance of faculty activities from research to teaching and public service. The report proposes that the faculty spend much more time not only in teaching but in intensive mentoring relationships with undergraduates. And how would we find the time to do this? By reconsidering the terms by which we evaluate scholarship. While the authors talk about shifting from quantitative to qualitative terms, we all know that this is a rather clichéd demand which no longer reflects the reality of such evaluations anyway. What is more frightening is that the authors propose limiting the number of publications that can be considered for promotion (discouraging people from publishing too much?) and considering expanding the already extremely broad definition of research and scholarship.

Please do not misunderstand me: there is no doubt that the faculty should and will have to find ways to put more time and energy into undergraduate education and various kinds of service. But the rather easy and unreflective proposals gathered together here amount to an attempt to radically shift the priorities and values of the UNC-CH and, I fear, its existence as a leading and world-famous research university. And I see no reason to assume that these proposals would significantly improve either the undergraduate education we give to students or the intellectual climate of this campus. In the end, this university can never provide the kind of education that students can get at some of the leading small liberal arts colleges and universities in this country. We simply do not have the staff to do this, nor should we try for, as the report acknowledges, our strength comes from the fact that we are a Research university. But that does not mean that we cannot provide an excellent education for students on our own terms, if we have the courage to explore these issues.

We need a vision of what such an education might be, and a strategic plan for how to realize it. We need to design an innovative undergraduate education for the future without contradicting or detracting from the research function of this university. We need to think about new ways of using the classroom to bring people together and to teach the different forms of reasoning that will be required for the twenty-first century. We need to bring nontraditional teahcers (maybe even administrators) into the classroom, and we need to create interdisciplinary classes. We need to teach nontraditional subjects in ways that teach critical skills and basic knowledges. And we need to find ways to continue these practices throughout a student's career at the university. Imagination rather than predictability should be the key to defining our vision into the future.

The university has a rare opportunity now to think about what it means to be both a public university and a leading research university, and how the different strengths and demands of these not always harmonious identities can be reworked to enable this institution to remain a leading force in education and scholarship in the 21st century. The establishment of land-grant universities raised questions and challenges for which new solutions had to be found; the massive expansion of the college population after the second world war raised equally perplexing questions and difficult challenges. I fear that this report has avoided the difficult questions and challenges; it has too quickly accepted the answers of the past without the very kind of discussion that it calls for, and as a result, it has started out with a position that is already far too compromised.

Lawrence Grossberg
Morris Davis Professor of Communication Studies

22 September 1997

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL
October 10, 1997, 3:00 P.M.

This meeting of the General Faculty and Faculty Council was primarily devoted to discussion of the Report of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate. A full transcript of the meeting can be found on the Faculty Governance web page and also the University Gazette web page.

Faculty Council Attendance

Present (65): B. Anderson, Bangdiwala, Barefoot, Bluestein, Bose, Brice, Brink, Bromberg, Carl, Clegg, Conover, Cordeiro-Stone, Covach, Cravey, Crimmins, J. Dalton, R. Dalton, Debreczeny, Devellis, Estroff, Favorov, Fink, Fletcher, Graves, Haggis, Harrison, Hattem, Holmgren, Hooper, Howard, Hyatt, Johnson, Lachiewicz, Lentz, Loda, Lord, Lubker, Margolis, Marshall, Mauriello, L. McNeil, Melchert, Moreau, Owen, Pagano, Panter, Pfaff, Plante, Platin, Rabinowitz, Raper, Salgado, Schaller, Searles, Shea, Skelly, Stabler, Stidham, Strauss, Tauchen, Tysinger, Vevea, Weiss, D. Williams, M. Williams.

Excused absences (18): L. Bailey, Collins, Daye, Eckel, Farel, Foshee, Fox, Gasaway, Gatzy, Hodges, Irene, Jackson, Maffly-Kipp, Mandel, Matson, Mill, Passannante, Pielak, White.

Unexcused absences (3): C. Anderson, Rosenman.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Hooker commended the work of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate and asked Provost Richard Richardson and Vice Chancellor Sue Kitchen to report on aspects of the report that are already at some stage of implementation.

Provost Richardson cited several examples of undergraduate involvement in research and spoke of the recent establishment of an office for prestige scholarships. He pointed out that the Office of the Provost is funding publication of the *Twenty-Four Seven* supplement that appears in each Tuesday issue of the *Daily Tar Heel*, and has contributed funding to the Taste of the Arts program. He spoke of the ongoing program of classroom improvements for which $2 million was spent last year and another $2 million has been allocated for this year. The Provost estimated that about 20% of the report's recommendations are at some stage of implementation at this time.

