

# UNC-Chapel Hill Office of Faculty Governance

## Meeting of the Faculty Council

Friday, November 9, 2007

3:00 p.m.

Hitchcock Multipurpose Room

Sonja Haynes Stone Center for Black Culture and History

Chancellor James Moeser

and

Professor Joe Templeton, Chair of the Faculty  
Presiding

## AGENDA

3:00 Welcome, Opening Remarks, and General Questions

- Chancellor James Moeser
- Provost Bernadette Gray-Little

3:25 Committee Reports

- Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee [pdf]
- Chancellor's Advisory Committee [pdf]
- Faculty Grievance Committee [pdf]
- Faculty Hearings Committee [pdf]

3:35 Introduction of Priority Registration Proposal

- Prof. Steve Reznick, Chair, Priority Registration Task Force
- Read the letter of transmittal and the proposal here

3:50 Explanation of Proposals from the Committee on Student Conduct

- Jonathan Sauls, Assistant Dean of Students
- Read the proposals:
  1. Proposal to Revise Appellate Process to Assure Meaningful Appeals: Revise Deadline for Appeal -- Appendix C, Section I.1.b.i
  2. Proposal to Revise Appellate Process to Assure Meaningful Appeals: Revise Appellate Review Board Process -- Appendix C, Section I.1.b.iii
  3. Proposal to Remove Requirement of Sending Charge Decisions by Certified Mail
  4. II.B.4 Proposal: Old Wording and II.B.4 Proposal: New Changes Implemented
  5. Proposal to Clarify Elements of Impaired/Reckless Driving Charges
  6. Proposal to Create Sanction of Drug or Alcohol Suspension
  7. Proposal to Create Usual and Minimum Sanction for Driving While Impaired Cases

4:00 Panel Discussion on Future Directions in Research at Carolina

- Panelists:

- Prof. Peggy Bentley, School of Public Health
- Prof. Jacquelyn Hall, History Department
- Prof. Harvey Seim, Marine Sciences, and Chair, Faculty Research Committee
- Tony Waldrop, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development
- Background information: "[Towards a Strategic Plan for Growing the Research Enterprise at Carolina: Outline of the Report from the Faculty Research Committee](#)"

4:45 Vote on Committee on Student Conduct Proposals

- Prof. Bob Adler, Chair, Committee on Student Conduct

4:55 Presentation of Nominees for 2008 Distinguished Alumnus/a Awards (closed session)

- [Faculty Council members click here to read nominee biographies](#) (secure area, login with ONYEN and usual ONYEN password required)

5:00 p.m. Adjourn



**Annual Report**  
**University Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure**  
**October 31, 2007**

The University Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) provides a final campus-wide faculty review of all recommended tenure-track promotion and tenure decisions prior to the Provost's forwarding final recommendations to the Chancellor and subsequently to the Board of Trustees. The committee also reviews recommended appointments of candidates from outside the University to tenured Associate Professor or Professor positions. This committee was created in 2003 to carry out personnel reviews that were previously performed by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. The committee reports to, and is advisory to, the Provost.

One week before the full committee meets each month, a rotating sub-committee of at least three APT members reads carefully all recommended personnel actions for the month, and decides whether any cases need to be referred to the full committee for study before full discussion and vote occurs. Cases can be flagged for a variety of reasons: concern about the credentials or productivity of the candidate; a divided faculty vote in the recommending academic unit; concern that prescribed personnel procedures were not properly followed in the recommending academic unit; or belief that the case would for some reason be instructive for APT committee members to read. When a case flagged for extra consideration comes from the home department of an APT committee member, that person excuses him/herself from the room during the discussion and vote on that case. Even in cases not flagged, APT committee members excuse themselves from the formal vote on all cases arising out of their home academic department.

Since our previous report:

- 1) The Committee reviewed all recommended APT actions for tenure-track faculty at the level of Associate Professor, Full Professor, or University-wide Distinguished Professor, and made recommendations to the Provost for or against approval of each action. During the period from October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007, the APT Committee reviewed 128 recommendations for appointment as Associate Professor or Professor with tenure or for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure or to Professor. The committee voted to recommend approval for 126 actions and voted not to recommend approval for two actions. In three cases, the committee returned a dossier to the originating department with a request for additional information to be supplied before the committee took a vote.
- 2) To improve our understanding of the criteria used in evaluating scholarship in different units of the University, the APT Committee has met, and continues to meet, with Deans, Associate Deans, and Chairs of several units, especially those units which have recently had a change of leadership or in which scholarly activity is not typically demonstrated via peer-reviewed academic journal articles and book publications.

Respectfully submitted by APT Committee: Janne Cannon, Thomas Clegg (Chair), Michael Gerhardt, Peter Gilligan, Trudier Harris, Margaret Leigh, Barbara Mark, Janet Mason, Ann Matthysse, Kathleen Sulk, Ruth Walden, Mark Wightman

## Chancellor's Advisory Committee

### Elected Committee

#### Annual Report for 2007

For Presentation at the Faculty Council: November 9, 2007

#### Membership:

Term ends 2008

- Carol W. Runyan, School of Public Health
- Ronald P. Strauss, School of Dentistry
- Timothy N. Taft, School of Medicine

Term ends 2009

- Darryl Gless, English and Comp. Literature
- Frayda Bluestein, School of Government
- Cam Patterson, School of Medicine

Term ends 2010

- Charles Daye, Law
- Joy Kasson, American Studies
- Steven Matson, Biology

Ex officio, with vote:

- The Chair of the Faculty, Joseph Templeton, Chemistry
- The Secretary of the Faculty, Joseph S. Ferrell, School of Government

Report prepared by Ron Strauss, Chair, with Committee Review.

#### Committee Charge:

The Faculty Code of University Government states that:

(a) The Advisory Committee consists of nine elected members, the chair of the faculty, the secretary of the faculty, and the chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.

(b) The committee is advisory to the chancellor in any matter deemed important by the chancellor or the committee, and particularly with respect to:

- 1) proposed amendments to the trustee policies and procedures governing academic tenure;
- 2) review of school and departmental statements of criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure;
- 3) academic program planning and assessment;
- 4) appointment of vice chancellors, deans, and other senior administrators;
- 5) recommendations for corrective action
  - i. pursuant to a report of the Faculty Hearings Committee with respect to a decision not to reappoint a probationary-term faculty member, or
  - ii. pursuant to a report of the Faculty Grievance Committee with respect to a decision not to promote to a higher rank a person holding permanent tenure at the rank of associate professor or assistant professor; and
- 6) appointment and renewal of appointment of the faculty marshal and appointment and review of the faculty athletics representative.

No faculty member may serve simultaneously as an elected member of the Advisory Committee and the Faculty Executive Committee; the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure; the Faculty Hearings Committee; or the Faculty Grievance Committee.

(c) The secretary of the faculty serves as secretary of the committee.

(d) The committee holds regular meetings once each month, at such time and place as fixed by the committee and the chancellor. The presiding officer is the chancellor, or, in his or her absence, the chair of the Advisory Committee. Special meetings may be called by the chancellor or the chair of the Advisory Committee. Notice of a special meeting called by the chair shall be given to the chancellor. Whoever calls the special meeting presides.

#### Report on Activities:

The Committee has met monthly with the Chancellor. The main topics addressed since the last report to the Faculty Council were: academic responsibility, campus emergency planning, engagement activities, development of new scientific projects and directions, enrollment growth, PACE initiative, faculty salaries and recruitment/retention activities, Carolina North planning, transit initiatives, global education and global health. No recommendations for specific action by Faculty Council are proposed.

## **2006-2007 Faculty Grievance Committee Activity Report**

### **Prepared by William C. Rivenbark, Chair**

A faculty member from the School of Dentistry filed a grievance on June 2, 2006, concerning performance evaluations, compensation, and racial harassment. A three-person subcommittee was assigned to the grievance, issuing its final report on August 25, 2006. The grievance was then forwarded to the Chancellor for review. The Chancellor issued the final administrative decision regarding the grievance on March 29, 2007.

A faculty member from the School of Medicine filed a grievance on June 2, 2006, concerning invention and scholarly consequences. A two-person subcommittee was assigned to the grievance, issuing its final report on July 16, 2007. The grievance was then forwarded to the Chancellor for review. The Chancellor has not issued his final administrative decision at this time.

A faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences contacted the faculty grievance committee on July 19, 2006 about the possibility of filing a grievance involving compensation. A meeting between the faculty member, the department head, and the chair of the faculty grievance committee was held on October 18, 2006 to discuss the details of the grievance and to identify possible strategies for resolution. The faculty member decided not to pursue the grievance (email dated November 15, 2006).

A faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences filed a grievance on August 2, 2006, concerning compensation. A three-person subcommittee was assigned to the grievance. However, all matters were settled between the faculty member and the university by stipulation of dismissal on August 24, 2006. Therefore, the grievance process was terminated.

