

MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, November 15, 1996, 3:00 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA

Type Time Item

OPEN SESSION

ACT	3:00	Memorial Resolution for the late J. Robert Butler: Daniel A. Textoris, Chair, Memorial Committee.
INFO	3:03	Remarks by Chancellor Hooker.
INFO	3:15	Question Period. [The Chancellor invites questions or comments on any topic.]
INFO	3:25	Chair of the Faculty Jane D. Brown.
DISC	3:35	•• Update Report of Task Force on Intellectual Climate: Pamela J. Conover, Chair. [List attached to Agenda.]
INFO	3:50	Annual Reports of Standing Committees: The State of the Faculty
ACT	4:00	Status of Women: Abigail T. Panter, Chair. *
INFO	4:10	Faculty Welfare: Steven L. Bachenheimer, Chair. *
		Advisory Committee: Janet Mason, Chair. *
DISC	4:10	•• Principles of Post-Tenure Review [attached to Agenda, along with memos].
INFO	4:50	Bus Tour for New Faculty: Mike Smith.
ACT	4:55	Old or New Business.

CLOSED SESSION
(to non-faculty persons)

ACT	5:00	Presentation of Candidates for Distinguished Alumnus(a) Awards for October 12, 1997 University Day: Weldon Thornton, Chair, Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards. [The folders for the DAA candidates are available for perusal by interested Council or other faculty members in 203 Carr Building.]
-----	------	--

KEY: Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

ACT = Action
INFO = Information
DISC = Discussion

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

•• Members of the Advisory Committee and the Task Force on Intellectual Climate will remain after adjournment and until 6 p.m. to continue discussions with interested faculty members and others.

The minutes of the October 11 General Faculty and Faculty Council meeting are attached to this Agenda. The next Faculty Council meeting is on December 6.

Minutes of the Faculty Council

November 15, 1996

[A full transcript of the proceedings can be found on the University's Internet homepage. The URL is <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/facoun/>]

Memorial Resolution

A memorial resolution for the late J. Robert Butler, Professor Emeritus of Geology, was presented by Professor Daniel A. Textoris.

Remarks by Chancellor Michael Hooker

Resolution of dispute with housekeepers. The University and the Housekeepers Association Steering Committee have reach agreement in principle on a settlement of the dispute. Details cannot be made public until the settlement has been approved by both parties and the administrative law judge having jurisdiction.

"Glass ceiling" report. The administration welcomes the "glass ceiling" report [a report on the relative progress of women faculty in the Division of Academic Affairs toward tenure as compared to male faculty]. We will address the concerns it identifies and will be conducting a parallel study for faculty in the Division of Health Affairs. We will also begin collecting data on an annual basis.

Classroom repair and renovation. We have designated \$1.7 million for classroom improvements. Renovations are beginning on the 46 classrooms identified as most in need by the Classroom Advisory Committee. There will be some inconvenience as classes are shifted to accommodate the work. We have also designated \$1.7 million for lecture hall improvements, with highest priority given to Venable 207 and 268. This work will be done in the summer and fall semester of 1997. Two million has been allotted for Murphey Hall renovations, which will be done in 1998-99. Carroll Hall will be renovated in 1997-98. When the School of Journalism and Mass Communication vacates Howell Hall, that building will become swing space for buildings being renovated.

Environmental studies. The Chancellor has asked to the Provost to begin inaugurating an undergraduate major in environmental studies with an anticipated inception date of Fall, 1998. Required courses will be identified by Fall, 1997. Details of administrative organization remain to be worked out.

M.P.A. program transferred. Administrative responsibility for the Master of Public Administration degree program has been transferred from the Department of Political Science to the Institute of Government. Course offerings will continue to be offered by faculty of both units.

Undergraduate advising. A recent survey of students done by General Administration suggests that our students are dissatisfied with undergraduate advising. We ranked 13 points lower in satisfaction rating than the next lowest institution and 24 points below the median for the entire System. The Chancellor has asked the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate to add this topic to its agenda.

Post-tenure review. Chancellor Hooker is convinced that this University does not have a problem with its faculty that will be addressed by post-tenure review, but we do "have a problem with perception out in the broader world," and for that reason must do something in this regard. He regards it as his job to change the perception that there is "deadwood" on the faculty and will be look for help from the faculty in doing that. He also believes it will be increasingly important to defend the institution of academic tenure with more vigor and persuasion than in the past. We have traditionally emphasized tenure's guarantee of academic freedom, but that has lost much of its persuasive force. We need to point to other benefits, such as the way in which tenure promotes inter-disciplinary efforts that otherwise might not be encouraged or rewarded. We also need to be prepared to demonstrate that tenure does not have the kinds of negative consequences at this institution that it is sometimes said to have produced elsewhere.

Technology. Chancellor Hooker acknowledged misgivings among some of the faculty about his emphasis on the use of digital technology in the academy. He does not mean that the University should compromise its high

standards of scholarship and teaching. In talking about change, he means changing our ways of doing things in order to remain the same. The strength of Carolina has been scholarship and teaching, and they will remain its strengths in the future. But in order to remain the leader in American higher education that we now are, we must take cognizance of the changing external environment. We must bring digital technology into the classroom, and he is concerned that we are not doing it fast enough. That concern underlies the funding recently made available for grants to faculty who want to experiment with this technology in their classrooms. The proposals that have come forward so far are so good that the Chancellor will make additional funding available. We also need to be prepared to enter the national and international arena in the emerging world of distance learning. There is "an enormous thirst out there, especially in developing nations, for American higher education taught in English."

[There were no questions or comments from Council members.]

Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty, Jane D. Brown

Professor Brown reported on several topics under discussion by the Faculty Assembly, which was also meeting today. They included ways to increase faculty and student involvement in the search for a new UNC president, possibilities for more flexible retirement options and incentives for early retirement, undesirable consequences of the Open Meetings Law for faculty participation in University governance, and President Spangler's thoughts on the subject of post-tenure review. As for the latter topic, Professor Brown reported that President Spangler sees this initiative as a "pre-emptive strike" to some extent. Ten states have already implemented such systems and others are in various stages of developing one. The President wants the University to take the initiative in this area rather than have it forced on us by the General Assembly. He also thinks it is important that the faculty have a major hand in shaping post-tenure review procedures.

World AIDS Week

Ms. Anna Wood, an undergraduate student, spoke to the Council about the campus observance of World AIDS Week during the first week in December. Information about supportive activities that the faculty could undertake was distributed, and interested faculty were urged to contact Cheryl Manning-Schaub at Student Health Services.

Update Report of the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate

Professor Pamela Conover, chair of the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate, briefed the Council on the work of the Task Force. It is working in six subcommittees: Inside the Classroom, First Year Experience, Service Learning, Public Spaces, Outside the Classroom, and Faculty Roles and Rewards. She described several ideas that the subcommittees are developing. Discussion of the Task Force's work will be the main item of business for the December meeting of the Council meeting.

Professor Conover called attention to the Task Force's Web page and urged the faculty to visit it. The URL is <http://www.unc.edu/campus/sigs/icc/>. A complete transcript of this portion of the meeting will be found on the University's Web page. Paper copies are available from the Office of Faculty Governance upon request.

Annual Reports of Standing Committees

Committee on the Status of Women. Professor Abigail Panter, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title.

Committee on Faculty Welfare. Professor Steven Bachenheimer, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title. Professor Bachenheimer noted that the matter of faculty benefits has historically had a low priority on this campus and expressed the committee's frustration that it has little authority in that regard. Chancellor Hooker agreed that our faculty benefits package is not competitive with our benchmark institutions (Michigan and Virginia). He is working with the General Assembly on a compensation package that addresses both salaries and benefits.

Professor Bachenheimer moved adoption of a resolution requesting that the name of the committee be changed to Committee on Faculty Life. Professor James Peacock, speaking as Chair of the Committee on

University Government, opposed the motion on grounds that the first dictionary definition of "wellfare" aptly describes the committee's charge. The motion to rename the committee was defeated.

Professor Peacock then moved that the charge of the committee be revised to read "The Committee works on the improvement of faculty benefits and working conditions." Professor Bachheimer supported this motion and it was unanimously adopted.

Professor Peacock's motion was referred to the Committee on University Government for preparation of an appropriate amendment to the Faculty Code.

Advisory Committee. Professor Janet Mason, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title.

Principles of Post-Tenure Review

Professor Janet Mason, Chair of the Advisory Committee, introduced a discussion of post-tenure review. President Spangler has directed each of the sixteen campuses to develop a statement of the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review. A system-wide committee will receive these statements and advise the President and Board of Governors as to the next steps to be taken. Professor Stirling Haig (Romance Languages) is our representative on that committee.

Chancellor Hooker assigned to the Advisory Committee the task of responding to the President's directive on behalf of this institution. The Committee has produced a draft statement, which has been circulated for comment to all members of the General Faculty. Professor Mason has also discussed the draft with the academic deans. With the benefit of comments from the faculty and key administrators, the Advisory Committee will finalize the draft on Wednesday, November 20, and will present our response to General Administration on Friday, November 22.

The Committee has kept the draft at a fairly general level in order to leave room for development of a system that recognizes the needs and uniqueness of each of the sixteen campuses campus in the System and the special circumstances of individual academic units within each institution. Therefore, the draft lacks much of the detail that would be necessary for a comprehensive discussion of post-tenure review. Professor Mason emphasized that the Advisory Committee wants to encourage a process that is supportive of academic tenure, and for that reason the draft emphasizes the faculty development aspect of post-tenure review.

The Council's discussion of the draft centered on five topics: (1) the nature of peer review and the proper role of administrators in such reviews, (2) concerns about the amount of time that could be consumed by regular reviews, (3) concerns that faculty development plans should not be permitted to discourage faculty members from seizing emerging opportunities, (4) concerns as to the need to adapt the faculty grievance process to accommodate post-tenure review, and (5) the hope that any new procedures would build on those already in place. A complete transcript of this portion of the meeting will be found on the University's Web page. Paper copies can be obtained from the Office of Faculty Governance upon request.

Distinguished Alumnus/Alumna Awards for 1997

Pursuant to a motion duly made and adopted, the Council went into closed session to consider the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards with respect to Distinguished Alumnus/Alumna Awards to be presented at University Day, 1997.

Professor Weldon Thornton, Chair of the Committee, presented a slate of five candidates. The slate was adopted unanimously.

At the conclusion of the closed session, the Council returned to open session. Upon a motion duly made and adopted, the Council then adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Minutes of the Faculty Council

November 15, 1996

[A full transcript of the proceedings can be found on the University's Internet homepage. The URL is <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/>.]

Memorial Resolution

A memorial resolution for the late J. Robert Butler, Professor Emeritus of Geology, was presented by Professor Daniel A. Textoris.

Remarks by Chancellor Michael Hooker

Resolution of dispute with housekeepers. The University and the Housekeepers Association Steering Committee have reach agreement in principle on a settlement of the dispute. Details cannot be made public until the settlement has been approved by both parties and the administrative law judge having jurisdiction.

"Glass ceiling" report. The administration welcomes the "glass ceiling" report [a report on the relative progress of women faculty in the Division of Academic Affairs toward tenure as compared to male faculty]. We will address the concerns it identifies and will be conducting a parallel study for faculty in the Division of Health Affairs. We will also begin collecting data on an annual basis.

Classroom repair and renovation. We have designated \$1.7 million for classroom improvements. Renovations are beginning on the 46 classrooms identified as most in need by the Classroom Advisory Committee. There will be some inconvenience as classes are shifted to accommodate the work. We have also designated \$1.7 million for lecture hall improvements, with highest priority given to Venable 207 and 268. This work will be done in the summer and fall semester of 1997. Two million has been allotted for Murphey Hall renovations, which will be done in 1998-99. Carroll Hall will be renovated in 1997-98. When the School of Journalism and Mass Communication vacates Howell Hall, that building will become swing space for buildings being renovated.

Environmental studies. The Chancellor has asked to the Provost to begin inaugurating an undergraduate major in environmental studies with an anticipated inception date of Fall, 1998. Required courses will be identified by Fall, 1997. Details of administrative organization remain to be worked out.

M.P.A. program transferred. Administrative responsibility for the Master of Public Administration degree program has been transferred from the Department of Political Science to the Institute of Government. Course offerings will continue to be offered by faculty of both units.

Undergraduate advising. A recent survey of students done by General Administration suggests that our students are dissatisfied with undergraduate advising. We ranked 13 points lower in satisfaction rating than the next lowest institution and 24 points below the median for the entire System. The Chancellor has asked the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate to add this topic to its agenda.

Post-tenure review. Chancellor Hooker is convinced that this University does not have a problem with its faculty that will be addressed by post-tenure review, but we do "have a problem with perception out in the broader world," and for that reason must do something in this regard. He regards it as his job to change the perception that there is "deadwood" on the faculty and will be look for help from the faculty

in doing that. He also believes it will be increasingly important to defend the institution of academic tenure with more vigor and persuasion than in the past. We have traditionally emphasized tenure's guarantee of academic freedom, but that has lost much of its persuasive force. We need to point to other benefits, such as the way in which tenure promotes inter-disciplinary efforts that otherwise might not be encouraged or rewarded. We also need to be prepared to demonstrate that tenure does not have the kinds of negative consequences at this institution that it is sometimes said to have produced elsewhere.

Technology. Chancellor Hooker acknowledged misgivings among some of the faculty about his emphasis on the use of digital technology in the academy. He does not mean that the University should compromise its high standards of scholarship and teaching. In talking about change, he means changing our ways of doing things in order to remain the same. The strength of Carolina has been scholarship and teaching, and they will remain its strengths in the future. But in order to remain the leader in American higher education that we now are, we must take cognizance of the changing external environment. We must bring digital technology into the classroom, and he is concerned that we are not doing it fast enough. That concern underlies the funding recently made available for grants to faculty who want to experiment with this technology in their classrooms. The proposals that have come forward so far are so good that the Chancellor will make additional funding available. We also need to be prepared to enter the national and international arena in the emerging world of distance learning. There is "an enormous thirst out there, especially in developing nations, for American higher education taught in English."

[There were no questions or comments from Council members.]

Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty, Jane D. Brown

Professor Brown reported on several topics under discussion by the Faculty Assembly, which was also meeting today. They included ways to increase faculty and student involvement in the search for a new UNC president, possibilities for more flexible retirement options and incentives for early retirement, undesirable consequences of the Open Meetings Law for faculty participation in University governance, and President Spangler's thoughts on the subject of post-tenure review. As for the latter topic, Professor Brown reported that President Spangler sees this initiative as a "pre-emptive strike" to some extent. Ten states have already implemented such systems and others are in various stages of developing one. The President wants the University to take the initiative in this area rather than have it forced on us by the General Assembly. He also thinks it is important that the faculty have a major hand in shaping post-tenure review procedures.

World AIDS Week

Ms. Anna Wood, an undergraduate student, spoke to the Council about the campus observance of World AIDS Week during the first week in December. Information about supportive activities that the faculty could undertake was distributed, and interested faculty were urged to contact Cheryl Manning-Schaub at Student Health Services.

Update Report of the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate

Professor Pamela Conover, chair of the Task Force on the Intellectual Climate, briefed the Council on the work of the Task Force. It is working in six subcommittees: Inside the Classroom, First Year Experience, Service Learning, Public Spaces, Outside the Classroom, and Faculty Roles and Rewards. She described several ideas that the subcommittees are developing. Discussion of the Task Force's work will be the main item of business for the December meeting of the Council. meeting.

Professor Conover called attention to the Task Force's Web page and urged the faculty to visit it. The URL is <http://www.unc.edu/campus/sigs/icc/>. A complete transcript of this portion of the meeting will be found on the University's Web page. Paper copies are available from the Office of Faculty Governance upon request.

Annual Reports of Standing Committees

Committee on the Status of Women. Professor Abigail Panter, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title.

Committee on Faculty Welfare. Professor Steven Bachenheimer, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title. Professor Bachenheimer noted that the matter of faculty benefits has historically had a low priority on this campus and expressed the committee's frustration that it has little authority in that regard. Chancellor Hooker agreed that our faculty benefits package is not competitive with our benchmark institutions (Michigan and Virginia). He is working with the General Assembly on a compensation package that addresses both salaries and benefits.

Professor Bachenheimer moved adoption of a resolution requesting that the name of the committee be changed to Committee on Faculty Life. Professor James Peacock, speaking as Chair of the Committee on University Government, opposed the motion on grounds that the first dictionary definition of "welfare" aptly describes the committee's charge. The motion to rename the committee was defeated.

Professor Peacock then moved that the charge of the committee be revised to read "The Committee works on the improvement of faculty benefits and working conditions." Professor Bachenheimer supported this motion and it was unanimously adopted.

Professor Peacock's motion was referred to the Committee on University Government for preparation of an appropriate amendment to the Faculty Code.

Advisory Committee. Professor Janet Mason, Chair. The annual report was received and read by title.

Principles of Post-Tenure Review

Professor Janet Mason, Chair of the Advisory Committee, introduced a discussion of post-tenure review. President Spangler has directed each of the sixteen campuses to develop a statement of the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review. A system-wide committee will receive these statements and advise the President and Board of Governors as to the next steps to be taken. Professor Stirling Haig (Romance Languages) is our representative on that committee.

Chancellor Hooker assigned to the Advisory Committee the task of responding to the President's directive on behalf of this institution. The Committee has produced a draft statement, which has been circulated for comment to all members of the General Faculty. Professor Mason has also discussed the draft with the academic deans. With the benefit of comments from the faculty and key administrators, the Advisory Committee will finalize the draft on Wednesday, November 20, and will present our response to General Administration on Friday, November 22.

The Committee has kept the draft at a fairly general level in order to leave room for development of a system that recognizes the needs and uniqueness of each of the sixteen campuses campus in the System and the special circumstances of individual academic units within each institution. Therefore, the draft lacks much of the detail that would be necessary for a comprehensive discussion of post-tenure review.

Professor Mason emphasized that the Advisory Committee wants to encourage a process that is supportive of academic tenure, and for that reason the draft emphasizes the faculty development aspect of post-tenure review.

The Council's discussion of the draft centered on five topics: (1) the nature of peer review and the proper role of administrators in such reviews, (2) concerns about the amount of time that could be consumed by regular reviews, (3) concerns that faculty development plans should not be permitted to discourage faculty members from seizing emerging opportunities, (4) concerns as to the need to adapt the faculty grievance process to accommodate post-tenure review, and (5) the hope that any new procedures would build on those already in place. A complete transcript of this portion of the meeting will be found on the University's Web page. Paper copies can be obtained from the Office of Faculty Governance upon request.

Distinguished Alumnus/Alumna Awards for 1997

Pursuant to a motion duly made and adopted, the Council went into closed session to consider the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards with respect to Distinguished Alumnus/Alumna Awards to be presented at University Day, 1997.