Vice Chancellor Kitchen reported that the Student Affairs office is being reorganized, and that she has put together a student learning team with representatives from many offices in Student Affairs that is looking at ways to expand the leadership curriculum. She looks forward to building on the living/learning courses now in place in the residence halls with a view toward a more collaborative experience with faculty and graduate students. Finally, she hopes to use the Task Force recommendations as a guide in plans for expanding the Carolina Union.

Chancellor Hooker commended the plan that Dean Risa Palm has proposed for freshman seminars in the General College. The proposal is for 160 seminars with 20 students in each.

Question Period.

Professor Barry Lentz (Biochemistry) asked the Chancellor to comment on (1) why the faculty were not brought into discussions about the Nike contract and (2) the relative importance of academics and athletics at this institution.

Chancellor Hooker said that if he had it to do over, he would have made an effort to have a dialogue with the faculty about the Nike contract as well as the larger issue of corporate sponsorship for any part of the University's activities.

As for the relative roles of academics and athletics, the Chancellor said that as a philosopher he thinks societal values are "entirely out of kilter." He said that at the press conference announcing Coach Dean Smith's retirement, Coach Smith had remarked to him "there's something wrong with the values of a society that would place this much emphasis on a coach retiring." The Chancellor said "the institution of intercollegiate sport in society has reached a point that [makes] it difficult for us to manage the tension between what we know we are and want to be and what we have become. [Insofar as intercollegiate athletics is concerned] we have become a purveyor or provider of public entertainment." However, "one institution simply cannot unilaterally disarm." He recalled the unsuccessful attempt that Frank Porter Graham made to de-emphasize football. The Chancellor thinks that the problem is more one of the society at large than it is of the university. "The challenge as manager at this university is simply to keep things in balance," he said. He thinks we are doing a good job of managing our athletic program and noted with pride that we have not had a scandal in that program in the past 35 years. The last one resulted in our hiring Dean Smith as basketball coach which some say was "an effort to de-emphasize basketball—hiring an assistant coach rather than going out and getting a big-name coach."

Annual Reports of Standing Committees

The annual reports of the Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Hearings Committee were received without comment.

Report of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate.

Professor Andrews, Chair of the Faculty, summarized the origins of the Task Force. Professor Pamela Conov [illegible] Chair of the Task Force, thanked those involved in producing the report and stated that the Task Force's basic goal is [illegible] make UNC the leader among public universities. "The success of our efforts does not depend upon the implementation of any one recommendation," she said; "it's the plan as a whole that matters." She added "there is always room for more good ideas; this is the beginning of the conversation, not the end."

The General Faculty and Council took up the Report of the Task Force first as a whole and then by chapter.

Professor Philip Bromberg (Medicine) asked to what extent the fact that we are a public institution influenced the recommendations. Are there differences in how to achieve intellectual climate in public and private institutions?

Professor Conover replied that one principal difference is that many private institutions have greater resources than we. Our mission as a public institution does have some influence on how we go about our work, but she does not think that there is much substantive difference.

Professor Marila Cordeiro-Stone (Pathology & Laboratory Medicine) thought that the sheer size of most public institutions makes it more difficult to cultivate intellectual climate than may be the case in smaller private institutions.

Professor James L. Peacock (Anthropology) thought that public universities may actually realize an advantage from the close connection between the university and the people of the state. "In the words of Ernest Boyer, 'practice can be reflective.' Combining intellectual and practical contributions may stimulate in a way that is not always possible in a private, more insulated setting."

Professor Joseph Pagano (Medicine) commended Dean Palm's proposal for freshman seminars. He sees that as an excellent opportunity to make progress in encouraging inter-disciplinary work.

Professor Catherine Marshall (Education) asked how the report addresses the integration of professional schools into the intellectual climate.

Professor Conover said that the report did not focus as heavily as it might have on professional school subjects, but that she hoped this would be an area for future discussions.

Professor Lawrence Grossberg (Communication Studies) said that he finds the Task Force report flawed at every level, despite the efforts and good intentions of those who worked on it. It claims to offer a vision of the 21st century university but fails to articulate what that vision might be. It lacks serious consideration of the unique situation of UNC-CH as a public research university. One might have expected the report to begin with a definition of the ideal intellect[illegible] climate, followed by a descriptive diagnosis of the actual intellectual climate. That would have led to a discussion [illegible] solutions that would move the university from the latter to the former. Instead, the report is a potpourri of ideas that have been tried elsewhere with mixed success. For example, he doubted that providing for each first-year student one seminar course would have much effect. He knew of many other universities that have instituted such programs, but none where it changed the intellectual climate in any significant way. Professor Grossberg made available copies of his "Open Letter on the Intellectual Climate" which develops extensively these themes and others.

