



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING of the FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, December 9th, 2005 at 3:00 p.m.

***** The Pleasants Family Assembly Room in Wilson Library *****

Chancellor James Moeser and Professor Judith Wegner, Chair of the Faculty, will preside.

AGENDA

Time	Item
3:00	<i>Faculty Council Convenes.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments from the Chancellor.• Questions and Comments from the Faculty Council.• Comments from Provost Robert Shelton.• Comments from Professor Judith Wegner.
3:45	Resolution 2005-10 Proposing an Amendment to the Trustee Policies and Procedures Governing Academic Tenure.
4:00	Discussion of Diversity Issues at UNC Chapel Hill.
4:40	Annual Report of the Status of Women Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Professor Susan T. Lord, Chair.
4:50	Annual Report of the Faculty Executive Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Professor Wegner.
5:00	<i>Adjourn.</i>

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Additional agenda background materials and documents pertaining to meetings of the Council may be found at
www.unc.edu/faculty/facccoun

Status of Women Committee Annual Report, 2005

Members:

Name	School/Department	Term
Susan Lord –Chair	Pathology and Laboratory Medicine	2007
Keith Muller	Biostatistics	2006
Beth Holmgren	Slavic Languages	2007

Committee Charge: “The committee addresses ongoing concerns of women faculty members, identifies obstacles to achievement and maintenance of equality in the representation and status of women on the faculty, and proposes steps for overcoming these obstacles.”(Faculty Code, Section 4-22)

Meeting Dates: October 29, 2004 and April 8, 2005

Report of Activities:

Two major items continued to be of interest to the Committee on the Status of Women: improvement of faculty benefits and responses to the salary equity study.

In response to the Provost’s substantive change in Faculty short-term disability and parental leave policy, the Committee sent a letter to the editor at the University Gazette and the Daily Tar Heel to strongly commend Provost Shelton for the significant strengthening of the University’s policy on serious illness, major disability and parental leave for faculty and administrators. This policy went into effect in the fall semester, 2004. We believe that there will be marked improvement in our ability to recruit and retain outstanding faculty as a result of this important change.

In response to the Faculty Council salary equity resolution adopted February 7, 2003, the Deans and Center Directors submitted in their 2004 annual reports specific data relevant the unit’s efforts to achieve gender equity. The reports were obtained by the Office of the Provost in early 2005. The reports were provided to this Committee by Judith Wegner. We reviewed these documents prior to our April meeting, when we thoroughly discussed the responses. We found the responses were quite variable and not what the members had expected. The members agreed that Etta Pisano, as Chair of the Committee, would communicate with Provost Shelton and Judith Wegner, the Chair of the Faculty, to let them know these reports did not contain the information we wished to obtain. We suggested that Lynn Williford help design of a form and a mechanism to obtain the desired information in the annual reports from the appropriate units. Etta was also asked to share the Committee’s impressions with the Chancellor’s advisory committee at their next meeting. Subsequent to the Committee’s April meeting, Etta and Keith Muller met

with Associate Provost Stephen Allred to discuss this first report from the academic units on the salary equity resolution. Their comments and suggestions were well-received and a plan was organized to work with Dr. Williford to prepare the needed mechanisms in time for implementation in February 2006. Keith Muller has met again with Stephen Allred and Lynn Williford and was encouraged by their proposals.

The Committee also decided to assist in organizing an event on women in science, a concern that remains timely in light of comments made by President Summers at Harvard University. Susan Lord agreed to represent this Committee, along with representatives from three other women's groups on campus, the Women's Center, the Association of Women Faculty and Professionals, and the Association for Professional Women in the Medical School, to organize events about women in science during the coming academic year. An ongoing effort on campus directly addresses issues relevant to women in academic science. Laurie McNeil, Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics, is leading an effort to obtain funds from the National Science Foundation to support an ADVANCE program at UNC-Chapel Hill. The goal of this program is to increase the representation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers, thereby contributing to the development of a more diverse science and engineering workforce. Support through this program will enable implementation of substantive strategies to address ongoing concerns of women faculty members in the science departments that are supported by the National Science Foundation.

Resolution 2005-10. Proposing an Amendment to the Trustee Policies and Procedures Governing Academic Tenure to Provide that a Decision Not to Reappoint Shall be Deemed Not to Have Been Timely Made if All Reviews and Appeals of the Decision Have Not Been Concluded Within Twelve Months Before the End of the Term.