Professor Weldon Thornton, Chair of the Committee, presented a slate of five candidates. The slate was adopted unanimously.

At the conclusion of the closed session, the Council returned to open session. Upon a motion duly made and adopted, the Council then adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell

Secretary of the Faculty

BUTLER MEMORIAL FOR FACULTY COUNCIL RECORDS

James Robert Butler, Professor Emeritus of Geology since 1993, died unexpectedly on April 15, 1996 in Chapel Hill.

Bob Butler was born in Macon, Georgia, on April 17, 1930. His post high school education consisted of the BS from the University of Georgia, the MS from the University of Colorado, and the PhD from Columbia University, in 1952, 1955, and 1962 respectively, all in geology.

Bob served in the U.S. Army from 1954-1956.

Bob's academic experience consisted of a lectureship at Columbia University from 1959-1960, with the remainder at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: visiting assistant professor, 1960-1962; assistant professor, 1962-1966; associate professor, 1966-1972; and professor, 1972-1993:

Bob held many honors, including fellowships from the Williamson Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, University of Colorado, Union Carbide, National Science Foundation, and IBM Faculty Computer. He had been elected into a number of societies, including Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Sigma Phi Alpha, and Sigma Gamma Epsilon. Professional societies included Geological Society of America (Fellow), Mineralogical Society, American Geophysical Union, National Association of Geology Teachers, North Carolina Academy of Science, North Carolina Archeological Society, Carolina Geological Society, and the Georgia Geological Society. He held chairmanships in many of these organizations.

He was extraordinarily active in research as shown by more than 80 publications, and by his active membership in a dozen regional, national, and international research-active organizations. Most of his research involved the geology of the Piedmont and Mountain provinces of the Carolinas, and this was

related to other regions throughout the world. There is no doubt that Bob's research, and the dozens of MS and PhD students that he supervised, contributed to a far better understanding of the geology of the southeastern United States.

Bob was truly the last of a breed of field geologists who carried on the great traditions of Dennison Olmstead and Elijah Mitchell. He saw his calling as surveying the regional geology of the Carolinas, of bringing modern analytical methods and tectonic models to our understanding of the geological history of the southern Appalachians. Within this context, he trained a generation of students to continue his work in universities, state and federal agencies, and mineral companies throughout the south.

However, he never lost his love of the west. For many years he taught Carolina's field course in New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. There is the image of Bob seated before a heaping plate of enchiladas with green chili sauce, pouring honey into one sopapilla after another, and wiping his famous bald pate with his napkin as the peppers began their work.

Bob was always ready to listen, encourage, and to offer guidance to faculty, staff, students, and colleagues from wherever. However, he rarely would tell you what he thought you should do. Instead, he listened carefully, asked questions, and provided information. Not infrequently, after a discussion, one would find that the mind frame had changed and you were headed in a different direction.

Bob clearly distinguished himself by the way he treated others. No question was considered foolish or without merit, and no person was belittled. Everyone was important and treated with respect, and he genuinely cared for the students.

His knowledge of rock outcrops and geologic literature was equalled by

his knowledge of barbeque restaurants. Non-stop conversations on field trips covered a variety of topics including packing peaches and growing up in Georgia, Carolina politics, geology in other parts of the world, histories of small towns such as Bat Cave, Old Fort, and Pageland. Bob was a wonderful story-teller, with a wealth of stories.

He was a member of the Faculty Council from 1963-1966, and he won the Tanner Distinguished Teaching Award in 1980. Although pressured by many to be chairman of the department on numerous occasions, Bob politely said no, so he could devote time to field research and teaching. Besides teaching all levels of courses, including his specialty in metamorphic rocks, he developed in recent years a course in archeological geology with colleagues in the Department of Anthropology. Not only was this an extremely successful course, which he continued to teach after retirement, but the two departments graduated a PhD in this field a few years ago.

Bob was famous for his ability to avoid committees and meetings. He always managed to be in the field at the right time. One colleague characterized him as "administratively challenged", but that minor lacuna aside, he was a valued citizen of the department.

A virtually unknown facet of Bob's professional contributions was an unpublished report written for the North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development in 1986. He reviewed a US Department of Energy report which contained two regions in North Carolina being considered for a high-level radioactive waste repository. He presented the geologic flaws which would have made the sites hazardous, and they were withdrawn from further consideration.

Bob served the region, the State, and the University with dedication, community spirit, and excellence for 33 years, and three more active years as

an emeritus professor.

He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth L. Butler, two brothers, Walter C. Butler, Jr. and Joseph H. Butler, a son, James R. Butler, Jr., two daughters, Sarah B. Pierce and Erin G. Butler, three stepchildren, and 12 grandchildren.

Bob leaves a great number of friends, colleagues, students, and family who will remember him with great warmth and fondness. He enriched so many lives, and for this we celebrate his life.

Daniel A. Textoris, Professor of Geology

P. Geoffrey Feiss, Professor of Geology

Steven A. Goldberg, Research Associate of Geochemistry

Oct. 11, 1996

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE

Chair: Pamela Conover, Political Science, CB#3265, 2-0424, conover.ham@mhs.unc.edu

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

This committee will seek to: (1) identify the kinds of activities and behaviors that are rewarded now, with what, and by whom; (2) identify key changes in the present reward system that would have the greatest influence on faculty activities; (3) propose innovative reward structures for departments and individual faculty who engage in activities that enhance the intellectual climate; and (4) devise ways to modify expectations within the local culture about faculty life cycles and responsibilities. **CHAIR:** Laurie McNeil, Physics and Astronomy, CB# 3255, 2-7204, mcneil@physics.unc.edu

FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE

This committee will focus on the socialization process in intellectual skills and attitudes from high school to the college setting. The purview of this committee is thus wide-ranging, with the following broad themes to be addressed through three interacting subcommittees: (1) Student Recruitment Through Orientation (how can we maximize learning skills and seriousness of academic purpose?); (2) Freshman Academic Programs (how can we strengthen student-faculty contact and nurture students' power of analytic thinking and powers of expression?); and (3) Living and Learning or the Extra-Academic Experience (how can we best make a variety of campus resources available to First Year students? Is there a role for a Freshman Campus?) **CHAIR:** Leon Fink, History, CB# 3195, 2-8080, lfink.ham@mhs.unc.edu

IN THE CLASSROOM

This committee will focus on institutional issues which facilitate or impede student-faculty interaction in the classroom. Our objective is to find mechanisms which can support new and existing efforts to provide a strong educational environment -- one which emphasizes learning how to learn, active student roles in inquiry oriented courses, and independent student scholarship. We will examine ways to use electronic technology to enhance student-faculty interaction and to expand educational services to the North Carolina community. We will also explore institutional devices which would support a continuing reexamination of the educational milieu, as well as those which could be useful in the facilitation and evaluation of educational innovations. **CHAIR:** Marshall H. Edgell, Microbiology and Immunology, CB# 7290, 2-0147, marshall@med.unc.edu

OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

This committee will identify current obstacles to intellectual exchanges outside the classroom and also identify examples of such exchanges that now exist. The committee will then suggest ways to enhance faculty-student exchanges in venues outside formal instruction (e.g. residence halls, Greek system, coffee houses, bookstores, advising system); it will also propose strategies to foster participation in informal discussions and public events (e.g. visiting speakers, conferences, plays and concerts). **CHAIR:** Lloyd Kramer, History, CB# 3195, 2-5554, lkramer@unc.edu

PUBLIC SPACES

This committee will identify the kinds of public space needed to facilitate intellectual discourse and faculty/student contact on campus at various scales: within departments, among departments and disciplines, and across the university. After assessing the availability and accessibility of public space, it will develop recommendations for future planning of space utilization and development that better support intellectual engagement on campus. **CHAIR:** Melinda Meade, Geography, CB# 3220, 2-3922, meade@geog.unc.edu

SERVICE AND COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING

The goal of this committee is to positively affect the intellectual climate of undergraduates at UNC-CH by increasing the availability of service learning experiences; improving the quality of service and community-based learning opportunities; and enhancing the ability and motivation of faculty to integrate these kinds of learning experiences into their teaching and courses. Service learning and other community-based learning allow students to make meaningful contributions to the community; apply classroom knowledge to real-life problems; improve and promote citizenship; and enhance self-esteem and career development. **CHAIR:** Donna LeFebvre, Political Science, CB#3265, 2-0429, lefebvre@nando.net

PLEASE JOIN IN A CAMPUS-WIDE DISCUSSION OF THESE ISSUES BY CONTACTING ANY OF THE ABOVE COMMITTEE CHAIRS OR ACCESSING THE TASK FORCE'S WEB PAGE: <http://www.unc.edu/campus/sigs/icc/>

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE
Committee Memberships

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS

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

FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE

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

IN THE CLASSROOM

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

OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

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

PUBLIC SPACES

Phil Berke (City and Regional Planning); Thomas Clegg (Physics and Astronomy); Norris Johnson (Anthropology); Vincent Kopp (Anesthesiology); Wayne Kuncel (Student Affairs); Melinda Meade (Geography); Aaron Nelson (Student Body President); Susanna Rinehart (Dramatic Art); Thomas Sayre (alumnus); Elin Slavick (Art); Robert Vanderbeck (graduate student); Reyna Walters (undergraduate student)

SERVICE AND COMMUNITY BASED LEARNING

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

TO: Faculty
FROM: Janet Mason, Chair, Chancellor's Advisory Committee
DATE: October 18, 1996
RE: Draft of Principal Features of a Meaningful System of Post-Tenure Review

Consistent with national trends in higher education, UNC General Administration is taking steps to "ensure that there is regular, systematic post-tenure evaluation of faculty performance throughout the University." On August 7, 1996, President Spangler sent to each chancellor in the UNC System the attached memorandum regarding post-tenure review. Among other things, it asks each campus to submit a list of its faculty's views regarding the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review.

As an initial step in this campus's response, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee was asked to produce a draft of such a list. The committee provides the following draft as a basis for the Faculty Council's consideration and discussion, at its meeting on November 15, of the question: "What should be the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review of faculty performance?"

The draft will be revised based on that discussion and other comments the committee receives, and will be submitted to a system-wide committee at General Administration. Professor Stirling Haig is this campus's representative on that committee.

As you review the draft, please keep in mind that its purpose is *not* to specify the details of a post-tenure review system for UNC at Chapel Hill or for individual units on campus. Those tasks will come later. This draft is aimed at communicating to General Administration our faculty's view of a general framework within which this campus (and other campuses) can design a system of post-tenure review that works here—that is supportive of tenure, that aids faculty development, and that provides accountability.

The Advisory Committee invites your comments, either at the November 15 Faculty Council meeting or by communications to me before the meeting.

Janet Mason
Institute of Government
CB # 3330, Knapp Building
Phone: 6-4246
FAX: 2-0654
mason.iog@mhs.unc.edu

Other members of the Advisory Committee are Bernadette Gray-Little, Vice-Chair (Psychology); Jaroslav T. Folda (Art); Stephen Weiss (Computer Science); Paul Debreczeny (Slavic Languages); Slayton Evans, Jr., (Chemistry); Linda Lacey (City & Regional Planning); Stirling Haig (Romance Languages); Gilbert White (Medicine); Jane Brown (Chair of the Faculty); and Joe Ferrell (Secretary of the Faculty).

DRAFT: Principal Features of a Meaningful System of Post-Tenure Review

Preamble

Academic tenure has served the academy well by enhancing academic freedom, the economic security of the professoriate, and institutional ability to attract and retain excellent faculty. Increasingly over the last decade, especially in the case of public institutions, critics have claimed that tenure diminishes institutional accountability and, in the worst case, protects incompetence. Here we propose principal features of a post-tenure review system designed to enhance both institutional quality and accountability. These features ultimately will strengthen the institution of academic tenure, preserving the freedom and excellence that are central to the spirit and purpose of the academy.

Principal Features

1. The goals of a system of post-tenure review should be to promote faculty development, increase faculty productivity, and provide accountability. A system of post-tenure review should not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action (including reductions in compensation or benefits) established under the principles of academic tenure.
2. A system of post-tenure review should consist of regular, comprehensive reviews of all tenured faculty members.
3. Post-tenure review procedures should supplement current procedures for the review of tenured faculty with a systematic and consistent process. Specifically, post-tenure review should:
 - be conducted by faculty peers,
 - use criteria consistent with the mission of each academic unit, and
 - be conducted no more frequently than every three years (to ensure reliable data and minimize administrative costs) and no less frequently than every five years (to ensure sufficient opportunities for review).
4. Post-tenure review should have direct consequences for faculty members. For example, it should:
 - influence directly the allocation of merit-based compensation, and
 - motivate faculty development plans.
5. Department chairs and deans, as the administrative and managerial representatives of the University, should be directly responsible for:
 - conveying the results of the post-tenure review to each faculty member, and
 - working with faculty members to construct development plans for improving performance.
6. Faculty development plans must be flexible and individualized. They should:
 - take into account the individual faculty member's intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage, and
 - be integrated into later reviews, providing incentives for successful execution.
7. A system of post-tenure review, including the faculty development activities arising from it, must be accompanied by the University administration's assurance that it will provide the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system.



The University of North Carolina

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

POST OFFICE BOX 2688, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27515-2688

C. D. SPANGLER, JR. *President*

Telephone 919 962-1000

Appalachian State
University

East Carolina
University

Elizabeth City
State University

Fayetteville State
University

North Carolina
Agricultural and
Technical State
University

North Carolina
Central University

North Carolina
School of
the Arts

North Carolina
State University
at Raleigh

Pembroke State
University

University of
North Carolina
at Asheville

University of
North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

University of
North Carolina
at Charlotte

University of
North Carolina
at Greensboro

University of
North Carolina
at Wilmington

Western Carolina
University

Winston-Salem
State University

August 7, 1996

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Chancellors

FROM: C. D. Spangler, Jr. *C. D. Spangler, Jr.*

RE: Review of Performance of Tenured Faculty

In September of 1993, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina issued a report entitled "Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina." This report endorsed the University's historical commitment to tenure as presented in Section 602 of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina and noted that "by and large, tenure policies and procedures within the University are sound" (p.ii). It pointed out that detailed criteria for tenure and other faculty personnel decisions are delegated to the individual campuses subject to the approval of the President and the Board of Governors.

The report stressed that institutions should give careful attention to the evaluation of faculty performance and to the availability of faculty professional development opportunities. We have made a good beginning by implementing the recommendations of the Board of Governors' report on tenure and teaching, but the major focus of that report was almost exclusively on the effectiveness of teaching and on newly appointed and non-tenured faculty members in a probationary status.

Since no institution can be better than the quality of its faculty, we must turn our attention to evaluating the broader obligations of all faculty members, with special emphasis on those who are tenured. Nothing in the Code prohibits review of faculty performance following tenure. Tenure and rigorous evaluations of faculty performance are compatible concepts. Post-tenure reviews and evaluations of faculty are conducted in various formal and informal ways now in our constituent institutions. However, systematic review of the performance of tenured professors

The Chancellors
Page 2
August 7, 1996

may not be carried out on a regular, recurring basis. I informed the Board of Governors in July that we will take a serious look at how, and when, and for what purpose we review the performance of faculty members after they receive tenure and will make a report to them by May 1, 1997. The purpose of the review and report will be to ensure that there is regular, systematic post-tenure evaluation of faculty performance throughout the University.

Therefore I am asking you to do the following:

1. By September 6, 1996, nominate a member of your Academic Affairs staff to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review in the University of North Carolina. This committee will plan to meet monthly throughout much of this academic year.
2. By October 30, have all appropriate units respond to the attached survey on evaluation of tenured faculty. Be sure that each unit attaches copies of its current policies and procedures for evaluation of tenured faculty.
3. By November 22, send a list describing what the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review of faculty performance should include from the point of view of your faculty. *The list should be the result of a formal process of soliciting the views of the faculty.*

This information and materials are to be submitted to Vice President Roy Carroll by the dates indicated.

Enclosure

cc: Vice-President Roy Carroll
Chief Academic Officers
Dr. Peter Petschauer, Chair of the Faculty Assembly

Faculty Council, November 15, 1996

Update Report of Task Force on Intellectual Climate: Pamela J. Conover, Chair.

Professor Brown: Pamela, from the Executive Committee on Faculty Council, and also the head of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate, will speak a minute about the December meeting when we're going to have a full discussion about the recommendations of the Task Force. And we didn't give her enough time last time, so a little more today.

Professor Conover: Well, thanks for having me back. I promised I would be brief last time. I'm not going to promise this time. [laughter] I want to do two things today. I want to update you about some of the ideas that are beginning to come out of this Task Force, and I want to inform you about some of the future activities, and once again try and engage you and involve you. The six Task Force committees have been meeting all semester. They've been very active, and a lot of good ideas have been coming out of them. At the December meeting of Faculty Council, we will take up some of those ideas in greater depth. At that time you will be asked to join our conversation by providing feedback to one of these committees. There's a sign-up sheet going around now. You're to list the three committees you'd most like to interact with, and what we're going to do at the December meeting is to break up in small groups. You'll be briefed about some of the ideas coming out of these committees and asked to, I think, function as something of a test group, a focus group, but also as representatives of the faculty in reacting initially to some of these ideas. So what I want to do today is to give you a little preview about what some of the ideas are like. Hopefully, entice you to want to find out more before the December meeting, and basically, prepare you for that meeting, give you something of an edge on what's going on. So what I'm going to do is run through what some of these committees are coming up with. None of these ideas are set in stone. Some of them are fairly provocative. They're meant to be. So, here we go.

Marshall Edgell chairs the Inside the Classroom committee. They are exploring a number of different ideas, one of which is an academy of distinguished teachers that would advise the Administration on educational matters. Another idea would be to require new faculty to actually take a workshop or perhaps even a course on how to enhance faculty interaction within the classroom. A third would be to establish a program that would take a very active role in encouraging faculty to increase the amount of student-faculty interactions in their courses. Another would be to focus on student independent scholarship, and how we can increase student research, especially in the first two years. Another is the establishment of a performance competence evaluation system to help develop the role of faculty more as a learning coach than as evaluators of student progress. A possibility that's already being explored in the College is the establishment of a structure to support cohort education, and that is keeping small groups of students together through similar experiences, pairing them for particular courses.

Moving to a second committee, Leon Fink has been very active with his First Year Experience committee. That committee has broken down into three subcommittees focusing on the recruitment of new students in our orientation, academic programs during the first year, and living and learning, how one integrates the social experience with the academic experience. They're considering, respectively, programs that have to deal with substantially revamping the C-Tops orientation program. Another proposal being taken up by the academic programs subcommittee is to revisit the idea of freshman seminars but hopefully from some new and innovative perspectives. And yet a third is the idea of a freshman campus.

The third committee is Service Learning. Donna LeFebvre chairs that committee, and they are moving rapidly towards recommending the creation of a center for public service on our campus. This center would support and expand service learning and other community service by undergraduates and graduates. It would act as a gateway, with a supporting database, between the state and local communities, students, staff, and faculty.