Professor Conover referred Prof. Grossberg to the SACS reaccreditation report which examines in considerable detail perceived problems with the intellectual climate at UNC-CH.

Professor Lloyd Kramer (History) wanted to emphasize that the report does not intend to take a coercive stance with either students or faculty. Rather, it hopes to suggest ways to channel and affirm the tremendous intellectual energy that already exists here.

Professor Stephen Leonard (Political Science) remarked that the fact that we cannot solve all the problems of society is not a reason to do nothing at all. He thought that if some of the measures tried at other institutions had a good effect on some students that would be sufficient reason to attempt them here. "If we can't touch everyone, we should at least try to reach some."

Chancellor Hooker spoke to the challenge of educating students for the 21st century. The basic task of preparing students for a technology-infused 21st century is not greatly different from what we've been doing for two centuries, which is to provide a good liberal arts education. The ideal is to prepare students to live meaningful and productive lives in an economy that will be greatly transformed from the one in which they have grown up. To enable students to live a productive life in any economy where technology is in constant flux, you don't provide only knowledge of the latest state-of-the-art principles; you teach the subtending epistemology of your discipline. The most important thing we can impart to our students is the ability to think analytically and critically and to make judgments in environments of ambiguity and uncertainty. That is the essence of a liberal arts education.

The discussion next turned to the Task Force recommendations regarding the First Year Initiative. This portion of the report was summarized by Professor Leon Fink (History).

Associate Dean Darryl Gless spoke briefly of Dean Palm's proposal for first-year seminars. The goal is to give ea[illegible] entering student a first-rate intellectual experience in a freshman seminar with full-time, established faculty who are activ[illegible] researchers and skilled teachers. The College will accumulate available vacant faculty positions and allocate them to departments and inter-disciplinary units that are interested in participating in the program. The new positions will not be ear-marked for this purpose; each unit will be able to deploy any of its faculty in the seminar program. Additionally, the

College will devise criteria that will ensure that the new faculty hired through this program will have expertise in computer-aided instruction. Such persons can become catalysts for the entire department. Essentially, the College is attempting in this program to cover several bases at once: "Active learning in undergraduate seminars with full-time faculty. Active learning together with students. Active learning that brings research and teaching together immediately at the entry level."

Professor Miles Fletcher (History) spoke of the success of the honors program and hoped that the first-year initiative would not take funding away from that program. He thinks Dean Palm's proposal will not harm the honors program.

Professor Laurie McNeil (Physics & Astronomy) spoke of the benefits of exposing entering students to a small class. She thinks this would encourage students to seek out smaller classes as they move to upper levels in the College or professional schools.

Professor Madeline Levine (Slavic Languages & Literature) agreed with Professor McNeil. From the perspective of a department that of necessity always teaches small classes, she has found that students attach great value to the experience and are profoundly influenced by it.

Professor Hugon Karwowski (Physics & Astronomy) suggested that retired faculty would be an excellent resource for offering freshman seminars.

Professor Jaroslav Folda (Art) thought that the report's proposals on residential life could be implemented more broadly than suggested. He also thought that postponing fraternity/sorority rush until the second year would be an improvement, and that student athletes should not participate in varsity sports until the second year.

Professor Richard Soloway (Assoc. Dean, Arts & Sciences) wanted to make clear the relationship between computer technology and the new hires to be undertaken as part of the freshman seminar initiative. The idea is not that the seminars would necessarily be computer-based. Many of them would most likely be taught in traditional ways.

Professor Deborah Bender (Health Policy & Administration) said she has heard students say very complimentary things about the alcohol-free event that opened the Fall semester.

The discussion next turned to discussion of the recommendations affecting Inside the Classroom. This part of the report was summarized by Professor Marshall Edgell (Microbiology & Immunology).

Professor Richard Pfaff (History) disagreed with the recommendation for an academy for distinguished teachers. He suggested that there is no reason to distinguish distinction in teaching from distinction in research or in service. If there is to be an academy for distinguished teachers then logically there would be others for research and service as well. The result would be a trifurcated faculty and no discernible benefit from the effort.

Professor James L. Peacock (Anthropology) spoke of the potential role of graduate students in fostering intellectual climate for undergraduates. He thought graduate students could be especially helpful in the freshman seminar context.