The Faculty Council resolves:

The Chancellor is requested to recommend to the Board of Trustees an amendment to Section 2.c.(2) of the Trustee Policies and Procedures Governing Academic Tenure as follows: to authorize the faculty ranks of senior lecturer and professor of the practice, as follows:

(2) Decisions not to reappoint upon expiration of probationary terms

A decision not to reappoint upon expiration of a probationary term at the rank of instructor, assistant professor or associate professor may be made in the first instance by the chairman of the department after consultation with the assembled full professors of the department; or it may be made, following a recommendation to reappoint by the department chairman, by any other officer of administration charged with reviewing such a recommendation. By whatever officer of administration made, a decision not to reappoint is final except as it may subsequently be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Sections 4 and 8. Permissible and impermissible grounds for making a decision not to reappoint are as provided in Section 4.a. hereof. All reviews and appeals of a decision not to reappoint, other than appeals pursuant to Section 8 or Section 9 hereof, shall be concluded not later than 12 months before the expiration of the term; otherwise, the decision not to reappoint shall be deemed not to have been timely made and communicated. Each decision not to reappoint shall be communicated for information through the administrative channels prescribed for review of a recommendation to reappoint; and notice thereof shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member by the department chairman within the times prescribed by Sections 2.b.(2), (3), and (4) hereof.

December 6, 2005
Faculty Executive Committee
(Elected by the Faculty at Large)

Annual Report to the Faculty Council

Elected Members: Alice Ammerman (Public Health, '08); Pamela Conover (Political Science, '06); Robert Dalton (Academic Affairs Library, '07); Connie Eble (English, '07); Noelle Granger (Medicine, '06); Evelyn Huber (Political Science, '07); Lloyd Kramer (History, '08); Steve Matson (Biology, '07); Laurie Mesibov (Government, '06); Ellen Peirce (Business, '08); Ross Simpson (Medicine, '06); and Joseph Templeton (Chemistry, '08). Those who completed their service at the end of the 2004-05 academic year are Steve Bachenheimer (Medicine, '05) and Margaret Leigh (Medicine, '05). *Ex Officio Members:* Judith Wegner (Chair of the Faculty); Joseph Ferrell (Secretary of the Faculty).

Meetings: The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) meets twice monthly throughout the year. The Provost regularly attends alternate meetings, as do other members of the Provost's office, the Director of Institutional Research, chairs of various faculty committees (such as athletics and advisory committees), and other colleagues as needed. The FEC also meets periodically with Chancellor Moeser to discuss topics of importance to the faculty and to the chancellor.

Charge: The FEC is charged in the Faculty Code to: (1) exercise the consultative powers delegated to the Faculty Council; (2) exercise the legislative powers of the Council when prompt action is required; (3) serve as an advisory committee for the Chair of the Faculty; (4) represent the Faculty Council and General Faculty in advising the University administration with respect to issues, such as planning; that the Committee deems important to the University's mission; (5) work with various officers and groups within the University toward the realization of goals set in actions of the Council; (6) report to the Council on the status of implementation of resolutions of the Council; and (7) serve as members of the Faculty Council.

Activities This Past Year: Over the past year, the FEC considered a number of topics including possible improvements in the state health plan, university policies on gifts, parking problems, university master plan, tuition policies, SACS reaccreditation, athletics, student and faculty retention, university budget, and selected legislative issues. It helped plan and present programming on academic freedom last spring, and contributed to the effort to secure substantial new merit scholarship support for undergraduates through reallocation of logo receipts previously allocated to athletics for this purpose. The FEC was also instrumental in communicating the faculty's views concerning priorities for selection of a new University President and recently met with the President-designate Erskine Bowles to articulate faculty priorities. This fall the FEC has focused on discussion of the "special scholarship provision" adopted by the legislature over the summer that reclassifies certain non-resident student scholarship recipients as residents for tuition purposes and is likely to lead to increased undergraduate student enrollment. The FEC has devoted considerable attention to support for graduate education and has worked with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Provost to raise related concerns to the Board of Trustees. The FEC has established a good working relationship with colleagues at NCSU (meeting each semester with the NCSU faculty executive committee and respective provosts). In that regard, it is developing strategies for collaborative work with faculty at NCSU and the Emerging Issues Forum on issues facing the public research universities and the University system, as well as pursuing shared concerns relating to support for graduate education. The FEC is also working on issues related to the Chancellor's Task Force on Engagement, and will continue to address such topics in the spring. The FEC also works closely with the Provost in offering advice on issues as they arise.

Diversity Assessment and Planning

with members of the

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

October 14, 2005

Background

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

Charge:

- What are we doing well?
- What do we need to improve?

Assessment Areas:

Perceptions and attitudes about

- University's vision and commitment to diversity
- Recruitment/retention efforts
- Educational benefits of diversity
- Support for critical thinking
- Climate
- School/unit level activities

Methods: randomized surveys, focus groups,
ethnographic interviews, school/unit reports

Selected Findings from Faculty Survey

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

Faculty perceive that recruitment efforts reflect a commitment to achieving a diverse faculty (61.9% strongly agree or agree), yet:

- African American and Hispanic respondents were significantly more likely than other respondents to disagree that their departments' recruitment and retention efforts reflected a commitment to diversity, and that tenure, promotion, and professional development opportunities were unbiased.
- Male respondents were considerably more positive than female respondents about the extent to which departmental recruitment and retention efforts reflected a commitment to diversity.

Carolina is perceived by faculty as invested in diversity and concerned with diversity issues (82.8% strongly agree or agree) and over 70% reported that they never heard disparaging remarks from students or from faculty, yet:

- 26.9% of Hispanic faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that the University is committed to creating an environment that welcomes many different perspectives and ideas. This level of disagreement was significantly higher than any other group (African American: 8.1%, Asian: 15.4%, Native American and Other: 15.8%).
- 42.3% of Hispanic faculty and 40% of African American faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that "Carolina is a comfortable place" for racial/ethnic minorities.
- 15% of respondents noted that they have felt unfairly treated at the University due to their gender.

Faculty thought the curriculum in their school/department adequately represented the contributions of a variety of groups of people (60% strongly agree or agree), and thought they were encouraged to include diversity issues in course content (59%), yet:

- While faculty were much more positive (60.7%) in agreeing or strongly agreeing that the University encourages faculty to include diversity content in courses, than were African American (50%), Asian (48.7%), or Hispanic faculty (44.4%).
- African American respondents were significantly more likely to disagree that faculty in their departments readily engage in diversity-related discussions.

Background: Task Force Recommendations

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

1. Clearly define and publicize the University's commitment to diversity.
2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives.
3. Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.
4. Achieve greater representation of ethnic minorities among the executive, administrative, and managerial positions and among the professional/non-faculty positions.
5. Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.
6. Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.
7. Take leadership in creating opportunities for interaction and cross-group learning.
8. Support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity.

Background:

Chancellor's Response

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

- We will clearly define and communicate our commitment to diversity, and we will adopt the core values for diversity proposed by the Task Force.
- We will ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives by developing a diversity plan that will allow us to monitor our progress annually.
- We will support innovative approaches to enhancing diversity at all levels of the University, and we will continue the support of programs that are instrumental to bringing diverse students to Carolina.
- We will make diversity education, orientation and training available to members of the University community, with particular attention to developing innovative strategies to offer relevant learning and cross-cultural opportunities for members of our community.
- We will create and sustain a respectful climate and take greater leadership to promote diversity competency.
- We will support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity, including the development of research agendas that will inform our policy decisions and program development on the state of diversity at our University.

Focus for Today's Discussion

Task Force Recommendation 2.

Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives by developing a plan for diversity.

Task Force Recommendation 3.

Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.

Task Force Recommendations 4. & 5.

Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.

Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.

Discussion

2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives via plan for diversity.
 - What processes would encourage faculty input and engagement with the diversity plan?
 - How are faculty best informed about the University's progress towards achieving diversity goals?

Discussion

3. Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.
 - What proven core hiring strategies best support strong and diverse candidate pools?
 - How can search committees share and develop effective hiring strategies?
 - What are important measures of success in hiring and retention?

Discussion

5. & 6. Make diversity education available to all members of the University community, and create and sustain a respectful climate.
- What aspects of diversity education are important in your academic context?
 - What would support faculty in conducting successful discussions of diversity in classrooms and/or departments?
 - What are important measures of success for these areas?

Comments on Resolution 2005-10 from Janne Cannon, Chair of the APT Committee, on behalf of the members of the committee:

Ten of the twelve members of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee discussed the proposed amendment (Resolution 2005-10) at a recent meeting of the committee. There would be two possible ways to implement this amendment: 1) by extending the employment of those who are denied reappointment and who file appeals, if those appeals extend into the final 12 months of their terms; or 2) by beginning the review process for all faculty in probationary terms approximately six months earlier than occurs now. It is our understanding that the Chancellor is unlikely to recommend the first option (automatically extending employment for those whose appeals of a negative decision are not concluded by 12 months before the end of their terms). Therefore, implementing the amendment would indeed make it necessary to begin the review process six months sooner than current procedures, for all faculty members in probationary terms. It is the unanimous opinion of the APT Committee that such a change in timing of the review process would be detrimental to the careers of numerous faculty members, especially those who are most vulnerable to possible non-reappointment and for whom the loss of six months' time to complete and publish scholarly projects could be critical. **Therefore, the members of the APT Committee are unanimously opposed to the resolution.**



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

December 9, 2005

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill convened at 3:00 p.m. in the Pleasants Family Assembly Room of the Wilson Library. The following 48 members of the Council attended: Alperin, Ammerman, Bachenheimer, Barreau, Becker, Cairns, Clemens, Copenhaver, Couper, Degener, DeSaix, Dupuis, Ebie, Gilligan, Givre, Granger, Guiledege, Heenan, Kamarej, Kramer, Lastra, Leonard, Marshall, Matson, Matthysse, McGrath, McIntosh, Mesibov, Muller, Peirce, Perrin, Peterson, Renner, Rustioni, Salmon, Smith, Sutherland, Sweeney, Tauchen, Templeton, Tobin, Trotman, Wallace, Weinberg, Wilson, Wissick, Wolford, Yankaskas. The following 36 members were granted excused absences: Anton, Arnold, Bennett, Blocher, Booth, Chapman, Conover, Dalton, de Silva, Ewend, Foley, Gasaway, Gerber, Holmgren, Howell, Huber, Jonas, Kagarise, Klebanow, Maclean, Martin, Miguel, Murphy, Murray, Papanikolas, Rock, Rogers, Sandelowski, Selassie, Simpson, Strom-Gottfried, Suilk, Taylor, Tiwana, Vick, Weil. The following four members were absent without excuse: Belger, Connolly, Keagy, Lin.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor James Moeser reported that he had recently discussed with the Faculty Executive Committee cross-cutting issues being taken up by the Engagement Task Force.

Questions and Comments from Council Members

Prof. Diane Leonard (Comparative Literature) said that it appears to her that graduate programs in languages and literatures are being eliminated in order to enhance undergraduate programs. She charged that this is being done without faculty input and with no open discussions; decisions are being made by *sol disant* advisory committees. Chancellor Moeser replied that Prof. Leonard's premise that undergraduate education is displacing graduate programs is incorrect. He said that decisions to eliminate graduate programs in the College are properly made by the College, not by the chancellor or provost, and that he would never second-guess a decision by the College or one of the professional schools to eliminate a program.

Prof. Frank Dominguez (Romance Languages) asserted that any cut in a major graduate program should be done with the knowledge and support of the faculty concerned. He said that this had not been the case with the elimination of the Ph.D. program in Portuguese; rather, a task force was convened, a recommendation to eliminate the program was put forward, and the program was eliminated without even informing the faculty that this was under consideration.

Dean Bernadette Gray-Little (Arts & Sciences) said that the advisory committees mentioned in this discussion were ad hoc groups, not the Administrative Board of the College or the Dean's Advisory Committee. She said that the issues involved in these decisions are complex and cannot be adequately addressed in the brief time available in the "Questions and Comments" portion of a Faculty Council meeting.

Prof. Ann Matthysse (Biology) questioned the wisdom of scheduling final exams on a Saturday. She also thought it not a good idea to begin final exams immediately after the last day of classes, and she objected to scheduling finals on a day when a football game is being held in Kenan Stadium because

loudspeakers from the stadium are clearly audible in nearby classrooms. Provost Robert Shelton replied that the Calendar Committee struggles each year to fit the calendar around various dates. This always entails compromises, he said. He encouraged the faculty to study the calendar and give feedback to the Office of the Provost.

University Registrar Alice Poehls said that she would raise these issues with the Calendar Committee at its next meeting. Chancellor Moeser observed that he prefers having reading day at the beginning of the exam period, rather than in the middle, but that students like the current plan.

Provost's Remarks

Provost Shelton asked that the faculty begin to think of nominees for the Nan Keohane Visiting Professorship for the fall semester, 2007. The 2005 recipient is Prof. Geoffrey Brennan (Philosophy) and the 2006 recipient will be Prof. Gerd Jürgen (Biology). The Keohane Professor receives a stipend of \$50,000. The selection committee is made up of faculty from Carolina and Duke, and the choice is made by the two provosts.

The provost reported that he has been able to fund 20 competitive leave requests this year. Eleven were allocated to the College, three to the School of Medicine, two to the School of Education, two to the School of Public Health, and one each to the School of Journalism and Mass Communication and the School of Social Work. He also been able to make 39 junior faculty awards and to increase the stipend from \$5,000 to \$7,500. These awards go to assistant professors.

Prof. Steven Bachenheimer (Microbiology) asked whether there are any plans to use some of the tuition increase funds to remedy salary compression. He said that previous studies indicate that there is a "loyalty penalty" of about \$1,000 per year for remaining at Carolina. Provost Shelton reviewed the general policies for use of tuition increase funds but did not directly address Prof. Bachenheimer's question. Chancellor Moeser added that he does not see tuition as the primary source of funding for faculty salaries; tuition funds must always be supplementary to state appropriations. He added that his highest priority is faculty salaries and he is glad to hear that incoming UNC President Eskine Bowles shares that view. The chancellor said that the students are emphasizing two points: (1) be fair, and (2) be predictable.

Resolution of Appreciation for Tommy Griffin

Prof. Judith Wegner, Chair of the Faculty, read and moved adoption of Resolution 2005-11 On Appreciation for Tommy Griffin's Service as Chair of the Employee Forum. See Appendix A.

Consideration of Resolution 2005-10

Prof. Wegner laid before the Council Resolution 2005-10 Proposing an Amendment to the Trustee Policies and Procedures Governing Academic Tenure. The resolution was submitted at the November 11, 2005, Faculty Council meeting as part of the annual report of the Advisory Committee and was explained at that time.

Prof. Wegner said that the Agenda Committee had advised that before the resolution was put to a vote, information be obtained on two points raised at the November meeting: (1) would adoption of the resolution require that tenure reviews begin earlier than at present, and (2) are the current tenure regulations in compliance with AAUP standards.

Executive Associate Provost Stephen Alford said that the Office of the Provost would require that all tenure reviews begin six months earlier than at present if the change in the tenure regulations being proposed is adopted by the Board of Trustees.

Prof. Wegner read from an email she had received from Prof. Janne Cannon, Chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. Prof. Cannon said that the APT Committee sees two ways to implement the proposed change: (1) extend all appointments in which an appeal has been entered by six months to enable completion of the appeal process, or (2) begin all reviews approximately

six months earlier than at present. She said that the APT Committee thinks it highly unlikely that the chancellor would agree to automatically extend the employment of all persons not being renewed, which would mean that implementation would require earlier review. Prof. Cannon said that it is the unanimous opinion of the APT Committee that beginning the review process earlier would be detrimental to the careers of young faculty members and that, for that reason, the APT Committee recommends rejection of the resolution as introduced.

Dean Gray-Little reported that she had discussed the proposed amendment with department chairs in the College. She said that the chairs concur with the concerns expressed by the APT Committee and that they unanimously oppose earlier review.

Prof. Ed Halloran (Nursing) reported that our current tenure regulations are not in conflict with AAUP standards; however, he said that AAUP officials strongly support conclusion of all appeals before the end of the term. He said that he personally favors adoption of the resolution.

Prof. Melissa Bullard (History) spoke in support of the resolution. She said that the underlying issue is who speaks for the University in a nonrenewal decision and when that decision is communicated and becomes effective. The tenure regulations require that notice of nonrenewal be communicated at least 12 months before the term expires, but at present there is ambiguity as to when effective notice is actually given. She described her understanding of the facts of a recent nonrenewal case involving extended reconsideration procedures (including an appeal to the Hearings Committee) in which the department chair changed his recommendation from negative to positive. The case then received a negative decision by the dean. The question in that case was who speaks for the University to give timely notice, i.e., whether the effective negative decision was made by the department chair in the first instance or by the dean in review of a reconsidered positive decision. Prof. Bullard said that in her opinion, the first definitive notice of nonrenewal came from the dean's office. Since that decision was made less than 12 months before the expiration of the term, the faculty member did not receive timely notice, she said. Prof. Bullard also advanced the following arguments in favor of the proposal:

- The change does not require or imply that all tenure review begin earlier; instead, it makes provision for rare and exceptional cases that drag out for legitimate reasons;
- Allowing extra time to a faculty member who is not renewed after review procedures that take more than 12 months to complete is consistent with the humanitarian intent of the AAUP guidelines to provide an employment cushion for junior faculty;
- The amendment creates a win-win situation in which the faculty member is protected by a cushion of employment while university administrators are freed from an overly rigid process and schedule of review;
- It is good public relations for faculty who have been denied tenure to depart the University feeling they have been treated fairly;
- Unless the issue of when effective notice of nonrenewal is rendered and by whom is clarified, it is bound to resurface each time a candidate for tenure is turned down in the first instance by the APT Committee with less than a full 12 months remaining in the candidate's term.

Prof. Bullard moved to amend the resolution by replacing the language to be inserted with "Any decision to dismiss that has not been communicated by the university at least 12 months before the expiration of the term shall be deemed not to have been timely made and communicated."

Dean Gray-Little said that Prof. Bullard's amendment does not address the problem that she just described.

Prof. Arne Kalleberg (Sociology), Chair of the Advisory Committee, said that Prof. Bullard's amendment begs the question.

Prof. Wegner called for a vote on the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

Prof. Wegner called for a vote on the original resolution. The resolution was rejected.

Discussion of Diversity Issues at UNC-Chapel Hill

The Council resumed its discussion of the report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity that had begun at the October 14, 2005, meeting.

Prof. Frank Wilson (Orthopaedics) observed that he remembers a time when the University's overarching emphasis was on unity. Now it seems, he said, that the trust is in the opposite direction. We focus on differences—diversity—rather than similarities. He said that the faculty in the Medical School had recently had long discussions on cultural competency. He thought that the outcome was that everyone agreed that they should be better doctors. He asked whether the real question under discussion by the Council is not how to be better citizens. We can always benefit from consciousness-heightening experiences, he said, but there is a danger that this can become all-absorbing and can detract from our basic mission.

Prof. Jay Smith (History) said that the term "diversity" means so many things to so many people that it has become almost meaningless unless it is fleshed out with qualifiers. He asked which diversity issues mean the most to us; which ones should we be pursuing? He said that his concern comes from recent experience in preparing for implementation of the new undergraduate curriculum. He has been working on the diversity component and what it encompasses. There are two ways of seeing diversity, he said, and they are in conflict. The curriculum review steering committee understood diversity as meaning variety, that is, students should be required to sample a broad range of disciplines. This view offends people who understand diversity in the context of the civil rights movement. To them, the diversity requirement means that we should be taking very seriously our duty to address specific inequities that are historically rooted in US history and that have given whites and males advantages over the African-American community, women, and gays and lesbians. Disagreement, conflict, confusion, and misunderstandings will inevitably follow if we are not clear what we mean by diversity, he said. Prof. Smith said he had learned this the hard way in trying to flesh out the diversity requirement in the curriculum.

Prof. Mary Anne Salmon (Social Work) said that arguments and conflicts will necessarily arise because this is a difficult topic to address. She said that there are wide differences between what historically disadvantaged groups and privileged groups think about a wide range of issues. We are often told by the majority group that "diversity" means only that we need to be polite and understanding of others. This is inadequate, she said. She hoped that we do not hid behind the vagueness of "diversity" to avoid coming to grips with hugely challenging, emotionally-charged issues.

Prof. Andrew Perrin (Sociology) said that a person is "diverse" only in the sense that any given number is random; context is everything.

Prof. Gregory Copenhaver (Biology) said that the most poignant things disclosed by the studies undertaken by the task force is the huge gap in perception from minority and majority respondents. Until the majority agrees that there is a problem, the problems perceived by the majority will not be solved, he said. He thought that at some point, we need to make the Alcoholics Anonymous statement: "Hi, I'm UNC and I have a diversity problem."

Prof. Bruce Cairns (Surgery) said he was not much concerned about trying to define diversity. He said that he knows there is a problem when he interacts with students and under-represented groups. We have a serious problem of failure to address fundamental ways in which the majority interacts with minorities.

Ms. Christie Degener (Health Sciences Library) observed that the demographic factors of the three groups surveyed by the task force (faculty, staff, and students) don't match up, which makes it difficult to compare attitudes. For example, staff but not faculty were asked to list number of years of service. She thought that people may initially have a positive attitude on a given topic which degrades over time.

Prof. Frank Dominguez (Romance Languages), noting that the faculty survey indicates that 20% of Hispanic faculty have negative views on diversity, asked if the task force members have any thoughts

about why this is the case. Dr. Cookie Newsom, Director of Diversity Education and Research, replied that more work needs to be done on this. The survey results do not really support any conclusion as to why many members of the Hispanic or African-American respondents report dissatisfaction. In response to a question as to whether the task force intends to undertake any qualitative research in the future, Assoc. Provost Archie Ervin said that the sub-group that designed the faculty survey chose not to venture into qualitative responses; the sub-groups that designed the student and staff surveys did solicit qualitative responses.

Prof. Charles Daye (Law) acknowledged that the issues under discussion are very complex. He said that the task force understood that the University is in the education business and that we need to overcome historical discrimination. The task force was asked to put together a pan-University plan; it simply was not possible to fill in all of the details. He said that he does believe that when people understand dimensions of diversity in their own context, they are able to work on it at their level and overall progress is the result. Prof. Daye said that he has been on the Carolina faculty since 1972 and is now confident for the first time that we are on the road to great strides forward. He agreed with those who have observed that the concept of diversity is meaningless with a context.

Annual Report of the Committee on the Status of Women

Prof. Susan Lord (Pathology), Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women, commented briefly on the committee's annual report. She said that this year the group hopes to address a problem that they are calling "women in the sciences." Prof. Laurie McNeill (Physics & Astronomy) is developing a proposal for funding by the National Sciences Foundation that will bring women to the campus to identify obstacles to attracting women to the sciences and to address them effectively.

Adjournment

Its business having concluded, the Faculty Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Appendix A

Resolution 2005-10

On Appreciation for Tommy Griffin's Service as Chair of the Employee Forum

WHEREAS Tommy Griffin has served for four years with distinction as Chair of the Employee Forum at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and

WHEREAS during this period he has consistently represented all those who work at the university with great energy, skill, and devotion; and

WHEREAS he has sought to work closely with faculty members and students in advancing the common good of all; and

WHEREAS he has effectively furthered employee involvement in shared governance both on the campus level and within the University System; and

WHEREAS he has encouraged and participated in collaborative problem-solving in diverse settings ranging from parking to construction to town-gown relations; and

WHEREAS he provided important leadership with Chancellor James Moeser in connection with the Chancellor's Task Force for a Better Workplace, leading to important improvements such as the establishment of the campus Ombuds office and the part-time degree program for staff; and

WHEREAS he has consistently been a voice of conscience on behalf of the greater good and the educational excellence; and

WHEREAS he has worked effectively with other staff, faculty, and administrators to bring critical issues relating to salaries, health benefits, and educational needs to the attention of members of the state legislature; and

WHEREAS he has advocated to the Board of Trustees and others about the key issues facing all those employed at the university and has provided a compelling human face in discussing issues of equity in these and other circles; and

WHEREAS he provided important informal counsel to many administrators, faculty and student leaders on numerous occasions; and

WHEREAS he has been a role model who has embodied the university's high ideals of public service and commitment to excellence; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Council, on behalf of all faculty members of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill wish to recognize these and other significant accomplishments; now therefore

THE FACULTY COUNCIL RESOLVES:

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill extends to Tommy Griffin its thanks and congratulations for his excellent service as chair of the Employee Forum for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 and his continuing contributions as a university leader in the highest traditions of this institution.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

January 20, 2006

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 Sorja Haynes Stone Center for Black Culture and History. The following 58 members of the Council attended: Alperin, Barreau, Becker, Belger, Blocher, Booth, Cairns, Chapman, Connolly, Copenhaver, Couper, Dalton, Degener, DeSaix, Dupuis, Eble, Foley, Frampton, Gerber, Gilligan, Givre, Granger, Gullede, Heenan, Howell, Huber, Jonas, Kamarei, Klebanow, Kramer, Lasta, Leonard, Matson, Matthysse, McGrath, McIntosh, Murray, Papanikolas, Peirce, Perrin, Peterson, Renner, Rogers, Sandelowski, Sawin, Selassie, Smith, Strom-Gottfried, Sulik, Sweeney, Taylor, Templeton, Tiwana, Vick, Wallace, Weinberg, Wilson, Wissick. The following 24 members were granted excused absences: Ammeman, Arnold, Bachenheimer, Bennett, Conover, Ewend, Gasaway, Holmgren, Kagarise, Marshall, Martin, Mesibov, Miguel, Muller, Murphy, Rock, Rustoni, Salmon, Simpson, Tauchen, Tobin, Trotman, Wolford, Yankaskas. The following four members were absent without excuse: Anton, Keagy, Lin, Sutherland.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Moeser told of efforts under way to update the data processing systems that support the University's enterprise systems. Our processes are embedded in systems that are old and reaching the point of no longer being supported by their original vendors. He said that many systems look contemporary on the surface, but underneath is obsolescent technology. Replacing these systems will be costly and painful, but it must be done. One of the challenges will be to charge the way we do business in many of the processes because the more customization that must be done to fit unique circumstances, the more costly. He said that Vice Chancellor Dan Reed has assembled a committee of faculty and staff to assist in the work.

The chancellor reported that the SACS reaccreditation team is scheduled to be on campus April 13-15, 2006. The team is chaired by Michael F. Adams, President of the University of Georgia.

Prof. Andrew Perrin (Sociology) asked for comment on recent demonstrations concerned with working conditions for food service workers in Lenoir Hall. Chancellor Moeser said that the University has had conversations with ARAMARK, the contractor that manages our food service operations, and that we have found that the company is in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Unlike State employees, ARAMARK workers have full rights to organize. The University's position on organizing efforts is strict neutrality.

Prof. Lloyd Kramer (History) reported that he has been contacted by a number of retired faculty members who are upset by the recent change in their access to on-campus parking permits.

Annual Reports to the Faculty Council

Prof. Wegner spoke briefly to the Annual Report of the Faculty Assembly Delegation.

Prof. Michael Lienesch, Chair of the Committee on University Government, moved adoption of Resolution 2006-1 Amending the Faculty Code of University Government as it Relations to the Membership of the University Committee on Copyright. Prof. Lienesch said that Chancellor Moeser had requested that the director of the University of North Carolina Press, or the director's designee, be made

an ex officio members of the Copyright Committee. The Committee on University Government endorses this request and recommends adoption of this amendment to the Faculty Code.

Resolution 2006-1 was adopted on first reading. See Appendix A.

Briefing and Discussion of the Difficult Dialogues Initiative

Prof. Wegner introduced a presentation on the Difficult Dialogues Initiative. UNC-Chapel Hill was one of 27 universities nationwide who were successful in securing funding from the Ford Foundation in connection with the launch of its recent Difficult Dialogues initiative. Among other things, our campus will work to develop discussion and moderator materials concerning how religious belief and intellectual inquiry intersect in a public university setting.

Prof. Wegner introduced Professor Emerita Margaret Holt, formerly on the faculty of the University of Georgia and now working as a consultant for the National Issues Forums Network through the Kettering Foundation.

Prof. Holt explained that the National Issues Forum seeks to address controversial issues through deliberation, not debate. The Forum works to frame an issue not as a yes or no, right or wrong dichotomy but as a choice among three or more options. She showed an 11-minute video on immigration issues as an example of the Forum's work.

Prof. Holt said that when Carolina submitted its proposal to the Ford Foundation, there was a suggestion that it would be beneficial to have issues framed that focus on tensions stemming from students' spirituality. She said that the Forum is helping establish a process for doing that. Prof. Holt said that the faculty can help address several questions: who are the critical people to be involved; what are the critical places to be visited; what documents would be helpful to those framing the issues; and how can the Faculty Council contribute to this endeavor, assuming that it wants to be involved.

Prof. Karen Booth (Women's Studies) said there is a "big elephant in the room that no one wants to talk about," and that is that two of the incidents that led to this initiative involved actions against gay/lesbian students. She thought it wrong to frame this entirely as matter of religious viewpoint.

Prof. John Sweeney (Journalism and Mass Communication) asked Prof. Holt how the Forum would maintain civil dialogue when one of the obvious options is not acceptable to the University. Prof. Holt replied that the Forum doesn't conduct votes, it fosters conversation.

Prof. Bereket Selassie (African and Afro-American Studies) said that he is quite interested in the intersection between international issues and national policy. He cited as an example the intersection between Islamic law (Sharia) and international law.

Prof. Andrew Perrin (Sociology) said that he finds the initiative to be exciting. He would like to add a concern that as we enter dialogue, we not minimize how difficult and contentious the issues are. He said we need to deal frankly with the fact that requiring calmness and civility may actually rule out an important element of why people believe and act as they do.

Report on Sustainability at UNC-Chapel Hill

Prof. Douglas Crawford-Brown, Chair of the Sustainability Task Force, distributed copies of the task force report and briefly summarized its recommendations.

Adjournment

Its business having been completed, the Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Appendix A

Resolution 2006-1. Amending the *Faculty Code of University Government* as it Relates to the Membership of the University Committee on Copyright.

The General Faculty Resolves:

Section 1. Section 4-25 of the *Faculty Code of University Government* is amended to read as follows:

§ 4-25. University Committee on Copyright. (a) The University Committee on Copyright is appointed by the chancellor. It consists of (i) faculty members, (ii) one or more graduate students, serving one-year renewable terms, and (iii) members from campus units, such as the campus libraries and the Office of Technology Development, that are involved in intellectual property matters. The Director the University of North Carolina Press, or the Director's designee, is an ex officio member. Faculty members constitute a majority of the members of the committee.

(b) The committee represents to the chancellor and the University community the concerns of faculty and other users and creators of scholarly information. The committee's functions include:

- 1) monitoring trends in such areas as institutional or consortial copyright use policies, changes in copyright ownership models, and guidelines for fair use of information in all formats;
- 2) identifying areas in which policy development is needed and recommending to the chancellor new or revised institutional policies and guidelines;
- 3) cooperating with the administration to propose and monitor the application of University policies and guidelines regarding ownership and use of copyrighted or licensed scholarly works; and
- 4) assisting in identifying educational needs of the faculty and others related to compliance with copyright policies and guidelines, and advising on appropriate ways to address those needs.

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.