The fourth committee is chaired by Melinda Meade. It deals with Public Spaces, and they, too, are exploring a number of ideas. These include requiring formal consultation with faculty and students by Facilities Planning, at a stage where in-house architects start to address a project--much as we now do to ensure handicapped access. We would propose doing that to ensure that our public spaces are designed to facilitate student-faculty interaction. Another possibility is creating a fund to be competitively won each year by faculty or students in departments or other groups for purposes of designing the use of lounges, renovating dead space in their buildings, otherwise improvising interactive space that we don't currently have enough of. A third possibility is establishing a fund which could be self-renewing, with contributions, to purchase the best student art or other creations for hanging in departments, faculty offices, and such. And a final possibility is the creation of a series of mini-amphitheaters as a motif around campus. Some could descend, for example, the banks and hills around building embankments. Others could be groupings of tables and benches between sidewalks that surround the quads. And these would be accessible to discussion groups, readers, small classes, and would bring people out to use campus space during much of the year when the weather permits.

The fifth committee is Outside the Classroom and Lloyd Kramer in the History Department chairs this committee. They are exploring a number of different ideas for bringing intellectual exchange into the various reaches of everyday life. One idea involves better coordination between faculty, as they organize their courses, and those who exercise extra-curricular activities on campus. Faculty would be strongly encouraged to integrate outside events into classroom activity. Indeed, into course requirements, thereby beginning to break down the dichotomy between inside and outside the classroom. The Chancellor mentioned earlier the importance of advising, and this committee has already begun to focus on that and is in the process of developing a proposal to change the advising system so as to make the advisor-student relationship much more than some sort of bureaucratic check-off of requirements, which many students feel that's what it is now.

The final committee is on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Laurie McNeil chairs that committee. A lot of the changes being discussed, and many of those that I just mentioned, will require changing, indeed, perhaps fundamentally rethinking in some very basic ways our role, the role of faculty. This committee is working at a bit of a disadvantage because they have to wait for the other committees to come up with proposals so they can begin to explore how to adjust faculty roles and rewards in order to facilitate those proposals. Nonetheless, some of the things they have begun exploring include encouraging deans and vice provosts to make part of a departmental budget depend on how much climate-enhancing activity its faculty has engaged in in the last year and plans to do in the future. Another possibility is a much broader definition of teaching load, to include other activities, like undergraduate thesis advising, general advising, and the like. A third possible proposal would be to establish a source of funds at the Provost level, with RFP's for climate-enhancing activities. Proposals, for example, might include time off to revamp a class to make it more of an inquiry style experience, funds for undergraduate research projects, resources to develop interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching projects. Another would be to encourage the naming of professorships for excellence in interdisciplinary scholarship teaching judged by its effects on members of the University community.

In sum, you can see these committees have been fairly busy. They are working hard to look at these different areas. No one idea is going to produce substantial change. But I think when the package of ideas is taken together and put into a coherent plan, that we will have an exciting blueprint for enhancing the intellectual climate on campus. In the upcoming weeks I'm going to ask you to do four things. Next week The Daily Tar Heel will be running a series of articles on intellectual climate. I've been very pleased with the excitement they've shown, and it would be very helpful if you would engage your students and your colleagues in discussion of these articles as well as some of the topics I've brought to you today. Secondly, the Task Force has a terrific Web page. The address is on the flyer that's on the back on the table. You've seen some signs similar to this [Prof. Conover displayed a sign inviting attention to the Web page]. I've brought a number of them today. Please visit the page, participate in the discussion boards, encourage your students and colleagues to do the same. If each of you could just persuade a few of your students, a few of your colleagues, to participate in our Web page conversation, the dialogue would be broadened considerably. And so what I want you to do is I want you to take one of these and post it on your door, and when people say "what is that?" tell them and encourage them to use it. It's really a very exciting innovation and a very appropriate way to carry on this conversation. The third thing as I've

already mentioned, is the discussion we're going to have in December at Faculty Council. It would be good if you gave that some thought ahead of time and acted as representatives and talked to you colleagues about some of these ideas. If you would like further advance information, you can contact me or any of the six committee chairs I've mentioned. And the fourth thing I'm going to ask, and a number of my committee chairs have mentioned this to me, and that is, engaging you in helping to combat the skepticism that they have encountered from many people around campus about whether this Task Force can do anything. Now, in asking that I realize a number of you might be skeptics about whether this Task Force can do anything. Let me assure you that the people on this are working very hard, but more than that, they believe that something can be done, and they are convinced that real and substantial changes can happen. I am convinced of it. I am confident that our Chancellor is convinced of it. The Provost and other administrators are convinced of it, and more importantly, are willing to help us in this project. So, together, I think we can do remarkable things, and I hope you will join us in that effort. And I look forward to our conversation in December. Thank you. [applause]

November 15, 1996
Committee on the Status of Women
Committee Appointed by the Chair of the Faculty
1995-1996 Annual Report

Members: Abigail T. Panter (1994-97), Chair; Allen F. Glazner (1995-98), Karla A. Henderson (1995-98), Catherine Marshall (1994-97), Laurie E. McNeil (1994-97), Susan J. Navarette (1996-99), Debra L. Shapiro (1996-99), Michael J. Symons (1996-99), Rebecca S. Wilder (1995-98), Brent S. Wissick (1994-97).

Members leaving committee during past year: Noelle Granger.

Meetings during past year: February 7, 1996.

Report prepared by: Abigail T. Panter and Laurie E. McNeil, with review of full committee.

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 those obstacles." (*The Faculty Code of University Government* IV.B.2.a.iii).

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of activities:

In this past year the Committee, in collaboration with the Provost's Office, has focused its efforts on the finding from Yi-Yun Chang's 1995 Biostatistics master thesis (under the direction of Michael Symons) suggesting that gender inequity may be present in the transition from Associate Professor to Full Professor in Academic Affairs, with women being promoted at lower rates than men. The thesis entitled, "A Description of Gender-Specific Promotion Patterns for Tenure-Track Faculty in State University" employed data provided by the Vice-Chancellors and was primarily a quantitative approach to promotion trends at the university.

This finding has been pursued in a second study, initiated by the Provost's Office, which examines promotion rates in the transition from Associate Professor to Full Professor – specifically for individuals in Academic Affairs. The study, conducted by Marilyn Yarbrough (then Associate Provost) and Kathleen McGaughey (Assistant Provost), is a more in-depth investigation of promotion decisions (with decisions tied to names obtained from Board of Trustee minutes) covering a longer span of follow up than the Chang study. Additionally, the study includes a qualitative component consisting of an in-person interview designed by Yarbrough (with input from the Committee) to examine reasons why individuals leave the University. The newer study does *not* find evidence of promotion discrepancies of the type found in the Chang study, either quantitatively or qualitatively. The Committee is examining reasons for this.

The Committee made two resolutions at the January 12, 1996 Faculty Council meeting: (1) The Affirmative Action Office should increase its efforts to obtain information from departing faculty to obtain a more accurate assessment of why men and women exit this university; and (2) The Vice Chancellors for Academic and Health Affairs should direct the Deans in their respective Divisions to direct the unit heads under their jurisdiction to examine procedures in use for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, strategies and efforts to support women's access to Full Professor status, and the outcomes of recent decisions in this category (including decisions to defer review).

In pursuing these resolutions the committee has:

1. Begun to develop a set of interview questions that would more adequately address why individuals (men and women) exit the university and whether there are common themes related to gender that characterize these reasons. For example, is non-response the option of choice for those with critical views at the time of resignation? A set of procedures for tracking departures from the university also is being developed to improve the current, poor response rates for the exit interview.
2. Begun planning for the assembly and categorization of procedures in use for promotion decisions from Associate to Full Professor. Procedures/policies have been submitted by a subset of units responding to the Provost's charge (and the Committee's request), and to complete this task, cooperation will be needed from units who have not yet responded.
3. Attended the School of Public Health's Chairs' Retreat (at the invitation of Associate Dean Schoenfeld) to discuss with chairs how they could help foster the success of their female faculty members. The Committee hopes that such discussions will continue in other departments and academic units.
4. Continued data analysis of the SAC's Reaccreditation Self-Study data set which assesses among other topics: perceptions versus reality of the fairness of tenure/promotion, teaching, non-classroom teaching, and committee assignments, salaries, and the use of different teaching methods and types of material (e.g., multicultural elements).

November 15, 1996
Faculty Welfare Committee
(Appointed by the Chancellor)
Annual Report

Members: (1994-97) Francoise M. Seiller-Moiseiwitsch, Julia Wood, Lawrence A. Zelenak; (1995-98) Edward J. Blocher, Lynn D. Glasscock; (1996-99) Diane K. Kjervik, Ruth C. Walden, James E. Allen; (1994-99) Steven L. Bachenheimer (Chair).

Members leaving the committee in the last year: Charles Liner, Donald Madison, Betty Mutran.

Meetings during the past year: (since the last annual report) 2/27, 3/26, 4/30, 8/26, 9/30, 10/28

Report prepared by: Steven Bachenheimer (Chair) with consultation and review by the committee

Committee charge: from the Faculty Code of University Government, **IV.B. 2) a) (iv):**
"The Committee works on the expansion and improvement of faculty benefits."

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges:

1. To monitor compliance with the resolution "Supporting extension of employment benefits to domestic partnerships, adopted November 10, 1995;
2. To monitor compliance with the resolution "Mechanisms to implement salary principles", adopted February 23, 1996

Report of activities:

1. Requested clarification by the Chancellor of provisions of the Parental Leave Policy;
2. Urged General Administration to rectify the current situation in which the end of the health insurance benefit year and the beginning of new coverage are not coincident;
3. Urged the Chancellor to give serious consideration to initiatives for providing low cost, informal faculty dining facilities on campus;
4. The committee has established a liaison with OIR to monitor and report to the Faculty Council on issues and trends related to salary and fringe benefits;
5. The committee has established a liaison with the Provost's office to monitor and report to the Faculty Council on issues related to compliance with new policies guiding salary increases;
6. The committee has monitored all employment benefits and found that their governing policies are in compliance with the resolution of Faculty Council supporting extension of employment benefits to domestic partnerships

Anticipated activities for the coming year

1. The Welfare Committee is preparing a report on the status of research assignments and competitive leave programs at UNC-Chapel Hill. The committee anticipates submitting the report for consideration by the Faculty Council in March of 1997;
2. In cooperation with OIR, the Welfare Committee expects to report to Faculty Council in the Spring Term of 1997 on 1996-97 salaries within units of UNC-Chapel Hill and comparative data from peer institutions. Beginning with the Fall Term of 1997 we will report 1997-98 salaries for units within UNC-Chapel Hill, and in the following Spring term on comparisons with peer institutions. The committee hopes to continue this pattern of reporting on a regular basis in the future;
3. In cooperation with the Provost's office, the Welfare Committee expects to report to Faculty Council in the Spring Term of 1997 on the status of the implementation of salary policies. We anticipate providing data on the number of units in compliance and examples of the types of policies implemented.

Recommendations for action by Faculty Council:

1. Motion that the name of the "Faculty Welfare Committee" be changed to the "Committee on Faculty Life".

Background: The current name of the committee does not reflect the broad range of issues on which the committee now focuses and wishes to in the future. The University Insurance Committee and General Administration in fact do all the "heavy lifting" with regard to faculty benefits in the areas of insurance and retirement programs. There is however an increasing need to identify a locus within the faculty committee structure which deals with day-to-day issues of faculty life (as examples (i) the condition of study leave programs, (ii) monitoring of salary raises and the implementation of salary policies, and (iii) the impact of off-campus, Web-based learning and electronic syllabi on faculty size and teaching loads) and life-cycle issues (as examples (i) the value and reward system for an aging faculty, and (ii) early-retirement incentive programs).

November 15, 1996
Chancellor's Advisory Committee
Elected Committee
Annual Report

Members: Janet Mason (1994-97), Chair; Bernadette Gray-Little (1995-98), Vice-Chair; Jaroslav T. Folda (1994-97); Stephen F. Weiss (1994-97); Paul Debreczeny (1995-98); Slayton A. Evans, Jr. (1996-97, alternate for Gregory Strayhorn); Linda Lacey (1996-99); Stirling Haig (1996-99); Gilbert C. White (1996-99). Gregory Strayhorn (1995-98) is on leave for 1996-97. The Chair of the Faculty, Jane Brown, and Secretary of the Faculty, Joe Ferrell, also are members.

Meetings during past year: 11-8-95; 12-13-95; 1-10-96; 2-14-96; 3-13-96; 4-10-96; 5-8-96; 6-12-96; 7-10-96; 7-31-96; 9-11-96; 10-9-96.

Report prepared by: Janet Mason (Chair), with review of full committee

Committee charge: The Faculty Code of University Government states that the Advisory Committee "shall be advisory to the Chancellor in faculty personnel decisions, program planning and assessment, resource planning and allocation, and other matters which are deemed important by the Chancellor or the Committee." The Code also directs the committee to nominate candidates for open seats on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and for the positions of Chair of the Faculty and Secretary of the Faculty.

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None

Report of Activities:

The committee has met monthly. A subcommittee reviews personnel actions and reports to the full committee, which makes recommendations to the Chancellor regarding actions that involve promotion or the granting of tenure. The committee no longer reviews initial appointments that do not involve tenure.

The committee's activities in 1995-96 focused primarily on developing recommendations for the Chancellor regarding the content of a proposed "report card" for the university. The committee worked in subcommittees that examined: (1) opportunity (access, diversity, and demographics), (2) quality (student/faculty/library), (3) research, (4) public service, and (5) resources, and consulted with Tim Sanford, Assistant Provost and Director of Institutional Research.

This year the committee's main activity has involved post-tenure review. The committee has participated in this campus's response to President Spangler's August, 1996, initiative relating to post-tenure review by

1. nominating one of its members, Professor Stirling Haig (Romance Languages), to serve on a system-wide post-tenure review committee, and
2. preparing a draft of the principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review.

The committee also has reviewed a draft "report card" and has begun discussion of the Advisory Committee's role in relation to the Chancellor and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council.

Recommendations for action by Faculty Council: None



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Department of Psychology
College of Arts & Sciences

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB# 3270, Davie Hall
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3270

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chancellor's Advisory Committee
FROM: Bernadette Gray-Little
RE: Survey on the Review of Tenured Faculty
DATE: October 23, 1996

Several weeks ago, chairs of departments and curricula were asked by the General Administration to respond to a survey on the Review of Tenured Faculty. The collection of these surveys was coordinated by the Provost's office. As suggested at our last meeting, I have summarized the numerical data from the surveys.

There were two pages to the survey. Page 1 of the survey is constructed as a matrix. Each column indicates a purpose of review, for example promotion or salary increase. Each row addresses questions about each kind of review, for example, its frequency, whether it is mandatory or voluntary; persons responsible for the initiation and conduct of the review, and so on. It should be noted that the responses are highly interdependent. For example, most departments conduct annual reviews for merit increases and different subsets of those same departments conduct reviews for "progress on professional development or growth plans," "progress on individual's contribution to the dept/school/college plans," and "check on faculty productivity." My impression is that the latter reviews are primarily part of the annual merit review. Furthermore, I suspect that chairs consider all of these issues in the annual review for merit, but did not check the additional purposes of the review because they are not independent events. Because the responses are so interdependent and because there is evidence of some confusion about the questions, the summary should be regarded with caution.

Page 2 of the survey asked respondents to indicate the positive and negative consequences of post-tenure review. There was also an invitation for comments about post-tenure review.

Responses to each page of the survey are described below. There is nothing surprising in the responses, which are summarized separately for Arts and Sciences, Professional Schools, and Health Affairs (see attachments).

Post-Tenure Review Surveys: Summaries of Comments and Attachments

Following are summaries of comments or policies submitted along with the actual survey responses. For the most part, they do not include descriptions of the process of required periodic reviews for purposes of possible promotion from associate to full professor.

Arts and Sciences

Anthropology

Department now spends significant time on post-tenure review. Five to eight faculty are involved for at least one week per year.

Art

Tenured faculty are reviewed via a number of instruments, according to instructions from the Dean's Office and policies spelled out in the Art Department's Personnel Procedures and Salary Policies Documents. Faculty conduct course evaluations each semester, which they report in their Annual Reports submitted to the Chair together with their list of professional scholarly and teaching activities. These reports, which are submitted to the Dean's Office, provide the basis for annual salary review and for decisions on merit increases. The Chair discusses the review of faculty members' work with the two Assistant Chairs and with an assembled body of Full Professors

Chemistry

In the hardcore sciences (Mathematical, Biological, Chemical, Physical, etc.) peer review—of publications, grant applications, or presentations—is a substantive component of an ongoing pre- and post-tenure review that is critical to the health of these fields. So even in the absence of a formal local review, there are extant and brutally regular indicators of post-tenure performance. Peer review is routinely used to assess eligibility for merit increases, scholarly leaves, etc., and this needs to be recognized in any post-tenure review process.

City and Regional Planning

An annual review is made by the chair as a basis for merit pay increases. Of course, the degree of incentive is only in direct proportion to the amount of pay raise money given to the University and then to the department.

Department has an annual, half-day, peer review faculty meeting at the end of the academic year. Excerpts from the department's annual report (course enrollments, grants, publications, service activities, awards) are supplemented by student course evaluations and a personal statement by the faculty member, and are used as the written pre-meeting basis. The Chair takes notes and delivers results to the individual faculty member. (Each individual is out of the room during the time he/she is being discussed.)

Classics

Post-tenure review is an ongoing process and takes various forms.

- All faculty have students fill out course evaluation forms in all courses. These are read by the chairman, become part of the faculty member's permanent file, and can affect decisions on merit salary increases.
- All faculty submit an account of their scholarly work, service activities, and teaching, including new initiatives, once a year. These are reviewed by the chairman, become part of the faculty member's permanent file, and form the most important single basis for decisions on merit salary increases.
- On an informal basis, faculty often give guest lectures in one another's classes and discuss both teaching methodology and their scholarly work. While informal, this is an important source of information about the professional activities and degree of commitment and involvement of one's peers.

Dramatic Art

Faculty have strong desire for faculty-to-faculty communication. Formal and informal talks occur every day in regard to: teaching strategies, individual student progress, concerns and problems of individual faculty in working with various students, individual professional development, sharing teaching and research resources, interaction through arts performance and rehearsal venues, individual teacher requests for help with teaching.

Economics

Each faculty member must file an annual report listing research activities, public service, and teaching, and must participate in the Carolina Course Review process. The chair evaluates annual reports and course reviews to measure relative performance of faculty members in research, teaching, and service. A scale is used to help identify superior performance (or its converse).

English

New chair expects to reinforce and make more consistent the processes now in place.

Geology

(From attachment, the department's "Procedures and Criteria Pertaining to Faculty Salary Increases")
— Each faculty member should keep the Chair informed of his/her professional activities and accomplishments by

- submitting written annual reports,
- giving a current resume to departmental manager at least annually,
- filing copies of all publications with departmental manager, and
- sending written information about special accomplishment, opportunities, etc.

Germanic Languages

The chair and full professors meet to discuss the relative degrees (not amounts) of salary increments to be recommended if pay raises are available. The meeting is advisory to the chair. At the meeting the following are considered and weighed: promotion; quality and quantity of publications; professional contributions; quality of teaching, based on evaluations; supervision of dissertations and theses; service; professional service to community; market considerations; importance to the department's overall efforts; and need to correct past inequities.

History

Salary review committee, consisting of five people (about 10% of department) is elected for three year terms. Its main tasks are:

- undertake systematic comparative review of faculty accomplishments and salary structure every three years (The committee is to review completely the accomplishments of all faculty not on the committee in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.);
- review each year the department's annual report and other materials in order to recommend to the chair those whose annualized accomplishments deserve special recognition within funding constraints;
- meet with chair each year to consider availability of funding and to work out for presentation to the department a percentage weighting of how any increase will be allocated (i.e., across-the-board, scholarly merit, outstanding recognition, etc.)

The committee forwards its ranking and recommendations to the chair who discusses the evaluations with the committee if chair's assessment of individual faculty differs seriously. The chair evaluates members of the Review Committee.

Linguistics

Except for evaluation by the chair for merit salary increases and peer evaluation of teaching, there is no current provision for evaluation of tenured full professors.

Teaching evaluation: Faculty are encouraged to use Carolina Course Review. Chair receives considerable informal feedback from graduate students. Faculty voted to develop its own course evaluation form, which is to be used in at least one course per year. These are to be kept on file and available to the chair in assessing faculty performance. A limited system of peer review in the form of class visitations has been approved. Each core faculty member will be visited once every two years by two colleagues who will consult with the instructor visited after the class. This review is expressly for self-improvements and its results are not to be used in connection with the chair's decision on merit raises or other such matters.

Music

(From "Faculty Salary Increase Policy") At the end of each academic year, the chair solicits information and requests from members of the faculty for special consideration. These may range from simple requests for salary increases based on specified criteria to recommendations concerning other faculty whose teaching or other achievements have been outstanding. In the spring, the chair consults formally with a representative subcommittee of full professors. Results of the subcommittee's evaluations are presented to the assembled full professors.

Philosophy

For the most part, tenured faculty are responsible professional teachers and scholars who are motivated both internally and by peer pressure to meet standards set by their profession. The work of faculty is also evaluated when it is presented in departmental colloquia. Each faculty member gives annual report to the department head.

Physics and Astronomy

Primary post-tenure review processes are:

- annual submissions of each faculty member to chair, followed by a personal meeting with the chair to discuss the submission
- student course evaluations filled out each semester for all courses taught
- external reviews of research programs (Department submits each year an increasing number of research proposals in competition for funding from a variety of sources. That faculty have obtained recently the most funding ever for these is a very important post-tenure quality indicator in today's highly competitive funding climate.)
- faculty peer evaluations of classroom teaching, held for tenured faculty once every five year

Political Science

Department does annual reviews that use annual reports (teaching, research, service) and that are the basis for merit raises or the absence thereof. Departments are small communities where everyone knows what each is doing or not doing—colleagues notice, and thus effects respect, which is every bit as important a motivational force as is salary.

Psychology

Document describes procedures used for annual faculty evaluation and assignment of salary raises. Each faculty member is evaluated each year with respect to research and scholarship; teaching effectiveness; and service. (The document describes what is meant by each of these criterion area.) Based on the evaluations, the chair advises faculty members about their performance and assigns merit pay raises.

Each year each faculty member is asked to provide the chair a current progress report including specified categories of information. It also includes a short narrative explaining the information and

describing research plans. A departmental evaluation committee (DEC) considers faculty accomplishments over a three-year period, although progress reports are submitted or updated annually.

The DEC consists of six faculty members, one from each program. They are chosen by the chair from a group nominated by the entire faculty to serve three-year rotating terms. Annual progress reports of all faculty are made available to all six members of the DEC. Each reads them in detail and independently rates each faculty member (except himself or herself) on the three criterion areas.

For feedback to faculty, the scores in each category are averaged across members of the DEC. Each faculty member is given his or her mean score on each of the three criterion scales, along with the distribution of average scores for all faculty in the department.

To calculate merit scores, ratings of each committee member are standardized across the faculty. Then the standardized scores in each category are averaged across the members of the DEC. As a result, each faculty member will be assigned three separate scores, each representing the mean standardized score he or she received from the committee on each of the three scales. These scores serve as a major basis of the merit salary raise for the next year, recognizing that other factors as well enter into the overall raise. The DEC prepares a confidential annual report for the chair.

The document lists examples of kinds of questions that may be considered by the raters in each criterion area. It also describes the rating scale to be used—five categories ranging from not satisfactory to meritorious—and describes each level of merit for each criterion level. Finally, it describes how individual merit scores are computed and how faculty raises are calculated.

Public Policy

Policies currently being drafted and under review.

Religious Studies

According to the department's faculty salary policy, a committee makes recommendations with reference to promotion, merit, and structural adjustment—factors that impinge on salary distribution.

Assessments of merit are based on the faculty member's performance as represented by a current c.v., the annual report, and a supplementary narrative commentary on his or her research, teaching, and service. The committee takes into account the past three years' activities.

The policy describes what constitutes evidence of research, the features to be evaluated under teaching, and aspects of service. The committee makes a recommendation on the relative weight to be attached to considerations of promotion, merit, and structural adjustment in the allotment of available salary funds. It also recommends salary increases for individual faculty members, in accord with these categories.

Romance Languages

Full professors do not have a formal review. However, all faculty are evaluated by the chair every year for merit salary increases. The review covers teaching evaluations of all courses, publications, departmental service, and national service. If there is a deficiency in any of these, the chair meets with the staff member to discuss ways of improving performance.

Slavic Languages

All tenured faculty are required to have their teaching evaluated by their students in at least one course each semester. They can use the Carolina Course Review or the department's own teaching evaluation form.

Whenever full professors make major contributions to scholarship in their respective fields, they are considered for nomination to distinguished (named) chairs. Such nomination is made by a peer group of faculty, on an ad hoc basis.

LSRA

In the process of writing formal policy.

Curriculum in Comparative Literature

Post-tenure review consists primarily of the chair's reading the course evaluations that are administered in every course and by reading the annual reports that faculty submit each year. Student evaluations of all courses must be given each semester, with the use of course evaluation forms provided by the Curriculum. Syllabi, book lists, and examination questions for all courses must be deposited with the Curriculum secretary each semester to be placed on file along with the course evaluations.

Curriculum in Marine Sciences

Reviews of the performance of tenured faculty members follow two basic schedules:

- annual reviews by the chair for merit salary increase, and
 - mandatory reviews of tenured assistant and associate professors for possible promotion.
- No specific policy exists for review of tenured faculty other than this.

Health Affairs

Medicine

(Attached Policy for "Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty.")

School of Nursing

The School's "Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation" state the following:

The annual faculty evaluation process is intended to serve as a time of reflection about the past and planning for the future, and as a vehicle for documenting, interpreting, and showcasing contributions to the School and larger University communities, and to the advancement of the discipline, nursing practice, and patient welfare. The completion of an annual, written evaluation is a NC Board of Nursing requirement for faculty in schools of nursing. Faculty self-evaluations are incorporated into the annual evaluation the Chairs write for each of the faculty members in their Departments, and are used in faculty development and in decision-making about the allocation of any available salary increase funds. Faculty are encourage to seek the advice and counsel of the Chairs of their Departments in completing their self-evaluations and in clarifying elements of these guidelines.

As part of the self-evaluation, each faculty member must submit

- a cover sheet with specified employment information,
- an updated curriculum vitae, with accomplishments of the previous calendar year highlighted,
- goals that were previously written for the year under review,
- a summary and evaluation of the faculty member's performance according to both the year's goals and to specified criteria,
- a rating of the faculty member's overall performance, and
- a list of goals for the coming year and the resources/assistance needed.

The document "Teaching and the Evaluation of Teaching" sets out the school's procedures for evaluation of teaching. It states that "[p]eer review of teaching for tenured faculty is required every six years or at the time of review for promotion." Faculty members conduct an assessment of their own teaching and submit a report to their chairs annually. Students evaluate teaching, courses and other teaching activities every semester, and these evaluations are incorporated into the faculty members' self-assessments of teaching for the annual performance review by chairs.

Health Behavior and Health Education

Have had a yearly conference with the chair held each May after a detailed Faculty Activity Form has been completed and handed in to the chair by all faculty. Tenured associate professors being considered for promotion to full professor meet with the full professors before the chair's letter to the Appointments and Promotions Committee. (Copy of 9-page Faculty Activity Form attached)

Environmental Sciences & Engineering

(*In response to survey item re. possible consequences of a negative post-tenure review*) Faculty who have less-than-meritorious performance over a period of several years are *encouraged* to take action to improve or to consider other professional paths that would be more rewarding.

NUTR

1. Memorandum from chair to all faculty sets out the criteria and process the chair uses for evaluation of faculty performance. Evaluations are used for
 - recommendations for promotion and tenure
 - determination of merit increases
 - rewarding contributions to the Department
 Memorandum includes suggested norms that provide general guidelines in areas of research, teaching and service.
2. The chair meets annually with each faculty member for a periodic joint performance review. Assessments by the division directors and full professors, the faculty member's annual report, and a written self-assessment serve as the basis for discussion.
3. An "Outline for Annual Report and Faculty Self Assessment" includes sections for teaching, research, public service, special achievements, anticipated plans for next fiscal year, self assessment, evaluation of support staff, and evaluation of performance of departmental chair.
4. The chair sends a personalized written evaluation to each faculty member, addressing research/scholarly practice, teaching, and service, and including a summary.

Dentistry

Formal post-tenure review occurs annually. Every third year the review must include a decision on promotion, if relevant. Reviews are based on teaching performance, research productivity, patient care quality and productivity, and service to the institution, university, governmental and professional agencies. The outcome of post-tenure reviews do make a difference in terms of salary, speed of further promotion, awards nominations, seed funding, etc. Reviews are initiated by the dean. Negative review may result in delayed promotion or smaller salary increase. Positive review may result in accelerated promotion (in addition to items checked on survey).

Professional Schools

Education

Annual reviews conducted (1) to provide advice/support to faculty members re. teaching, research, and service competence, and (2) to assist dean in determining merit salary increases. Reviews are conducted by program chairs, under supervision of the associate dean for academic programs. Specific procedures:

- information collected in format for annual report (also includes information over 3-year period; copies of published work for most recent year; student course evaluations for all assigned courses; a section on professional development projections)
- chair reviews annual report with faculty development objectives in mind

- chair discusses professional development plans with faculty member based on annual report course syllabi
- no written feedback except where discrepancies arise

Note: By end of '97, all faculty will be reviewed and the review process will occur each year.

Information & Library Science

In November, 1995, the faculty adopted the following: "Following initiatives from the UNC Board of Governors and discussion within the School, the [personnel] committee recommends that full professors be reviewed internally every six years. Such reviews are to include peer evaluations of teaching, research, and service."

Law (no formal written policy)

The dean conducts reviews annually. Consequences include:

- Serious problems identified may result in reduced or no merit increase, request for developmental plan, or request that faculty member work with other campus units (e.g., Center for Teaching and Learning).
- Disciplinary action might be taken if a serious problem cognizable under university policies is identified.
- Positive accomplishments may result in merit increases, award nominations, award of chairs, or support for professional development expenses if funds available.
- Dean publicizes accomplishments and comments on them at each faculty meeting.

Specific procedures:

- Dean reviews student teaching evaluations, scholarship, service, and other materials or information submitted by the faculty member.
- Review is initiated by dean and communicated each year through a meeting between the dean and faculty member.
- Dean meets more frequently with faculty members if they are having trouble in an area and informally visits classes when time permits.
- Tenured faculty members visit each other's classes voluntarily and exchange comments when time permits.

Comments

1. Addition of more reviews will demand a further expenditure of time. Evaluations of candidates (when filling a position) and peer reviews of proposals and publications consume large portions of our time. At some point, we are spending so much time evaluating that we have insufficient time to teach, develop courses and educational materials, keep up to date in our field, do research, and write. We should not add further reviews and evaluations until we eliminate some existing ones. Is it wise to divert good teachers and researchers from doing their work to doing evaluations and reviews? A cost/benefit analysis is called for.
2. Additional layers of formal evaluation might possibly ensure that faculty development opportunities are distributed fairly and effectively. However, such a program could also turn out to be time-consuming, counter-productive, and to have an adverse impact upon faculty morale, unless it is very carefully implemented.

- SURVEY PAGE 1-

The College of Arts and Sciences

There were responses from 37 departments and curricula in which faculty have primary appointments. (Eight additional units have no faculty with primary appointments and so did not complete the survey.)

Review for Promotion

Most of the responses indicate that the timing of such reviews is determined by tenure policy and procedures in the University and in the College. In 1995, departments in the college were required to revise their tenure procedures to ensure consistency with college procedures, thus the timing of the reviews is fairly standard.

In general, reviews for the purpose of promotion occur in all units (36/37), on a schedule that is set by tenure regulations; they are mandatory (34/36); they are initiated by the chair or personnel committee, and they involve evaluation by a peer group of faculty. (One unit has only full professors.) The results of this reviews are communicated both by conference with the chair (25/36) and by written report (25/36) in most departments. In a small number of units, the results of the review are communicated by conference with a peer group.

Review for Salary Increases

All units conduct reviews for salary increases. Such reviews are conducted annually (36/37); they are mandatory (35/37); are primarily initiated by the department head (31/37); and are conducted by department heads (31/37). In a substantial number of units, peer groups of faculty (15/37) participate in reviews for salary increases. In 10 of the units where faculty peers conduct the review for merit, the chairs are also involved, but in five others, the chairs apparently do not participate in merit reviews. The results of merit reviews are communicated equally by conference with department chairs (17/37) and by written report (16/37). In three departments, the results of merit reviews are communicated only through the paycheck.

Review for Progress on Professional Development or Growth Plans

Nineteen units conduct reviews for this purpose. They are mostly conducted on an annual basis (12/19), but less frequent time intervals also occur. For the most part, such reviews are mandatory, and they are initiated and conducted by the department head. Results of such reviews are communicated primarily through a conference with the chair (13/19).

Review for Progress on the Individual's Contribution to the Unit

About half of the units (18/ 37) conduct reviews for this purpose. Again such reviews, where conducted, are largely annual (13/18), mandatory, initiated and conducted by the department head. Communication regarding such reviews is by means of conference.

Review for Regular Check on Faculty Productivity Over Time

Twenty-one units conduct reviews for this purpose. Where such reviews occur, they are largely annual (12/21), but in some units, they occur are triennially (3/21). Such reviews are primarily mandatory (16/21), and are initiated by the department chair. The department chair is also involved in conducting such reviews, but in about half of the cases peer groups of faculty are also involved. The results of this type of review are communicated primarily by a conference with the chair (14/21).

Review as Follow-up When Problems in Performance Have Been Identified

Nearly two-thirds of the reporting units conduct reviews as a follow-up to problematic performance. As might be expected, these are often on a variable schedule (11/21), but 8 units indicate annual reviews for this purpose. Such reviews are likely to be mandatory, but voluntary reviews are also common. These reviews are initiated by the department head (20/21), conducted by the department head (20/21), and the results are communicated primarily via a conference with the department head (18/21).



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Department of Psychology
College of Arts & Sciences

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB# 3270, Davie Hall
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3270

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chancellor's Advisory Committee
FROM: Bernadette Gray-Little
RE: Survey on the Review of Tenured Faculty
DATE: October 23, 1996

Several weeks ago, chairs of departments and curricula were asked by the General Administration to respond to a survey on the Review of Tenured Faculty. The collection of these surveys was coordinated by the Provost's office. As suggested at our last meeting, I have summarized the numerical data from the surveys.

There were two pages to the survey. Page 1 of the survey is constructed as a matrix. Each column indicates a purpose of review, for example promotion or salary increase. Each row addresses questions about each kind of review, for example, its frequency, whether it is mandatory or voluntary; persons responsible for the initiation and conduct of the review, and so on. It should be noted that the responses are highly interdependent. For example, most departments conduct annual reviews for merit increases and different subsets of those same departments conduct reviews for "progress on professional development or growth plans," "progress on individual's contribution to the dept/school/college plans," and "check on faculty productivity." My impression is that the latter reviews are primarily part of the annual merit review. Furthermore, I suspect that chairs consider all of these issues in the annual review for merit, but did not check the additional purposes of the review because they are not independent events. Because the responses are so interdependent and because there is evidence of some confusion about the questions, the summary should be regarded with caution.

Page 2 of the survey asked respondents to indicate the positive and negative consequences of post-tenure review. There was also an invitation for comments about post-tenure review.

Responses to each page of the survey are described below. There is nothing surprising in the responses, which are summarized separately for Arts and Sciences, Professional Schools, and Health Affairs (see attachments).

Professional Schools

Review for Promotion

Responses were received from the deans of 4 professional schools and the director of one institute. Four of the five units indicate that reviews are conducted for promotion. In the one instance where this column was not checked, it was probably an oversight. The timing of reviews varies from one unit to the next. It is not clear whether respondents were answering with regard to the review of a given individual or with regard to how often reviews for promotion are conducted in the unit. In all units that conduct reviews for this promotion, the reviews are mandatory and initiated by the unit head. In most units, the head (3/4) is involved in conducting the review, and, in half, peer groups of faculty are also involved. The results are communicated through a conference with the chair in all instances. Three units also provide written feedback.

Reviews for Salary Increases

All units conduct merit reviews for salary increases on an annual, mandatory basis. In every instance the dean or director initiates and is responsible for the conduct of the merit review. In one instance, feedback is given through a conference with the chair. Otherwise, feedback is by means of a letter or written report.

Review for Progress on Professional Development or Growth Plans

Four of the five units conduct reviews for this purpose. In three units the reviews are annual and mandatory, and in one unit it is voluntary. Such reviews are initiated and conducted primarily by the dean or director who communicates the results in a conference with the faculty member.

Review for Progress on the Individual's Contribution to the Unit

The pattern here is essentially the same as above. The majority of deans and directors report that they conduct such reviews on an annual basis, that they are mandatory, and are primarily the responsibility of unit head.

Review for Regular Check on Faculty Productivity Over Time

Three of the five units conduct reviews for this purpose. In all three, the reviews are mandatory and initiated by the unit head. In two of the units, the dean or director conducts the reviews, but other faculty or directors of subprograms may also be involved.