Professor Edgell responded to Professor Pfaff's objection to the academy proposal by saying that the recommendation is for an academy of distinguished teaching *scholars*. One must first have impeccable credentials as a scholar.

Professor George Rabinowitz (Political Science) spoke to the unhealthy influence on intellectual climate of grade inflation and the difficulty of obtaining meaningful evaluation of teaching.

The discussion next turned to Faculty Roles and Rewards. This part of the report was summarized by Professor Laurie McNeil (Physics & Astronomy).

Professor Joseph Pagano (Medicine) observed that there is a definite link between excellence in research and excellence in teaching. He does not think that a really good faculty member will be deficient in either area. He suggested that we have not yet arrived at an optimal reward system that will bring out the best in our faculty. The most severe problem is the prospect of relatively trivial salary increases.

Professor Arlen Anderson (Physics & Astronomy) thought it important that each department foster a better sense of community. Some faculty may really excel at teaching, others at research, but all are contributing to the common goal of the department.

Professor George Rabinowitz was skeptical of the value of compiling teaching portfolios. Does this not simply generate more paperwork for an already overworked faculty?

Professor Madeline Levine said that she regrets the necessity of compiling and reporting information on public service. Faculty members should engage in service to the community because it's the right thing to do, not in hope of some reward.

Professor Craig Melchert (Linguistics) noted that the principal problem with giving greater weight to teaching in the reward structure is the difficulty of evaluating it fairly. He thinks there is a need for some kind of measure that is not entirely subjective. He, too, is skeptical of the value of additional reporting requirements.

Professor Janice Dodds (Public Health) reported favorably on her department's experiences in discussing how to evaluate teaching.

Professor John Evans (Kenan-Flagler Business School) gave several examples of benefits that the business school has realized from having faculty compile teaching portfolios.

The discussion next turned to the recommendations regarding Outside the Classroom. These were summarized by Professor Lloyd Kramer (History).

Professor Conrad Neumann (Marine Sciences) spoke of the benefits of field trips, but noted a serious unresolved issue in the risk of personal liability to which faculty who take students in the field are exposed and the inadequate insurance coverage available.

Professor Ronald Hyatt (Physical Education) spoke warmly of the excellent job being done by advisers.

The discussion then turned to the recommendations regarding Education for Civic Responsibility. These were summarized by Linda Carl (Office of the Provost).

Professor Richard Pfaff objected to the notion of giving academic credit for ordinary community service. He thinks that one of the most important values we can communicate to our students is that one owes service to the community without hope of reward.

Professor Pamela Conover reported that students have responded very positively to a community service requirement in a course that she teaches. Ms. Carl said that the term "service learning" is very broadly defined. In the Division of Health Affairs, the term "community-based education" is more often used to describe a close academic and intellectual relationship between the service rendered and the academic content. The proposal for a service center is intended to coordinate the university's many service activities. Otherwise, there is a danger of confusing the people with whom we serve and work.

The report's recommendations on Common Space were presented by Professor Melinda Meade (Geography) but, due to the lateness of the hour, they evoked no comment.

Professor Andrews proposed that he, as Chair of the Faculty, the Provost, the President of the Student Body, and perhaps a few others, serve as a coordinating committee to oversee implementation of the Task Force report. The coordinating committee would then identify appropriate working groups for each of the major recommendations.

Professor Bobbi Lubker (Education) moved that the Council endorse Professor Andrews' proposal. Seconded.

Professor Pfaff hoped that some channel would remain open for addressing the kinds of concerns articulated by Professor Grossberg. He would not want the faculty in general to think that a Faculty Council vote has ended a conversation that should continue at the level of first principles, not just implementing mechanisms. He did not think that it could be said, in fairness, that today's discussion has resolved any of the first principles.

Professor Miles Fletcher (History) asked if there would be a report back to the Council at least by April. Professor Andrews replied that he hoped to have an interim report before then, especially since the incumbent student body leadership will change in February.

Professor Frayda Bluestein (Institute of Government) asked how recommendations in the report might be modifie[illegible] Professor Andrews replied that the report itself has been delivered but whether and to what extent its recommendations should be implemented is still an open question.

Professor Susanna Rinehart (Dramatic Art) hoped that the discussion of intellectual climate would be ongoing.

Professor Celia Hooper (Medical Allied Health Professions) asked that faculty members in Health Affairs not be forgotten in developing plans for the freshman seminars.

Professor Lubker's motion was put to a vote and adopted without dissent.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty