



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

## MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, December 6<sup>th</sup> 2002 at 3:00 p.m.

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

Chancellor James Moeser and Professor Sue Estroff, Chair of the Faculty, will preside.

### AGENDA

Type	Time	Item
	3:00	<i>Call to Order. The Secretary of the Faculty.</i>
DISC	3:00	<b>Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time.</b> Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments.
DISC	3:15	<b>Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty.</b> Professor Sue Estroff invites questions or comments.
INFO	3:30	<b>Annual Report of the Faculty Committee on University Government.</b> Professor Elizabeth Gibson, Chair.
ACT	3:35	<b>Resolutions Amending the Faculty Code of University Government.</b> Resolution 2002-8 amending the Code as it relates to the Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences. Resolution 2002-9 amending the Code as it relates to the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.
DISC	3:40	<b>Discussion of the Faculty Salary Equity Study.</b>
INFO	3:50	<b>Annual Report of the Status of Women Committee.</b> Professor Etta Pisano, Chair.
DISC	4:00	<b>Report of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure.</b> Professors Paul Farel and Barbara Harris, Co-chairs.
INFO	4:25	<b>Progress Report of the Task Force on the Academic Plan.</b> Associate Provost Steve Allred.
INFO	4:30	<b>Progress Report on the Honor System Reform Process.</b> Professor Judith Wegner.
DISC	4:45	<b>Open Discussion of Topics Raised by Faculty Members.</b>
ACT	5:00	<b>Adjourn.</b>

Joseph S. Ferrell  
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY: **ACT** = Action, **DISC** = Discussion, **INFO** = Information.  
Documents pertaining to meetings of the Council may be found at [www.unc.edu/faculty/facoun](http://www.unc.edu/faculty/facoun) on the Web.

Annual Report of the  
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT  
For Presentation to the Faculty Council on  
December 6, 2002

**Current Members:**

Joseph S. Ferrell (ex officio)  
Elizabeth Gibson (2003), Chair  
Don Higginbotham (2005)  
Michael Lienesch (2005)  
Mary Lynn (2005)  
Janet Mason (2003)  
Vincas Steponaitis (2003)  
Thomas Warburton (2004)

**Members leaving the committee this year:** Jean Goeppinger, James L. Peacock, III  
**Meeting Dates:** January 23, 2002; April 29, 2002; May 9, 2002; October 1, 2002;  
October 21, 2002; November 25, 2002.

**Annual Report prepared by:** Elizabeth Gibson, chair. This report covers the period  
from January 2002 to December 2002.

**Committee Charge.** Section 4-19 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* reads  
as follows:

4-19. **Faculty Committee on University Government.** (a) The committee shall consist of seven members appointed by the chancellor, serving for staggered and renewable terms of three years each. The secretary of the faculty will serve as an ex officio member.

(b) The committee shall be especially concerned with the continuing development, adaptation, and interpretation of *The Faculty Code of University Government*. Subject to the powers of the University's Board of Governors and president, and of the Board of Trustees and the chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the *Code* represents legislation enacted by the faculty regarding forms of internal organization and procedures at this institution which are deemed necessary for its fair and effective operation.

(c) The committee should periodically review the existing *Code* and solicit suggestions for its improvement, and should recommend appropriate amendments in the *Code* for consideration and vote of the General Faculty. As provided under Article I of the *Code*, it should consider and report on other proposals to amend the *Code* and shall also periodically make appropriate adjustments of the elective representatives in the Faculty Council. The committee may also consider and report on special questions of the University governance which may be referred to it by the chancellor or members of the faculty. The committee shall be especially concerned with maintaining internal forms and procedures of academic administration which reflect principles of democracy and equity, vision and adaptability, and quality and responsibility, toward achieving the intellectual aims of the University.

**Report of Activities.**

*Resolutions Presented and Adopted.* The committee completed its work related to the following resolutions, which the General Faculty approved on first reading in January 2002 and adopted unanimously on February 22, 2002.

Resolution 2002-1. Amending The Faculty Code of University Government as it relates to the composition and selection of members of the Administrative Board of the Library.

Resolution 2002-2. Amending The Faculty Code of University Government to reflect a change in University organization and title and to authorize the Committee on University Government to effect amendments to reflect current titles and names of academic and administrative units and titles.

*Resolutions Presented.* The committee proposes and by separate documents presents today for approval on first reading by the General Faculty the following resolutions:

Resolution 2002-8. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the specification of officers of Arts and Sciences Divisions and eligibility to vote for and hold such offices.

Resolution 2002-9. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the responsibilities and membership of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

*Ongoing.* In response to a request from the chair of the faculty, the committee has been engaging in a thorough review of *The Faculty Code of University Government* with an eye toward proposing amendments that will promote consistency among provisions and bring the *Code* in line with current faculty governance and University practices.



*The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

**Resolution # 2002-8. Amending The Faculty Code of University Government as it relates to the specification of officers of Arts and Sciences Divisions and eligibility to vote for and hold such offices.**

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Section 8-5 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

**§ 8-5. Divisional faculties.** (a) The faculty of each Arts and Sciences Division shall be composed of the faculty members of its component departments. Each Division shall have a chair; ~~a vice-chair, a secretary, and an Advisory Committee consisting of at least one representative from each of the component departments; all shall serve terms of three years and such other officers as its by-laws specify.~~ The chair and other officers shall be elected by members of the voting faculty holding primary appointments in departments and curricula assigned to the Division. ~~The faculty of each Division shall elect a chair.~~ Each Division, in consultation with the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, shall adopt appropriate rules and regulations governing its functions and procedures, including procedures for the ~~selection of a vice-chair, a secretary, and departmental representatives on the Advisory Committee electing its officers.~~ The faculty of each Division shall meet at least once each year upon the call of the chair.

(b) Each Division, within its area and in cooperation with the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, shall concern itself with the courses and curricula, shall originate and develop educational objectives and implement these policies, and the chairs of the several Divisions shall be members of the Committee on Instructional Personnel. In addition, they shall serve in an advisory capacity, upon request or upon their own initiative, to the respective departments and to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in matters involving budgetary, personnel, and instructional problems.

~~(e) Only members holding the faculty ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor have the right to vote for and hold the offices of Division chair and vice chair.~~

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.



*The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

**Resolution # 2002-9. Amending The Faculty Code of University Government as it relates to the responsibilities and membership of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.**

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Section 4-24 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

**§ 4-24. Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.** (a) The Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions shall consist of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the General College or the dean's designee as chair; the associate dean for academic advising in the College of Arts and Sciences of the General College; the vice chairs of the Divisions of Fine Arts, Humanities, Basic and Applied Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences; and two other academic deans from outside the College of Arts and Sciences and seven faculty members engaged in undergraduate instruction, all appointed by the provost. At least five of these faculty members shall hold primary appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences. The two academic deans shall be selected by the Committee on Instructional Personnel and shall be rotated on three-year terms; if their terms as dean end before their terms on the committee, the Committee on Instructional Personnel shall make other appointments. The committee may add ad hoc members (who shall be faculty members engaged in undergraduate instruction) as it deems necessary. The university registrar, the director of undergraduate admissions, and the vice chancellor and dean of for student affairs shall be ex officio, non-voting members of the committee. The committee shall meet at least once each semester or more on call of the chair. The chair shall call a meeting whenever requested by the university registrar or the director of undergraduate admissions.

(b) The committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the director of undergraduate admissions. In particular, it shall address the design and application of admissions policy, recommend guidelines for special talent and exceptional admissions, and monitor and respond to the national college admissions environment.

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.

## Status of Women Committee Annual Report November 25, 2002

---

**Members:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Department</u>	<u>Term</u>
Etta Pisano --Chair	Radiology & Biomedical Engineering	2005
Virginia Dickie	Allied Health Sciences	2004
Annegret Fauser	Music	2004
Julie Fishell	Dramatic Art	2004
Jean Goeppinger	Nursing	2003
Gail E. Henderson	Social Medicine	2003
Gregory Cable	Dramatic Art	2005
Margaret Lanchantin	Exercise & Sport Science	2005
Peter Rock	Medicine	2005
Thomas Whitmore	Geography	2004

**Meeting Dates:** January 18, 2002, April 12, 2002, September 13, 2002, October 25, 2002, November 22, 2002

**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)

**Report of Activities:**

Fall Semester, 2002

The Committee met with Lynn Williford and Bernadette Gray-Little to review the results of the Salary Gender Equity Study.

The Committee worked with other women’s groups around campus, the Carolina Women’s Center, the Association of Women Faculty and Professionals and the Association of Professional Women in the Medical School (APWTMS) to hear feedback from women on the results of the salary study and to create proposals for UNC-CH response to the study.

The Committee subsequently met to finalize response proposals to the salary gender equity study to be presented to the Faculty Council on 12/6/02.

## *Executive Summary*

### **Report on the 2002 Faculty Salary Equity Study**

#### **A Study by the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost**

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**  
*Lynn Williford and Bernadette Gray-Little*

#### **Introduction**

This report describes the findings of a multiple regression analysis of faculty salaries to determine if systematic patterns of disparity by gender and ethnicity might exist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. A number of equity-related analyses have been conducted at the University during the past decade with selected faculty populations. However, findings of several widely publicized reports in the past two years concerning the status of women faculty in major research institutions suggested that increased representation had not necessarily led to salary and status equity. In response to those reports, several campus groups expressed an interest to Chancellor James Moeser and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert Shelton in seeing more research on equity issues concerning women and minority faculty on this campus. Executive Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little was asked to work with Dr. Lynn Williford, Assistant Provost and Director of Institutional Research, to conduct a campus-wide study on this topic. Input from various faculty committees was sought concerning specific research questions that should be addressed. Recommendations were made to study a variety of employment conditions that might be perceived as barriers by women and minorities. Provost Shelton determined that the immediate goal would be to determine if salary differences by gender and ethnicity could be detected after controlling for factors that should be compensable, with the possibility of pursuing related topics in subsequent years.

#### **Methodology**

**Study design.** Multiple regression analysis is the statistical method of choice for salary equity studies because it provides a means of estimating the impact of gender and ethnicity on salaries while holding constant other quantitative factors. A number of publications specific to faculty salary equity analyses were reviewed in the process of designing this study, including the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) publication *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty* (Haignere, 2002). Reviews were also undertaken of the methods used by other institutions, including Michigan, UCLA, UC-San Diego, UC-Irvine, MIT, the SUNY System, Cal Tech, Wisconsin, Illinois, Duke, Washington University, and NC State University. The UNC-Chapel Hill study differed from many of the other studies reviewed in terms of its inclusion of non-tenure track faculty and the clinical areas of Medicine and Dentistry.

**Data Sources and Population.** Data for the study were extracted from University payroll files, and reviewed for accuracy and completeness by department chairs. The population included all 2,566 individuals with a full-time, permanent, primary appointment as a faculty member on the designated census date, in either an active or on-leave status. Senior administrators in the roles of chancellor, dean, vice chancellor, provost, associate provost, or director of a major center or institute were excluded.

**Variables Used in the Analysis.** Variables used as predictors of salary were derived from existing campus electronic databases and included measures of: earned degrees, tenure status, distinguished professorships, rank, years since terminal degree, years at UNC-Chapel Hill, years in current rank, departmental affiliation, and the relative market value of the academic discipline. Notably missing from this study are measures of faculty productivity and quality, other than what is represented in the academic rank and distinguished title variables. Consistent with the approach taken by other institutions that have documented the many difficulties in quantifying merit for statistical analyses, the assumption was made that there are no systematic differences in productivity related to gender and ethnicity.

All salaries were adjusted to 9-month equivalents for faculty in Academic Affairs and 12-month equivalents for Health Affairs. Clinical income received by School of Medicine and School of Dentistry faculty was captured and added to base salaries to model the unique compensation policies of those units.

## Results

Faculty data were aggregated into three major units for analysis: (1) Academic Affairs, with additional analyses of tenured/tenure track faculty and the College of Arts and Sciences; (2) the School of Medicine, with additional analyses of tenured/tenure track faculty and those in clinical medicine departments; and (3) other Health Affairs units (Pharmacy, Public Health, Nursing, and Dentistry). Several methods of regression analyses recommended in the literature were used to examine the relationship between gender/ethnicity and salaries; in the table below, the coefficients are expressed in terms of the average salary differences in dollars for females and minorities compared to white males after controlling for all other variables in the model.

Multiple Regression Model Results			
	N	%	R <sup>2</sup> Coefficient
<b>Academic Affairs</b>			
Total Population	1,090	100.0%	.819
Female	353	32.3%	-\$1,332
Minority	153	14.0%	\$1,680
<b>Tenured/Tenure Track Only</b>			
Total Population	927	100.0%	.814
Female	261	28.1%	-\$1,830
Minority	129	13.9%	\$1,249
<b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</b>			
Total Population	743	100.0%	.786
Female	211	28.4%	-\$1,169
Minority	106	14.3%	629
<b>School of Medicine (MD and doctoral degree holders only)</b>			
Total Population	941	100.0%	.817
Female	283	30.3%	-\$6,976*
Minority	121	12.9%	-\$597
<b>Tenured/Tenure Track Only</b>			
Total Population	612	100.0%	.796
Female	139	22.7%	-\$6,713*
Minority	65	10.6%	\$6,261
<b>Clinical Medicine Departments</b>			
Total Population	676	100.0%	.793
Female	200	33.2%	-\$9,293*
Minority	81	12.0%	-\$195
<b>Other Health Affairs Units (Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Public Health)</b>			
Total Population	421	100.0%	.800
Female	196	46.5%	-\$3,440
Minority	53	12.6%	\$2,552

\*Would be considered significantly different from zero at p<.05 in a random sample of this size, but in an analysis of a population where inference to a larger group is not the objective, statistical significance is generally considered irrelevant, and the coefficients are treated as actual differences. See main report for discussion of the use of statistical significance in faculty salary equity studies.

Each of the models attempted was highly predictive of salaries, with R<sup>2</sup> values averaging .80. This indicates that about 80% of the variability in faculty salaries could be accounted for by the variables included in this study. Furthermore, across all populations and all models attempted, the strongest predictors of salary were those variables that we normally expect to be related to higher salaries: full professor rank, distinguished professorship, administrator of a large unit, tenure track appointment as opposed to fixed term, and specialization in a relatively high paying discipline.

After adjustments for the variables expected to be related to higher salaries, the variables gender and ethnicity contributed very little to the overall prediction of salaries. However, examination of the coefficients indicates that status as a minority member was positively related to salary in all but the School of Medicine analyses, where a very small negative differential was observed. Average female salaries lagged behind the average for the white male reference category in every analysis, ranging from a deficit of \$1,169 in the College of Arts & Sciences to \$9,293 in Clinical Medicine.

Although the models developed are quite robust, the results indicate that between fifteen and twenty-five percent of the variability in faculty salaries was not explained by the analyses. This remaining variability is quite likely due to differences in the quality of faculty contributions that are not accounted for in the regression analyses. Therefore, the results of this study should be treated as preliminary only. Further analyses at the school/department level might focus on individuals with large negative disparities between their predicted and actual salaries in an attempt to determine what productivity differences or other factors might account for the observed gap.



Committee on the Status of Women  
Gender Equity Proposal

Part A

All faculty members must be paid fairly without regard to gender or race. To accomplish that end, all of the data from the recent UNC-CH salary equity study should be provided to an independent faculty panel that will immediately work with Lynn Williford to determine which women should receive immediate financial redress for inappropriately low salaries. All employees whose salaries differ significantly from the multiple regression model must be identified by this group and investigated confidentially. **If there is insufficient reason for the evident salary differential for these employees, they should be given raises so that the model predicts their salaries.**

This panel will include faculty members with appropriate statistical expertise, at least one member of the Committee on the Status of Women, and representatives of faculty women's groups from around campus.

Part B

Committees on Salary Equity, based at each professional school, and each institute and division of the College of Arts and Sciences, will be formed. These committees will be charged with annually reviewing all salaries, including one-time payments, for all faculty of the relevant administrative unit.

These committees will:

- Consist of faculty members from the relevant administrative unit and will be elected by the faculty of that unit for three-year terms.
- Consist of no more than 5 faculty members, at least two of whom are women and one of whom is from an under-represented minority group.
- Write an annual public report on its activities.
- Review the information submitted annually by the Chairs and other administrators under Part D of this proposal.
- Make recommendations to the Chancellor for correction of salary inequities as revealed in these annual reports.

Part C

The publicly available salary information for all faculty should include all compensation received from the university during the previous year, including bonuses and supplements, as is currently required by law.

## Part D

In order to promote equity for women faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, annual reports by all deans, chairs, and center directors will henceforth include specific data on their efforts for gender equity within their own administrative areas.

These annual reports will include the following information.

- 1) Salaries, supplements and bonuses of men and women by rank and length of time at rank.
- 2) Percentage of male and female faculty who are tenure-track versus fixed term appointments.
- 3) Percentage of newly hired faculty who are men and women. Percentage of applicants for the position who are men and women. Percentage of those interviewed who are men and women. Percentage of those offered second interviews who are men and women. Composition of all search committees.
- 4) Percentage of men and women faculty who stay in the department through their first tenure review. Percentage of men and women who reach tenure review and who are awarded tenure. Percentage of men and women faculty who are promoted to Professor.
- 5) Percentage of men and women faculty who have been nominated and awarded distinguished professorships, endowed chairs and university and national prizes.
- 6) Description of non-salary compensation in start-up packages, for all new faculty members, including summary of efforts to obtain employment for their domestic partners, for all new faculty members.
- 7) Description of non-salary compensation provided to all male and female faculty members, including space (square footage provided per dollar of overhead receipts, where appropriate), secretarial support, and discretionary funding, etc.
- 8) Percentage of time spent by men and women faculty, subdivided by rank, doing research, teaching, committee work, clinical work, and other responsibilities.
- 9) Description of retention strategies employed for all faculty who have left UNC in the last year.

These measures were selected because they are known to influence the salary of faculty members. Many of them (1-6) are readily available through existing databases. The others could be obtained by administrators through center or departmental records. The focus of deans and other administrators should be on data interpretation rather than retrieval. Performance goals can be set for the items and the achievement of these goals can be monitored. Most of these measures were not included in the Chancellor's recent salary equity study.

Benchmarks for success over defined periods of time, and exceptions for reporting expectations based on the unique circumstances of particular administrative units, would be set by the Provost's office in consultation with administrators and faculty. If administrators did not meet these predetermined goals, a written explanation would be expected in their annual reports. Decisions regarding reappointment and raises for these individuals would be based in part on their achievement of their gender equity goals.

It is hoped that this annual exercise will raise the consciousness to issues of gender equity by UNC-CH administrators, and will allow the Chancellor's office to monitor the status of women faculty on this campus, with the goal of preventing salary inequity in the future.



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Faculty Council

FROM: Robert Shelton, Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Provost  
Darryl Gless, Senior Associate Dean, College of  
Arts and Sciences

DATE: November 18, 2002

RE: Academic Plan Draft

Since last spring we have co-chaired a task force charged to develop an academic strategic plan for Carolina. The roster of task force members is attached.

For your consideration we provide the current draft of the Academic Plan. This draft reflects the Task Force's work based on their charge to produce a set of academic themes and priorities to guide resource allocation for the next five years. The next important next step is to render those general themes more concrete -- in effect to give the document the degree of specificity that will make it useful for decision makers.

We welcome all comments you wish to make about this document. We are also particularly interested, however, in your ideas about specific areas that promise to reward investment. These can be either inter-disciplinary areas that cross departmental and school boundaries, now emphasized in this draft, or fundamentally important single disciplines and professional programs. The latter are now referred to most often in general terms. Your review can provide the concreteness in those areas and others that the plan now requires.

This draft will be distributed at the Faculty Council meeting of December 6, 2002. We will have time for discussion of the draft at the January meeting, but also ask that in the interim you provide your suggestions to Darryl Gless at [glessd@email.unc.edu](mailto:glessd@email.unc.edu). Thank you for your help as we make this draft responsive to the needs of the entire University.

Academic Planning Task Force Roster -- March 4, 2002

Robert N. Shelton, Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Provost (Committee Co-Chair)  
Office of the Provost  
CB #3000, South Building  
2-2198 [robert\\_shelton@unc.edu](mailto:robert_shelton@unc.edu)

Professor Darryl Gless (Committee Co-Chair)  
Senior Associate Dean  
College of Arts and sciences  
CB #3100, South Building  
2-9270 [glessd@email.unc.edu](mailto:glessd@email.unc.edu)

Professor Steve Allred, Associate Provost  
for Academic Initiatives  
Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
CB #3000, South Building  
2-4510 [steve\\_allred@unc.edu](mailto:steve_allred@unc.edu)

Professor Harry Amana  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
CB #3365, Carroll Hall  
2-4080 [harryamana@unc.edu](mailto:harryamana@unc.edu)

Dr. Ned Brooks  
Department of Health Policy & Administration  
School of Public Health  
CB #7400, McGavran-Greenberg Hall  
3-4846 [ned\\_brooks@unc.edu](mailto:ned_brooks@unc.edu)

Dr. Linda Carl, Assistant Provost for Educational Programs  
Office of Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
CB #3000, South Building  
2-4008 [linda\\_carl@unc.edu](mailto:linda_carl@unc.edu)

Professor Ray Dooley  
Department of Dramatic Art  
CB #3230, Center for Dramatic Art  
2-8272 [rdooley@email.unc.edu](mailto:rdooley@email.unc.edu)

Professor Arturo Escobar  
Department of Anthropology  
CB #3115, Alumni Building  
3-7392 [aescobar@email.unc.edu](mailto:aescobar@email.unc.edu)

Professor Sue Estroff  
Chair of the Faculty  
Office of Faculty Governance  
CB #9170, Carr Building  
2-1671 [sue\\_estroff@med.unc.edu](mailto:sue_estroff@med.unc.edu)

Ms. Frances Ferris  
856 Morrison Dorm  
UNC-Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514  
914-1538 [fferris@email.unc.edu](mailto:fferris@email.unc.edu)

Ms. Rebecca Frucht  
230 Granville Towers East  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-3651  
370-5616 [rfrucht@email.unc.edu](mailto:rfrucht@email.unc.edu)

Professor Elizabeth Gibson  
School of Law  
CB #3380, Van Hecke-Wettach Hall  
2-8506 [elizabeth.gibson@unc.edu](mailto:elizabeth.gibson@unc.edu)

Ms. Carol Jenkins, Director  
Health Sciences Library  
CB #7585, HSL  
6-2111 [carol\\_jenkins@unc.edu](mailto:carol_jenkins@unc.edu)

Dr. Joseph Jordan, Director  
Sonja Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center  
CB #5250, Student Union  
2-9001 [jfordan@email.unc.edu](mailto:jfordan@email.unc.edu)

Mr. Gary Lloyd  
Office of the Registrar  
CB #2100, Hanes Hall  
2-9857 [gary\\_lloyd@unc.edu](mailto:gary_lloyd@unc.edu)

Dr. Jerry Lucido, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management  
and Director of Undergraduate Admissions  
CB #2200, Jackson Hall  
6-3623 [jlucido@email.unc.edu](mailto:jlucido@email.unc.edu)

Professor Laurie Mesibov  
School of Government  
CB #3330, Knapp Building  
6-4253 [mesibov@iogmail.iog.unc.edu](mailto:mesibov@iogmail.iog.unc.edu)

Mr. Britt Mize  
Department of English  
CB #3520, Greenlaw Hall  
914-7569 [bmize@email.unc.edu](mailto:bmize@email.unc.edu)

Professor Gene Orringer  
Executive Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs  
School of Medicine  
CB #7000, MacNider  
3-9485 [epo@med.unc.edu](mailto:epo@med.unc.edu)

Professor David Reeve  
Department of Philosophy  
CB #3125, Caldwell Hall  
6-3318 [cddreeve@email.unc.edu](mailto:cddreeve@email.unc.edu)

Ms. Mariecia Smith  
4202 Bernau Avenue, Apt. E  
Greensboro, NC 27407-4301  
(336) 855-3714 [mymith@email.unc.edu](mailto:mymith@email.unc.edu)

Professor Linda Spremulli  
Department of Chemistry  
CB #3290, Kenan Laboratories  
6-1567 [lls@email.unc.edu](mailto:lls@email.unc.edu)

Professor Ron Strauss, Chair  
Department of Dental Ecology  
School of Dentistry  
CB #7450, Dental Office Building  
6-2788 [ron\\_strauss@dentistry.unc.edu](mailto:ron_strauss@dentistry.unc.edu)

Professor Rich Superfine  
Department of Physics and Astronomy  
CB #3255, Phillips Hall  
2-1185 [rsuper@physics.unc.edu](mailto:rsuper@physics.unc.edu)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE**  
**TO REVIEW THE STUDENT JUDICIAL SYSTEM**  
**JUNE 2002**

The following two pages represent a brief summary of the most significant elements of the report of the Chancellor's Task Force to Review the Student Judicial System. The recommendations that follow, while important, are not exhaustive of all of the changes the Task Force has proposed. The Task Force hopes that the report in its entirety—and the recommendations proposed therein—will not be forgotten simply because the executive summary exists. (The full report is at <http://judicialreport.unc.edu> on the Web.)

**STRENGTHS OF THE CURRENT STUDENT JUDICIAL SYSTEM**

- One of the greatest strengths of the system is that it is essentially student-run.
- Since the 1830s students have assumed leadership of the student disciplinary system at UNC Chapel Hill, resulting in a view of administrators not as disciplinary bodies or enemies to students, but as sources of education and guidance.
- Students' rights (i.e., provision of student counsel, right to appeal, protection of basic rights) and privacy interests are of paramount importance in the current system.
- Normative sanctions for academic dishonesty and for drug offenses allow consistency in assigning responsibility and give students some measure of the seriousness of violating the Code.
- The University Hearings Board, comprised of members of the faculty, administrative staff and student body, serves the important function of appellate review for the judicial system.
- The professions have their own codes of ethics, and because they have their own judicial systems, the professional schools can more appropriately incorporate these into their student systems, presently separate from the undergraduate system.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Many faculty members feel disengaged from the judicial process and often choose not to use the student judicial system.
- Because faculty support of and student participation in the judicial system are not as strong as they should be, the campus climate is less than ideal for the practice of honor.
- The standard of proof "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt" is very difficult to meet in many cases.
- Sanctions currently have little deterrent value because discipline is not announced publicly and therefore is not visible to students. Normative sanctions help somewhat with this problem, but the present lack of flexibility in the sanctions as written causes them often to be ignored. Additionally, normative sanctions for graduate students are frequently not imposed.
- Although only three grounds for appeal exist in the Instrument, in practice almost anything can be appealed as nothing in the judicial system constitutes a disincentive to filing.
- The complexity of the system means that sanctions are usually imposed many months after the alleged offense, resulting in a delayed and often lost opportunity for education of the accused student.
- A clear description of the rights and responsibilities of complainants and defendants is integral to the operation of the student judicial system. Currently this information is scattered throughout various parts of the Instrument.
- Although without exception faculty and student participants in the system expressed their support for its tenets and procedures, they also expressed a need for a more systematic training protocol designed to reinforce their skills and reassure them of their competence to carry out their roles consistent with the aims of the system.

#### PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Create the position of the Student Advocate for Honor to coordinate education across the campus, as well as tangible public relations efforts on campus, including the use of the *Daily Tar Heel* and other means of promoting community awareness. Have periodic campus-wide discussions and debates about the responsibilities of all constituents for the promotion of honesty, integrity and personal responsibility.
- Create the position of Faculty Adviser to the Student Attorney General so that the Student Attorney General will have available a faculty member with whom to discuss charge decisions pertaining to academic dishonesty.
- Change the standard of proof from the more stringent "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt" to "By Clear and Convincing Evidence" for all charges in both academic integrity and conduct cases.
- Establish the Informal Faculty-Student Session as an alternative route for academic integrity cases.
- Add a scale of normative sanctions, including for Campus Code violations, that takes a broad range of mitigating and aggravating factors into account.
- Add to the range of normative sanctions for academic integrity the "XF" grade ("failure due to academic dishonesty"). Institute an honor/integrity course requirement that would allow the "X" to be removed but would retain the "F" on a student's transcript.
- Create three-person Appeals Review Committee comprised of experienced University Hearings Board members to determine whether a student should be granted a University Hearings Board hearing.
- Acknowledge and perhaps formalize the Honor Court Expedited Hearing Process as a fast-track option for guilty pleas in both academic integrity and conduct cases.
- Develop a simplified, unitary document addressing integrity on campus, not to replace the Instrument, but to familiarize the campus community with the basic premises and procedures of the system. The statement Basic Premises should be simplified so that the very specific core beliefs of the system are easily understood.
- Request the Chair of the Faculty to oversee recruitment of faculty members to serve on University Hearings Boards.



November 11, 2002

DRAFT

Academic Plan

## The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

### Introduction

We stand at a key crossroad as Carolina enters its third century. Through the official launching of the Carolina First Campaign, implementation of the Campus Master Plan, development of Carolina North, renewal of the undergraduate curriculum, and the exercise of visionary leadership, we seek to become the leading public university in the United States. The University of North Carolina has helped transform the State and the South; has emerged as a leading research university; has developed a deep tradition of public service; and has demonstrated a persisting commitment to excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and professional teaching. At the same time, Carolina occupies a region undergoing rapid demographic changes. Seeking to reflect those changes, we seek to become more diverse and to increase our international presence.

This academic plan aims to specify how, during the first decade of the twenty-first century, Carolina will realize the purposes set forth in its mission statement:

The mission of the University is to serve all the people of the State, and indeed the nation, as a center for scholarship and creative endeavor. The University exists to teach students at all levels in an environment of research, free inquiry, and personal

responsibility; to expand the body of knowledge; to improve the condition of human life through service and publication; and to enrich our culture.

Guided by that statement and our aspiration to be nation's leading public university, this plan describes our overarching goals and provides a template for budget allocation for the next five years. As public and private funding becomes available senior leaders should adhere as closely as possible to the plan's priorities. Since the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge is the University's fundamental purpose, these priorities should also determine the shape and implementation of the University's financial and other supporting plans.

#### **Foundational Budgetary Criteria**

All budgetary decisions will favor programs that have broad educational impact either within or beyond the University and that provide or promise significant advances in research, intellectual substance, depth, and excitement. The fundamental goal of this academic plan is to enable us to preserve and strengthen what Carolina already does well while standing ready to grasp new opportunities.

In drafting the Academic Plan, the Task Force drew upon three excellent and extensive sources: (1) the Report of the Intellectual Climate Task Force of 1997; (2) the Carolina First Campaign Report of 2002; and (3) the Curriculum Review Project in the College of Arts and Sciences of 2001-02. The plan is to be read in conjunction with those reports.

## **Academic Strengths and Priorities**

Carolina enthusiastically embraces its public identity and its public mission, yet embodies a standard of excellence equal to that of great private universities. One of Carolina's enduring strengths is its capacity to provide an exceptional liberal-arts education for undergraduates in a research university setting. Exemplary strengths in the humanities and social sciences, the requirement that all students complete a single, strong General College curriculum, an "out of class" campus environment that complements students' in-class experience, and an unwavering commitment to excellent teaching are among Carolina's defining features.

Equally important are our graduate and professional programs and our commitment to excellence in basic and natural sciences. We have made a major commitment to build the science complex and to allocate substantial resources to the rapidly developing scientific areas, including genomics and proteomics. We are also seeking to develop an arts common, with a concomitant programmatic emphasis on the arts.

Carolina's graduate and professional degree programs have emerged during the past half-century as leaders in many areas. Their continued development, adequate funding, and mutually reinforcing relationship with undergraduate studies will require unrelenting attention.

## **Prudent Program Expansion**

The University must avoid over-expansion, which could cause it to stray from core competencies. If we lose sight of our strengths and expand without sufficient forethought into areas in which we have less proficiency, we may lose our strength. Conversely, we cannot cling to outmoded models and practices, allowing reluctance or nostalgia to forestall actions needed to keep pace with a changing world.

So far, Carolina has steered a middle course, and should continue to do so. University leaders must carefully consider expansion into new areas and, once decided upon, fully support those initiatives by providing adequate infrastructure, faculty, staff, and funding.

Carolina is also distinguished by its tradition of interdisciplinary scholarship and curricula. There are outstanding programs and faculty clusters engaged in the study of American, European, and world histories and cultures, in demography and population dynamics, and in a broad variety of social science and health programs. Barriers to interdisciplinary programs remain, however, as stated below.

### **Modest Growth**

To preserve core areas of academic excellence, the University must grow only modestly and slowly. Carolina has reached a size at which it is both large enough to attain a critical mass of competing and complementary thought, and a national and international visibility and voice. Yet unlike some of its larger public peers, Carolina has retained a sense of place, philosophy, and collegiality that defines it as "Carolina."

### **Science Initiatives**

Carolina's recent expansion in the natural and material sciences has resulted in the groundbreaking for a long-awaited Science Complex, and a focus on imaginative collaborations among the sciences across campus. Genomics, nanoscience, proteomics, and new programs in human biology hold great promise for research and for graduate and undergraduate education.

### **Interdisciplinary Initiatives**

Bridging the sciences with the social sciences and humanities are new programs in health disparities and inequality, international health, and cultural studies of science. These initiatives join vital, existing curricula and research areas in social medicine and ethics, health promotion and disease prevention, American studies, and women's studies. These vibrant sub-disciplines and clusters draw faculty from diverse disciplines and students who bring with them a variety of intellectual and career interests.

### Arts Initiatives

Balancing this expansion in the sciences and enduring strengths in social sciences and humanities is Carolina's renewed commitment to the arts. Programs such as PlayMakers Repertory Company, which produces first-tier professional theatre; the Jazz Festival and the William S. Newman Artists Series, which attract musicians of international renown; and the Ackland Art Museum, which continues to collect and exhibit with thoughtful brilliance, are setting a high standard for the arts at Carolina. But thoughtful and committed expansion is in progress: the recent completion of the new Center for Dramatic Art, the coming expansion of the Ackland Art Museum, and the refurbishments of Memorial Hall, Hill Hall, and Playmakers Theatre demonstrate Carolina's renewed commitment to excellence in the arts.

What is required, then, to preserve and enhance the essence of Carolina, while at the same time being alert and prepared to respond to a world changing more rapidly than ever before? Achieving that balance between preservation, renewal, and innovation requires, first, informed, committed, and transparent leadership from those most responsible for Carolina's direction and resources. Above all, it requires continuing, broad discussion among

administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and continuous monitoring of progress toward shared goals.

### **Priorities**

To enhance that balance, the Academic Plan identifies six priorities: (1) further strengthening of the intellectual climate for undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies, (2) making significant gains in faculty recruitment, retention, and development, (3) furthering the integration of interdisciplinary research and education, (4) enhancing public engagement, (5) extending our international research, teaching, and presence, and (6) furthering our gains in faculty, student, and staff diversity. These priorities are discussed in turn below.

### **I. Strengthening the Intellectual Climate**

Five key changes must be made to strengthen the intellectual climate:

- Increase the number of small-group student experiences
- Better integrate student living and learning space
- Create a graduate student center and better integrate graduate students into the university community
- Broaden and improve the means of teaching
- Continue to improve undergraduate advising

A discussion of these recommendations follows.

Carolina's last self-study (1993-95) and the subsequent chancellor's Task Force on

Intellectual Climate envisioned a UNC Chapel Hill that would provide all its undergraduates a

more demanding, student-centered educational experience. That experience is to occur in small classes that engage students directly and actively in the processes of discovering, verifying, and presenting new knowledge; that extends into students lives outside the classroom, library, and laboratory; and that informs substantive and increasing engagement with communities beyond the university itself.

Many of the Intellectual Climate Task Force's recommendations have been implemented — including a summer reading program for entering students, an exciting and successful array of first-year seminars, expanded research opportunities for undergraduates, and a more coherent focus on service, fostered by a new Center for Public Service. To build on these successes, the Academic Plan Task Force urges the adoption of a five-part strategy, which will require aggressive pursuit of two overriding goals:

1. dramatic reduction of the current faculty/student ratio, and
2. development of better ways to "count," value, support and reward excellent teaching, — in classrooms as well as and in offices, laboratories, libraries, and service and research settings that reach beyond the university's boundaries.

Those actions promise success in realizing many of this plan's other primary goals — including, emphatically, faculty recruitment, retention, and development. Most directly, however, reducing the faculty/student ratio and valuing excellence in many kinds of teaching will contribute to the following five-part strategy:

1. First, the University must provide more small-group and experiential learning experiences, and make them available throughout our students' courses of study. The well-received first-year seminar program should be fully implemented to ensure that every first-year

student has at least one such seminar. The honors program should be expanded, and more upper-class seminars should be made available within undergraduate majors.

At every level, more courses should adopt innovative formats, including interdisciplinary seminars and inquiry-based seminars that are student-initiated (and in some cases student-led). Students must have greater opportunities to participate actively and frequently in class discussion and to express and test their ideas in conversation with other instructors and fellow students.

At the same time, students should be provided more opportunities to learn by doing and observing outside of the classroom. That will require more service-learning classes, more independent study opportunities, more internships, and more study-abroad options — as well as scholarships to make overseas experiences affordable for more of our students. Our goal is to enable every Carolina student to have the opportunity to participate in seminars, to study abroad, to engage in research projects, to perform public service, and to write a senior thesis.

2. Second, we must explore appropriate ways to integrate Carolina's living and learning environments. A cadre of faculty directors of study might maintain offices in campus residence halls and fraternity and sorority houses. These faculty directors would serve as advisors and activities directors, fostering intellectual growth outside of the classroom. The connection between intellectual life and living environments might be enhanced if first- and second-year students were primarily located in the residence halls nearest the classrooms and the faculty of the liberal-arts core classes that they take, although the changing geographical orientation of the campus, and the emerging mixed-use orientation of south campus development are already starting to address this concern. Moreover, orientation programming should be reviewed to ensure that it contributes directly to the immediate intellectual engagement of first-year students.



Fraternity and sorority rush must be re-examined to ensure that it does not detract from the immediate intellectual engagement and cultural immersion of first-year students. Finally, more residential spaces should be organized around academic themes.

3. Third, we need to create means for allowing graduate and professional students to integrate more fully into the life of the University. The presence of exemplary graduate and professional students immeasurably strengthens Carolina's undergraduate programs, just as the undergraduates help enliven and enrich graduate and professional studies. But graduate and professional study often focuses students on a distinct discipline, located on a single part of the campus. That experience, however, should not deprive graduate or professional students of the opportunity to engage with people in other disciplines. To alleviate this isolation, we should create a graduate student center in the heart of campus — a place in which students may gather informally and participate in interdisciplinary seminars. Graduate and professional students should also be recruited to serve as advisors and role models for undergraduates in dormitories, extracurricular activities, and within departments and schools.

4. Fourth, we need to encourage more faculty to think about the various ways students learn and how their teaching can best reach all students. Departments need to provide incentives that take into account the extra knowledge and skills needed to excel in problem-based learning, service learning, interdisciplinary education, and effective uses of instructional technology. Sustainable funding should be available for curricular innovation grants. Particular attention must be paid to the use of electronic technology, for both on-campus and distance learners, and to faculty involvement in the integration of technology into teaching.

5. Fifth, we need to continue to improve the undergraduate advising system. Recent advances in our computer-based audit system to help students meet formal requirements for

graduation have been helpful as has the hiring of full-time advisors. More advisors are needed, and they need better pay and improved career prospects.

#### **Areas for Investment**

Decisions about specific areas for increased investment in times of restricted resources must follow from extended discussions among Carolina's administrators, faculty, staff, and students. Here are some proposed recommendations to begin that discussion:

Increase faculty to bring the supply of first-year and honors seminars into better balance with demand, and to increase their availability in the appropriate departments. This investment will enhance the educational climate for undergraduate students and therefore preserve and reinforce one of Carolina's core strengths. Seminar topics will be adjusted as new areas of study develop through research, scholarly, and creative advances.

Particular areas of long-term and current strength as well as multi-disciplinary power and potential — all of which would draw students into first-year and honors seminars and research projects — include:

- Classical studies
- Medieval and early modern studies
- International studies,
- Latin American studies,
- Southern studies,
- American studies, and,
- African American studies.

Promising interdisciplinary areas that would also enrich undergraduate study while promoting renewal of the arts, internationalization, and diversity include the new initiatives in

Writing for the Screen and Stage, Jewish Studies, Middle Eastern Studies, and the established but burgeoning undergraduate program in International Studies.

#### **Measures of success**

The extent to which we make these changes will be measured using these metrics:

- Freshmen retention rates and graduation rates
- Number of undergraduates enrolled in first-year seminars
- Number of undergraduate courses enrolling fewer than 20 students
- Rate of student participation in undergraduate research and independent study
- Number of students in honors programs and in living-learning centers
- Number of distinguished scholarship recipients
- Student experience indices: teaching, advising, and intellectual climate

#### **II. Strengthening Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Development**

Six steps are important to strengthening faculty recruitment, retention, and development:

- Streamline the recruitment process and combine it with an effective spousal hiring program
- Create a sabbatical program
- Expand resources for course development
- Build sufficient infrastructure and staff support for faculty research
- Fully fund the libraries
- Create a faculty center

Sustaining Carolina's strengths and becoming the nation's leading public university will require unprecedented successes in recruiting, retaining, and developing extraordinary faculty members. The University will see unprecedented levels of retirements over the next decade, and

must therefore vigorously compete for the best talent in the entire national and international intellectual pool. To do this, we must pursue the following six goals:

1. First, we need to have searches that are flexible and continuing, that allow rapid identification of new talent, completion of negotiations, and formulation of offers. Because faculty members increasingly come as pairs, we need to use the strong base of colleges, universities, and businesses in the Triangle to enable Carolina to recruit both partners simultaneously. We must also acknowledge and respond to the special challenges of recruiting women and minorities, including adopting a tenure and a leave process that recognizes the difficulty of starting families while establishing research and teaching programs.

2. Second, faculty members need opportunities for recurrent retooling and development. The sustained intellectual life of the faculty requires time dedicated to research and, especially, for starting new research and teaching directions. Because of the information explosion and technologies that provide unprecedented access to research opportunities, productive faculty in all disciplines are obliged to devote increasing amounts of time simply trying to keeping abreast of new developments. Changing funding patterns also oblige them increasingly to spend time competing for external funding to maintain their research programs. New research and teaching directions require time devoted to study, often in the partnership with collaborators.

The single fundamental improvement that will enable Carolina to begin to confront these challenges more effectively is to develop a true sabbatical program. Although a patchwork of leave programs has increased research opportunities in recent years, the lack of a formal sabbatical program is a huge impediment to faculty development, one that puts Carolina at an increasingly serious competitive disadvantage in contrast to the well-funded private institutions and our peer public institutions.

3. Third, recognition of superb teaching must be increased, rewarded, and made more firmly a basis for tenure, promotion, and salary increments. Faculty do much of their most important teaching through advising, mentoring, directing independent study, and guiding students' research. This array of activities needs to be better appreciated and promoted within the university and better reported and explained to the broader community. And above all, opportunities for course development need to be increased, to enable faculty to design or redesign courses in ways that make most effective use of their research and of ever-improving instructional technologies. Expanded resources must be provided for course development and instruction.
4. Fourth, campus infrastructure is critical for the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty. This is especially true for centralized research facilities, and it includes not only equipment but well qualified and well compensated staff. The University needs to devote resources to developing the physical, chemical, biological and computational facilities on this campus - facilities that are considered part of the normal operations required for the science programs on other campuses. The science complex provides an historic opportunity for this campus, and the physical space that it provides should be complemented with a long-range plan for the establishment and maintenance of these resources.
5. Fifth, our libraries need to be better funded in order to keep up with the explosion of information and the reduction in purchasing power occasioned by unprecedented increases in costs, especially of scientific journals. There are dramatic changes looming in scholarly communication, brought about by the rising cost of traditional publishing; commercial and governmental pressures that restrict access to intellectual property; and the power of online technology to bring current information quickly to the point of use, as well as to archive and

make available vast amounts of information in multiple formats. Carolina must begin to sort out what this means to its success, and be willing to take a leadership role.

6. Sixth, the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty who are excellent in research requires the recruitment and development of first-quality graduate and professional students. Funding for graduate and professional students at Carolina must become much more competitive. We lose too many of our top candidates because other institutions — our peers as well as many lesser ones — can offer much better support for graduate education.

7. Seventh, a stronger sense of community within the faculty, and between the faculty, students and staff will also aid in faculty recruitment, retention, and development. It will also invigorate research and teaching that occurs when faculty and graduate students are able to get together frequently and informally. A sense of departmental isolation inhibits new intellectual initiatives and an appreciation of the larger life and contributions of the university. One way to mitigate this problem is to create a faculty center. And as the campus master planners pointed out, the University needs a series of indoor and outdoor social gathering places across the campus for informal encounters. Such spaces should be included in plans for future buildings.

#### **Areas for Investment**

The goals described above imply a series of high-priority funding targets:

- A continuing spousal hiring program, in partnership with nearby universities and businesses
- More competitive salaries and benefits
- A comprehensive, funded sabbatical program

- Special opportunities such as recruitment bonuses and summer salary in disciplines in which those benefits are rare
- Much increased and more broadly available research and travel funding for faculty who do not have endowed chairs
- Adequate and well-compensated staff to support research, teaching, and outreach
- Increased availability of course development grants

#### **Measures of Success:**

Metrics for achieving these steps include

- Number of winning competitions for department's first-choice hires
- Increasingly competitive salary and benefit packages for faculty
- Number of faculty retained despite offers by other institutions
- Percentage of funding increases for leaves, research, travel, summer salaries, and course development grants
- Ranking of library system by the Association of Research Libraries
- Increasing success in competition for top graduate and professional students

### **III. Furthering Interdisciplinary Education, Research, and Service**

Four steps must be taken to further interdisciplinary collaboration at Carolina:

- Review policies to reduce barriers to interdisciplinary work
- Encourage development of academic initiatives cutting across school boundaries
- Increase central funding for interdisciplinary research
- Provide common spaces for interdisciplinary exchange

Carolina has a well-deserved reputation for excellence in interdisciplinary education, research, and service. As a campus with a broad range of disciplines in close geographic proximity, the successes of inter-school, inter-center, and pan-university linkages among fields of inquiry provide a strategic opportunity for interdisciplinary research and education. To make that happen, the University's policies, structures, and its traditional walls between fields must become semi-permeable membranes that permit students and faculty to collaborate across disciplines and to maximize the possibility of creativity and innovation.

Although solid disciplinary knowledge in a field of inquiry remains an essential element of success, many complex problems require the ability to work beyond one's own specialty. Our graduates will be expected to work in teams comprising people who represent varied backgrounds, and Carolina's ability to model interdisciplinarity in the educational setting will better equip them to succeed in their careers. Similarly, interdisciplinary educational and service endeavors provide opportunities for further innovation, for developing non-traditional methodologies, and for sharing campus resources.

Therefore, increasing the array of collaborative, scholarly activities in education, research, and service of faculty and students from different professional schools and different departments in Arts and Sciences will further distinguish Carolina as a leader among universities.

#### **Measures of Success:**

Metrics for achieving these steps include:

- Reduced bureaucratic barriers to interdisciplinary work, which include piecemeal funding by individual academic units, problematic registration procedures, incompatible school calendars, and "red tape" such as requirements for numerous sign-offs for interdisciplinary endeavors



- Increased availability of funding reserved by central administration to support interdisciplinary education (curricula, area studies, institutes, etc.)
- The development of reward systems that encourage faculty to engage in interdisciplinary scholarship, education, and service
- Increases in common space available for interdisciplinary activities
- Increases in the number of dual degree and interdisciplinary certificate programs

#### **IV. Enhancing Engagement**

Four Key steps to enhance engagement include:

- Providing senior leadership in public engagement
- Developing strategic initiatives to meet major challenges facing the State
- Shifting our focus from public service to public engagement
- Building partnerships for engagement within and outside the University

As Chancellor Moeser said in his State of the University Address of September 4, 2002, Carolina's tradition and history of engagement and service to North Carolina are "part of our genetic code, a core value." Engagement with North Carolina, he added, "transcends public service, linking our research and creativity to the felt needs of the state." Through engagement with communities and individuals, Carolina improves lives far beyond this campus while enriching the education of our students and the professional lives of our faculty and staff. Carolina will reach her goal of being the leading public university in America only if engagement remains one of our highest priorities and only if we can demonstrate its beneficial effects, tangible and intangible, for the University itself and the communities we serve.

Carolina has a remarkably strong history of public service to the people of North Carolina. That commitment to service, a commitment that extends beyond teaching and research, has been a distinguishing feature of this great University. The critical question is not whether Carolina has done a good job in the past, or even how our public service compares with the service of other universities. Instead we must look to the future and ask whether the University truly is engaged in serving North Carolina in ways that honor and expand our traditional commitment to public service. We must find ways to build mutual respect and communication between the University and its many constituents, and help us reach a common understanding about service that increases our responsiveness to the public.

Now is the time to guarantee that service to North Carolina continues as a hallmark of this University. Four steps must be taken, as follows.

1. Provide senior leadership in expanding Carolina's public engagement with North Carolina. The School of Government through its Dean should provide the necessary leadership to help the University become more engaged with North Carolina. The School has a long and distinguished history of working with public officials and their communities throughout North Carolina. The School of Government's mission is focused on improving the lives of North Carolinians and it has the necessary credibility and experience to lead the University's transition to greater engagement. The Dean of the School of Government should provide leadership for the campus by serving in the dual role as Vice Chancellor for Public Service and Engagement.

Public engagement must be assigned a high priority, and placing the responsibility at this level will communicate its importance to people inside and outside the campus. This designation will provide the Dean with campus-wide authority to facilitate and advance our public service mission in North Carolina. It also will enable the Dean to keep engagement with North Carolina

on the campus agenda by meeting regularly with the Chancellor's Cabinet and with the other vice chancellors.

2. Identify the leading challenges facing North Carolina and develop strategic initiatives to meet them. We will identify the major challenges facing North Carolina and we will create campus proposals to address those challenges. Starting with a series of regional town meetings in which the Chancellor listens to North Carolinians talk about how the University might work to improve their lives, we will signal that our approach to service is shifting from public service to engagement that requires responsiveness and greater respect for community partners.

We will also identify major challenges through a diverse and representative advisory board composed of government officials, business and community leaders, foundation directors, students, faculty, and campus administrators. That board, in turn, could evaluate proposals for projects that have a broad impact in North Carolina and that involve multiple academic units and disciplines. The Vice Chancellor would take the lead in trying to improve faculty proposals by encouraging partnerships on campus and in the community.

3. Lead the campus in shifting gradually our focus from public service to public engagement.

The Chancellor should appoint a task force of campus and statewide leaders to study the concept of engagement and to recommend strategies for making it an integral part of our campus plan.

The task force would answer the following question: *What must be done to insure that Carolina's tradition of public service continues and expands so that it is the leader in engagement by a public research university?* The Vice Chancellor for Public Service and

Engagement would lead the task force, which would make recommendations to insure that is an obligation and a responsibility, something that we owe society, not something we practice if we have extra time or if it happens to be convenient.

4. Develop partnerships within the University and with outside groups to help meet the challenges facing North Carolina. As we make progress in becoming a more engaged institution with North Carolina, it will be important to develop partnerships with business, government, nonprofits, and other campuses. Decisions about how faculty spend their time happen at the school and unit levels, and that should continue to be the case. Faculty involvement in engagement must be nurtured and supported—it cannot be forced. By soliciting faculty proposals and providing resources to support their work (along with guidance in building partnerships and improving the proposals), this proposal works within the faculty culture to advance engagement. To help develop these internal and external partnerships, we must enhance the role of the Carolina Center for Public Service. The Center has made a good start in providing grant funding for student and faculty public service projects, and has created a clearinghouse for public service information for the citizens of the State. But much more could be done, from increased funding for service learning to expanded opportunities for faculty engagement. The Vice Chancellor will collaborate closely with the Center, but there will not be any change in administrative reporting relationships.

#### **Areas for investment**

This proposal for engagement will address directly the common complaint that the University does not help North Carolina address its most important issues. At the same time, however, the use of targeted projects allows us to be more responsive without necessarily creating expectations that we will respond to all requests for assistance. The projects will use North Carolina as a laboratory for improving life here, but they also will generate knowledge and solutions that apply everywhere. Of course this proposal cannot succeed without a commitment

of new resources. It will be necessary to provide support for public service projects throughout North Carolina. This funding will not be used to provide permanent support for programs and activities, but the funding may be available for multi-year projects. Without interfering with public service already being performed by our faculty and students, this proposal will create opportunities for even greater service to North Carolina.

#### **Measures of Success**

Metrics by which engagement may be measured include:

- Number of undergraduate service learning courses offered
- Number of engagement partnerships with outside organizations
- Number of students enrolled in service learning courses
- Level of volunteer participation by faculty, staff, and students
- Number of faculty and staff appointments to state, national, international service panels

#### **V. Strengthening Carolina's International Focus and Presence**

Steps needed to strengthen Carolina's international focus and presence include:

- Increasing funding to support international activities at all levels
- Expanding study abroad programs
- Implementing the Global Citizenship requirements of the proposed General Education Curriculum
- Expanding other international programs at all levels (graduate, undergraduate, research, faculty exchanges, visiting scholars, etc.)

- Increasing support for existing and new initiatives regarding international research and teaching (from area studies centers to novel integrative research and teaching approaches)
- Providing tuition remission waivers for foreign students

Carolina must become a global institution. This requires an approach to undergraduate education that enables our students to become global citizens endowed with intercultural competence. To do this, we must substantially increase the number of undergraduate agreements and education abroad opportunities, reward those units that encourage students to engage in international study, find financial aid to make education abroad possible to all wishing to do so, provide appropriate language training, and build more exchange opportunities with universities abroad.

These measures should extend beyond undergraduate education. The university should foster graduate international education in many ways, providing intensive fieldwork and research opportunities overseas, increasing tuition remission waivers for graduate foreign students, expanding support for advanced research centers, reinvigorating area-studies institutes, and developing strategies for the establishment of an international presence for Carolina through projects and partnerships. In these ways, Carolina can contribute to the study and solution of pressing social issues, including those resulting from genomics research, environmentalism, and the increasingly urgent need to preserve peace and reduce conflict under conditions of globalism.

#### **Measures of Success**

Some indicators to assess progress toward internationalizing Carolina include:

- Increasing number of international, study abroad, and foreign exchange programs
- Increasing student participation in those programs

- Increasing numbers of faculty projects occurring in and providing service to other nations
- Levels and trends of Title VI, USAID, and similar funding
- Number of visiting students, teachers, and researchers.

#### **VI. Furthering Diversity**

Steps needed to increase Carolina's capacity to draw upon, welcome, and benefit from

the nation's and the world's most able researchers, teachers, and public servants include the

following:

- Ensure that people of all abilities, races, and cultures feel welcomed as students as well as members of the faculty and staff
- Sustain effective diversity hiring efforts
- Continue successful minority student recruitment efforts
- Sustain excellent support programs for minority students
- Implement the proposed US Diversity requirement for undergraduates

Diversity is critical to the University's effectiveness as an educational institution, one that fully prepares its students for the world they will inhabit and lead. The university must develop strategies to integrate into the curriculum and daily life the needs and concerns of "minorities," especially Black Americans, Native Americans and Latinos. To do this, we need to create an atmosphere in which individuals are welcomed and enabled fully to realize their abilities, without regard to race, ethnicity, disability, gender, or sexual orientation. We need to implement the recommendations made in March 2000 by the Minority Affairs Review Committee that have not yet been accomplished.

These include

- Centralizing in the Office of Minority Affairs minority concerns as they relate to outreach, recruitment, retention, and scholarships
- Implementing the recommendations of the Intellectual Climate Task Force of special concern to minorities (e.g., English as a second language, sickle cell anemia research, immigration and naturalization issues, minorities and the media); sustaining excellence in African American studies; continuing to support and publicize the accomplishments and activities of the Sonja Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center and the Institute of African-American Research
- Increasing support for the curricula in Native American studies and area studies programs with an effort to move it toward departmental status
- Making better use of established minority organizations in the recruitment of minority faculty. A recent successful model that bears further examination is the School of Medicine's Minority Faculty Recruitment Program.

Finally, we need to expand our intra-university programs that call on the unique historical perspectives or special opportunities at the state's six historically Black and minority universities. These could include joint research efforts, cross-listed courses, teleconferences, distance-learning opportunities, and shared lectures, conferences and seminars. Funding might be sought to create programs like the Robertson Scholars Program with our minority sister institutions. At a minimum, we should identify additional opportunities to cross-list courses with minority-area programs.

**Measures of Success:**

Metrics for achieving these steps include:

- Increasing the number of minority faculty and students



- Increasing numbers of minority faculty retained despite offers from other institutions
- Increasing success in minority student retention and graduation rates
- Increasing the number of collaborative programs with neighboring HBCUs
- Increasing numbers of students enrolled in US Diversity courses

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

The Academic Plan is not a precise set of instructions but a broad statement of priorities.

The Plan should be fully discussed with the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Deans' Council, the Faculty Council, the Employee Forum, student leadership, and other stakeholders. Once their revisions are considered and incorporated as appropriate by the Task Force, the final report should be presented to the UNC Board of Trustees for approval.

Once the Board of Trustees approves the plan, evaluation is the next critical step. The academic plan will only be useful if there are periodic reviews of progress made towards its implementation. A subcommittee of the Task Force should be appointed to extract a checklist from the academic plan and make an annual report to the Provost and Chancellor, assessing progress in implementing the plan's recommendations.

## **PROPOSED RESOLVES RESPONDING TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE**

The following Resolves have been prepared by the Secretary of the Faculty in response to the Report of the Task Force on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. They are presented to the Faculty Council for information only. Some or all of these Resolves may be presented to the Council for action later this year. The wording of this document has not been formally approved by the Task Force.

### **I. Responses to Recommendations with Respect to Flexibility in the Process of Promotion and Tenure.**

I.1. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill should seek appropriate funding to support a system of paid parental leave for full-time faculty holding tenure-track appointments who bear primary responsibility for the care of a newborn child.

I.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that the administration assume responsibility for explaining to new faculty appointed to probationary-term positions the provisions of the tenure regulations concerning special provisions for extending the maximum probationary period.

I.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that the administration take steps to ensure that faculty members who take advantage of special provisions for extending the maximum probationary period are not subjected to stricter requirements for reappointment and promotion than those expected of colleagues who do not choose to take advantage of those provisions.

I.4. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to Section 2.c.(6)(iii) of the tenure regulations (see text below) to increase from one year to two years the maximum extension of the probationary period that may be granted.

[For reasons of health, requirements of childbirth or child care, or similar compelling circumstances, a faculty member holding a probationary term of appointment at the rank of assistant professor or associate professor may request that the maximum probationary period be extended for a period not to exceed 12 months (including any extension that may have been granted under subsection (ii) above), with no resulting change in normal employment obligations, in order to provide the faculty member additional time to demonstrate fully his or her professional qualifications for reappointment or permanent tenure.]

I.5. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations that would permit a probationary-term faculty member and the head of the appointing unit to mutually agree to delay the decision on reappointment until the final year of the probationary period, with the proviso that in such case the faculty member is not entitled to 12-months notice of a decision not to reappoint.

## **II. Responses to Recommendations with Respect to Policies and Procedures for Appointment and Promotion of Fixed-Term Faculty.**

II.2. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code of University Government establishing an elected standing committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

II.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit develop a plan that defines the desired mix of tenure-track and fixed-term faculty appointments in that unit.

II.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that all appointments to fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, contain provisions relevant to the possibility that funding to cover the full duration of the contract may not be available due to funding rescissions.

II.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that, to the maximum feasible extent, no person should be appointed to more than three consecutive one-year terms in a fixed-term rank before appointment to a longer term is made available.

II.5. The Faculty Council urges the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to rescind the administrative rule now in effect that links the term of fixed-term faculty appointments to the term of appointment of the department chair.

II.6. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code stating the expectation that all appointments and reappointments to fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, will be made with the same consultations within the appointing unit as is the case for appointments to tenure-track positions.

II.7. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations creating the rank of senior lecturer.

II.8. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each appointing unit develop descriptions of the evaluation and criteria for appointment and promotion within fixed-term ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in tenure-track appointments.

II.9. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that promotions within fixed-term ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in tenure-track appointments follow the same time line for review as is prescribed for tenure-track appointments.

II.10. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit include fixed-term faculty in school and departmental decision-making and advisory venues, except those relating to evaluation and promotion of tenure-track faculty.

II.11. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department heads make every effort to include fixed-term faculty in professional development activities.

II.12. The Faculty Council requests the Provost to examine the criteria for awards, particularly those related to service, to ensure that fixed-term faculty are eligible for consideration unless disqualified by the terms establishing the award.

### **III. Responses to Recommendations with Respect to Review of Tenure-Track Appointments and Promotions**

III.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code expressing the expectation that deans and department chairs will consult all tenured faculty in the appointing unit in appointments and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure, except initial appointment at the rank of professor for which consultation with the professors alone is sufficient.

III.2. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code establishing a University-wide system for review of all appointments and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure and all promotions from the rank of associate professor to the rank of professor. The system should provide for at least three levels of review, culminating with the Advisory Committee. The intermediate level of review should be conducted either by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action in question or by an elected committee of the unit's faculty, as may be appropriate for the size and complexity of the appointing unit.

III.3. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code enlarging the membership of the Advisory Committee to twelve, and specifying that it is advisory to the Provost with respect to faculty personnel matters and to the Chancellor on all other matters.

III.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that a decision not to reappoint a probationary-term faculty member should be forwarded by the dean or department chair to his or her immediate administrative superior for review as to the adequacy, consistency, and coherence of the evidence supporting the decision not to reappoint. In conducting that review, the reviewing officer should seek the advice of the faculty advisory committee that would have reviewed the decision had it been positive.

Transcript of Faculty Council meeting held Dec. 6, 2002 in Assembly Room, Wilson Library, at 3 p.m.

**Sue Estroff:** And thanks to those of you who are either intrepid enough or foolish enough to be here, but the chancellor promised me that I could have a hot shower over at the gym, which I just did with everybody else in my family. Thank you for coming. In view of the extraordinary circumstances we're facing this week --- extraordinary all the way across the board --- I'm hereby suspending the agenda that was planned for today and reducing it to one item which will be the chancellor's remarks and question and answer time. We will, in consultation with the executive committee and the agenda committee, schedule a special meeting of the council to deal with the very important business that was on the docket for today. And I exhort all of you to look for that time and come to that meeting. So, without further ado ...

**Chancellor James Moeser:** Thank you, Sue, and I likewise extend my thanks and appreciation to you for being here today. I suspect many of you here had some degree of difficulty and inconvenience ... just walking ... there's no straight path across Polk Place ... there are only diagonal paths across Polk Place. When I first ... I want to speak about the weather emergency first. I think all of us have a similar reaction seeing the degree of destruction and devastation which a weather event like this can cause. For anyone who truly loves this campus and its natural beauty, it's heartbreaking. I was not here for Hurricane Fran or Hugo, but all reports in many ways this is a disaster of equal proportion. And the only solace I can take from that is that since I wasn't here for Fran and Hugo and some of the natural beauty of this place notwithstanding those storms I am reassured by the fact that our groundskeepers and people who know about trees tell us that nature has a wonderful way of healing itself. And we have a great, great staff of groundskeepers. You should know that there were people on this campus that were here all night on Thursday monitoring the ice as it formed and ready to take action. You know we did close the campus on Thursday totally, and I think it was totally appropriate that we should have. I really want to thank the public safety, the grounds, the electrical distribution crews who got power back to this campus in rapid-fire order. We were actually completely down only a few hours on Thursday. Power was quickly restored, in part because we do have our own cogeneration facility but also because we have a really dedicated staff who worked hard connecting -- reconnecting -- lines and routing around downed lines to get power back first of all to the hospital and then to the entire campus so that our students and their residence halls have been warm. They have light and heat, and the food services have been able to continue to deliver.

The second critical decision we had was whether or not we would maintain a normal schedule today, this being the first day of exams. If there was any good luck in a disaster, it was that the day we really needed to close was the students' reading day. And this was primarily a real hardship obviously for those students that were off campus and who didn't have access to electricity and to Internet. At least we didn't have to reschedule any exams. The difficult decision was whether we would go forward with the 8 a.m. exams this morning, and there were consultations with the provost's office and the director of public safety and myself and we decided that -- there was a suggestion that we perhaps move those 8 a.m. Friday exams to 8 a.m. Saturday but then the question would be, what do we do about the students and/or faculty who come, show up and don't get this message because it's impossible to communicate with people and so some exams go on and some exams don't, so we went to Stage One of weather situation which gives faculty to make changes where appropriate and we encouraged the faculty to be considerate to those students who

were simply unable to get to campus at 8 a.m. or who arrived late and give them the benefit of a full three-hour time period to take their exam. And I hope that this was - I believe it was - the better of the decision options that we had before us, and I hope that it has worked. We've received actually very few complaints although of course there have been some because there was no perfect solution. Suffice it to say that this is a very difficult situation for all of us, and it's not just limited to campus: Many of us are without power in our homes. We all face devastation and destruction of the natural landscape around us and absence of electrical power for obviously a number of days. The University is doing what it can to be of assistance to the community, and as much as we do have power, we do have warmth, we do have hot water and therefore showers, we have opened the campus to the community. We've offered Woollen Gym to the American Red Cross to use as a shelter tonight. They've accepted that offer and so tonight the Red Cross will administer Woollen Gym as a shelter for any who need that shelter, and as Sue mentioned, the gym is available now for anyone of the University community, for our community, who needs a hot shower. You simply need to bring your own towels. A hot shower can feel good, especially if you have not only no hot water but no heat. And we're serving hot food in the upstairs at Lenoir and in Chase and at The Carolina Inn - and at very reasonable prices. At three times a day - morning, noon and evening - food will be available to the larger community on a cash basis, and we've been able to receive food deliveries, and we may be one of the few places in the community where people can get a warm meal. So we hope that this will be well received, and we know it's needed by the people of Chapel Hill and Orange County.

So I just want to thank everyone who has pitched in. I think if this weren't final exam period - I should also mention that the cleanup out here will be slow and painstaking, and you don't hear any chainsaws right now. The reason we're not chainsawing that wood is because final exams are taking place. And this is a place which has its values right in that regard, and so we will delay a very necessary cleanup of this campus while those final exams are taking place so students will not be disturbed by that. I think everyone will support that decision as well, so we'll have to live with this debris until the end of the final exam period. Hopefully when students return for the new term, the campus will at least be clean. We'll be looking at scars until well past spring, I suspect.

I appreciate the willingness of the faculty to come to this meeting this afternoon. I requested that we not postpone this meeting because I thought it was important for me to have this opportunity to speak directly to you. And this has been a very difficult period for me personally - I would say the most difficult period of my professional life. And yet I think it's very important that you and I as colleagues have an opportunity to speak to one another. I hope you by now have all received the e-mail I sent to all the members of the faculty and staff concerning the Ehringhaus issue. I want to say a few things more about that; I don't want to repeat what I said in the e-mail because I really -- that was a message from the heart, and it was my message. I was not instructed by anyone to send that message, but it was, I thought, important for me to take this opportunity to speak directly to the faculty.

As I said to the staff when I spoke to the Employee Forum on Wednesday, this has been a humbling experience for me, and I stand before you as a very humble person. It's not an easy thing to admit mistakes, and it's especially not an easy thing to admit a mistake in such a public forum and to be the subject of news articles and editorials. I would like to think that while it's important to admit mistakes, it's more important to resolve not to repeat them and to learn from them, and so I think the

questions that one wants to ask at this point are what can we learn and how can we better function in a collaborative of shared responsibility for the leadership of a great institution such as this one.

One of the resolutions I've made for myself is that opportunities for consultations with the faculty leadership is paramount. I think that's absolutely essential, and I've had some good conversations already with the chair of the faculty, with the executive committee of the council, and I have my regular meeting with the Chancellor's Advisory Committee – the (elected?) committee of the faculty next week. I want to be careful in this process – in this time of tremendous and considerable personal stress not to make any decisions quickly or reactively or impulsively, and so I want to give close consideration to what changes we need to make, and I welcome your comments and suggestions in that regard.

I think it's important to say that – and sometimes it's a very delicate balance between – the need to consult and the need to respect the propriety of very sensitive personnel matters, and obviously this recent incident is exactly such a situation where discreet and very confidential consultation is important – where broad scale consultation perhaps is not possible. But I'm determined that we will find measures in which we can do that and do it productively, moving forward. There is a great deal, obviously, there is a great deal for us to do together. We are in the process of trying to develop an academic plan of this university. I think it's really critically important that we as colleagues develop what for us will be the academic priorities for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where we will place our energies in developing critical private support for academic programs. Which areas of the academic perspective where we will invest those resources that come to us from state appropriations and tuition. That's a critically important process. It's a process that's under way. I must say it's not under way I think to anyone's satisfaction at this point. And I think we have to look at our mutual responsibility to make that a process that truly works because my sense is this university needs a road map for its future, and that map must be developed most of all by its faculty and the academic leadership that's in place across the University – department chairs and program leaders as well as deans and vice chancellors and myself, but it's gotta be a collaborative process. And any plan that we develop won't really have much meaning unless there's a general sense of buying in across the fabric of the University. I appeal to you for working with us to find ways to make that process as we develop, and as I said the at the executive council the other night, I'm not so concerned about arbitrary deadlines that we might impose upon ourselves as I am the quality of the end result – that it really reflect the very best thinking that you can bring to these critical issues. And we do have critical issues that will face us in the State of North Carolina. That's why this situation, I think, has troubled so many, because the state, obviously, is in a very difficult budgetary climate. We have some serious work to do with regard not only – and I have some serious work to do – to restore that sense of confidence not only on campus but across the state that this is a university that not only has a great vision for itself but a great connection to the state – a connection that is profound as a matter of fact – in terms of the public service that is delivered by Chapel Hill to virtually every county of this state and the small communities – not only in terms of what we do on this campus educating people in various degree programs – bachelor's to terminal doctoral programs – and not only with the great research that's done by the faculty of this university but the application of that work directly to service of the state and ultimately the nation and the world. This is a university that truly is engaged with the people who own it. We have not done, in my view, all that we could have done, in fact we fall really short, I think, of what we

need to be doing in terms of expressing to the people who own this university, namely the people of North Carolina, the commitment that this university has to them and to their needs at a time when this state obviously has enormous problems -- problems which this university is, and ought to be, addressing. And it pains me that our own difficulties in the recent few weeks actually make the job -- our job -- more difficult. And for that -- I truly regret that -- and I'm determined with my own efforts as well yours, working with you, and everyone on this campus who loves this university and cares about its role in the state and the nation to do what is necessary to rectify those relationships.

I realize that the agenda has been postponed and as a matter of fact I'm surprised but very pleased to see this many people in this room, I would like to say a couple of things about a couple of issues that are on your agenda because my sense is that it's very important to you, and I want you to know where -- what my position is -- especially with regard to two key issues that are on your agenda when we meet next. One is the issue of gender equity, which is a very important issue on this campus. Our in-depth analysis is moving forward as quickly as possible at this time. We want to be in a position by the spring semester to make determinations about any necessary corrective actions. Now I want to be careful not to over-promise on available resources given the uncertainty that all of us know about in this state budget, but let me be clear that this issue needs to be top priority with whatever resources we have. The Office of the Provost has set a deadline of December the tenth, which is just around the corner, for completion of analysis at the academic unit level of preliminary results. Bernadette Gray-Little, the executive vice-provost, has discussed those reports with some of the deans already. I gather the process is ongoing and nearing its completion. From what we get next week we will be able to tell whether there are individual faculty members -- male or female -- who are substantially lower than what one would expect or predict their salaries to be in given programs. This analysis will set the state for examining reasons for such discrepancies at the departmental level. Then, of course, the next question is what we will do about it. And as I said we will attach a very high priority to remediation of individual salary lines where it cannot be established that gender is not a cause of these salary gaps. I place responsibility for the administration of this program directly with the Office of the Provost, and I assure you that the officers of the -- provost himself and his senior associates will be dedicated to this. This is my commitment to you.

With regard to the report of the committee on appointments and tenure, I think I will save my remarks until the meeting at which that will be discussed, but let me just say that I regard this as a very important issue for this faculty. There are some critical recommendations. I have my own views about those recommendations; I'll save those comments for a later time, but I do want to say that I think there is no more important issue for us to discuss together or for this faculty to take action on. These are the most critically important decisions that the university ever makes, and we must make sure that the processes that we have in place are the best processes possible. I believe -- I guess I will reveal a little bit of my point of view at this point -- that it is both possible that it can be better and both necessary that we effect some improvements to the current processes, and I think the report of this committee is a very good start toward that goal.

Finally just let me say that we're moving ahead with the plans for a special hooding ceremony for doctoral students who earn their degrees the graduate school. They will be held on Polk Place the Saturday before the Sunday commencement in May. At



this special ceremony we will have a speaker, and each doctoral recipient will be called to the stage to be hooded by his or her adviser. Linda Dykstra, the dean of the graduate school, has assumed leadership of this event. This will be a ceremony of the graduate school, and I want to thank her for her willingness to do that. I will pledge to you to make this a very meaningful experience for both our doctoral graduates and their advisers, and I hope that you and feedback that we've received from faculty – the graduate faculty – the feedback that we've received as well as from doctoral candidates since the ceremony – will very much be welcome.

That concludes my remarks, but I stand before you as one who's quite willing to take questions, to receive your criticism. I have been the subject of a great deal of criticism, so join in. (laughter)

**Diane Kjerвик:** I'm Diane Kjerвик from the nursing school and Carolina Women's Center also. I wanted to address the advise and consent portion of what you said, and I take note that you're recognizing a lapse or more you could have done in that regard to check with faculty groups before taking action, and I'm glad you recognize that. That's important, but in following up on that in terms of the faculty equity issue that you – the salary equity, the gender study that you stated – it sounds like you're moving ahead, and I'm not saying I disagree with what you're doing, but we haven't heard the report or had a discussion here about the Committee on the Status of Women's recommendations which were based upon tremendous input that a number of us took to get from people around campus, and you haven't heard those yet. It's just recently been developed based upon much input that has been solicited, so that's a concern I have, and because I see that you're moving ahead with it, I feel that I must bring something to your attention from the School of Nursing, because the faculty there did pass a motion just a couple of weeks ago that they wanted me to convey today, thinking that today was the day to discuss the gender equity study, so I'll just share this with you. They discussed the need – this is the nursing faculty – to widen the comparative analysis to schools beyond the School of Nursing because in terms of nursing, we have so few men that to look to a comparison to the men doesn't give us any information. So, in other words, that kind of comparison does not capture the evidence of gender inequities experienced by nursing faculty. A comparison of nursing to other similarly situated Health Affairs schools with a large number of male faculty at UNC-Chapel Hill, such as pharmacy and public health, such as actually was done in the report, you know we were put together with public health and pharmacy, so, we like that, so we wanted to say continue to look at that kind of a comparison. A motion in support of this suggestion offered by the faculty passed unanimously. So, the nursing faculty doesn't often agree on everything clearly like that, but they wanted to make sure that you knew it was important to them that you would not scrutinize only at the department level when it came to nursing because that doesn't give us any kind of comparison to the male side of the equation. And beyond that, I'll rest.

**Moeser:** Thank you. Let me just respond quickly with regard to your first point, please don't conclude that by what I said that the final "i" has been dotted and "y" crossed with regard to the process and procedure. In fact, that's probably a discussion that will, in fact, take place at the next meeting, and I will rely on executive associate provost Gray-Little to talk about exactly what the present process is and procedures that the provost expects to have in place, but it's – Bernadette correct me if I'm wrong – clearly there is not intent – no idea of preempting or putting in place something prior to a discussion. I think what we wanted to communicate – what the executive committee asked me to communicate

- was that (OBSCURED BY COUGHING) to a timeline, that we are determined to move on with this process. The last thing I wanted you to sense from us is that we are not committed: one, to remediate whatever problem we establish this is, and doing it in a timely manner. That's really the message that I want to send, and with regards to response to resolutions from the Commission on the Status of Women, or for that matter, motions from the School of Nursing, I think those are discussions yet to take place, and we simply haven't responded.

**Unknown speaker:** Can I add something to that? We have also had conversations, one somewhat more formal than the one I had tackled(?) with executive vice provost Bernadette Gray-Little in the lobby of South Building. I did express on your behalf concerns that when the criteria get set for what constitutes substantial (?) and what constitutes productivity equality, that there be appropriate groups in faculty assembled for the various areas on the campus so that those criteria don't get established absent agreement about what those should be. So I think your point is well taken. I think those conversations are happening, and I think the provost's office is well aware that making an assessment once the analysis is done and absent agreement about the criteria would be a mistake and that would have to involve agreement about (GARBLED)

**Bill Smith:** I'd like to make a comment or two. As you know, (GARBLED) ...reorganization of the Office of Legal Affairs, most of the press and the things that we've been reading concerning financial arrangements attached to that ... You don't need to know what my opinion is (GARBLED) I think that's overshadowed, that is in terms of what I think is more substantial in terms of what you've referred to as in an earlier press release on this as reorganization of the Office of Legal Affairs. I try to be a member of this faculty - an ordinary? member of this faculty as often as I could, and I think ordinary members of this faculty have occasional, but not too many, brushes with the Office of Legal Affairs, but over 25 years ago, I guess, my first ??? of administration was as ??? chair and I ??? something with the Office of Legal Affairs at that time and after that I did special assignment work with ??? Williamson and Chancellor Fordham. Then I guess my last brush with the ??? administration was working with Dick Richardson and the ??? provost so I have observed this office over a fairly long period of time. Office of Legal Affairs is obviously an important office, not just for the chancellor. Sometimes I think that I've read??? That it gives the chancellor legal advice ... other members of the administration as well as the faculty and the staff when they find themselves in a position, or potentially in a position, where they're going to have some dealing with a legal affairs or state attorney general's office or the courts. And I see this office operate, and your intentions if I understood it in your press release was to somewhat restructure that office so it is more devoted strictly to legal affairs and less involved in some other more general policy issues that the University faces. Now, in that regard, and away from the thing that got you in hot water, which actually doesn't sound too bad, (garbled, laughter) I want to say that I support that decision. I think I have seen the Office of Legal Affairs more involved with policy decision than necessarily reflecting that others should have been more involved and have been less involved. I think there are matters of policy that are strictly matters of Academic Affairs, where historically and traditionally and I think for the good of the order, faculty should be the primary voice. There's others where there's other administrators - deans or departments chairs, I suppose - and there are times when Office of Legal Affairs needs to be giving advice, needs to be talking about ??? but should not be involved in basic academic and scholarly policy-making decisions. That issue is lost in the whole lieu of this. I support that change, which I think is needed,

and in fact is overdue. Now I do think it is a case that part of this came about historically. There was a time (interrupted by tape running out) ... that's when Hooker became ill, when Dick Richardson sort of became ill, and then we went through a period with interims, and I think it's natural for a team in South Building to try to pull together to keep it running. I think part of this naturally came from that, but I strongly support the changes in that, and I would encourage you to take faculty advice also as you restructure that office.

**Moeser:** Thank you. I assure you that I shall, and I appreciate your comment, which I don't think I need to amplify on. I think that you correctly analyzed really what the intent of the change was in regard to the role of the legal counsel.

**Laura Janda:** I had a couple comments going back to the situation with the gender equity, and I'd like to reinforce Diane Kjervik's statement that it would be important to take under advisement the information that has been gathered by the Women's Center in addressing this matter. I just wanted to state that I'd like to caution you against suggesting that gender equity is something that we can manage with available resources because this suggests that gender equity is a luxury item that we take care of only when we have extra money in our budget, and we probably aren't anticipating having extra money in our budget for a long time, but the pot isn't entirely empty even though maybe it isn't as full as we'd like it to be and maybe what we need to do is some general stirring in a broad sense rather than targeting specific individuals. I hope maybe that's your real intent, but I would caution you against stating it as something that we deal with when we have available resources.

**Moeser:** I just want to say that in saying 'available resources' I didn't pin that necessarily to new resources. All we have to work with is -- that's what available means -- is the resources that we have, and I've said, we will attach a very high priority to this issue. I also want to be careful not to over promise. Watch what we deliver, not what we say, and so, let's work -- this is a process that I'd like to work on very seriously -- during this spring semester -- to identify the true nature of the problem so we know exactly what we're dealing with -- and go from there.

**Bobbi Owen:** I want to commend you and the University for opening the University -- its heat and its hot water to share with the community. I was looking forward to his being a very long meeting today so I could get a lot of warmth before heading back home. I hope that sharing with the community might be a good first step in terms of improving the relationships that we have with the Town of Chapel Hill. When Mayor Foy was here a few months ago he said that he perceived that our relationship with the town was really broken, and I know that there are neighborhoods that are feeling somewhat embattled by the University's position as having (?) at a time when other areas maybe don't have particular ??? and you've spoken to us about your willingness to have that kind of conversation and to mend some broken fences, and I hope that you will extend that a little further to the Town of Chapel Hill.

**Moeser:** Thank you for that comment. Actually I went on WCHL radio yesterday for an hour, and that question actually came up, and I will repeat roughly what I said then, and that is that I think perhaps I do have a role to play in that regard to looking at finding areas where we can reconcile with the town and with the neighborhoods in this town. Recognizing that these are very complex issues, but I think the last thing this University wants to be is perceived as an institution that just moves forward without regard to the impact on our neighbors. Though I assure you

of the Charlotte-Mecklenberg School System, it would have been very ordinary. It wouldn't have merited two paragraphs in The Charlotte Observer. But it was the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; it was an unusual circumstance, and in my opinion it's really gotten blown out of perspective when you look at it in the large picture. There's nothing we can do about that now except learn from the experience and move forward.

**Unknown speaker: (possibly someone in pathology???)** I must say, I think one aspect of your analysis, the relationship between faculty and staff and the emporium in South Building. To many people who are members of staff, faculty really are members of the emporium. I have a part-time secretary whose husband recently lost his job; she has serious health problems; she really doesn't know what she's going to do. She needs, I agree, a perfectly reasonable settlement in the business world, and I'm the one who has to defend the actions for the University. I feel compelled to do that. I do that all the time. And just like you, I want to be able to defend the actions of the University. I beg you, I beg you to please try and mend our fences with staff, an excellent academic client depends on an excellent faculty, but an excellent faculty most certainly depends on the staff who are willing to work for us, and I think right now, still and yet, we have a lot of fences to mend with staff -- staff who perhaps are not as sophisticated and understanding of ????

**Moeser:** I realize, I recognize that many of you are looking toward going home before it gets too dark...

**Sue Estroff:** I wanted to say something to the council as I am one of those people who's going to ??? but I don't want to cut this conversation short. One of the things that I think is most important before you as elected members of the faculty to communicate to the chancellor is directly or here is what you want and expect from him over these next months. I have heard from him now repeatedly his sincerest commitment to forge a different relationship, and it is incumbent on the council every month not to sit there and say, no hum at the end of his remarks. The conversation we've had today is one of the better ones we've had, so I call on you to (interrupted by tape running out) ... and with us about what you think it will take for us to move -- not to move on to improve the way things are working. Our futures are happily entangled. I think all of us want to be successful. The part that we can do, I think, is to be more forthcoming. I value hugely the input of the mandarins and silverback males in the audience who always rise to speak but the rest of us have something to say also. So give us all -- that's an ecological ??? (drowned out by laughter) So I'm asking you what you can give back to the chancellor is your candor and your opinions and your thoughts in this forum and in other forums and I have a feeling from listening to him that he will listen. So, that's our part in it. And I don't want to cut the conversation short (mutter mutter mutter)

**Moeser:** I do want to thank you for being here this afternoon. Many thought there would be just a handful of us, or two or three gathered together. The fact that you are here I interpret as a sign of both concern but dedication to a mutual enterprise of this great university. We are in this together. I have the responsibility in this situation. I've accepted that responsibility, but the larger and greater responsibility is I think to move forward and find more effective ways for us to work together at Carolina. Because this university is in all of our hands, and I completely concur with the point that was made with regard to the staff. I spoke to the Employee Forum the other day. I think the staff -- I agree -- understand the situation least of all. They have faced -- even while we've had minimal increases of salary for faculty, we've had

think, to celebrate the academic culture at the university, where the faculty really (interrupted by coughing) center, University Day is that, but it's only one time -- one day out of 365 days -- so I couldn't agree more. That's one of the reasons I mentioned the academic climate. Let us challenge ourselves to have a really deep campus debate about the academic plan. The thing that has frustrated me about the process is that it's been slow going, and I just want to see more substance in it. I'd like to hear a really lively debate in this room about whether 14<sup>th</sup> century ethnomusicology ought to be -- I'm trying to think of an obscure example -- should be an academic priority at this university. Now as a matter of fact, I don't think it ought to be, but I think we ought to be dealing with the big themes that should drive us. And we've made some big decisions. Even since I've been here we've made the commitment to genome sciences and we've made some others. They have been made on ad hoc basis. In part, and sometimes they do emerge out of retention. I don't think that's the best way to make academic decisions. I think you all agree with that. We ought to have an academic plan that says investment in this area is key to Carolina's future, and more importantly, the discussion that gets us to that point I think is really where our energies ought to be devoted. Not to take anything away from next week's agenda -- these are important issues -- but we're really not dealing with the substance of what it is to be a great university. I'll be the first to say -- let me say it before you say it to me -- that measures of excellence no longer drive (? Interrupted by coughing) a great university. They are superficial, and they only describe the sort of external facade -- they can get at some quantitative things -- but a statement that really describes the intellectual aspirations of this place would and could describe a great university. That's why I care so much about that document and even more importantly the process that gets us to the document. And let me say finally, that a great academic plan that I write or that Robert Shelton writes or that any other, especially administrator writes, won't be worth what the former vice president described about his office, John Nance Gardner, unless it has your enthusiastic ??? that it's really your document and not our document -- one that really comes out of the faculty. And that's why the process of creating it is as important, perhaps arguably even more important, than the end result because it does allow us to have that kind of engagement about things we care about, academic issues of quality and excellence, what it means to be a great university. God helps us to get beyond these sort of troubles to the point where we can have that discussion.

**Joe Ferrell: (secretary of the faculty)** I want to say a little bit about the controversy from the perspective of my background which is public government. I've taught in the School of Government for 34 years. This termination is not the first senior public official in North Carolina who has been asked to be terminated. It, however, is in my experience the only one that has caused this kind of outcry, and I was asking myself why did we have this kind of outcry. I think the reason really has been touched on by what ??? had to say and Bill Smith. We are -- the University is accustomed to working in different environments than most public ?? The concept of EPA personnel really originated to describe political appointees in the governor's cabinet. There's no question in anybody's mind that the governor or the president that matter has the perfect right to change people who got their positions by virtue of working in a campaign as a political appointee. It's understood that the chief executive can say to you, you are no longer doing the job I want you to do, I want to find somebody else. And no one thinks anything of it. In our local government, the analogous officials are county managers, city managers and the school superintendents. They don't have job security; they serve at the pleasure of their appointing bodies. We change school superintendents all the time. We sometime pay

and as long as you're the chancellor I'm going to follow you. But those are some concerns – the scope and the size of the settlement and the approach that was taken. And that is several viewpoints that have been given to me.

**Moeser:** Thank you for your candid statement which I accept on all accounts. I accept your criticism as accurate, and I pledge to you today to be a chancellor that consults appropriately with the faculty and through the proper channels and the proper mechanisms. And I will say that one of the things that I am trying not to do in the wake of this situation is to make impulsive, reactive decisions. That would be in and unto itself a mistake as well – to be reflective, to listen, as I'm doing today, listening to you, and in other forms, and then to take what seem to be appropriate measures. I assure you I am going to look for concrete ways by which a consultative apparatus can be in place. I think that in fact there are some that are not fully used at the present time, and I'm looking at the way South Building operates in terms of responsibilities of each of the vice chancellors – the way we work together as a team and so on. I think it's time for that kind of over all look, and I'm quite willing to do that. One of the things that actually interests me is the extent to which everything becomes, in a sense, my issue. I say this not to shirk responsibility for what we were just talking about – that's clearly mine, and ultimately everything is as it comes through various vice chancellors, but I also believe very strongly that it's appropriate for decisions to get made at other points in the University and for me to support those, especially when the processes have been appropriately followed. So I think your criticism, Mr. Marshall, is not easy to hear, but I accept it as what I need to hear. Professor Pfaff:

**Dick Pfaff:** I've been billed as the spokesman for the right wing ... the center ... the right wing (garbled, but followed by laughter) this conversation is extraordinarily promising. I'd like to pick up in particular on one of the things that ??? said, and that had to do with the growth of the administrative culture, the culture in South Building which is an enclosed kind of culture ..... if I can give an example, which is

(I simply couldn't hear this individual well enough to attempt a transcription ...)  
(Ends with applause that covers up Moeser's responding remarks)

**Moeser:** a conversation that we had, of all places, in South Building, about three days ago, but I think you will agree with it, namely that the conversations we need to be having, you and I, the faculty and the chancellor, the faculty will all of us who live in South Building, we need to be spending more and more of our time talking about issues of educational quality, not focusing on administrative issues that the thing about which faculty are truly passionate, aside from parking, (is an administrative issue), we are all here today, every one of us are here today, I came up through, I fell in love with the university as a student, I decided I wanted a career as a faculty member, I must tell you I never dreamed of being a college administrator much less a dean or a vice chancellor or a provost or a chancellor, and in fact one of the columnists who really got it right said, "He's just an organ player." That's true; that is absolutely true. That is what I do; that is probably what I love most. I came into this academy as a faculty member, and we should be spending more of our time talking about the passions which drive academics – commitment to our own work, to the glorious interaction with students called teaching, and to the service that we engage in which I think really fulfills our lives, when we can use our professional knowledge somehow to make people's lives better, either individually or ????. Those, we don't have enough opportunities, as a university. I heard Sue Estroff at an earlier meeting in the academic year. We don't have enough opportunity, I

that we will look for avenues that will avoid – or perhaps alternative roads – to avoid a collision, specifically with regards to the ??? Hills neighborhood where we have some – as you know – an issue before us. And I have to say that what I perceive in many of the cases that we deal with is the opposition of goods – not an opposition of good vs. evil or black and white – and it's much more complex – it's a two-sided issue. There are people in this room who are deeply committed to this university's programs in genomic sciences, and the building that is coming online is the genetic medicine building – a very key research facility for our programs, not only in medicine but across the academic spectrum. But I think having said that, we also have to be considerate of the people who are directly impacted by the chain of dominos and so I think the challenge for us is to look for alternative solutions. We ought to be – as a university we want to be creative, resourceful in finding – if one solution is simply ultimately unacceptable – there's gotta be, I like to think, more than one solution. I don't know what that solution is, but I guess why I said yesterday what I'll say again is we will once again rededicate ourselves to looking for a solution which does not, will not be so objectionable as the one that we put on the table. And I say that with the Board of Trustees having approved a proposal. We have some work to do. And I wish I could tell you that I have the answer to this, but we will certainly work and try to (interrupted by coughing). As I look out at you, I am looking out at people by and large who live in the Town of Chapel Hill. How many of you actually live in the Town of Chapel Hill, just out of curiosity. I'm looking at our neighbors when I look at our faculty, and I recognize that fact, that we are the Town of Chapel Hill – not they. And I think we do have to remind ourselves of that fact – that we do not want to soil our own nest, and we must be careful not to do that.

**Ron Hyatt:** Chancellor, two things: One, we would like to invite our faculty to participate in our December commencement. One of our own is speaking, and we plan to have a good crowd. And so we look forward to that and thank them for the wonderful turnout at our glorious founding day ...

**Moeser:** Would you just remind the faculty of the time and place?

**Hyatt:** That would be Sunday the 20<sup>th</sup> at two o'clock. I'm sorry, Friday. We just signed the letter. Letters are coming out to you and are being...

**Moeser:** And the speaker? It's professor Jim Leloudis...

**Hyatt:** Jim Leloudis, one of our own, and that's always great. Chancellor, a couple of other areas: As we move towards campus incorporated, and it's going on whether we like it or not, the prior move has been evolutionary, and some have seen the recent actions as revolutionary. And it sort of goes against the culture of consultation here on campus as I perceive it. You may not do, or take into regard anything the faculty says, but it is always good to hear different inputs, and so I see that as part of the process and product. We made a gigantic leap where before tenured faculty members had served and at the time that they were through they were well wished and returned to their department to get the stones of their fellow faculty members and so forth, but it has changed the approach and the scope and the size. And I bring this to you from folks who have spoken to me, not just myself, that the scope and the size, and we were trying to find any winners in this event, and it's been very, very difficult. We fear the loss of overhead funds; we fear the downturn in the alumni giving; we fear that there is a great change taking place in the corporate governments of the university. I only speak for those who have spoken to me. You were my chancellor when I came in here, and you'll be my chancellor when I go out,



those school superintendents an incredibly large amount of money as part of their severance agreements because it's understood in that kind of professional expertise and that level of salary cannot just pick up and go on and find another job tomorrow. We do the same thing with city managers and county managers. The difference is, in the case of those three positions, it's understood that that's the way that those things go. We're talking about professional administrators that move from one unit to another, and the eventuality of ??? of termination is recognized and negotiated in advance at the time they're hired, so the individual who comes in is negotiating with the governing board. They enter into a contract and they know ahead of time what notice is going to be given and what the severance package is going to be. Now, in our university environment, we used to bring vice chancellors up from the English department or the medical school. When they got tired of it, or the chancellor got tired of them, they simply went back to their faculty positions. I don't think any university is operating that way nowadays. When you have a vacancy in a top level, senior management position, we now appoint search committees; we do national searches. If in this national search one of our own quote unquote rises to the top of the heap, that's fine, but that usually is not the case, and so we usually bring in someone from somewhere else and ??? The difference is, we cannot develop the culture of negotiating with ultimate termination of those appointments agreed upon. We need to do that. We need to negotiate those kinds of events ahead of time. And we need to consult, I'm sorry to say, the consultation needs to be broader than just simply with the Board of Trustees. In the case of local governments, ??? they are elected citizens, and they are very sensitive to how the public is going to see this they've negotiated ??? The same is true for the city council that hires a manager or the board of commissioners that hires a county manager. Our trustees are wonderful people; they do the University a great service, but they didn't get their jobs by virtue of being in touch with the man on the street. They increasingly come from the corporate world where severance packages are very grand, and in this case, this would probably have been in the corporate world a rather modest agreement, and I don't think anyone would have taken any notice, but it's not corporate; it's the university. So I think our challenge is to recognize that the senior administration in the university has changed from what it used to be – from what it was when most of us signed on to this like ??? . I think what good will come out of this controversy the Board of Governors, Board of Trustees, Office of the President are probably now in the process of developing guidelines for the actual protection of senior administrators. Many of you probably think that senior administrators by year terms; that used to be the case. That's no longer the case. They now simply serve at the pleasure of the president ???, at the pleasure of the chancellor. They have no job protection. They have no right to any particular notice or termination. They have no right to any kind of severance package. Legally, they can just be terminated at will. Now they are the only, these senior EPA appointees, are the only members of the university community that are in that kind of ??? with essentially no protection. Us tenured faculty can be discharged for cause. That's a process that will take a long time. You see that coming down the road a long time. Probationary term faculty are entitled to one full year's notice for non-reappointment of a second term. In fact, you get 18 months' notice the way the process works. So you're not out on the street long. Fixed term faculty know what their terms of appointment are, but even they have the right to ask six months ahead of time, is my appointment going to be renewed or not. If the answer is no, then at least they have six months to ??? We just don't have anything to deal with our EPA non-faculty personnel – certainly not at the senior level. That means it needs to be addressed on a system-wide basis, and I think we can make some salary ??? and it's long past due. I really am sorry that it's got to be such a terrible controversy in the press. Had this been the superintendent



virtually none for our SPA staff for two years. I have pledged to them that if no one else speaks on behalf of staff's salary increases in the state budget process, I will. And I think we should, all of us – that the issue of salary is not a faculty salary issue, it's a faculty/staff salary issue and that I don't know what should be a top priority in the state budget than this. It is critically important, and I hope that you will do your part. I appeal to you to do your part to help the staff understand the situations that we face and to know that they are valued. The most important thing that you could do, especially as we approach this holiday season, but beyond this holiday season, is on a daily basis when you find people who are doing really dedicated work, and we have an example here, right now, with the people who really poured themselves into, and will be engaged in a massive cleanup of this campus and working under great hardship – to thank them for that work. If it were not for our final exams I would hope that we could mobilize our students, but it's just simply not possible nor appropriate to do that with students at exams. So the staff will have to carry us through this whole month and when we come back, so do take those opportunities. Thank you for being here today. I do not mistake your presence as an unqualified support. I very much hear your message and we will work together constructively. Thank you.

Meeting is adjourned. Travel safely.



*The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL December 6, 2002, 3:00 p.m.**

### **Attendance**

Present (42): Bachenheimer, Bollen, Cairns, Carter, Chenault, Colindres, Crawford-Brown, Foley, Henry, Janda, Kjervik, Leigh, Lohr, Malizia, McGraw, Meyer, Nelson, Nicholas, Nonini, Owen, Parikh, Pfaff, Pisano, Reinert, Reisner, Rock, Rowan, Salmon, Schauer, Shea, Sigurdsson, W. Wraith, Straughan, Strauss, Tauchen, Toews, Tulloch, Vandermeer, Watson, Weiss, Wilson, Yopp.

Excused absences (48): Admiora, Allison, Ammerman, Bane, Barbour, Bouldin, Carelli, Cotton, Daye, D'Cruz, Diette, Eiler, Elvers, Files, Fishell, Fowler, George, Gerber, Gilland, Gollop, Granger, Holditch-Davis, Kagarise, Kessler, Kelley, Langbauer, LeFebvre, McQueen, Meece, Metzguer, Miller, Molina, Moran, Orthner, Panter, Poole, Porto, Raasch, Retsch-Bogart, Rippe, Rong, Sams, Slain, J. Smith, Sueta, Tresolini, Vick, Wallace, Willis.  
No unexcused absences.

### **Call to Order**

Prof. Estroff called the meeting to order. She suspended the agenda previously announced for this meeting, with the exception of the Chancellor's Remarks, due to the ice storm and resulting power outage that had paralyzed the community. A special meeting of the General Faculty and Faculty Council to complete the announced agenda will be called for a later date.

### **Chancellor's Remarks**

Chancellor Moeser began by expressing his admiration for the dedicated staff who worked so rapidly and efficiently to restore power to the campus after the December 4 ice storm. Although most of the community, and indeed the entire North Carolina Piedmont, is still without electricity, the campus was blacked out for only a few hours on December 5. He decided not to reschedule final exams, which began today. The chancellor reported that the University has offered Woollen Gym to the American Red Cross for use as a shelter. We are also serving hot food at reasonable prices in Lenoir, Chase, and the Carolina Inn to the entire community.

Chancellor Moeser turned to the controversy that had arisen over his recent decision with respect to a severance agreement with Vice Chancellor and General Counsel Susan Ehringhaus.

The chancellor said he had asked that today's Council meeting not be postponed because he thought it was important to speak directly to the faculty. He said that this has been the most difficult period of his professional life. It has been a humbling experience. It is not an easy thing to admit mistakes, especially in such a public forum, nor to be the subject of so many news articles and editorials. While it is important to admit mistakes, it is more important to resolve not to repeat them and to learn from them. The question, then, is what can we learn from this experience and how can we better function in a collaborative of shared responsibility for the leadership of this great institution.

Chancellor Moeser said that one of the resolutions he has made is to take better advantage of opportunities for consultation with the leadership of the faculty. He has had good conversations recently with the chair of the Faculty and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. He will consult the Advisory Committee next week at its regular December meeting. He wanted to be careful in this time of considerable personal stress not to make decisions quickly or impulsively.

Sometimes there is a delicate balance between the need to consult and the need to respect the confidentiality of very sensitive personnel matters. The recent incident is an example of a situation in which broad consultation was not appropriate, but discreet and very confidential consultation might have been. He said he is determined to find measures in which that could be done productively.

There is a great deal of work that we now need to address together. We are in the process of developing an academic plan for the University—one that will define our academic priorities and point to way to where we will place our energies in developing critical support for our academic programs from private giving, State appropriations, and tuition. It is critically important that this plan be developed in a collaborative process among the faculty and its academic leadership. Unless there is a general sense of "buy-in" across the fabric of the University, the plan really will not have much meaning. The chancellor said that he is not so much concerned about arbitrary deadlines for a final plan as he is about the quality of the end result. We have serious work to do to restore the sense of confidence that this is a university that not only has a great vision for itself but also has profound connections to the State of North Carolina.

Chancellor Moeser then commented briefly on some of the agenda items that would have been discussed at today's meeting but for the weather emergency.

*Gender equity.* The chancellor said that the administrator's in-depth analysis of equity in faculty salaries is moving forward as quickly as possible. He wants to be in a position by the Spring semester to be able to make determinations about corrective actions. For now, he wanted to be careful not to over-promise on available resources, given the uncertainty in the State budget, but he said that the matter "needs to be top priority with whatever resources we have." The chancellor said that he has placed responsibility for remediation of individual salaries with the Office of the Provost and gave the Council his commitment that he and his senior associates are dedicated to this.

*Hooding ceremony.* We are moving ahead with plans for a special hooding ceremony for doctoral students whose degrees are conferred by the Graduate School. The ceremony will be held on Polk Place on the Saturday before Commencement. There will be a speaker. Each doctoral recipient will be hooded by his or her advisor.

Referring to the chancellor's remarks about the faculty salary equity study, Prof. Diane Kjerвик (Nursing) said that she is somewhat surprised that the administration is moving ahead with remediation before the Council has had an opportunity to discuss the report of the Committee on the Status of Women and its recommendations. She wanted to bring to the chancellor's attention a motion adopted by the faculty of the School of Nursing asking that the comparative analysis of salaries in Nursing be broadened to include other Health Affairs schools such as Public Health and Pharmacy. There are so few men in Nursing that gender comparisons confined to that school alone do not convey much useful information. Chancellor Moeser responded to Prof. Kjerвик's first point by saying that there is no intent to pre-empt the Committee's report prior to discussion by the Council.

Prof. William Smith (Mathematics) said that he understood the chancellor's intent in restructuring the Office of Legal Affairs is to make it more devoted strictly to legal affairs and less involved in matters of policy. He supports that change and hopes that the chancellor will seek faculty advice as the restructuring takes place. The chancellor replied that Prof. Smith had correctly analyzed the reason for the change.

Prof. Laura Janda (Slavic Languages) cautioned against suggesting that gender equity is something that can be managed with available resources because this suggests that gender equity is a luxury item that we can address only when we have extra money on hand. The chancellor replied that he had not meant to imply that "available resources" means only new resources.

Prof. Bobbi Owen (Dramatic Art) commended the chancellor for sharing the University's heat and hot water with the community. She hoped that this sharing with the community will be a good first step in improving relationships with the Town of Chapel Hill.

Prof. Ron Hyatt (Exercise & Sport Science) said that as we move toward "campus incorporated" it is important not to lose our culture of consultation. There was a time when senior administrators were drawn from the ranks of the faculty and, at the end of their terms, returned to their departments to receive the thanks or stones of their colleagues. The controversy over the legal officer arises from the approach to the severance package, its scope, and its size. It has been very, very difficult to find any winners in this matter. The faculty fear the loss of overhead funds, the downturn in alumni giving, and the great change that seems to be taking place in the corporate governance of the University. Chancellor Moeser expressed his thanks for Prof. Hyatt's candid remarks, which he accepted on all counts.

Prof. Richard Pfaff (History) commented on the administrative culture of the University. He characterized South Building as a kind of closed culture in which decisions have not always been taken with consultations of the nature and extent that the faculty expect. He regretted the trend toward treating the chancellor as if he were the chief executive of the nation. As an example, he cited the chancellor's recent state of the university address which seemed to have been structured with the president's State of the Union address in mind—all of the vice chancellors and deans seated together in the front row and formally introduced as if they somehow constituted "the University" in the same way that the president and his cabinet constitute "the government." Prof. Pfaff said that he does not believe that is

how Chancellor Moeser understands the University, but nevertheless the impression is given of a culture at the upper level of administration [South Building] that would be unthinkable in other contexts within the institution. He urged the chancellor to cultivate the wider academic culture. No great university can flourish if its predominant culture is administrative. He regretted the executive and competitive mind-set to which we seem to be committed. He rejected the intellectual viability of the notion that we must continually bid for the services of faculty members through a repetitive process of offer and counter-offer. We all understand that this is a zero-sum game. He hoped that the kind of reflectiveness that has heretofore been lacking in South Building will now be fostered by the discussions that have emanated from recent events.

Chancellor Moeser replied that within the past three days he and others in South Building had discussed the need to spend more of our time talking about issues of educational quality, which is what the faculty are truly passionate about, rather than focusing on administrative issues. The chancellor said that when he decided he wanted a career as a faculty member, he never dreamed of administration as a goal. He still believes that would should be spending more of our time talking about the passions that drive academics—commitment to our own disciplines, the glorious interaction with students that we call teaching, and to the service in which we engage that fulfills our lives. For example, let us challenge ourselves to have a deep campus debate about the academic plan.

Prof. Joseph Ferrell (Government) spoke to extent of the controversy that erupted about Ms. Ehringhaus' severance agreement. He said that this is not the first time a senior public official has been asked to step aside, nor the first time in which a severance agreement has been part of that process. It is, however, the first that he can recall generating controversy of this extent. He thought that the controversy might have been less had the severance terms been negotiated in advance at the time of appointment rather than negotiated in secret at the end. Severance agreements for school superintendents and city and county managers, for example, are in wide use throughout North Carolina and seldom attract negative comment. It is understood that these officials serve at the pleasure of the governing boards and may be dismissed with little notice. To attract the caliber of individual needed in the job, reasonable severance provisions are essential. He hoped that the current controversy would result in a change in appointment procedures for senior administrators, especially those who are brought in from the outside with no prior academic base in this institution, in which severance packages are negotiated up front and are approved in advance by the appropriate authorities.

Prof. Howard Reisner (Pathology & Laboratory Medicine) noted that from the perspective of the staff, faculty members are part of the "imperium." He often finds himself having to defend the University's actions, which he feels compelled to do. He hoped the chancellor would try hard to mend our fences with the staff. An excellent academic institution depends on having an excellent faculty, but we faculty most certainly depend on staff who are willing to work for us.

### **Adjournment.**

Its business having been completed, the Council adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell  
Secretary of the Faculty