Review as Follow-up When Problems in Performance Have Been Identified

Four of the five schools report reviews for this purpose. Such reviews occur largely on an annual basis (3/4). In every case such reviews are mandatory, they are initiated and conducted by the unit head, and feedback about the review is through a conference with the dean or director.

Health Affairs

Responses were received from 10 units in Health Affairs. They represent responses from both deans of some schools and chairs of departments within other schools.

Review for Promotion

All the reporting units conduct reviews for promotion. The frequency varies widely: three units conduct reviews every year, three conduct such reviews every three years, and four units have a variable review schedule. In 9 of the 10 units the reviews are mandatory. The department head is primarily the person who initiates the review. The reviews almost always involve the department head (8/10), but reviews by faculty peers (4/10) are also common. Almost universally, results are communicated by means of a conference with the unit head, but in most instances there is also a written report (7/10).

Review for Salary Increases

Nine of the 10 units conduct merit reviews. These are annual and mandatory. Merit reviews are primarily initiated by department or unit heads (8/9). The unit head conducts the review in all 9 units and communicates results through a conference (7/10) and/or written report.

Review for Progress on Professional Development or Growth Plans

Nine of the 10 units conduct such reviews. These are primarily done on an annual basis and are mandatory in slightly more than half of the units. The department chair conducts the review all nine units and is primarily the person to initiate such reviews. In all units the feedback is by means of a conference. In four units, there are also written reports.

Review for Progress on the Individual's Contribution to the Unit

Eight of the 10 units conduct reviews for contributions to the unit. These are largely annual reviews (7/8), mostly mandatory (6/8), and are always initiated and conducted by the department chair, who provides feedback through a conference. In three of the units, there are also written reports.

Review for Regular Check on Faculty Productivity Over Time

All 10 of the units conduct reviews to check on faculty productivity. These are always annual reviews. They are primarily mandatory (9/10), and initiated by the department chair (9/10). The department chair or dean is always involved in conducting the review and in some instances other persons such as the dean, division chief and so on, are also involved. Feedback is provided through a conference in every unit, and, in almost half, there is also a written report.

Review as Follow-up When Problems in Performance Have Been Identified

Nine of the 10 units conduct reviews in response to problematic performance. Such reviews may be conducted annually, or more likely, on a variable schedule. Reviews for this purpose are usually mandatory (6/9). They are initiated by the department head (6/9), who has the primary responsibility for conducting such reviews (8/10). Feedback about such reviews is largely through conference, but a minority of the units also provide a written report.

Faculty Council, November 15, 1996

Discussion Concerning Principles of Post-Tenure Review

[Extract from the Chancellor's Opening Remarks]

Chancellor Hooker: You have on your Agenda for today post-tenure review. This is an issue that I have thought a lot about for the last several years, and an issue that I've talked a lot about in North Carolina since I started over a year ago meeting individually with members of the Legislature, and I've looked closely at the situation here, especially with the help of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. It is obvious to me that we don't have a problem which post-tenure review will address except that we have a problem with perception out in the broader world. And for that reason I think we have to do something. But we have so many processes of review already for post tenured faculty that it is arguably excessively burdensome already and anything additional that we did I think would be supererogatory, and I hope that what we will be able to do is simply to bundle together the best of what we are already doing and let that be our post-tenure review process. But obviously it merits discussion by you before I pronounce what we need to do. But the one thing I am absolutely sure of, beyond the shadow of a doubt, and that is that we don't have deadwood. The local culture, the values, the intellectual values, of this campus have ensured that all of us have remained adequately productive in the scholarly arena and in the teaching arena, and we just don't have a problem. But, as I say, what counts in the world of politics is perception more than reality, and so I regard it as my job to change the perception in the minds of members of the Legislature and the broader world, and will be looking for your help in doing that. But I'm happy to say that we just don't have a problem. Now I think it's also important that we defend more vocally, more articulately, than we have, the whole institution of tenure. People tend to defend it by pointing to the initial reasons for it, having to do with academic freedom, and the detractors of tenure will tell you that there are other ways of guaranteeing academic freedoms, such as the First Amendment and contractual rights, and so forth. But there are many other benefits from a system of tenure well administered as ours is, and one just occurs to me from my own field. It promotes inter-disciplinary work in a way that if you didn't have it I don't think could be encouraged. For example, in Philosophy I remember when Applied Ethics first came to the fore, and now every university has Applied Ethics courses--Legal Ethics and Environmental Ethics and Business Ethics and Medical Ethics--as a standard part of the Philosophy curriculum. But I well remember when those were radical courses, and, while undergraduates wanted them, faculty were reluctant to teach them, especially junior faculty, and so people who had the security of tenure took on those courses first. They really brought about almost a revolutionary change in undergraduate teaching in Philosophy. So that is another benefit of tenure. And I think we need to be more articulate in defending the institution of tenure, especially where we can demonstrate, as we can here, that it doesn't have the negative consequences that it is sometimes seen to have elsewhere.

[Extract from Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty]

Professor Brown: I want to say a little about post-tenure review. This is an initiative of President Spangler. He spoke about it today as a preemptive strike to some extent. The legislatures of about one-third of the states have asked for studies of post-tenure review. About 10 states now have mandated post-tenure review. The President thinks that if we don't take the initiative, the Legislature will do it for us. And so he sees it as most important that we, the campuses and the faculty, be involved in developing a post-tenure review system. It's moving very quickly. I think we may not have sufficient input, but what we're arguing for at this point is that it remain as flexible as possible at the General Administration level and it comes back to the campuses to really look at, to spell out the specifics. And that even if it comes back, when it comes back to the campuses, that we keep it as flexible as possible, and that it really is unit-driven and faculty-driven about what it's going to look like. And so, I encourage us to have a full conversation about it today. It really is our moment for feedback to General Administration to say, this is what we want or what we don't want, this is what's going to be most beneficial for us. So I encourage you to be a part of that conversation today.

[Transcript of Council discussion of post-tenure review]

Professor Mason: I don't think we could have had a better introduction to the topic than the comments Jane and the Chancellor have made already to you about it. The main purpose for my being here, along with some members of our Committee, is to hear from you, to get your reactions to and suggestions about the draft that you

received along with the Agenda and that also was published in The Gazette. But before I make a few comments about the draft, I want to acknowledge the other members of the Committee who are here. This has been a real Committee task, and everyone on the Committee has contributed to it, so I won't read through the list, although I'll ask you to take note of that, but I would like the members who are here to stand up and identify themselves. And Jerry, can you start? Jerry Folda, the Art Department. Bernadette Gray-Little, Psychology. Paul Debrecezy, Slavic Languages. Gil White, Medicine. Stirling Haig, Romance Languages.

Before I invite your comments, I want to talk briefly about four aspects of the draft, and if there's anyone who ended up without a copy, I have some extras with me to pass around. The four things I'd like to mention are: the context in which this draft was written; second, the current status of the draft; third, and related to that, opportunities for your continued input into what the document says; and then, finally, what I think the Advisory Committee viewed as some underlying principles, guiding principles, in going about the task of putting the draft together.

First, as already has been noted, the context in which we set about to draft these principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review was President Spangler's directive to all sixteen campuses to develop such a statement and submit it to General Administration. So, whatever we submit will be one of 16 such documents that go to General Administration, and that a System-wide committee there will then work with to develop whatever position General Administration will take. We're really fortunate to have Professor Stirling Haig as this campus's representative on that committee. And he, I'm sure would be willing at some point to answer questions you have about what that committee is doing or will be doing. I'm especially glad he's on that committee because he's reported to us that he's one of very few faculty members on the committee. Most campuses sent administrators to represent their campuses, so we're especially grateful to have Stirling in that role.

Second, in addition to the context, I'm going to tell you about the status of the draft. The Committee already has received some comments from faculty members. We've heard from the deans, both in Academic Affairs and in Health Affairs, and from the members of the Executive Committee. Based on those comments in the time we've had to look at the draft, if we were setting out to write it again, we'd write some parts differently from the draft that you have in front of you. And we will revise it, but we don't want to do that without also having the benefit of your comments and suggestions about it. And later, if you want, I'd be glad to summarize the gist of the main concerns or comments we've had from the people we have heard from. Next Wednesday the Committee will meet to revise the draft, and then it's due to General Administration by next Friday.

Third, and related to that, I want to tell you about continued opportunities for input, as those of us who are here from the Committee will stay after this meeting, and if you don't have time to have your say during the time that we have right now. In addition, we'd be happy to hear from you by any means between now and the end of the day Tuesday, so that we'd have the benefit of your suggestions before we sit down to draft the final. And then, most importantly, even after this draft is given, the document is given to General Administration, I encourage all of you to keep in mind Stirling's role as a member of the System-wide committee for any input you want to have, not just about this document, but, too, directly to General Administration about what they do with this and the other 15 they'll receive.

Finally, the things that I think were the Committee's guiding principles, and I also think these are consistent with what the Chancellor said when he spoke about this topic. Because this is going to General Administration, presumably for use in development of the directive that then will come from General Administration back to all the campuses, the Committee deliberately kept this draft on a fairly general level. We wanted to encourage General Administration to leave each campus the room and flexibility that it needs to devise a post-tenure review system that recognizes the needs and uniqueness of each campus. And, similarly, we hope when it gets to the campus level that that same recognition of uniqueness and special needs be given to every department on campus. So, there are a lot of details that one would want to talk about if you were having a comprehensive discussion of post-tenure review that are not in this document. They're not there deliberately, because our Committee didn't want General Administration to provide all the details. Rather, we hope there will be a large tent within which we will later be comfortable filling in the details about what post-tenure review should be here. Second, the Committee wanted to encourage a process that is supportive of tenure. I know that some people think that what really is going on is an attack on tenure. So we felt it very important that this draft be written in a way that is supportive of tenure. We wanted to encourage and to emphasize the faculty development aspect of a post-tenure review process, and that is consistent, in fact, with what President Spangler says in his letter asking the campuses to do this, that. And, finally, we wanted and tried to envision in general a system of post-tenure review that is both compatible and consistent with existing review procedures. As the Chancellor said, we don't want to add a layer to all the things

people have to do already, but hope, we would hope, pulling those things together. Next, we hope to have a procedure that is compatible and consistent with existing standards and procedures for disciplinary action and dismissal. So we don't view this, and hope General Administration won't view it, as either contradicting or replacing the standards and procedures that already exist for disciplinary action. So, as a Committee, we really invite and want your reactions and suggestions about the draft. We want to know whether those are the correct guiding principles to use to put the final draft together, and if they are, how this draft could be improved to reflect that. So let me ask first if there's anything Committee members would like to add to what I've just said, and if not, I would invite whatever comments or questions you have.

Professor Miles Fletcher (History): I did contact members of the History Department by email and asked them to relay their comments to me about the proposed post-tenure review, and I appreciate all the work that the Committee has done on it, so I'll just convey some of those concerns. One is, I think the emphasis on peer review is very important. That is embedded in the culture of this Institution, and I think that post-tenure review should be peer review -- the faculty should be reviewing each other. Secondly, I think the greatest concern of my colleagues is the time that this will take, and I was urged to convey to you the necessity that this process take as little time as possible. People are just concerned that they're going to have to take time away from the primary missions of teaching and research. And I see some conflict here between activities of the Intellectual Climate Committee. It seems to be distressing to faculty to think that we want to spend more time with students and to do more things in the classroom, and yet here comes another burdensome administrative demand. And there's the conflict. The time to do this is going to come from teaching and research, and so that should be kept to a minimum.

Professor Mason: Can I come in on that? I wish I had brought with me a written comment I received from a professor who said, "Dear Professor Mason, I'm sorry I don't have time to comment more fully to your draft, but I am too busy" and then he went on for half a page with the things he's too busy doing to comment. Now I think that concern is broadly shared.

Professor Fletcher: Right. I think time is the most precious commodity of people here right now, and so that's a concern here. Finally, I'll just add very quickly I hope what whatever criteria are used are as flexible as possible. I think that faculty go through different stages in their careers and what they contribute to the University. There's a danger in a formalized review system of using a cookie cutter approach and thus, in a way, negating the strengths that people develop at different stages. And I know developmental plans are mentioned in the report, and I have some concerns about those, because of know of faculty who rather quickly get opportunities, or rather suddenly get opportunities to develop new interests. And I would hate to see a three or five year developmental plan inhibit faculty from taking advantage of those opportunities. I know in the last two years I've become very interested in using computer technology in my classes - something I wouldn't have dreamed of three years ago. If I had a developmental plan filed and I thought a review committee was going to ask me two years hence, well, why haven't you fulfilled those goals, I might not be doing some of the things in the classroom which evidently are now, as Chancellor Hooker said, University goals. And so I'm very fearful that this process might induce people to think in rather rigid terms about their careers and their contributions to their community. I'm also concerned about the service component of a faculty member's career. If faculty members know that they're being reviewed every x number of years and are expected to meet certain goals, this might inhibit the tremendous contributions that faculty make for service that is unrewarded or under-rewarded.

Professor John Anderson (Nutrition): I was wondering what the definition of faculty peer is for tenured faculty members. Is it another tenured faculty member or is it any faculty member?

Professor Mason: A chair of a department on our Committee who raised the same issue, and he said he didn't know whether he was a faculty peer, so that's a piece of this. We've gotten a number of other comments on that, both what is a faculty peer and what a number of people perceive as our failure to adequately address the role of administrators. So, I'm not sure we had a uniform assumption about what a faculty peer is. Would you like to, would anyone like to propose how this might read to clarify that issue?

Professor Anderson: I was wondering whether a department chair who is also a full professor, let's say, would that person be a peer or would that person be a departmental administrative representative? Because they're the ones usually who do the reviews, anyway, with the full faculty or some category, full professors, or whatever. So I'm a little bit confused about this.

Professor Mason: Right. I think at the very least we need to work on what the fact, acknowledged fact, that obviously department chairs and deans have a role in this process, which I think we took so much for granted that we didn't say it. I'm not sure, I think there's general agreement that faculty, that this does have to include an aspect

of peer review. And I don't know whether we need for General Administration to say more than that or whether we prefer to say that when we get to the level of providing the details. Thank you.

Professor Debra Shapiro (Business School): The document assumes that there will be criteria that will be applied consistently, and there will be missions that I assume will also be known [to] all. I think it also needs to include a grievance procedure available to people in the event that this, in fact, is not happening and there may be partiality guiding people's assessments of faculty.

Professor Ferrell: Do you mean a departmental grievance procedure in addition to the one already available generally?

Professor Shapiro: Is there a grievance procedure now for post-tenured faculty, for these kinds of assessments?

Professor Mason: There is a Grievance Committee that has broad jurisdiction to entertain grievances on almost anything except something involving the grant of tenure or promotions. Denial of tenure or promotion.

Professor Shapiro: Thank you. I had not made that connection.

Professor Larry Benninger (Geology): Partly echoing Professor Fletcher's comments, I think there are a number of problems of definition and, of course, we're at an early stage and I appreciate that. Just to begin at the beginning, do we know who is going to decide what counts as faculty productivity and what is counted under faculty accountability?

Professor Mason: I think we assumed, and maybe we need to state, that we're talking about, at the very least, the three main areas of faculty activity: research, teaching, and service, and view this not focusing on only one or two of those, but on all three. As far as what the standards are, again, I think our position was those should be developed at the campus and in the detailed way at the departmental level. And I'm not sure I'm responding to your question.

Professor Benninger: Well, it seems that one of the issues on the campus now is that activities are counted differentially, and sometimes it comes down to merely counting the publications, as opposed to looking at contributions in the area which you serve. And I'm just wondering whether we are ever going to have from on high an explicit policy about what needs to be taken into account in doing these kinds of assessments.

Professor Mason: I think that's a very important question, but a different one from what this is designed to do.

Professor Carl Bose (Pediatrics): I'm comforted by the lack of specificity in this document, because I think we have diversity of missions. And you pointed this out, and the Chancellor did as well. And this document permits flexibility of the review process. The only concern I have, the risk in it is, that you go to GA with this and it's passed through to the Legislature without specificity, and they aren't sufficiently satisfied. And so they impose their scheme upon this framework which includes a lot of specificity, and I think that's where it's going to take a deft hand at passing this through GA with enough support of a lack of specificity that it can be sold to the Legislature. The risk, of course, is that it can't be and they turn around and impose their own framework. If the framework and specificity is going to be imposed, I think this is the group and people on this campus are the people to develop it. I hope that we'll have that opportunity, if we get down the road and we find that things are heading in a different direction than we would like.

Professor Mason: I agree, and that's certainly the Committee's view, and I know that in Stirling on that System-wide committee we have a strong advocate for exactly what you said. In fact I think he already has made a difference in their conversations for emphasizing the need for flexibility and local determination of those standards. I don't view this, and I don't know what other people are thinking, but I don't view it as something that's going from here to General Administration to the General Assembly. At least, I hope not. I hope it's going from here to General Administration, where it will be worked on, come back to here and the other 15 campuses, and that what we can give the General Assembly or anyone else who has concerns in this area is a "look, this is what we're doing." And that test will come in our performing well at that next level of setting the standards and filling in the details. And the risk is if we don't do that.

Professor Haig: After the General Administration, the next body to look at it will be the Board of Governors.

Professor Mason: That's true. President Spangler's letter said that he had promised a report to the Board of Governors in May.

Professor Brian Herman (Medical School): I guess what I'm a little bit concerned about is what I don't see here is where the buck stops. In other words, there are very general plans about how this should be carried out, and define who a faculty peer is. There's some suggestion about the department chairs having to help the faculty develop faculty plans in the event that they're not reviewed in a positive way. But it's not clear from any of this

where the actual end point is and who says, you know, this is what has to be done, this isn't done and this is the consequence of not putting that into action. Is that still supposed to be at the level of the chair, is that the level of the faculty peers, or the level of the School to be aware of this - where is this going to come from?

Professor Mason: I think our view, and Committee colleagues help out if I get this wrong, our view is that much of what you just asked about is, and remains, in the hands of the department chair or other administrator that has supervisory responsibility. There are two questions we've had before today that relate to that. One is how does this relate to salary policy procedures, and how the other is whether we have dealt adequately with possible negative consequences. So I think we can do a better job of tying this together: one, by making it clear that the department chair and other similar administrators are key players in this, that not, we sort of said they "deliver" the results, and we don't mean that that's all their role is. Clearly, they're the ones responsible for seeing that this is carried out in their departments, and for using the results, possibly, as well, in creating the results. But at the very least, using the results as part of what is weighed in decisions about salary, work assignments, other things, other kinds of decisions that administrators make. In the early part of the draft we were very intent on saying that this is separate from and does not abrogate either the standards or procedures for disciplining a faculty member. What we failed to say, though, is that certainly the outcome of a review would be relevant. I don't think this needs to be spelled out, but if someone is a candidate for being disciplined or dismissed, it's just incredible to think that the results of any review process, this or any other, wouldn't be part of what are looked at there. So we, I think, assumed more than we spelled out those kinds of connections.

Professor Barry Lentz (Biochemistry & Biophysics): What happens to these reviews? Do they become a part of one's record? And if that's the case, I think I'm still thinking about the issue that you raised. And, you know, if you think that a review was unfair, you don't want to go to the Grievance Committee with that. There must be some way of a discussion, some way of initiating a discussion and challenging a review if you, because it's going to become a part of your permanent record. And there should be some mechanism for challenging it, short of a formal grievance against the University. And I think that's maybe what you were getting at.

Professor Fletcher: I would just second that. Unfortunately I don't know much about the grievance process, but I gather it's a very time-consuming, exhaustive procedure, that we might want to set up some other procedure for handling complaints about a review for someone who felt they didn't get a fair review. Something that could be handled more expeditiously than a true, formal grievance procedure. So I just back those comments.

Professor Mason: Is that something you think should be different from the more structured and formal is needed than what exists now? Because one thing we kept running into in thinking about this whole issue is we have review. We have pre-tenure and post-tenure review. We have reviews every year before salary decisions are made. But do you think because we're talking about a more consistent, formal process that we also need a more formal.....

Professor Fletcher: A lot to me would depend on what kind of a procedure comes out, and so if it's a true just bundling together of things that happen already, then maybe there's less need for a formal procedure. But it depends a lot on what happens.

Professor Lentz: Our, at least in my department, the existing yearly review procedure is nothing but an accounting process. I mean, this sounds like more of a process. What papers have you published, what courses have you taught, put one in column A, one in column B, and one in another column.

Professor Mason: I'm not sure that's all it is in many departments.

Professor Lentz: Well, in many departments it may not be, but this sounds like a much more exhaustive procedure. It will be evaluative rather than just accounting. And if you disagree with the outcome of that, there ought to be some mechanism for a dialogue, at least for that discourse.

Professor Brown: I think there's a great variety across the University about what's being done now. The School of Business, I know, does a very elaborate process, of every professor every year. Is that right? One unit evaluating and guiding each other. And the survey that was done on the campus illustrates this. I put some copies back there, a summary of all that's being done. So some units do very comprehensive reviews already - for all faculty. And some, it sounds like mere accounting.

Professor Ron Strauss (Dental School): In talking about this with my colleagues, they largely felt as though this is happening already, and that this needs to be recognized. But they also were quite pleased with the self-assessment component of their annual review, where each faculty member uses scales and assesses their work for the year and outlines their goals for the following year. That's identical for pre- and post-tenure reviews. Just an annual thing. And then, with, in consultation with, the department chair, their evaluation and the chair's evaluation are reconciled essentially. Now, there is no grievance procedure I know of, though I'm sure you could go

to the Dean if you had concerns. People were proud of that, and proud that they were engaged in self-assessment, at least as much as having some other committee or group of peers identify challenges for them. So I would hope as we think about specifics, we would at least look at that option or methodology.

Professor Mason: Of the survey results that was much more typical in Health Affairs than in other areas. But a number of them have a strong component of self-assessment. Other comments, questions?

Professor Bachenheimer: The discussion has centered around peer review, evaluation, but I was disturbed to hear that there are many administrators who are representatives of the units at the System-wide level. Are we unique in sending faculty, and what does this say about how other campuses view this process? And are we sort of whistling in the dark?

Professor Mason: Stirling, would you be willing to come up and talk for a little bit about both, not just the composition but the process of that committee?

Professor Haig: Well I do feel somehow like I need a star on my cap when I sit down with those people. But, you know where my heart lies. And speaking also very much as a very ex chair of a department. But I don't think that there's a particular concern that the views that I hear expressed by the deans and the vice chancellors who are on that General Administration committee differ substantially from the kinds of discussions that we have had in our subcommittee that was assigned the task of post-tenure review, or in the Chancellor's Advisory Committee at large. I think the tenor of the discussions has been rather pretty much the same all around. You might be wondering what this committee of administrators is doing, and what it is doing is much what we have done, which is to receive and seek out information on post-tenure review throughout the nation. We've had a workshop that was led by a national authority on post-tenure review. We've had email exchanges of information on an email site that was set up for us. We've seen models of post-tenure review that have now been actually voted on some of the campuses. East Carolina, for example, has adopted a policy on post-tenure review. We've seen copies of policies that have been adopted at other campuses, small, large, and also other systems. The University of Maryland system has just adopted a post-tenure review policy. The University of Georgia system has done the same. I'm hoping that what will come of the policy at the GA level will be a set of principles that will be flexible enough so that our campuses, each with a different mission and a different character, and background, history, and everything, will be able to largely use existing processes where we think that they're sufficient, or, and, therefore, to address the time question, to be able to merely add in where necessary. For example, I think it's true that in Arts and Sciences full professors are not currently reviewed in this context with the same thoroughness that Assistant or Associate Professors are when they're candidates for promotion, for example. But now this would be extended to full professors. But I think that many of the questions regarding detail and specificity will have to be worked out at the departmental or unit level.

Professor Bose: I just want to ask one question about your investigation and your discussion about applications or review systems in other areas of the country, other educational institutions. I think people are studiously avoiding the whole issue of whether a result of the review would be loss of tenure, a dissolution to some extent, of the whole tenure system. Is that coming up in the discussions at GA, amongst the campuses, amongst administrators, and is that part of review systems in other institutions?

Professor Haig: Well, I think Jane mentioned President Spangler's view that this was a, would you say, a preemptive strike? Yes, a preemptive strike to try to self-inoculate against future attacks on tenure, and that if we do this, and we can then, and I think quite appropriately and properly, claim that we are being good stewards of this system that's served the academic academy so well, and that we are also accountable to our state Legislatures and overseeing boards. So I think it will help ward off the hostility that does exist in some quarters toward the tenure system.

Professor Bose: Well, I can well imagine some legislators would take a very dim view of this, the depth of this attempt, and, in fact--I hate to make an unpopular statement--there are some failures of the tenure system. I think we all recognize that. There are people that get mired down in mediocrity and aren't productive anymore. Might we be better stewards if we at least admitted that the option of removing tenure, losing tenure, is an option in the system? I mean, then that would respond to everyone's desires, I suppose, even those that don't see the tenure system as a valuable system anymore, which all of us, I think, here do.

Professor Brown: So do you think it should be more specific?

Professor Bose: I don't know. I'm not suggesting that.

Professor Mason: That, no doubt, is someone's agenda out there somewhere. Our approach to this has been to assume that this is not what this is about, and that's why, again, why we made the statement that it is our view that a system of post-tenure review should be separate from and shouldn't affect or abrogate the standards and

procedures for discipline. And I view a loss of tenure as one more in a range of kinds of discipline short of dismissal. So my view would be if people are concerned about kinds of sanctions that are available, whether they're applied when they ought to be applied, that needs to be dealt with the Trustee's tenure regulations and that we need to try to avoid contaminating review processes by either having that be the reason that we're doing them, or having them too closely linked. We may have gone too far in the other direction in this document trying to stress the developmental side, partly because we were reacting to concerns about going the other direction. But, you know, if you look at the Trustees' policies, you've got it already. Grounds for dismissal are misconduct, unfitness to continue on the faculty, failure to perform, and incompetence. Now, those are pretty conclusive. And if we're not using them, I don't think it's because we don't have a post-tenure review system. And I would just hope people who want to address that kind of issue would do it in the right place and not tack it on to this.

Professor Genna Rae McNeil (History): I'm not clear exactly where it should go but I think certainly before matters come to the point of needing to go to a grievance committee, there ought to be some place at which it is made clear that faculty members may have an opportunity to respond to anything that is in writing regarding about his or her performance, and that there ought to be a manner in which something can be expunged from the record if it is invalidly or illegitimately placed in a person's record, and that, in fact, perhaps with the Provost's Office or the Dean's Office there should be a place to which a faculty member can go if he or she has a real problem in terms of communicating with the chairperson in regard to his or her post-tenure review. I think we know that there are things that can arise that means that there needs to be another person with whom someone can speak and perhaps even someone to talk about the possibility of litigation.

Professor Mason: Well, it sounds like several of you are saying that a list of principal features should include a review or appeal process, without going the next step and saying what that looks like, but that at the very least we should say that that should be a feature. I think that's, well add that. Any other comments or questions?

Professor Gil White: I don't feel like I've gotten a good feeling from the group whether they feel peers should be doing this or non-peers. And I wonder if we could get anymore discussion on that.

Professor Brown: For what is a peer?

Professor White: Well, no, not what is a peer, but who the faculty would like being their reviewers. Maybe that's the question. Should it be administrators, should it be peers. To a certain extent that means you have to define who a peer is. But I don't mean defining what a peer is for purposes of this particular document. I just mean who does the faculty want reviewing themselves.

Professor Fletcher: The way we do everything, and I think a lot of units in Arts and Sciences are this way, is a committee of faculty do reviews and their advice is advisory to the chair, who makes the final determination, but that report of the committee is usually determinative. So....

Professor Brown: And is it different levels of faculty doing that, or...?

Professor Fletcher: It would depend on the rank of the person. Right now we use it mostly for promotions, so for Assistant Professors it would be a committee of tenured professors, for Associate Professors, it would be a committee of full professors, so it's not exactly peers; it's faculty, but of a higher rank than the person being reviewed. For Full Professors, it would be a committee of other Full Professors.

Professor Brown: of chaired professors? [laughter]

Professor Fletcher: I wouldn't go that far.

Professor Ferrell: Would you consider that peer review might on occasion include faculty from other institutions? Or is your understanding that peer review means persons, colleagues, on this campus?

Professor Fletcher: Persons or colleagues on this campus. Whether, I mean a review process usually, particularly for promotion, involves getting letters from the outside. That would be a big step for this. I mean, again, it would take a tremendous amount of time. There are a lot of faculty in Arts and Sciences, and you put a five-year review committee, you're going to be reviewing, or a five-year review period, you're going to be reviewing in Arts and Sciences I imagine 70 to 100 professors a year. And so, I don't know how extensive, how time consuming people want to make this process. I would argue for as little time consuming as possible.

Professor Ferrell: You don't mean also to limit it to persons in that individual's department? Some of your departments in Arts and Sciences are very small.

Professor Fletcher: Well, I don't know if we have to work out that level of detail here.

Professor Brown: Not for this document.

Professor Fletcher: That's right. But as a general matter if in the larger departments, it would be just people in your department. I'm in History. I'm also in Asian Studies, which has a very small core of faculty, and that

would have to involve, pull from outside of that core faculty. So for some small departments it might involve faculty outside the immediate unit.

Professor Bill Smith (Mathematics): I think just the gist of the last little train of discussion supports the position of this committee, right? In general terms. And I think peer is fairly general but adequately specific. I think peer could include someone from outside, appropriately, under appropriate circumstances. Peer does not mean rank. You're not going to find that in the dictionary. A sort of rank as a definition of peer. I think you're not going to find a classification as to whether one is teaching all the time or perhaps doing a little administrative work on the side, or something that eliminates you from being a peer. I think peer is exactly the right word to use here, it being one of the basic principles of AAUP and all of our scholarly groups have thought about this over the years. That basically evaluations of scholarly work should be supported by people of similar areas of scholarly work looking at it. And I think peer review captures that completely. It doesn't eliminate anything. It does somewhat set the standard, and I would be afraid of the document being more specific.

Professor Maria Salgado (Romance Languages): I was wondering whether any of those other documents that you talked about, like the University of Maryland or East Carolina, do they say anything about who's doing the reviewing, or do they specify who their peers are?

Professor Mason: Stirling would need to answer that. I assume that do since they are documents for specific institutions, but ..

Professor Haig: I don't have it here, I'm sorry.

Professor White: But there are instances of both. There are some cases where the review is done administratively, and some instances where the review has been peer review.

Professor Phil Bromberg (Medicine): I just wondered whether we might take elements of the existing system. In the Department of Medicine there is, in essence, self-review that is prepared each year and sent to the chairman. If everyone did that, the next step would be if the chairman is concerned about performance in specific cases, there can be a committee of peers, however that is ultimately defined, who review that situation. Or it might be that that would be begun right away. It would be a year or two, in which after discussion with the faculty member of those concerns, if they still remain in the mind of the chairman, that there would be at the end of that time if there is a lack of progress.... Instead of having to formally review every single faculty member regardless of what their self-assessment, and in a recently documented track record.

Professor Brown: That's something that's been brought up in response to Miles' concern, as well, about time consuming - does everyone have to reviewed even if they had stellar work and everybody knows it is stellar work. That possibility has a different kind of system.

Professor Mason: Can I just add to that, because I think fairly consistently we have taken the position that everyone should be reviewed sometime. And you could make, you can change the outer limit - every five years, every six years. But one point some of the comments we received made is that this should not be just, you know, a checkup to make sure people are working hard enough, but it also should be a basis for documenting and rewarding extremely meritorious work. So, in that sense, I think our Committee felt that some periodic review, maybe not with the same frequency for everybody, but at some point for everyone, was important, and it would be, I think, quite possible to say that a certain kind of outcome or concern would trigger a speedier next review.

Professor Bromberg: But if you're having an annual review, then maybe merit is rewarding, although in my humble opinion, there's only one coin of the realm that gets rewarded. That's when you have competing offers and you take the road of saying, well, this is a very attractive offer. If you don't have that, then merit doesn't cut much ice.

Professor Terry Evens: A quick suggestion. It seems to me that given an auspicious point about time consumption and all, and external reviews, that some reviews might be included as a possibility in reviews in appeals cases for recourse. That would be a good place.

Professor Fletcher: I hate to keep making comments, but the topic interests me. I really like the idea just proposed about self-reviews and, because I think it's, I mean it's silly to spend time reviewing people that are doing a good job. I just don't see the point in it, and as to the issue of compensation, if you have a good salary policy in place, then the merits should be rewarded. And that, in a way, is a separate concern. And so, the point of this review is to, the review process, is to correct problems that one may see, so that idea has a lot of appeal to me.

Professor Mason: Do you think that idea is doable within the draft we have. If General Administration sent us this draft and said, develop your process, would there be anything in these general principal features to keep us from doing that?

Professor Fletcher: Offhand, well I'd have to read it again, but I don't think so.

Professor Gray-Little: Just a comment. In the systems that do have post-tenure review, there can be one of the two models that we're talking about, either a system where everyone is reviewed on some kind of basis, or a system where there is a trigger for review, and that trigger can sometimes be the annual review that's already in place, and then more extended review is done on the basis of that. So those both of those approaches exist in current post-tenure review systems.

Professor Brown: Here?

Professor Gray-Little: No, not in our review. Generally in discussions that I've seen of post-tenure review. It seems that both of those systems are viable and are in different places. Some people take their current review procedures and build an extra step onto them, that uses what's going on, and that triggers a then more extended review where it seems appropriate.

Professor Brown: Okay, final comments.

Professor Sarah Chambers (History): Just following up on that, and I don't want to be nitpicky about it because the language is good in general. But on #3 where you say the tenure review procedures you supplement, for procedures I get the sense that what you meant was that we already have procedures, and we shouldn't duplicate. But it almost seems to say that, yes, we do need additional. I don't know if there's a way to word that, if there is in fact adequate procedures, then maybe all they need is a trigger and not a supplement. And that in units where perhaps there isn't already a regular review, from our end, that they would need to.

Professor Mason: Thank you. That's consistent with some other comments. But one thing I hope we'll do is to in the Preamble and throughout, put much more emphasis on how much review already occurs, and how we hope parts of that will suffice and be part of this.

DISCUSSION GROUPS FOR DECEMBER 6 MEETING

Please write your first three choices for the discussion group you'd like to be in when the Council discusses the recommendations of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate at the December Council meeting:

1. Inside the classroom
2. Outside the classroom
3. Freshman Year Experience
4. Public spaces
5. Service learning
6. Faculty roles and rewards

Please put your choices left to right in the three spaces.

Anderson, Carl					Ji, Chuanshu				
Anderson, John					Johnstone, Robert				
Andrews, Richard					Lachewicz, Paul				
Bailey, Ann					LeFebvre, Donna				
Bailey, L'Tanya					Lentz, Barry				
Bangdiwala, Shrikant					Leonard, Stephen				
Barefoot, Martha					Loda, Frank				
Beck, Melinda					Loeb, Ben, Jr.				
Beckman, Richard					Maffly-Kipp, Laurie				
Bentley, Stuart					Mandel, Stanley				
Bose, Carl					Matson, Steven				
Brice, Richard					Mauriello, Sally				
Brink, Lela					McNeil, Genna Rae				
Bromberg, Philip					McNeil, Laurie				
Brown, Edwin					Mill, Michael				
Chambers, Sarah					Owen, Bobbi				
Conley, John					Pagano, Joseph				
Conover, Pamela					Parter, Abigail				
Crimmins, Michael					Passannante, Anthony				
Crumley, Carole					Peacock, James				
Dalton, Robert					Pielak, Gary				
Danis, Marion					Pike, David				
Dodds, Janice					Platin, Enrique				
Eckel, Fred					Rabinowitz, George				
Estroff, Sue					Renner, Jordan				
Evens, Terence					Rinehart, Susanna				
Farel, Paul					Roseman, Julian				
Favorov, Oleg					Rutledge, John				
Fletcher, Miles					Salgado, Maria				
Foshee, Vangie					Searles, Lillie				
Fox, Donald					Shapiro, Debra				
Frankenberg, Dink					Shea, Virginia				
Gless, Darryl					Skelly, Anne				
Hattem, David					Stidham, Shaler, Jr.				
Herman, Brian					Strauss, Ronald				
Hodges, Vanessa					Stuck, Gary				
Hogue, Carol					Tauchen, Helen				
Holmgren, Douglas					Tysinger, Barbara				
Howard, James, Jr.					Weber, David				
Irene, Eugene					White, Judy				
Jackson, William					Williams, Dennis				
Jenkins, Carol					Yankaskas, Bonnie				



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

The James A. Taylor Student Health Service
Division of Student Affairs

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB# 7470, Student Health Service Building
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-7470

TO: UNC Faculty and Staff

FROM: World AIDS Day 1996 Planning Committee

RE: Involvement in WAD activities

As an integral part of the University community, we would like to invite your department to participate in the campus-wide recognition of World AIDS Day 1996. The committee has planned events for Monday, December 2 through Wednesday, December 4. The official theme of WAD is "One World, One Hope" and the University theme is "If not us, then who?" The following are some of the major activities planned so far:

Sunday, 12/1: Display of AIDS Quilt panels in Ackland Art Museum, with panel-making program

Monday, 12/2: Film festival in Union Auditorium, Information tables in The Pit

Tuesday, 12/3: Multicultural Extravaganza in Memorial Hall with guest speakers and musical groups, followed by a candlelight vigil

Wednesday, 12/4: Resource Day and Values Auction in The Pit, Bar Brigade (condom and info distribution in local bars), benefit concert in local club

In addition to these activities, there will be a section of the AIDS quilt rotating through the residence halls on campus and free walk-in HIV testing/counseling in the Student Wellness Center.