A faculty member from the School of Medicine filed a grievance on August 24, 2006, concerning the school's compensation plan and salary reduction. A two-person subcommittee was assigned to the grievance, issuing its final report on February 2, 2007. The grievance was then forwarded to the Chancellor for review. The Chancellor issued the final administrative decision regarding the grievance on August 27, 2007.

A faculty member of the School of Public Health filed a grievance on August 25, 2006, concerning an annual faculty review and student advising. A two-person subcommittee was assigned to the grievance, issuing its final report on December 14, 2006. The grievance was then forwarded to the Chancellor for review. The Chancellor issued the final administrative decision regarding the grievance on August 27, 2007.

A faculty member from the School of Medicine contacted the faculty grievance committee on December 3, 2006 involving a verbal resignation. However, the faculty member decided not to pursue the grievance after agreeing to a one-year contract. The faculty member notified the chair of the faculty grievance committee of this decision by telephone on February 21, 2007.

A professor from the College of Arts and Sciences contacted the faculty grievance committee on January 25, 2007 about the possibility of filing a grievance involving harassment. The faculty member emailed the chair of the faculty grievance committee on January 29, 2007, stating that other alternatives were being pursued.

**Faculty Hearings Committee**  
Annual Report  
November, 2007

**MEMBERS 2007-2008:** Rosann Farber (Pathology & Lab Medicine, 2010); Zhi Liu (Dermatology 2009), Abigail Panter (Psychology, 2008); A. Wayne Pittman (School of Pharmacy, 2008); Michael Votta (Music, 2009); Richard Whisnant (School of Government, 2010)

**MEMBERS 2006-2007:** Carl L. Bose (School of Medicine, 2007); Patrick J. Conway (Economics, 2007); Abigail Panter (Psychology, 2008); A. Wayne Pittman (School of Pharmacy, 2008); Linda L. Spremulli, Chair; (Chemistry, 2007); Michael Votta (Music, 2009)

**REPORT PREPARED BY:** Abigail Panter, and reviewed and approved by the 2006-2008 committee.

**COMMITTEE CHARGE:** According to *The Faculty Code of University Government*, the Faculty Hearings Committee is composed of six faculty members with permanent tenure, serving three-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 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.).

**MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE IN 2006-07:** None.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES:**

- The committee received and granted a request for a hearing challenging the Chancellor's intent to dismiss a tenured faculty member on the grounds of being unfit to continue as a member of the faculty. The committee conducted a full hearing and concluded that the presented evidence did not support the contention that the faculty was unfit to continue as a member of the faculty. The Chancellor rejected the committee's reasoning and requested that an additional hearing be held so that the adm inistration could restate and expand its case against the faculty member. The committee declined to do so.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION BY FACULTY COUNCIL:** NONE

Respectfully submitted,

Rosann Farber  
Zhi Liu  
Abigail Panter, Chair  
A. Wayne Pittman  
Michael Votta  
Richard Whisnant



## THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

AT

CHAPEL HILL

J. Steven Reznick  
Director of Developmental Psychology  
(919) 962-9720  
(919) 962-2537 FAX  
e-mail: reznick@unc.edu

Department of Psychology  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Campus Box 3270, Davie Hall  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3270  
<http://www.unc.edu/depts/psychweb/>

November 7, 2007

### Letter of Transmittal to Accompany the Proposal for Priority Registration

A complex system of priority registration that is based on assorted traditions, permissions, and precedents has evolved at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. There is a long history of efforts to establish a formal priority registration policy on our campus, and the goal of the Proposal for Priority Registration that is attached here is to provide a transparent, systematic mechanism for administering priority registration under appropriate scrutiny.

Informal conversations in fall 2006 led the Faculty Committee on Athletics to establish a task force to explore the possibility of proposing a priority registration system that would assist varsity athletes and other students who have notably difficult scheduling issues due to their university obligations. I was asked to Chair this task force. The initial members of the task force were Lissa Broome, Jack Evans, George Lensing (all from the Faculty Committee on Athletics), John Blanchard (Department of Athletics), and Robert Mercer (Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes).

To launch this endeavor, I consulted with various individuals regarding the groups of students who should be candidates to be covered by priority registration and the steps that would lead to a registration priority proposal being implemented. Conversations with Senior Associate Dean Bobbi Owen, Provost Bernadette Gray-Little, and Associate Dean of Academic Services Carolyn Cannon indicated that education majors, students with disabilities, and allied health majors were obvious candidates. Also, a plan emerged whereby if the Faculty Committee on Athletics endorsed the task force's proposal, the proposal would then be forwarded to the Registrar, and she would seek advice from the Educational Policy Committee regarding the proposal's merits pursuant to the charge of that committee to act "as a council of advice for the university registrar in administering faculty regulations concerning . . . registration."

To expand the task force's expertise, I consulted with Dean Tom James of the School of Education and on his advice, invited Jane Smith, Licensure Officer and Coordinator of Teacher Recruitment and Retention to join the task force. Subsequently, I also asked Anne Bryan, Director of Student Affairs of the School of Education to join. Beverly Foster, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee and Director of Undergraduate Studies in the School of Nursing; and Harold Woodard, Associate Dean of Student Academic Counseling, also agreed to join the task force.

After an initial meeting in December, the task force met four times and corresponded via e-mail. Our deliberations were focused on preparing the attached Proposal for Priority Registration. This



proposal addresses the general issue of priority registration and does not address enrollment priorities for select groups of students in particular courses (e.g., honor student enrollment in honor's classes, or eligibility for courses with supplemental instruction). Another issue that this proposal does not address is the problem facing a student who is off campus due to a university sanctioned event on the specific day when that student is expected to register for classes. These issues are adequately covered by current policies. It is our understanding that UNC currently allows students with learning disabilities to register before their classmates in order to reduce barriers to their academic success. The present proposal would formalize this policy and extend it to a broader group of students who are deemed eligible.

We consulted with the University Registrar Alice Poehls and Applications Analyst Megan Keefe regarding the feasibility of the plan. The Registrar also helped us compile the registration priority policies at other ACC schools and at universities that we consider to be our "comparables" by updating a report prepared by the previous Registrar, David Lanier, in 2002 (Survey of Registration Priorities for Athletes 2007 – attached). She also gathered new data regarding priority registration policies at our peer institutions (Registration Priority for Athletes and Others at Selected Universities – attached). We also examined information gathered by Robert Mercer concerning registration policies for athletes at schools in the ACC and some of our comparables (SA Registration Procedures at Comparable Universities – attached). On the basis of these data, we are confident that our proposal is feasible and well within the boundaries that have been adopted by comparable institutions.

One important aspect of our deliberations was to determine how many student athletes would be eligible to be considered for priority registration. Under the guidelines of our proposal, the Athletics Department could nominate a student-athlete for priority registration during a semester in which the student's practice obligation is at the NCAA maximum of 20 hours per week. John Blanchard prepared a table (attached) showing the number of weeks per semester in which varsity athletes are practicing at the NCAA maximum of 20 hours per week. One sport (cross country) has no official practices in the spring semester, so under the guidelines of our proposal, athletes who only participate in cross country (and are not members of the track & field team) would not be eligible for priority registration for that semester. Several sports practice at the 20 hour limit for only a few weeks a semester (e.g., baseball and softball in the fall semester). These students could be nominated for priority registration, but the Priority Registration Advisory Committee might advise against it on a sport-by-sport or student-by-student basis.

The Faculty Committee on Athletics reviewed the Proposal on May 1, 2007, endorsed it, and forwarded it to the Educational Policy Committee. Subsequently, Lissa Broome and Jack Evans raised the issue of priority registration with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. During the summer of 2007, I met with Student Body President Eve Carson to review the proposal, and I provided documentation to be posted on the Student Government website. I also met with Melissa Exum, Theresa Maitland, Jim Kessler, and Fred Clark to review the implications of this policy for students with special needs.

The Educational Policy Committee reviewed the Priority Registration Proposal on October 10 and October 17, and voted to return the Proposal to the task force with the request that clarifications be made regarding the scope of students who would be covered, the focus on groups of students rather than individual students, the expectations regarding annual reports, and the explicit inclusion of a four-year sunset provision that would require reauthorization of the Proposal after a thorough review by the Educational Policy Committee in collaboration with Faculty Council. A straw poll suggested that Educational Policy Committee members would vote in favor of the proposal if it incorporated the recommended changes.

I consulted with Lissa Broome and reconvened the task force with some change of membership. Specifically, Jane Smith was no longer available, but Anne Bryan continued to represent the School of Education. I also asked Theresa Maitland, Jim Kessler, and Fred Clark to join the task force. Modifications were made in the Proposal to incorporate the suggestions from the Educational Policy Committee. The Faculty Athletics Committee reviewed the revised policy on November 6, 2007 and approved it unanimously. The Educational Policy Committee reviewed the revised policy on November 7, 2007, made one minor modification, and approved it unanimously.

To summarize, we have made a diligent effort to formulate a priority registration system that solves obvious problems and has appropriate limitations and oversight to avoid misuse. The modifications suggested by the Educational Policy Committee are improvements. We look forward to a broad discussion of the proposal, and hopefully, its eventual implementation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. Steven Reznick".

J. Steven Reznick, Ph.D.  
Professor and Director, Program in Child Development

## Proposal for Priority Registration – November 7, 2007

### Rationale

Some groups of undergraduate students encounter unusual challenges in our registration system that inhibit their academic progress and threaten their timely graduation. For example, students with physical or learning disabilities may require reasonable accommodations in order to reduce barriers to their academic success. Education majors in teaching programs spend the second semester of their senior year off campus as student teachers, and during their junior and senior year must complete specific courses required for certification in their areas of specialization. Nursing students must spend significant amounts of time in clinical rotations in order to meet licensure requirements. Varsity athletes must fit their class schedules with their practice/competition schedules so that they can make progress toward their degrees as required by the University and the NCAA. This proposal suggests a process for priority registration that provides a flexible but transparent approach to these issues.

### Mechanism

A process for determining how students qualify for priority registration is described in subsequent paragraphs. Those students who qualify for priority registration will be allowed to register ahead of their cohort. UNC has adopted a new registration ordering plan in which the order in which students register is based on the number of semesters completed. Students who qualify for priority registration would receive the earliest assignment times for their semester cohort. In other words, a sophomore who receives priority registration would register before other sophomores but not before any juniors or seniors.

The Registrar will convene a Priority Registration Advisory Committee (the PRAC) that will meet each semester to review the student groups who have been recommended for priority registration. Members of the PRAC will be appointed by the Registrar and will include faculty, students, and administrators representing a range of interests and expertise. We recommend that the PRAC include some individuals who have had experience in educational policy, academic advising, and disability services.

Each semester, prior to the start of registration, an official who has responsibility for students who are potentially eligible for priority registration (e.g., a Dean, Director, or Department Chair) will send the Registrar a list of students who are recommended for priority registration and a rationale for the need for priority registration given the demands of the students' activities. The Registrar will forward these rationale statements to the PRAC along with a tally of the number of students being proposed (i.e., the Registrar will not give PRAC an actual list of names). In the interest of transparency and accountability, the PRAC's meetings will be open to the public, and all rationale statements and tallies as well as the PRAC's decisions will be publicly available. Having received advice from the PRAC, the Registrar will adjust assignment times for those students who are selected for priority registration.

The PRAC will review summary data regarding the operation of priority registration (e.g., the specific courses that are selected during priority registration) and suggest modifications to the Priority Registration Policy as needed. The Registrar will consult with the PRAC and seek advice from the Educational Policy Committee

regarding any amendments to the Priority Registration Policy. The Registrar will present an annual report to the Educational Policy Committee indicating the number of students who were granted or denied priority registration, and evaluating whether course selection during priority registration appears to be serving its intended purpose.

The Priority Registration Policy proposed here will be in effect for a trial period of four years. After four years, the Registrar will request that the Educational Policy Committee in collaboration with Faculty Council review how well the policy is working and make a formal recommendation regarding whether the policy should be continued as is, modified, or allowed to lapse.

### Limitations

As a general rule, we recommend that no more than 25% of the seats in each section be available for priority registration. The Registrar and the PRAC will monitor the distribution of priority registration students across sections to determine whether any sections are being selected disproportionately. If significant over-enrollment occurs in selected courses, the Registrar will work with the department involved so that seat availability in selected courses is capped at 25% during the next priority registration.

### Eligibility for Priority Registration

Priority registration will be extended to undergraduate students who encounter unusual challenges in our registration system that inhibit their academic progress and threaten their timely graduation. It is difficult to establish an a priori definition of “unusual”, but the Priority Registration Task Force has identified three groups that would be exemplars of these unusual registration challenges. Thus, these student groups are eligible to be considered for priority registration if the students in the group meet any of the following conditions:

- The student engages in an activity that formally represents the University and by virtue of that representation is required to attend practices and events during hours in which classes are offered (e.g., varsity athletes during a semester in which the student’s practice obligation is at the NCAA maximum of 20 hours per week);
- The student is enrolled in a degree program requiring that at least one semester be spent off campus (e.g., student teaching), that specific courses in Arts and Sciences be successfully completed in order to obtain licensure (e.g., Education majors), or that requires significant time be devoted to clinical practice (e.g., nursing, allied health, etc); or
- The student has a disability for which priority registration is an approved accommodation.

Other groups that may have comparable registration challenges may be proposed for priority registration by an official who has responsibility for their program (e.g., a Dean, Director, or Department Chair), and these groups will be reviewed by the PRAC. Individual students may not apply directly to the Registrar for priority registration.

**FEC Quiz Uno**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

1. A. I do **not** favor priority registration for athletes and other students with special needs because...  
B. I favor priority registration for athletes and other students with special needs because...
2. A. The adoption of an achievement index academic metric is worthwhile because...  
B. The adoption of an achievement index academic metric is **not** worthwhile because...
3. A. The next chancellor should have a Carolina connection because...  
B. The next chancellor need **not** have a Carolina connection because...
4. A. It would be great to have a group of nine "superfaculty" providing intellectual leadership for UNC-CH because...  
B. It is **not** a good idea to have a group of nine "superfaculty" providing intellectual leadership for UNC-CH because...
5. A. Aiming for \$1 billion dollars a year in research support is a good idea because...  
B. Aiming for \$1 billion dollars a year in research support is **not** a good idea because...
6. A. Teaching award guidelines should be identical for tenure and non-tenure track faculty.  
B. Teaching award guidelines need **not** be identical for tenure and non-tenure track faculty.
7. A. Confidentiality is the most important aspect of the search for a new chancellor because...  
B. A transparent process is the most important aspect of the search for a new chancellor because...
8. A. We should replace the current summer school structure with a third semester equivalent in every way to the current academic year semesters because...  
B. We should retain the current summer school structure because...
9. A. We could improve Carolina by eliminating tenure because...  
B. We could improve Carolina by strengthening tenure because...
10. A. The role of athletics at Carolina is currently balanced nicely because...  
B. The role of athletics at Carolina is currently **unbalanced** because...

**Proposal to Revise Appellate Process to Assure Meaningful Appeals:**  
**Revise Deadline for Appeal – Appendix C, Section I.1.b.i**

Proposal I:

*Amend Section I.1.b.i. of Appendix C to the Instrument to provide that the accused student may petition for appeal no later than five (5) business days from receipt of the rationale statement of the Court.*

***Current Wording:***

**I.1.b.i. Right of Appeal.** An accused student who has been found guilty before a student court or University Hearings Board with original authority as provided in Section E, or who has had judgment and sanctions determined by an expedited hearing panel as provided in section F of Appendix C may file a petition for appeal no later than five business days (weekends and University holidays excepted) from the announcement of judgment and sanctions as provided in section E.7 of Appendix C. Appeals shall be heard as promptly as possible and, except under unusual circumstances as determined by the Judicial Programs Officer, shall be scheduled for hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the date the initial judgment is announced.

***Proposed Revision:***

**I.1.b.i. Right of Appeal.** An accused student who has been found guilty before a student court or University Hearings Board with original authority as provided in Section E, or who has had judgment and sanctions determined by an expedited hearing panel as provided in section F of Appendix C may file a petition for appeal no later than five business days (weekends and University holidays excepted) from delivery to the accused student of the written summary of the hearing panel's judgment and sanctions as provided in section E.7 of Appendix C. For purposes of this section, delivery shall mean hand-delivery or transmission of the written summary by certified or electronic mail. Appeals shall be heard as promptly as possible and, except under unusual circumstances as determined by the Judicial Programs Officer, shall be scheduled for hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the date the initial judgment is announced.

***Rationale for Proposed Revision:***

Both the University and the accused student are served by an appellate process that encourages well-conceived, substantively sound appeal petitions. Applying the current language, many accused students are confronted with the task of submitting an appeal petition without the benefit of reviewing the hearing panel's rationale. This circumstance tends to produce poorly written rationales, inaccurate suppositions about the Court's reasoning for the sanction, or unfounded speculation about whether the Court considered certain evidence. Based upon the personal experiences of those who conduct post-hearing meetings with accused students, this revision would likely reduce the number of appeals or, at a minimum, significantly improve the quality of the petitions that are submitted.

Proposal to Revise Appellate Process to Assure Meaningful Appeals:  
Revise Appellate Review Board Process – Appendix C, Section I.1.b.iii

Proposal II:

*Amend Section I.1.b.iii. of Appendix C to the Instrument to provide that review of a denial of appeal by the Appellate Review Board is permissive at the election of the accused student rather than mandatory.*

**Current Wording:**

**I.1.b.iii. Appeal Petition.** An appeal petition shall be filed in a timely fashion as specified in paragraph b.i. of this section, and shall consist of a detailed written statement specifying the precise grounds for appeal and indicating with precision the supporting facts, and shall be signed by the accused student (or, in an appeal by a student group, by the group's president or chief officer). The Judicial Programs Officer will review the petition to determine whether it is based upon one or more of the grounds for appeal stated in this section and provides a factual basis for the appeal. If the Judicial Program Officer determines that the petition states a permissible ground and sufficient factual basis for appeal, he or she shall refer the matter to a University Hearings Board appellate panel for action. If the Judicial Program Officer determines that the appeal petition does not state a permitted ground or a sufficient factual basis for appeal, he or she shall refer the petition for appeal to a three-member Appellate Review Board composed of a member of the Faculty Hearings Panel, an administrator designated by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and a member of the appropriate student honor court who has not been involved in consideration of the case during the original proceeding before the student court. The Appellate Review Board shall determine whether the appeal petition states a permissible ground and sufficient factual basis for appeal, and shall refer the matter for review by a University Hearings Board if requisite grounds and factual basis are stated, or if not shall dismiss the appeal.

**Proposed Revision:**

**I.1.b.iii. Appeal Petition.** An appeal petition shall be filed in a timely fashion as specified in paragraph b.i. of this section, and shall consist of a detailed written statement specifying the precise grounds for appeal and indicating with precision the supporting facts, and shall be signed by the accused student (or, in an appeal by a student group, by the group's president or chief officer). The Judicial Programs Officer will review the petition to determine whether it is based upon one or more of the grounds for appeal stated in this section and provides a factual basis for the appeal. If the Judicial Program Officer determines that the petition states a permissible ground and sufficient factual basis for appeal, he or she shall refer the matter to a University Hearings Board appellate panel for action. If the Judicial Program Officer determines that the appeal petition does not state a permitted ground or a sufficient factual basis for appeal, the Judicial Program Officer shall notify the accused student in writing of this determination and of the right to have this determination reviewed by a three-member Appellate Review Board. Within five business days (weekends and University holidays excepted) of notification that the Judicial Program Officer has determined that the appeal

petition does not state a permissible ground or sufficient factual basis for appeal as provided in this section, the accused student may request, in writing, that the Appellate Review Board review this determination. The Appellate Review Board shall be composed of a member of the Faculty Hearings Panel, an administrator designated by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and a member of the appropriate student honor court who has not been involved in consideration of the case during the original proceeding before the student court. Upon such a request, the Appellate Review Board shall determine whether the appeal petition states a permissible ground and sufficient factual basis for appeal, and shall refer the matter for review by a University Hearings Board if requisite grounds and factual basis are stated, or if not shall dismiss the appeal.

***Rationale for Proposed Revision:***

Currently, referral of a determination that an appeal petition fails to state an appropriate ground or a factual basis is mandatory. This process creates a potentially unnecessary step. A thorough review of the appeal petition by the Judicial Programs Officer generally produces a detailed explanation of why the appeal was denied. In certain cases, this explanation satisfies the student that the appeal was either frivolous or unfounded, thereby obviating the need for further review by the Appellate Review Board. By making the ARB review permissive, rather than mandatory, this revision preserves the intent of the Instrument to afford meaningful review while eliminating potentially unnecessary ARB reviews.



## Proposal to Remove Requirement of Sending Charge Decisions by Certified Mail

Proposal:

*Amend Section B.1. of Appendix C to the Instrument to provide that charge decisions need not be sent via certified mail.*

*Current Wording:*

### **B. Initiation of Charges**

**1. Charge and Notice to Appear.** The applicable student attorney general or his or her designee shall review the report of alleged misconduct and conduct a preliminary investigation prior to determining whether charges under the Honor Code should be filed. Under ordinary circumstances, charge determinations should be made within 30 days, provided that an extension of up to an additional 30 days may be permitted for good cause as determined by the applicable student attorney general or for up to an additional 60 days under exceptional circumstances with the concurrent of the Judicial Programs Officer. If the applicable student attorney general determines that there is a reasonable basis for concluding that a student has violated the Honor Code, he or she shall notify the accused student or students in writing by certified mail of the student attorney general's intention to commence an action under the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, the charges to be pursued, the underlying allegations and factual basis for the charges, possible sanctions, and the student's procedural rights. In all instances in which charged offenses could result in expulsion, the notice shall include this possibility and must specify that expulsion precludes matriculation at any UNC constituent institution. The notice shall also advise the accused student of the need to schedule a preliminary conference, and may specify the date and time of the anticipated hearing on the charges, so long as the date specified is at least 10 calendar days from the date on which the date written notice is received by the accused student. The applicable student attorney general shall also advise the Judicial Programs Officer of the proposed action by copy of the communication notifying the student.

*Proposed Revision:*

### **B. Initiation of Charges**

**1. Charge and Notice to Appear.** The applicable student attorney general or his or her designee shall review the report of alleged misconduct and conduct a preliminary investigation prior to determining whether charges under the Honor Code should be filed. Under ordinary circumstances, charge determinations should be made within 30 days, provided that an extension of up to an additional 30 days may be permitted for good cause as determined by the applicable student attorney general or for up to an additional 60 days under exceptional circumstances with the concurrent of the Judicial Programs Officer. If the applicable student attorney general determines that there is a reasonable basis for concluding that a student has violated the Honor Code, he or

she shall notify the accused student or students in writing of the student attorney general's intention to commence an action under the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, the charges to be pursued, the underlying allegations and factual basis for the charges, possible sanctions, and the student's procedural rights. In all instances in which charged offenses could result in expulsion, the notice shall include this possibility and must specify that expulsion precludes matriculation at any UNC constituent institution. The notice shall also advise the accused student of the need to schedule a preliminary conference, and may specify the date and time of the anticipated hearing on the charges, so long as the date specified is at least 10 calendar days from the date on which the date written notice is received by the accused student. For purposes of this section, the written notice required herein shall be delivered by regular, certified, or electronic mail, or such other method as may be reasonably calculated to provide the student with timely notice of the charge(s). The applicable student attorney general shall also advise the Judicial Programs Officer of the proposed action by copy of the communication notifying the student.

***Rationale for Proposed Revision:***

Currently, the *Instrument* requires that all charge decisions be sent via certified mail. While undoubtedly conceived as a provision to ensure timely and adequate notice of the commencement of an Honor Court action, it has, in practice, become an expensive, onerous, and generally unsuccessful mandate. Less than half of the certified mail parcels sent by the Honor System are delivered to the intended addressee. This is in large part because students do not regularly provide current addresses for University records. Moreover, many certified mail parcels may ultimately be delivered or forwarded to a home address where they are frequently intercepted by parents, siblings, or other family members.

Under current practice, charge decisions are sent both by certified mail and to the student's email address. In the significant majority of cases, students receive notice and initiate the next step in the process as a result of the email communication. It is also noteworthy that most students have had an initial meeting with the Student Attorney General or his representative prior to the charge decision being made and are actually expecting an email from the Honor System.

Because email is the favored means of communication for most students and because an electronic address is accessible even when the student's physical address changes, it would be beneficial to codify this delivery method in the *Instrument*, while not excluding other possible means of delivery if appropriate to the particular case.

## II.B.4. Proposal: Old Wording

### **B. Academic Dishonesty.**

It shall be the responsibility of every student enrolled at the University of North Carolina to support the principles of academic integrity and to refrain from all forms of academic dishonesty, including but not limited to, the following:

1. **Plagiarism** in the form of deliberate or reckless representation of another's words, thoughts, or ideas as one's own without attribution in connection with submission of academic work, whether graded or otherwise.
2. **Falsification, fabrication, or misrepresentation of data**, other information, or citations in connection with an academic assignment, whether graded or otherwise.
3. **Unauthorized assistance or unauthorized collaboration** in connection with academic work, whether graded or otherwise.
4. **Cheating on examinations or other academic assignments**, whether graded or otherwise, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Using unauthorized materials and methods (notes, books, electronic information, telephonic or other forms of electronic communication, or other sources or methods);
  - b. Violating or subverting requirements governing administration of examinations or other academic assignments;
  - c. Compromising the security of examinations or academic assignments;
  - d. Representing another's work as one's own; or
  - e. Engaging in other actions that compromise the integrity of the grading or evaluation process.
5. **Deliberately furnishing false information** to members of the University community in connection with their efforts to prevent, investigate, or enforce University requirements regarding academic dishonesty.
6. **Forging, falsifying, or misusing University documents**, records, identification cards, computers, or other resources so as to violate requirements regarding academic dishonesty.
7. **Violating other University policies** that are designed to assure that academic work conforms to requirements relating to academic integrity.
8. **Assisting or aiding another** to engage in acts of academic dishonesty prohibited by Section II. B.

## II.B.4. Proposal: New Changes Implemented

### **B. Academic Dishonesty.**

It shall be the responsibility of every student enrolled at the University of North Carolina to support the principles of academic integrity and to refrain from all forms of academic dishonesty, including but not limited to, the following:

1. **Plagiarism** in the form of deliberate or reckless representation of another's words, thoughts, or ideas as one's own without attribution in connection with submission of academic work, whether graded or otherwise.
2. **Falsification, fabrication, or misrepresentation of data**, other information, or citations in connection with an academic assignment, whether graded or otherwise.
3. **Unauthorized assistance or unauthorized collaboration** in connection with academic work, whether graded or otherwise.
4. **Cheating on examinations or other academic assignments**, whether graded or otherwise, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Using unauthorized materials and methods (notes, books, electronic information, telephonic or other forms of electronic communication, or other sources or methods);
  - b. Representing another's work as one's own; or
5. **Violating procedures pertaining the examination process:**
  - a. Violating or subverting requirements governing administration of examinations or other academic assignments;
  - b. Compromising the security of examinations or academic assignments;
  - c. Engaging in other actions that compromise the integrity of the grading or evaluation process.
6. **Deliberately furnishing false information** to members of the University community in connection with their efforts to prevent, investigate, or enforce University requirements regarding academic dishonesty.
7. **Forging, falsifying, or misusing University documents**, records, identification cards, computers, or other resources so as to violate requirements regarding academic dishonesty.
8. **Violating other University policies** that are designed to assure that academic work conforms to requirements relating to academic integrity.
9. **Assisting or aiding another** to engage in acts of academic dishonesty prohibited by Section II. B.

**Proposal to Clarify Elements of Impaired/Reckless Driving Charge:**

Proposal:

*Amend Section II.C.1h. of the Instrument as follows:*

*Current Wording:*

- h. Operating a motor vehicle in a reckless manner to while impaired by alcohol, drugs, or other substances so as to create a significant threat to members of the University community.**

*Proposed Revision:*

- h. Operating a motor vehicle:
  - i. while impaired by alcohol, drugs, or other substances, and/or**
  - ii. in a reckless manner so as to create a significant threat to members of the University community.****

### Proposal to Create Sanction of Drug or Alcohol Suspension

Proposal:

*Amend Section III B. 2. of the Instrument to include a new subsection (a) with all existing subsections re-lettered (b) through (g)*

*Proposed Revision:*

### III. Sanctions

\*\*\*\*\*

**B. Available Sanctions: Individuals.** The following sanctions alone or in combination may be imposed in connection with offenses under this *Instrument*:

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. Conduct sanctions** including by not limited to

**a. Drug or alcohol suspension including completion of a drug or alcohol education and counseling program, participation in specified forms of community service, and acceptance of such other conditions and requirements as shall be approved by the Judicial Programs Officer.**

**b. Drug or alcohol probation** including completion of a drug or alcohol education and counseling program, participation in specified forms of community service, and acceptance of such other conditions and requirements as shall be approved by the Judicial Programs Officer. A refusal or failure to comply with the terms of a drug or alcohol program, as determined by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, will result in suspension for the unexpired term of the probation.

**c. Behavior management.** Completion of projects, programs, or requirements designed to help the student manage behavior and understand why it was inappropriate.

**d. "No contact" orders.** Compliance with orders of no contact that limit access to specific university areas or forms of contact with particular persons;

**e. Community service.** Completion of up to 60 hours of community service over a period not to exceed twelve weeks under the guidelines established by the Judicial Programs Officer.

**f. Restitution.** Where applicable, payment of restitution in an amount determined by the hearing board and paid under guidelines established by the Judicial Programs Officer

**g. Other requirements.** Where applicable, taking necessary steps to inform affected parties, correct misrepresentations, or otherwise remedy the effects of misconduct.

**Proposal to Create Usual and Minimum Sanction for Driving While Impaired Cases**

Proposal:

*Amend Section III.D.3. of the Instrument to add a new subsection (c) as follows:*

***Proposed Revision:***

**III. Sanctions**

\* \* \* \* \*

**D. Gravity of Offenses**

\* \* \* \* \*

**3. Conduct Adversely Affecting Persons**

- a. For deliberate sexual invasion of another, the minimum sanction shall be suspension for two full academic semesters.
- b. For illegally possession, manufacturing, selling, or delivering a controlled substance as defined by state or federal law, actions established by relevant policies of the Board of Trustees, including as specified, drug probation, suspension, or expulsion, depending upon the gravity of the offense and prior history of misconduct.
- c. For operating a motor vehicle while impaired by alcohol, drugs, or other substances
  - i. The usual sanction shall be drug or alcohol suspension for at least one full academic semester.
  - ii. The minimum sanction shall be probation for at least one full academic semester.



## **Towards a Strategic Plan for Growing the Research Enterprise at Carolina**

### *Outline of the Report from the Faculty Research Committee*

**Goal:** a strategy to enhance the research enterprise at UNC to meet the Chancellor's goal of a funding level of \$1B/yr.

**Needed:** a clear assessment of investment areas that will enable Carolina faculty to maximize their potential in obtaining research funding. This suggests the development and vetting of a strategic plan.

**Guiding principles:** address weaknesses in the current system that supports research and augment through strategic investment the strengths that are believed to best enable the campus to more effectively compete for research funding.

### *Enhance faculty incentives to succeed:*

1. Faculty compensation packages should be carefully evaluated.
2. Invest strategically in new hires.
3. Graduate student support should be revisited.
4. Faculty should receive increased recognition (e.g. National Academies).
5. Implement a campus-wide sabbatical program.
6. Evaluate administrative support at departmental level.

### *Expanding the funding base*

1. Identify existing funding sources.
2. Identify alternative funding sources.
3. Develop strategies to seek alternative funding, e.g.
  - HHMI
  - Private and public companies
  - Private donors
4. Change culture on campus to be more inclusive of alternative funding sources.

### *Intramural Funding*

1. Dramatically increase funding for the University Research Council (URC) grants program.
2. Increase the number of URC grant submission dates from two to four per year.
3. Make intramural funding details more transparent.
4. Expand bridge funding opportunities.
5. Continue to enhance the collection, organization and distribution of information about intramural funding opportunities on the web.

### *Foster Interdisciplinary Research*

1. Significantly increase the URCl funding.
2. Enable existing Centers to pursue IDR through hires and training.
3. Foster on-going learning.

### *Supporting UNC-Chapel Hill Core Facilities*

1. Need stable funding to support technical personnel, instrument acquisition, service contracts, software licenses, and service upgrades.
2. Provide consistent 21<sup>st</sup> century administration systems.
3. Address need for back-up freezers, off-site storage, and the like.
4. Initiate new core services, such as systems biology expertise and biohazardous sample sorting.
5. Eliminate redundancies through efficiencies such as centralizing sources of lab animal coordinators and lab animal workers.
6. Charge more competitive rates for services to bring back UNC investigators who are sending their work to the heavily subsidized core facilities at Duke.
7. Insure adequate infrastructure support, such as space, and establish contiguous space that meets the core's needs.

### **Recommendations for Supporting Research**

#### *From the Provost's Faculty Development Initiative Planning Committee*

1. Set up a grant-support center.
2. Establish a fund to support just-tenured associate professors organizing national conferences in their specialty area.
3. Expand the URC to foster new areas of research among more senior faculty.
4. Grants to promote mentoring up – and mentoring down.
5. Establish an interdisciplinary research suite.

## **2008 Distinguished Alumna/Alumnus Awards**

**William Joseph Bynum, Jr.  
A.B., 1982**

Bill Bynum, Class of 1982, is chief executive officer of ECD/HOPE (Enterprise Corporation of the Delta and Hope Community Credit Union). As chair of the Black Student Movement in his undergraduate years, Bynum worked to foster increased sensitivity to the needs of minority students, greater collaboration among student organizations, and improvements in recruitment and retention of Black students and faculty. After graduating, Bynum helped establish the Durham-based Self Help Credit Union, one of the nation's preeminent community development financial institutions. He went on to serve as director of programs at the North Carolina Rural Center where he designed and managed programs addressing development needs in rural and economically-distressed communities. In 1994 Bynum was recruited to Jackson, Mississippi, to start the Enterprise Corporation of the Delta, an effort to spur economic development in the delta regions of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Today, ECD is among the nation's most respected community development financial institutions. In 1995, Bynum founded Hope Community Credit Union. In 2002, ECD assumed management of HOPE. After Hurricane Katrina ravaged the Gulf Coast in August, 2005, ECD/HOPE stepped in to extend services to people, businesses, and nonprofits affected by the storm and has become a model for success in undertakings that have been marked more often by failure. Bynum has advised President Clinton and President Bush on community development matters, chairs the Community Development Advisory Board, and serves on the boards of the Regions Bank Community Development corporation, the Foundation for the Mid-South, the Mississippi Children's Museum, the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation, the William Winter Institute for Racial Reconciliation, and the Mississippi Access to Justice Commission. He is a Henry Crown Fellow of the Aspen Institute, and the recipient of several awards for community development work and entrepreneurship.

William Joseph Bynum, Jr., was nominated by Professor Hodding Carter III

**Leah McCall Devlin  
B.S., 1976; D.D.S., 1979; M.P.H., 1984**

Leah Devlin earned her undergraduate degree at Carolina in 1976 and continued on here to receive a doctorate in dentistry and a master's degree in public health. She was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa and the honor society of the School of Public Health. Devlin began her professional career at the Wake County Department of Health, where she served as director for ten years. She joined the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services in 1966 and became State Health Director in 2001. She is the first woman to have held that position. Devlin has served the Triangle community as a board member for Healthy Wake 2000, the North Carolina Museum of Natural Science, the Central Region board of Wachovia Bank, and the Community Advisory Board for

WUNC Radio. She is also a member of the North Carolina Institute of Medicine, the Women's Forum of North Carolina, and the UNC School of Public Health Foundation Board. Devlin's honors include the 1994 Health Director of the Year presented by the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, Planned Parenthood's Margaret Sanger Award, the North Carolina Public Health Association's Rankin Award, and the Poe Center for Health Education's President's Award. Devlin has been an outstanding advocate of public health and has been especially generous in offering her time and expertise to Carolina's School of Public Health.

Dr. Leah Devlin was nominated by Dean Barbara K. Rimer

**Mary Wilmer (Molly) Barker**  
**A.B., 1982; M.S.W., 1989**

Molly Barker is the founder of Girls on the Run International, a non-profit prevention program that teaches self-respect and healthy lifestyles to preteen girls. Over the last decade this program has grown to include over 100 councils serving 40,000 girls across the United States and Canada. Girls on the Run is a 12-week 24-lesson character building program ending with a non-competitive 5K race. The goals of the curriculum are to encourage positive emotional, social, mental, spiritual and physical development. Barker designed the program as an outlet for young girls to address "Girl Box Issues," which are restrictions placed on women that make them follow a particular path in order to be recognized and valued. The success of the program prompted Barker to write *Girls on Track: A Parent's Guide to Inspiring Our Daughters to Achieve a Lifetime of Self-Esteem and Respect*. The book has been a best-seller, and was named a Best Parenting and Families book by Amazon.com. Barker was awarded the 2004 Charlotte Woman of the Year, the Enterprising Woman Magazine's Advocacy Award, Pfeiffer University's Servant Leadership Award, the School of Social Work's 2002 Distinguished Alumni Award, and Parent Magazine's Parent of the Month. She has been profiled in People magazine and the Carolina Alumni Review, and has appeared on Oprah Winfrey's Hi Gorgeous! tour. Barker's recent activities at Carolina include membership on the School of Social Work Board of Advisers and the 2006 key-note speaker at the Carolina Women's Center Annual Meeting.

Molly Barker was nominated by Kristen Huffman, Assistant Director of Alumni Relations and the Annual Fund of the UNC School of Social Work.

**Walter Lowry Caudill**  
**B.S. Chem. 1979**

Dr. Lowry Caudill is the retired, worldwide president of pharmaceutical development for Cardinal Health where he led a unit providing complete development services for the pharmaceutical industry at nine sites, including RTP, San Diego, Somerset New Jersey, Philadelphia, Manchester UK and Schorndorf Germany. Caudill and Dr. Alfred Childers

co-founded Magellan Laboratories in 1991, a company later acquired by Cardinal Health. Magellan became one of the fastest growing, privately held companies in RTP and received many regional and national awards for growth and entrepreneurial development. Magellan was awarded the Triangle Business Journal's Fast 50 award for nine years and was in the Top 10 for six of the nine years. In 1998 Caudill and Childers were named Entrepreneur of the Year for North and South Carolina by Ernst and Young, the Kauffman Foundation, USA Today, and NASDAQ and were finalists for the 1998 National Entrepreneur of the Year. Caudill did his undergraduate work at Carolina with undergraduate research under the direction of Professor Royce Murray. He received his Ph.D. from Indiana University in 1983 under the direction of Professor Mark Wightman, now a member of the Carolina faculty. Upon graduation he became a research scientist at Baxter-Travenol and later joined the Glaxo Research Institute. Product lines that his groups helped develop include Zantac, Imitrex, Zofran, Zinacef, and Ventolin. Caudill is a steering committee member of the Carolina First Campaign and is chair of the Private Fundraising Steering Committee for the UNC-CH Physical Science Complex. He serves on the Chemistry Department's External Advisory Board and on the Board of Advisors of the Educational Foundation. He remains an active member of the American Chemical Society and the American Association of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

W. Lowry Caudill was nominated by Professors Royce W. Murray and R. Mark Wightman

#### **Debra Wehrle Stewart** **Ph.D., 1975**

Debra Stewart is the fifth president of the Council of Graduate Schools. She came to that position in 2000 after serving as vice chancellor and dean of the graduate school at North Carolina State University. She has also served as interim chancellor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (1997). The Council of Graduate Schools is the leading organization dedicated to the improvement and advancement of graduate education. Its 453 members award over 95% of all U.S. doctorates and about 70% of all U.S. master's degrees. Its 21 international members include ten major Canadian universities. Stewart's service to graduate education includes chairing the Graduate Record Examination Board, the Council on Research Policy and Graduate Education, the Board of Directors of Oak Ridge Associated Universities, and the Board of Directors of the Council of Graduate Schools. Stewart's current board memberships include the National Research Council Board on Higher Education and the Work Force and the advisory board of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate. During her twelve years of leadership positions in North Carolina Stewart worked to mobilize stakeholders inside and outside the university to advance university programs. She spearheaded a strategic plan for graduate education at N.C. State that created a framework for interdisciplinary curriculum, significantly enhanced financial support for graduate assistants, and solved a long-term program with tuition remissions. Stewart received her Ph.D. in political science from Carolina, her M.A. from the University of Maryland, and her A.B. from Marquette University where she majored in philosophy. She is the author or coauthor of numerous scholarly articles

on administrative theory and public policy. Her disciplinary research focuses on ethics and managerial decision-making.

Debra Stewart was nominated by Dean Lynda Dykstra

## 2008 Honorary Degrees

### Jessye Norman

The Kennedy Center's biography of Jessye Norman has this to say:

"Jessye Norman is one of the most celebrated artists of our century. She has been equally at home in American spirituals, French chansons, or German Lieder. In opera, she has made her own Wagner's Sieglinda and Elisabeth but also Gluck's Alceste, Mozart's Countess Almaviva, Strauss' Ariadne and Stravinsky's Jocasta. From Haydn to Mahler to Schoenberg and Berg, from Satie and Poulenc to Gershwin and Bernstein, the range of Norman's musical reach has been and continues to be breathtaking. She is a diva in the truest sense, in that there is something of the divine in the music she makes. Norman was born into a musical family in Augusta, Georgia, learned the piano when she could barely walk, and sang "Jesus is Calling" in public when she was only six. Norman pursued formal musical studies at Howard University, then later at the Peabody Conservatory and the University of Michigan. She made her operatic debut in a 1969 production of Tannhauser at the Deutsche Oper in Berlin. The French, who named an orchid after Jessye Norman, also made her a Commander of the Order of Arts and Letters and followed this by awarding her the Legion of Honor. She is an honorary fellow of Harvard and Cambridge universities, and has received honorary doctorates from, among others, Julliard, Howard, Harvard and Yale. In 1990 Jessye Norman was named honorary ambassador to the United Nations by U.N. secretary general Javier Perez de Cuellar."

Jessye Norman will deliver the 2008 Commencement Address and is nominated for an honorary degree by Chancellor James Moeser.

# UNC-Chapel Hill Office of Faculty Governance

## JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

**November 9, 2007**

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill convened at 3:00 p.m. in the Hitchcock Multipurpose Room of the Sonja Haynes Stone Center for Black Culture and History.

The following 51 members of the Council attended: Aaron, Andrews, Bagnell, Bangdiwala, Bareau, Bickford, Blocher, Bloom, Brice, Chin, Conway, Copenhaver, DeSaix, Earp, Gullledge, Halloran, Hendrick, Hightow, Hobbs, Hodges, Katznelson, Kelly, Kendall, LeFebvre, Leonard, Lesneski, Matfity-Kipp, McGrath, Meade, Melamut, Murray, Oatley, Papanikolas, Parsons, Puvost, Renner, Rodgers, Saunders, Sheldon, Silversmith, Stein, Sweeney, Temple, Threadgill, Toews, Visser, Weinberg, Whisnant, Williams, Wilson and Yankaskas.

The following 32 members were granted excused absences: Ammerman, Bachenheimer, Balthrop, Binotti, Blackburn, Boukheifia, Broome, Campbell, Coleman, Couper, Dupuis, Ernst, Ewend, Gerber, Gilligan, Heenan, Koroluk, Lauen, Mauro, McCombs, Moss, Orth, Paquette, Peirce, Perrin, Rhodes, Thorp, Votta, Wegner, Whisnant, Wilder, and Wissick.

The following 5 members were absent without excuse: Ashby, Kramer, Marshall, Rosamond, and Weil.

### **Welcome**

Chair of the Faculty Joe Templeton called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### **Committee Reports**

Prof. Templeton commended to the Council the annual reports from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee, the Faculty Grievance Committee, the Faculty Hearings Committee, and the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. Although a representative of each committee was present to answer questions, Faculty Council members asked none. Templeton thanked the committees for the important work they do.

### **Chancellor's Remarks**

**Click here to listen to the audio of the chancellor's remarks.**

*Tuition Advisory Task Force:* Chancellor Moeser provided context for the work of the Tuition Advisory Task Force, which will present its recommendations in the coming week. He reminded the Council that faculty salaries and compensation have been the top priority for funds raised through both tuition increases and the Carolina First campaign. Since the fall of 2004, Carolina has received an additional \$32.5 million from the state and another \$17.5 million from campus-based tuition for faculty salaries. The chancellor noted that we are beginning to see results in our quest to raise average salaries of tenured and tenure track faculty to the 80 th percentile of our approved list of peer institutions. As of last spring, salaries overall exceeded the 50 th percentile, and in the College of Arts and Sciences, we have exceeded the benchmark for assistant and associate professors in the natural sciences and for assistant professors in the fine arts. But our peers are moving as well; salaries for faculty have been increasing

everywhere. The chancellor said that each year, 35% of campus-based tuition underwrites need-based aid, helping to offset the effect of tuition increases on those receiving aid. Because of the state's generosity this year, the chancellor is recommending no tuition increase for resident undergraduates for the coming year, although he will recommend increases for non-resident graduate and undergraduate students, whose education should not be subsidized by the state, and whose tuition increases will reflect the real cost of their education.

*Water conservation:* The chancellor observed that, as the largest consumer of water in the state, the UNC system needs to take conservation seriously. Water use has already been reduced 25% across the campus, at least partly due to changes in equipment and technology. Starting tomorrow, UNC students will compete with students from NC State to see who can conserve the most water in residence halls between now and the UNC-NC State basketball game in Chapel Hill in February. The chancellor directed people to the university's sustainability web site (<http://sustainability.unc.edu/>), which contains more suggestions on water conservation.

*High school visits:* The chancellor reported on his recent visits to Hillside High School in Durham, where he spoke about the Carolina Covenant, and to the South Bronx Preparatory School in New York (one of 14 charter schools established in that city by the College Board), where he spoke more generally about UNC, the importance of going to college, and the availability of financial assistance for those who work hard.

*Question period:*

Shiela Rodgers (Nursing) asked whether attention was being given to the salary structure for fixed-term faculty in hopes of raising them to the 80 th percentile as well. The chancellor replied that the 80 th percentile target has been for tenured and tenure-track faculty, but that the university realizes it must make competitive offers to fixed-term faculty, who also compete in national markets. The university, he said, is not ignoring fixed-term faculty. The Provost added that the funding received thus far for faculty salary increases has been for salaries for *all* faculty, except for a 1% sum this year that was targeted for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Richard Weinberg (Cell Biology) asked for clarification about whether the new campus smoking policy would prohibit smoking within 100 feet of "all outdoor areas" of the campus or within 100 feet "of any campus building," which he had understood to be the previous recommendation. The chancellor replied that the law allows smoking to be prohibited within 100 ft of all university structures, but that if you draw circles around all structures according to this measurement, very few spaces remain where smoking would be allowed.

**Provost's Remarks**

[Click here to listen to the audio of the provost's remarks.](#)

*Major searches underway:* The provost updated the Council on major personnel changes and searches underway. Dan Reed (RENCI) has accepted an offer from Microsoft; the Associate Director of RENC I will serve as acting director until a search can be mounted. Dean Steve Jones of the Business School has decided not to seek reappointment upon completion of a five-year term. The committee searching for a new dean of the School of Education is interviewing candidates and will invite three or four to visit the campus in January. The search for a new Chief Information Officer may be complete in time to report to the Faculty Council in December. A search will begin soon for a new director of the Institute of African American Research, as Prof. Sandy Darity has moved to Duke after several years in a joint appointment.



Another upcoming search will look for a leader for the new Center for Faculty Excellence, which will support faculty teaching, research, and leadership development. An insider will be sought for the position of half-time faculty director, while a larger search will be mounted for a full time executive director. Finally, the search for a new dean of the Graduate School is ongoing.

There were no questions for the provost.

### **Introduction of Priority Registration Proposal**

**[Click here to listen to the audio of the priority registration proposal discussion.](#)**

Chair Templeton said that the proposal for a new priority registration system will be introduced today, with time available for informational or clarifying questions. A vote will be scheduled for the December meeting. If an additional discussion forum is needed between now and then, one may be set up.

Prof. Steve Reznick (Psychology), a member of the Faculty Athletics Committee who had chaired the Priority Registration Task Force, presented the proposal that the task force had developed.

Reznick stressed that the university presently has a priority registration system, made up of a complex web of traditions, precedents, and practices whose origins would be a challenge to reconstruct. Under the present system, registration is open to certain deans one week ahead of when it opens to the rest of campus. The deans can make early registration available to those with special needs. Reznick said that the proposal before the Council now seeks to replace this poorly understood system with a system that is transparent and has regular oversight. The proposal has been unanimously endorsed by the Athletics Committee, the registrar, and the Educational Policy Committee.

Reznick explained that the plan would allow certain, identified groups of students to register ahead of other students in their same class year. Seniors in these groups would register before other seniors, juniors before other juniors, but not before any seniors. Additionally, the task force recommends a cap (presently suggested to be 25%) on the number of seats in any course that would be in play during priority registration, but Reznick noted that current software makes this feature of the proposal difficult to implement. The new PeopleSoft system may help with this, although it will not change the fact that departments have ultimate control over this particular matter.

Reznick explained that the new system would be managed by the Priority Registration Advisory Committee (PRAC), a committee of faculty, students, and administrators appointed by the registrar to review all requests for priority registration. PRAC will only consider requests made on behalf of discrete groups of students, not individuals. The proposal identifies several sample groups that might be eligible, but does not make final determinations. Leaders of particular programs will nominate groups of students for priority registration. Based on a report that includes the rationale for priority and a total number of students included in a nominated group, the PRAC will decide which groups get priority. PRAC meetings will be public, deliberations will be recorded, and requests accepted or denied will be noted. Having a list of students included in all approved groups, the registrar will grant priority status. PRAC will monitor data and report annually to EPC about how the privilege is being used.

Reznick concluded his “bicycle tour” of priority registration by saying that additional documents relating to the proposal will be posted on the Faculty Governance website soon. He stated that no other university appears to have a system as formal as the one we are considering.

*Question period:*

Bernadette Gray-Little (Psychology/Provost) asked why the proposal's eligibility requirements privileged those taking courses for licensure over those who need courses simply to fulfill their majors. Reznick responded that in the School of Education, the time from entering the program leading to certification in one's junior year to the end is very short, giving students only three semesters to complete their courses for certification. This short time frame does not apply to completing a major.

Gray-Little asked if priority would be extended for all courses, or just certain courses. Reznick responded that the system would simply assign a certain time to register but would not identify which courses could be registered for during that time. Gray-Little observed that licensure requirements did not seem to differ markedly from other requirements students need to meet.

Patrick Conway (Economics) asked if a group such as those going on a junior year abroad would be considered a "group" under this system. Reznick said they could be, if the advisor of their program made a recommendation for them. Reznick reiterated that the new policy would make the process transparent and said that it will be up to the PRAC to decide how to allocate priority registration.

Conway commented that he disliked the fact that individuals would not be able to apply and asked what accommodations could be made for students working more than 20 hours a week to pay for college. Reznick responded that considering individual applications would be impossible without more staff.

Susan Bickford (Political Science) observed that she expected the inclusion of student athletes among priority registrants will be controversial among faculty who might not object to priority registration for those with academic (e.g. licensure) constraints. She wondered why certain extracurricular activities are being advantaged over others. Reznick responded that student athletes formally represent the university and are required to attend practices and other events during class time. Bickford suggested that coaches could be asked not to hold events or practices during class hours.

Pete Andrews (Public Policy) asked about the relationship between the authority of the PRAC and the power of individual departments to admit students, especially their own majors, to classes. Reznick said the task force had hoped to address this problem by limiting the number of seats in play and by monitoring the workings of the process. He did note that this is not designed to allow numerous student athletes to get into easy courses; it is designed to allow students to design the most efficient schedules possible.

Chair Templeton observed that the conversation seemed to be migrating from clarification to discussion and offered to arrange an additional meeting in December to facilitate greater debate. No one, however, favored an additional meeting. Templeton promised to make priority registration the centerpiece of the December Council meeting in order to permit adequate time for debate before the vote.

Mike Rationchenko (Undergraduate member of EPC, liaison to Faculty Council) asked for data on the number of students having trouble filling their requirements because of registration problems. Reznick stated that much of the information about this has been gained through exit interviews with student athletes. He offered to gather additional information before the December meeting on anything the Council wanted to know.

Beverly Foster (Nursing) suggested that it might be helpful to know how many students receive priority registration now and who they are.

Greg Copenhaver (Biology) requested that a discussion board be established on the Faculty Council website. This idea was well received.

Thomas Oatley (Political Science) asked for more information about impact on departments' ability to manage enrollments.

Robin Visser (Asian Studies) asked if the software allows courses to be tagged as electives or requirements. Registrar Alice Poehls said it does not.

### **Explanation of Proposals from the Committee on Student Conduct**

**[Click here to listen to the audio of the explanation of these proposals.](#)**

**[Visit the Agenda page for links to all the proposals.](#)**

Jonathan Sauls, Assistant Dean of Students, presented a series of proposals, all but one of which (the final proposal) have been unanimously approved by the Committee on Student Conduct. He explained that the first two proposals change the procedures of the appellate process. As currently worded, the rules request a student to file an appeal within five business days, but this rule overlooks the fact that the finding from the court may not have been received. The proposed change allows the five days to start once the student receives the court's findings. This may cut down on appeals.

Greg Copenhaver (Biology) asked how the office knows when the finding has been received. Sauls reported that he usually hands this information to the student directly, in a face-to-face meeting.

Sauls explained the second proposed change, an alteration that would permit, but no longer require, Appellate Review Board review of all appeals denied by Sauls or his fellow deans. This change is expected to save time. The third proposal removes the requirement that charge decisions be sent via certified mail, which is often returned undelivered. This proposal eliminates mandatory certified mail in favor of email or other methods that will insure that the student has timely notice. This is likely to save considerable money.

Sauls noted that the fourth proposal clarifies wording in several sections, while the final three proposals deal with the DWI cases that have become a significant part of the conduct caseload in the undergraduate honor system. The proposals separate the offenses of DWI and reckless driving and create a drug and alcohol "suspension" sanction to supplement the current probation sanction.

Sauls stated that the final proposal, to create a usual sanction for DWI cases, passed the COSC by a split vote. Supporters felt the proposal codifies existing practice and ensures equity, while opponents feared that the implementation of a "usual" sanction would impair the committee's flexibility. Sauls noted that "usual" does not mean "mandatory," but that it is the sanction imposed when there is no mitigating information.

Joy Renner (Allied Health Sciences) asked how the Dean of Students office is informed that a student has incurred a DWI. Sauls said the office gets a daily police report and determines whether the university has jurisdiction by considering whether the infraction affected the university in some way, especially if it occurred near campus.

Susan Bickford (Political Science) asked how the office confirms that students have received emails. Sauls said these emails usually are sent after students are told to expect them. The emails often require action by the student, and if the student does not respond, the office follows up in other ways.

Chair Templeton said that COSC chair Professor Bob Adler will arrive later in the meeting to call for a

vote on these proposals.

### **Panel Discussion on Future Directions in Research at Carolina**

**[Click here to listen to the audio of this panel discussion.](#)**

Chair Templeton introduced the panel discussion on research at Carolina, which builds upon the Faculty Committee on Research's spring 2007 annual report. That report had proposed some strategies by which the university might meet the chancellor's stated goal of raising the amount of outside funded research at UNC to \$1 billion by 2016.

Panelists were: Prof. Peggy Bentley ( School of Public Health); Prof. Jacquelyn Hall (History Department); Prof. Harvey Seim (Marine Sciences, and Chair, Faculty Research Committee); and Tony Waldrop (Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development).

Templeton posed a series of questions to the panelists.

Templeton Question #1: What are the advantages and disadvantages of setting an audacious dollar goal for research at Carolina?

Waldrop noted that he and the chancellor had discussed the prospect that naming a dollar figure might indicate too great an emphasis on money. But they had decided that a figure was a helpful way to express a concrete goal.

Templeton Question #2: How important is outside funding in your discipline?

Hall observed that outside funding is increasingly important for the arts and humanities, but that it plays a different role than it does in the sciences and Health Affairs schools. She expressed concern that a campaign like this may disadvantage the arts and humanities.

Bentley noted that as a medical anthropologist, she has in previous jobs needed to generate 80-100% of her salary, and that even here there is pressure to generate considerable support. She emphasized the need for finding ways to foster interdisciplinary research by inducing donors to provide incentives for scholars in different fields to work together.

Seim noted that outside funding is essential in marine sciences, but that the level of pressure has changed as it has become more difficult to get NSF funding. Interdisciplinary research, while appealing, entails complicated negotiations about how departments will share money, work together, or use resources at other campuses. If we are serious about growing the interdisciplinary research enterprise, we need resources.

Waldrop observed that funding agencies are more and more interested in interdisciplinary projects. To encourage interdisciplinary projects, we need to look at how we reward team scholarship work in our promotion and tenure process.

Greg Copenhaver (Biology) commented that from his experience on government review panels, interdisciplinarity is expected now, not novel. The fundamentals of research remain important, and we need to focus on finding ways to let researcher know of grant opportunities that are relevant to them.

Waldrop reminded everyone of the existence of the GrantSource library to help faculty search for

funding, but said we do not presently have resources to contact faculty about every relevant grant.

Referring to a one-page handout provided today that summarized the April 2007 Research Committee report (available on the Faculty Governance website) Diane Leonard (English and Comparative Literature Lit/AALP liaison) asked what the research committee meant by its admonition that the university "enhance faculty incentives to succeed" and address compensation issues.

Seim explained that the report sought to encourage development of a strategic plan to reach the \$1 billion goal.

Templeton Question #3: What would be some advantages/drawbacks to allowing centers and institutes to hire faculty?

Bentley asked if this question implied hiring of tenure-track faculty (Templeton confirmed that it did). She asserted that hiring faculty without a departmental home is not a good idea because it changes a center's core mission of fostering collaboration across different units.

Hall agreed, but wondered about whether the centers might hire non tenure-track faculty, professors of the practice, or researchers.

Seim noted that the Research Committee had focused on how the university can respond quickly to opportunities, thinking that centers and institutes might be able to hire more quickly than departments.

Waldrop observed that the more germane question may be about who initiates and leads the search. While centers and institutes might take the lead in hiring faculty that focus on their priorities and areas, such hires could still have a regular departmental home. Hall endorsed this idea.

Bentley noted that the School of Public Health has four areas of emphasis (health disparities, obesity, global health, water), and that having these areas of focus helps guide hiring across departmental lines.

Steve Reznick (Psychology) asked whether a junior faculty member who came up for promotion having a few grants and publications and a long list of grants applied for but not won would achieve tenure.

Waldrop noted that impact is more important than quantity. Gray-Little added that departments that require sponsored research have been struggling with this in recent years, as there are a number of very good faculty members who have not received much funding. Seim said that the tenure process would need to recognize and reward people who seek funding beyond NIH and NSF, because the only way to increase funding is to approach new sources.

Hall observed that in the humanities, getting grants is less relevant than publishing to achieving tenure, but she emphasized the role grants play in providing the time that faculty need to do their research and writing.

Diane Leonard (English and Comparative Literature/AALP liaison) asked about the levels of internal research support the university has in place, especially for areas that don't attract much outside funding. She noted that research and study leaves sometimes seem to be used for recruitments rather than for existing faculty.

Bentley reported that Public Health does not offer sabbaticals; faculty have to buy out their time. But she and Waldrop agreed that time is a critical factor in faculty ability to attract grants.

Greg Copenhaver (Biology) observed that as federal dollars are decreasing, reductions in funding available for graduate students and postdocs is also declining.

Laurie Matfity-Kipp (Religious Studies) asked if there had been any attention to how to educate faculty to be entrepreneurs in seeking funding, especially in connecting with publics or donors who need particular research done. Do current university policies or programs encourage or discourage this?

Pete Andrews (Public Policy) emphasized the need for more funding for the University Research Council, which compares but poorly with Wisconsin's internal faculty research support program. Faculty involved in the early stages of the Carolina First campaign had named this a top priority, but the idea never quite took root. Might there be a chance to make raising some funds for enhanced internal research support a focus for the campaign's final push? Waldrop agreed that the URC funding was shockingly small, although he has increased it during his tenure here.

Mick Murray (Pharmacy) asked how the plans and discussions about research relate to the UNC Tomorrow initiative and possibilities for community engagement. Waldrop responded that we already had an Engagement Task Force and a Vice Chancellor for Engagement (Mike Smith) in place before the UNC Tomorrow initiative began.

#### **Vote on Committee on Student Conduct Proposals**

Prof. Bob Adler, Chair, Committee on Student Conduct, arrived to call for the vote on the committee's proposals. He moved that the first four proposals (the minor procedural changes) be approved as a bundle. Kant Bangdiwala (Biostatistics) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Adler moved adoption of the fifth, sixth, and seventh proposals, and Doug Kelly (Statistics) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Adler thanked the Council and noted that the proposals still have to go student government and Chancellor Moeser for approval.

#### **Presentation of Nominees for 2008 Distinguished Alumnus/a Awards (closed session)**

The Faculty Council went into closed session.

On behalf of Secretary Joseph Ferrell (who missed the meeting due to illness) and the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards, Chair Templeton presented five nominees for Distinguished Alumna and Alumnus Awards to be presented on University Day 2008, and one nominee for an Honorary Degree to be presented at Commencement 2008. Each nominee was approved.

#### **Adjournment**

Its business having been completed, the Council adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Anne Mitchell Whisnant  
Acting Secretary