The committee is very excited about the events being planned and our goal is to get the entire University community involved in one way or another. Thus, we are hoping that your department would be willing to participate in some of the events we have planned or organize an activity that can be incorporated into our schedule. Some suggestions for getting involved include sponsoring a resource/information table in the Pit, choosing an individual to speak briefly at the Extravaganza about how AIDS has affected his/her life, or hanging a World AIDS Day banner in the department office.

If your department is interested in getting involved, please contact Committee Co-Chairs Ali Fisher or Cheryl Manning-Shaub at (919) 966-6586 for further information. Due to time constraints, we will need to confirm your participation by Monday, November 18.

Thank you for your time and we hope that you will join us in recognizing World AIDS Day 1996!

**TRANSCRIPT
MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1996, 3:00 P.M.**

Faculty Council Attendance:

Present (59): C. Anderson, J. Anderson, L. Bailey, Barefoot, Beck, Bose, Brice, Bromberg, Brown, Chambers, Conover, Crumley, Dodds, Estroff, Evens, Favorov, Fletcher, Foshee, Fox, Frankenberg, Hattem, Herman, Holmgren, Irene, Jackson, Jenkins, Johnstone, LeFebvre, Lentz, Leonard, Loeb, Maffly-Kipp, Mandel, Matson, Mauriello, G. McNeil, Mill, Owen, Panter, Peacock, Platin, Rabinowitz, Renner, Rinehart, Rutledge, Salgado, Searles, Shapiro, Shea, Skelly, Stidham, Strauss, Stuck, Tauchen, Tysinger, White, Yankaskas.

Excused absences (22): Andrews, Beckman, Bentley, Brink, Conley, Crimmins, Danis, Eckel, Farel, Gless, Hodges, Hogue, Howard, Ji, Lachiewicz, Loda, L. McNeil, Pagano, Passannante, Pielak, Weber, Williams.

Unexcused absences (3): Bangdiwala, Pike, Rosenman.

Open Session

Memorial Resolution for the late J. Robert Butler: Daniel A. Textoris, Chair, Memorial Committee.

James Robert Butler, Professor Emeritus of Geology since 1993, died unexpectedly on April 15, 1996, in Chapel Hill.

Bob Butler was born in Macon, Georgia, on April 17, 1930. His post high school education consisted of the BS from the University of Georgia, the MS from the University of Colorado, and the PhD from Columbia University, in 1952, 1955, and 1962, respectively, all in geology.

Bob served in the U.S. Army from 1954-1956.

Bob's academic experience consisted of a lectureship at Columbia University from 1959- 1960, with the remainder at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: visiting assistant professor, 1960-1962; assistant professor, 1962-1966; associate professor, 1966-1972; and professor, 1972-1993.

Bob held many honors, including fellowships from the Williamson Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, University of Colorado, Union Carbide, National Science Foundation, and IBM Faculty Computer. He had been elected into a number of societies, including Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Sigma Phi Alpha, and Sigma Gamma Epsilon. Professional societies included Geological Society of America (Fellow), Mineralogical Society, American Geophysical Union, National Association of Geology Teachers, North Carolina Academy of Science, North Carolina Archeological Society, Carolina Geological Society, and the Georgia Geological Society. He held chairmanships in many of these organizations.

He was extraordinarily active in research as shown by more than 80 publications, and by his active membership in a dozen regional, national, and international research-active organizations. Most of his research involved the geology of the Piedmont and Mountain provinces of the Carolinas, and this was related to other regions throughout the world. There is no doubt that Bob's research, and the dozens of MS and PhD students that he supervised, contributed to a far better understanding of the geology of the southeastern United States.

Bob was truly the last of a breed of field geologists who carried on the great traditions of Dennison Olmstead and Elijah Mitchell. He saw his calling as surveying the regional geology of the Carolinas, of bringing modern analytical methods and tectonic models to our understanding of the geological history of the southern

Daniel Textoris, Professor of Geology, P. Geoffrey Feiss, Professor of Geology, and Stephen A. Goldberg, Research Associate of Geochemistry. We request that this Memorial and the longer, more intimate one, be placed in the record and copies be sent to the family.

Chancellor Hooker: Let me ask you, please, to stand for a moment of silence. [standing silence] Thank you.

Remarks by Chancellor Hooker.

Just a few minutes ago I stood on the steps of South Building with three members of the Housekeepers Association steering committee and read to the press the following statement: "The University and the Housekeepers Association steering committee have agreed in principle to resolve their dispute and have made substantial progress toward finalizing that agreement. The parties need a brief additional period of time to consult with their various constituencies before presenting a definitive agreement to the presiding administrative law judge." It was the happiest moment in my 14 months at Chapel Hill. [applause] I wish I could tell you more--thank you--I wish I could say more, but we have agreed that we won't until we've reached absolute, final agreement and all of the various constituencies have signed on, and so, regretfully, I will not be able to say anything else about it, except to tell you that I am enormously pleased.

The glass ceiling report: I'm very pleased to have it, but I want to make sure that everybody understands that I think it's essential that we address the concerns that have been expressed in the report, and we will be conducting for Health Affairs the same study that we did for Academic Affairs, to ensure that we've got comparable data for the entire University, and that we will be continuing to collect data on an annual basis.

There's been much discussion about the classroom repair and renovation, and I just wanted to give you, as I said I would last time, a report with respect to where we are. We have designated \$1.7 million for classroom improvements. The Classroom Advisory Committee--that's the faculty committee that I keep referring to--evaluated the various needs, and they've identified 46 classrooms most in need. Those renovations will begin almost immediately and will continue through the spring and summer terms. Classrooms will be taken off-line as the renovations begin. The work will be done by our Physical Plant and by outside contractors, and I obviously beg your indulgence for the inconvenience as we shift classrooms around. I assure you the inconvenience will be rewarded at the end of this process. We also have \$1.7 million designated for lecture hall improvements. Highest priority for those go to Venable 207 and 268. Anybody who's seen those classrooms or those lecture halls will understand why. For those we've received the architect's proposals, and we have plans to pull them off-line beginning late spring, and they will be off-line through the summer and the fall of '97. That work will be done by outside contractors. Murphey Hall: \$2 million has been set aside. We have received the architect's proposal, and will begin renovation in the summer. The Business School, as you know, will vacate Carroll Hall the summer of '97. Carroll Hall renovations will take place through the end of '97 and '98, and the School of Journalism will move in in the fall of '98. Howell Hall will be designated as swing space during the period of renovations, and Murphey will be vacated and renovated in '98 and '99.

Last week I asked the Provost to begin inaugurating an undergraduate major in Environmental Studies. We will present it to the President and then to the Board of Governors, for their approval. We hope to have it up and running in the fall of '98, but by the fall of '97 we will have identified the courses so that students will know what will be required in the major and can begin taking them. We haven't worked out the details of the administrative organization of the program. That is one of the things that has held us up for so long. But when the students came and presented me with the six petitions and urged what they've been urging for so long, it seemed to me that it was imprudent to wait any longer. In fact we were beginning to look silly, I thought, and so I've asked the Provost just to go ahead and we will iron out the problems as we move along with the development of the major.

Appalachians. Within this context, he trained a generation of students to continue his work in universities, state and federal agencies, and mineral companies through the south.

However, he never lost his love of the west. For many years he taught Carolina's field course in New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. There is the image of Bob seated before a heaping plate of enchiladas with green chili sauce, pouring honey into one sapodilla after another, and wiping his famous bald pate with his napkins as the peppers began their work.

Bob was always ready to listen, encourage, and to offer guidance to faculty, staff, students, and colleagues from wherever. However, he rarely would tell you what he thought you should do. Instead, he listened carefully, asked questions, and provided information. Not infrequently, after a discussion, one would find that the mind frame had changed and you were headed in a different direction.

Bob clearly distinguished himself by the way he treated others. No question was considered foolish or without merit, and no person was belittled. Everyone was important and treated with respect, and he genuinely cared for the students.

His knowledge of rock outcrops and geologic literature was equaled by his knowledge of barbecue restaurants. Non-stop conversations on field trips covered a variety of topics including packing peaches and growing up in Georgia, Carolina politics, geology in other parts of the world, histories of small towns as Bat Cave, Old Fort, and Pageland. Bob was a wonderful story-teller, with a wealth of stories.

He was a member of the Faculty Council from 1963-1966, and he won the Tanner Distinguished Teaching Award in 1980. Although pressured by many to be chairman of the department on numerous occasions, Bob politely said no, so he could devote time to field research and teaching. Besides teaching all levels of courses, including his specialty in metamorphic rocks, he developed in recent years a course in archeological geology with colleagues in the Department of Anthropology. Not only was this an extremely successful course, which he continued to teach after retirement, but the two departments graduated a PhD in this field a few years ago.

Bob was famous for his ability to avoid committees and meetings. He always managed to be in the field at the right time. One colleague characterized him as "administratively challenged", but that minor lacuna aside, he was a valued citizen of the department.

A virtually unknown facet of Bob's professional contributions was an unpublished report written for the North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development in 1986. He reviewed a US Department of Energy report which contained two regions in North Carolina being considered for a high-level radioactive waste repository. He presented the geologic flaws which would have made the sites hazardous, and they were withdrawn from further consideration.

Bob served the region, the State, and the University with dedication, community spirit, and excellence for 33 years, and three more active years as an emeritus professor.

He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth L. Butler, two brothers, Walter C. Butler, Jr., and Joseph H. Butler, a son, James Butler, Jr., two daughters, Sarah B. Pierce and Erin G. Butler, three stepchildren, and 12 grandchildren.

Bob leaves a great number of friends, colleagues, students, and family who will remember him with great warmth and fondness. He enriched so many lives, and for this we celebrate his life.

Some of you know that the administration of the M.P.A. program is moving from Political Science to the Institute of Government, and the Provost has been in charge of that process, has done a good job with it. The program will continue to be jointly taught by the Political Science Department and members of the Institute.

You read in the local paper the report on advising that was done by General Administration. I have met recently with the Student Congress, and I think it's fair to say the strongest expression of discontent that I've received in that meeting, where I invited them to share all of their discontents with me, the strongest expression of discontent came with respect to advising, and I think we have a problem. Now I gave a litany of my experience with advising at all of the posts that I've held previously, and pronounced that I thought that advising was pretty good here. I still believe that, but the fact of the matter is that the General Administration did a survey of graduating seniors who found only 47% satisfaction here, which put us 13 points below the next lowest institution in the UNC System, and 24 points below the median for the universities in the System. And I think you will agree with me that we have a challenge here. We owe it to our students to figure out how we can do a better job and get a higher satisfaction rating. So I'm going to discuss with the Intellectual Climate Task Force the possibility of adding this as an additional charge, supplemented by additional personnel as may be needed. But I think we rightly know we owe it to our students to get to the bottom of the problems and do a better job, and I'm committed to doing whatever is necessary to enable us to do that.

You have on your Agenda for today post-tenure review. This is an issue that I have thought a lot about for the last several years, and an issue that I've talked a lot about in North Carolina since I started over a year ago meeting individually with members of the Legislature, and I've looked closely at the situation here, especially with the help of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. It is obvious to me that we don't have a problem which post-tenure review will address except that we have a problem with perception out in the broader world. And for that reason I think we have to do something. But we have so many processes of review already for post-tenured faculty that it is arguably excessively burdensome already and anything additional that we did I think would be supererogatory, and I hope that what we will be able to do is simply to bundle together the best of what we are already doing and let that be our post-tenure review process. But obviously it merits discussion by you before I pronounce what we need to do. But the one thing I am absolutely sure of, beyond the shadow of a doubt, and that is that we don't have deadwood. The local culture, the values, the intellectual values, of this campus have ensured that all of us have remained adequately productive in the scholarly arena and in the teaching arena, and we just don't have a problem. But, as I say, what counts in the world of politics is perception more than reality, and so I regard it as my job to change the perception in the minds of members of the Legislature and the broader world, and will be looking for your help in doing that. But I'm happy to say that we just don't have a problem. Now I think it's also important that we defend more vocally, more articulately, than we have, the whole institution of tenure. People tend to defend it by pointing to the initial reasons for it, having to do with academic freedom, and the detractors of tenure will tell you that there are other ways of guaranteeing academic freedoms, such as the First Amendment and contractual rights, and so forth. But there are many other benefits from a system of tenure well administered as ours is, and one just occurs to me from my own field. It promotes inter-disciplinary work in a way that if you didn't have it I don't think could be encouraged. For example, in Philosophy I remember when Applied Ethics first came to the fore, and now every university has Applied Ethics courses--Legal Ethics and Environmental Ethics and Business Ethics and Medical Ethics--as a standard part of the Philosophy curriculum. But I well remember when those were radical courses, and, while undergraduates wanted them, faculty were reluctant to teach them, especially junior faculty, and so people who had the security of tenure took on those courses first. They really brought about almost a revolutionary change in undergraduate teaching in Philosophy. So that is another benefit of tenure. And I think we need to be more articulate in defending the institution of tenure, especially where we can demonstrate, as we can here, that it doesn't have the negative consequences that it is sometimes seen to have elsewhere.

You're also going to discuss today the proposed bus tour for new faculty, or relatively new faculty. [This item was postponed until the January meeting.] That is something that I know, as a result of my travels around

the state, will benefit us enormously. Everybody knows that I believe the biggest problem that I faced when I arrived here last year was the perception out in the rest of the state that somehow Chapel Hill was aloof from the state, had an image of being detached, not interested in the rest of the state. That, I'm happy to say, is an image that we're having a fair amount of success dispelling as we travel around the state and build support in the state. On the hundred county tour that I've undertaken, I go into a part of the state that I haven't been in before, typically will visit and meet with public school officials there, with business and community leaders, and always with the legislators in that district. And I think that this effort is going to be a great benefit to us. It is building a lot of support for Chapel Hill out in the rest of the state, and is dissolving this image of us as somehow aloof from the rest of the state. And one of the things that I talk about out there is all the ways that we benefit every corner of the state - which we do.

Just one more point before I stop, and that is, I keep hearing misgivings about my drumbeat theme that we have to change, especially that we have to adopt the new digital technologies. And I just want to make it clear that when I talk about our changing, I'm talking about our changing in order to remain the same. The strength of Carolina, historically, has been in its scholarship and its teaching. Its strength in the future will be in its scholarship and in its teaching. My vision for Carolina is what I assume is the vision of everybody here, and that is that we will occupy in American higher education the position of leadership in the 21st Century that we have in the 20th Century. But in order to do that I think we have to take cognizance of the changing external environment, and in competition for students I can tell you that bringing digital technology into the classroom is something that we absolutely have to do, and sooner rather than later. I am anxious, frankly, that we are not doing it as fast as I believe we should. And that's the reason that I've identified the flexible funds this year for the faculty grant program. We have received such good proposals that I'm going to take funds that I had been holding back and commit them to funding more grants in that program than we had originally intended to fund, because I think that's just giving faculty the freedom, the latitude to experiment with the best way to get digital technology in the classroom. The other area where digital technology is going to bring about, I think, revolutionary changes in higher education is in distance learning. And, as you know, if you've been reading my remarks in the paper, I think we have a responsibility to do what we can to make education available to citizens in the state who would not otherwise have access education at Chapel Hill for various reasons. And we can do that through digital learning. But I also believe, very strongly, that within the next five years you're going to see the major universities in this country, and primarily the public universities, are going to be developing digital education, distance learning for worldwide markets. There is an enormous thirst out there, especially in developing nations, for American higher education, taught in English, which has become the international language of business and commerce and science. Those universities that get into this arena first are going to realize enormous revenues, simply through volume of transactions, in distance learning. And the question is, well, what will they do with those revenues? What they will do with those revenues is supplement existing budgets, which will enable them to repair classroom facilities, pay graduate students more, pay faculty more, that is, win the competitive race that we are in with our competition. And so, if we want to occupy this position of leadership that I think we all want to occupy, we had best recognize what the competition is beginning to do and that we need to be doing it ourselves as well. And so that's the nature of my passion of getting into the business of distance education. Obviously, in anything like that the challenge is to maintain quality control so that we don't, we don't lose any quality and that we are proud of the degrees that we offer, the courses, through distance learning, and that will be our passion as we move forward.

There's much else that I'd like to say, but let me stop there, and invite questions or comments. [There were none.] Okay. I have to take leave of you about 4:00 to go off to a fund-raising event, and I apologize in advance for that. Thank you. Professor Brown: Thank you.

Chair of the Faculty Jane D. Brown.

First of all, great news about the housekeepers, who were exceptional. I'd like to thank everyone involved. It's taken many people to make that happen, very hard hours, and it's great news for the whole community. Thank you. I just came back from a Faculty Assembly meeting. President Spangler brought us up-to-date on what's going on at General Administration. That had a stack of reports about that high of all of the reports, some of the reports that they have created to take back to the Legislature when it reconvenes. And so they've been working hard. Some of it affects us. One thing that he didn't speak about, but we were concerned about is the search for the next president of the UNC System. There is now a leadership statement--you probably saw about it in the newspaper. They're asking for God, basically. [laughter] It lists something like 56 attributes of the next President. It's quite remarkable. But embedded in there are some of the things I was concerned about, so that's good--values highly the life of the mind, has a passion for higher education, and so on. So it's in there, and we'll see what happens. I'm also looking for further opportunities for the faculty and students to be involved in this process. Right now John Dervin, who is the representative of all the student groups, is down there trying to draft a resolution that says that faculty and students should be able to meet with the final candidates before they are selected, so I hope that will happen. The other thing that the President talked about is that there is a study that's going to be released in the next couple of days about phased retirement. I'm not quite sure what this is going to look like, but just to alert you that General Administration's been looking at possibilities of a more flexible retirement plan. In the next piece will be something about retirement incentives. There's a lot of faculty involvement in those studies and we're looking carefully at how we will be able to do that in a way that works for us. The third thing they are talking about that I am appreciative of is the Open Meetings Law. There has been enough concern about how that has been affecting consultations between the administration and the faculty. They are still in negotiation about that. And I'm concerned about this. As a Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication, I'm in somewhat of awkward position. I'm concerned that the way it's been defined it goes too far, and it drives a wedge between faculty and administration, so that we won't be able to have the kind of consultation we need to really be involved in the future of the University. So I'm encouraging them to continue to look at that and to come up with a definition that works again for us as faculty. And, finally, I want to say a little about post-tenure review. This is an initiative of President Spangler. He spoke about it today as a preemptive strike to some extent. The legislatures of about one-third of the states have asked for studies of post-tenure review. About 10 states now have mandated post-tenure review. The President thinks that if we don't take the initiative, the Legislature will do it for us. And so he sees it as most important that we, the campuses and the faculty, be involved in developing a post-tenure review system. It's moving very quickly. I think we may not have sufficient input, but what we're arguing for at this point is that it remain as flexible as possible at the General Administration level and it comes back to the campuses to really look at, to spell out the specifics. And that even if it comes back, when it comes back to the campuses, that we keep it as flexible as possible, and that it really is unit-driven and faculty-driven about what it's going to look like. And so, I encourage us to have a full conversation about it today. It really is our moment for feedback to General Administration to say, this is what we want or what we don't want, this is what's going to be most beneficial for us. So I encourage you to be a part of that conversation today.

Finally - I'm sorry I didn't tell the Chancellor that Mike Smith cannot be here today to speak about the bus tour. He will be here in January complete with a slide show of the stops the bus tour will make in North Carolina. So, we'll look forward to that. Thank you. And finally, I want to just take a minute for a project that Anna Wood, an undergraduate student, has been involved in. She'll just speak for just a minute about that.

Anna Wood, Undergraduate Student: World AIDS Week.

Ms. Wood: What I want to speak about is during first week in December, from the 1st through the 4th we are going to be observing World AIDS Week, and we have several events going on. [Ms. Wood referred to some written materials she had available in limited quantity.] I hope you will present [this information] to your department and that you will be willing to pull something together or participate in any way in this week. It could be something as simple as a banner; we'd appreciate it. You can contact Cheryl Manning-Schaub over at

Student Health, and the number is 966-6586. And if we run out of these forms, please contact her over there, and we'll get a letter to you as soon as possible about the information and everything. So we'd really appreciate anyone who is interested in just participating in any way or helping out in any way. Thank you.

Professor Brown: Thank you. We'll keep a letter, too, in case anyone wants it, so we can distribute it.

Ms. Wood: Okay. Thank you.

Update Report of Task Force on Intellectual Climate: Pamela J. Conover, Chair.

Professor Brown: Pamela, from the Executive Committee on Faculty Council, and also the head of the Task Force on Intellectual Climate, will speak a minute about the December meeting when we're going to have a full discussion about the recommendations of the Task Force. And we didn't give her enough time last time, so a little more today.

Professor Conover: Well, thanks for having me back. I promised I would be brief last time. I'm not going to promise this time. [laughter] I want to do two things today. I want to update you about some of the ideas that are beginning to come out of this Task Force, and I want to inform you about some of the future activities, and once again try and engage you and involve you. The six Task Force committees have been meeting all semester. They've been very active, and a lot of good ideas have been coming out of them. At the December meeting of Faculty Council, we will take up some of those ideas in greater depth. At that time you will be asked to join our conversation by providing feedback to one of these committees. There's a sign-up sheet going around now. You're to list the three committees you'd most like to interact with, and what we're going to do at the December meeting is to break up in small groups. You'll be briefed about some of the ideas coming out of these committees and asked to, I think, function as something of a test group, a focus group, but also as representatives of the faculty in reacting initially to some of these ideas. So what I want to do today is to give you a little preview about what some of the ideas are like. Hopefully, entice you to want to find out more before the December meeting, and basically, prepare you for that meeting, give you something of an edge on what's going on. So what I'm going to do is run through what some of these committees are coming up with. None of these ideas are set in stone. Some of them are fairly provocative. They're meant to be. So, here we go.

Marshall Edgell chairs the **Inside the Classroom** committee. They are exploring a number of different ideas, one of which is an academy of distinguished teachers that would advise the Administration on educational matters. Another idea would be to require new faculty to actually take a workshop or perhaps even a course on how to enhance faculty interaction within the classroom. A third would be to establish a program that would take a very active role in encouraging faculty to increase the amount of student-faculty interactions in their courses. Another would be to focus on student independent scholarship, and how we can increase student research, especially in the first two years. Another is the establishment of a performance competence evaluation system to help develop the role of faculty more as a learning coach than as evaluators of student progress. A possibility that's already being explored in the College is the establishment of a structure to support cohort education, and that is keeping small groups of students together through similar experiences, pairing them for particular courses.

Moving to a second committee, Leon Fink has been very active with his **First Year Experience** committee. That committee has broken down into three subcommittees focusing on the recruitment of new students in our orientation, academic programs during the first year, and living and learning, how one integrates the social experience with the academic experience. They're considering, respectively, programs that have to deal with substantially revamping the C-Tops orientation program. Another proposal being taken up by the academic programs subcommittee is to revisit the idea of freshman seminars but hopefully from some new and innovative perspectives. And yet a third is the idea of a freshman campus.

The third committee is **Service Learning**. Donna LeFebvre chairs that committee, and they are moving rapidly towards recommending the creation of a center for public service on our campus. This center would support and expand service learning and other community service by undergraduates and graduates. It would act as a gateway, with a supporting database, between the state and local communities, students, staff, and faculty.

The fourth committee is chaired by Melinda Meade. It deals with **Public Spaces**, and they, too, are exploring a number of ideas. These include requiring formal consultation with faculty and students by Facilities Planning, at a stage where in-house architects start to address a project--much as we now do to ensure handicapped access. We would propose doing that to ensure that our public spaces are designed to facilitate student-faculty interaction. Another possibility is creating a fund to be competitively won each year by faculty or students in departments or other groups for purposes of designing the use of lounges, renovating dead space in their buildings, otherwise improvising interactive space that we don't currently have enough of. A third possibility is establishing a fund which could be self-renewing, with contributions, to purchase the best student art or other creations for hanging in departments, faculty offices, and such. And a final possibility is the creation of a series of mini-amphitheaters as a motif around campus. Some could descend, for example, the banks and hills around building embankments. Others could be groupings of tables and benches between sidewalks that surround the quads. And these would be accessible to discussion groups, readers, small classes, and would bring people out to use campus space during much of the year when the weather permits.

The fifth committee is **Outside the Classroom** and Lloyd Kramer in the History Department chairs this committee. They are exploring a number of different ideas for bringing intellectual exchange into the various reaches of everyday life. One idea involves better coordination between faculty, as they organize their courses, and those who exercise extra-curricular activities on campus. Faculty would be strongly encouraged to integrate outside events into classroom activity. Indeed, into course requirements, thereby beginning to break down the dichotomy between inside and outside the classroom. The Chancellor mentioned earlier the importance of advising, and this committee has already begun to focus on that and is in the process of developing a proposal to change the advising system so as to make the advisor-student relationship much more than some sort of bureaucratic check-off of requirements, which many students feel that's what it is now.

The final committee is on **Faculty Roles and Rewards**. Laurie McNeil chairs that committee. A lot of the changes being discussed, and many of those that I just mentioned, will require changing, indeed, perhaps fundamentally rethinking in some very basic ways our role, the role of faculty. This committee is working at a bit of a disadvantage because they have to wait for the other committees to come up with proposals so they can begin to explore how to adjust faculty roles and rewards in order to facilitate those proposals. Nonetheless, some of the things they have begun exploring include encouraging deans and vice provosts to make part of a departmental budget depend on how much climate-enhancing activity its faculty has engaged in in the last year and plans to do in the future. Another possibility is a much broader definition of teaching load, to include other activities, like undergraduate thesis advising, general advising, and the like. A third possible proposal would be to establish a source of funds at the Provost level, with RFP's for climate-enhancing activities. Proposals, for example, might include time off to revamp a class to make it more of an inquiry style experience, funds for undergraduate research projects, resources to develop interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching projects. Another would be to encourage the naming of professorships for excellence in interdisciplinary scholarship teaching judged by its effects on members of the University community.

In sum, you can see these committees have been fairly busy. They are working hard to look at these different areas. No one idea is going to produce substantial change. But I think when the package of ideas is taken together and put into a coherent plan, that we will have an exciting blueprint for enhancing the intellectual climate on campus. In the upcoming weeks I'm going to ask you to do four things. Next week The Daily Tar Heel will be running a series of articles on intellectual climate. I've been very pleased with the excitement they've

shown, and it would be very helpful if you would engage your students and your colleagues in discussion of these articles as well as some of the topics I've brought to you today. Secondly, the Task Force has a terrific Web page. The address is on the flyer that's on the back on the table. You've seen some signs similar to this [Prof. Conover displayed a sign inviting attention to the Web page]. I've brought a number of them today. Please visit the page, participate in the discussion boards, encourage your students and colleagues to do the same. If each of you could just persuade a few of your students, a few of your colleagues, to participate in our Web page conversation, the dialogue would be broadened considerably. And so what I want you to do is I want you to take one of these and post it on your door, and when people say "what is that?" tell them and encourage them to use it. It's really a very exciting innovation and a very appropriate way to carry on this conversation. The third thing as I've already mentioned, is the discussion we're going to have in December at Faculty Council. It would be good if you gave that some thought ahead of time and acted as representatives and talked to your colleagues about some of these ideas. If you would like further advance information, you can contact me or any of the six committee chairs I've mentioned. And the fourth thing I'm going to ask, and a number of my committee chairs have mentioned this to me, and that is, engaging you in helping to combat the skepticism that they have encountered from many people around campus about whether this Task Force can do anything. Now, in asking that I realize a number of you might be skeptics about whether this Task Force can do anything. Let me assure you that the people on this are working very hard, but more than that, they believe that something can be done, and they are convinced that real and substantial changes can happen. I am convinced of it. I am confident that our Chancellor is convinced of it. The Provost and other administrators are convinced of it, and more importantly, are willing to help us in this project. So, together, I think we can do remarkable things, and I hope you will join us in that effort. And I look forward to our conversation in December. Thank you. [applause]

Annual Reports of Standing Committees: The State of the Faculty

Status of Women: Abigail T. Panter, Chair.

Professor Brown: Abigail Panter is here. There are no resolutions, but would you like to speak to it at all, say anything?

Professor Panter: I just wanted to say briefly that I really was pleased with the glass ceiling report that the Provost's Office did, and we have suggested to the Provost that we're happy to hear that it's being taken seriously and ongoing, that the Health Affairs side of the picture will be taken care of and be looked at shortly. So the study, the glass ceiling study, will be replicated in Health Affairs as well, and we are pleased.

Professor Brown: Any questions or comments for Abigail? Good. Well we appreciate the hard work that your Committee does. Thanks very much.

Faculty Welfare: Steven L. Bachenheimer, Chair.

Professor Brown: Steve Bachenheimer for the Welfare Committee. There is a resolution attached to this report, so if you could all get that out.

Professor Bachenheimer: Well, I'll go right to that page, which is the recommendation, unless there is any question about anything else in the report. The name of the Committee is the Faculty Welfare Committee, and some of us have been uncomfortable with that name. It has some connotations we don't like. The charge of the Welfare Committee, as currently stated in the Faculty Code is to expand and improve faculty benefits. Well, we can't do that. We can make suggestions as to changes in wording of policies that hopefully don't cost anything in terms of money. But improving faculty benefits has historically had a low priority on this campus as far as I can tell. Most people are much more interested in seeing regular, or meaningful increases in salary, and fringe benefit issues tend to sort of get swept to the side, a little bit at least. There're other committees on campus or in

General Administration that actually do the heavy lifting in terms of making recommendations to the Legislature, in terms of improvement in faculty benefits. In addition, the Committee actually talks about lots of different things that don't have anything to do with benefit programs, and I've listed some of those towards the middle and the end of the background paragraph here. And, as a result, we've felt that we would like to have a different name, and we've thought about several different names, and we took the approach that that had the broadest connotation, that might be a good thing, so we thought about "Faculty Life." We rejected a name like "Faculty Well-Being" [chuckles], because personally that's a little too touchy-feely for me, and other people have felt that way, though other people who think that the name "Faculty Well-Being" would be nice, but we are proposing a "Committee on Faculty Life." That is the motion, and at the very least we thought we might get some help in terms of the charge to the Committee, too, so we feel a little more comfortable about the breadth of the issues we take.

Professor Brown: Is there a second to that motion? He's proposing a name change for the Committee.

Professor Bachenheimer: It might be important to realize that if the Council votes in favor, that the proposal goes to the Government Committee. They actually deal with this issue, so if you vote up, it doesn't mean we get a name change.

Professor Brown: It actually means it goes to the Government Committee that then will bring it back for a further vote. Is that correct? It's an amendment to The Code to change a standing committee's name. So do I hear a second for this motion? [seconded] Any further discussion?

Professor Jim Peacock (Anthropology)[Chair, Committee on University Government]: The Government Committee has considered the proposal and acknowledges the need to expand the charge, and we have a simple alternative proposal, which is to change the wording of the charge. The charge presently is as follows: "The Committee works on the expansion and improvement of faculty benefits." We propose to eliminate two words and add two words, or three, actually, so that it would read: "The Committee works on the improvement of faculty benefits and working conditions." The Committee did not like the idea of renaming your Committee, "Faculty Life" because we were afraid it was too broad and that the specific functions of the Committee would, therefore, be in danger of being lost. Webster's Dictionary defines "welfare" as follows: "State of health, happiness, and prosperity.; well-being."

Professor Brown: So are you speaking against the motion?

Professor Peacock: I'm speaking, I guess what I am proposing is a substitute motion which would not change the name, but would slightly change the charge.

Professor Brown: Oh. So you want, you've got a substitute motion. Would we need a second to that?

Professor Peacock: Yes, I guess I would speak against, I would speak against the motion

Professor Brown: How do you want to speak?

Professor Peacock: Well, I can do it another way, if you like. I can oppose the motion to change the name and then later introduce a motion to change the charge.

Professor Ferrell: That would be the correct way to do it. The motion to substitute is out of order.

Professor Brown: Thank you. Would anybody else like to speak to this?

Professor Sue Estroff (Social Medicine): I have trouble with the "Faculty Life" for the some of the reasons that Jim said, but I also have a very bad association with this word that goes with the anti-choice people. I hate to cede it to them, but it also implies that we might have a committee on "Faculty Non-Life." [laughter]

Professor Brown: Any further comment on this resolution? Are we all prepared to vote on this? All those in favor of changing the Committee's name from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to the Committee on Faculty Life, say aye. [there were some ayes] All those opposed, say no. [a sizable majority of no's] Okay, they don't like it, Steve. I'm sorry. [laughter] Maybe you ought to go back and work with the Government Committee about a name.

Professor Bachenheimer: I'm wondering if Jim would make his alternate proposal.

Professor Brown: Do you want to make it now, Jim?

Professor Peacock: Yes. The alternate proposal is to add, well, to omit the words "expansion and" and add the words "working conditions." I'll read it as revised. The revised charge is: "The Committee works on the improvement of faculty benefits and working conditions." The idea, Sue, is we don't have lives, but we have work. [laughter]

Professor Brown: Okay, so that's a motion?

Professor Peacock: That is the motion.

Professor Brown: Is there a second to that motion? [seconded]

Professor Brown: Discussion of the motion--to change the charge of the Welfare Committee, keeping the name Welfare Committee, and to make it "The Committee works on the improvement of faculty benefits and working conditions."

Professor Estroff: I have a question. What if you want to change the name and the charge? What should you do about this motion?

Professor Brown: Vote on it and then come back with a name change.

Professor Estroff: Okay. Thank you.

Professor Brown: Any further discussion about the charge of the Committee? We're ready to vote on that. All those in favor of the charge to the Committee as Jim just read it, say aye. [loud ayes] All those opposed, say no. [none] Okay. They're liking the charge. Very great. [laughter] Sue, do you have a motion about the name? Okay, I say we go back to the Committee and work with Government Committee about a new name if you want to take that up.

Chancellor Hooker: I'm out-of-order, but may I say something? Steve is absolutely right. Our benefits level is lower. There's a greater gap between our benefits and those of our benchmark institutions, which now are Michigan and Virginia, than there is a gap between our salaries. I'm aware of that. What I'm working on with the Legislature is a compensation package, which includes salary and benefits. But you're absolutely right that we have not kept pace with the benefits. And I just wanted to acknowledge that and let you know that I'm working on it.

Professor Brown: Marvelous. Thank you very much. By focusing on the name change, we have not mentioned the Committee's activities for the coming year. And since we've asked for the report so early in the year you haven't been able to move on those. And I also wanted to say that we've asked the Welfare Committee to look into the salary policies and how that's gone, that we spent so much time on last year creating the salary policies. And so they're going to be working with Tim Sanford's Office about how the salaries are being distributed, and so on. And now it looks like you'll also be working with the Chancellor about benefits.

Professor Bachenheimer: Right. And we established a liaison with the Provost's Office as well in terms of the policies, the salary policy guidelines. And we will be reporting in the spring on several of those.

Professor Brown: Very good. Thank you very much.

Advisory Committee: Janet Mason, Chair.

Professor Brown: Now, to the Advisory Committee. First their report. They're just supposed to make an annual report, and then we'll move on to the discussion of tenure review principles.

Professor Mason: Unless you have questions about the report we filed, we didn't have anything to add to that and we didn't have any actions. So I'm ready to move ahead to post-tenure review.

Principles of Post-Tenure Review: Janet Mason, Chair, Advisory Committee.

Professor Mason: I don't think we could have had a better introduction to the topic than the comments Jane and the Chancellor have made already to you about it. The main purpose for my being here, along with some members of our Committee, is to hear from you, to get your reactions to and suggestions about the draft that you received along with the Agenda and that also was published in The Gazette. But before I make a few comments about the draft, I want to acknowledge the other members of the Committee who are here. This has been a real Committee task, and everyone on the Committee has contributed to it, so I won't read through the list, although I'll ask you to take note of that, but I would like the members who are here to stand up and identify themselves. And Jerry, can you start? Jerry Folda, the Art Department. Bernadette Gray-Little, Psychology. Paul Debreczeny, Slavic Languages. Gil White, Medicine. Stirling Haig, Romance Languages.

Before I invite your comments, I want to talk briefly about four aspects of the draft, and if there's anyone who ended up without a copy, I have some extras with me to pass around. The four things I'd like to mention are: the context in which this draft was written; second, the current status of the draft; third, and related to that, opportunities for your continued input into what the document says; and then, finally, what I think the Advisory Committee viewed as some underlying principles, guiding principles, in going about the task of putting the draft together.

First, as already has been noted, the context in which we set about to draft these principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review was President Spangler's directive to all sixteen campuses to develop such a statement and submit it to General Administration. So, whatever we submit will be one of 16 such documents that go to General Administration, and that a System-wide committee there will then work with to develop whatever position General Administration will take. We're really fortunate to have Professor Stirling Haig as this campus's representative on that committee. And he, I'm sure would be willing at some point to answer questions you have about what that committee is doing or will be doing. I'm especially glad he's on that committee because he's reported to us that he's one of very few faculty members on the committee. Most campuses sent administrators to represent their campuses, so we're especially grateful to have Stirling in that role.

Second, in addition to the context, I'm going to tell you about the status of the draft. The Committee already has received some comments from faculty members. We've heard from the deans, both in Academic Affairs and in Health Affairs, and from the members of the Executive Committee. Based on those comments in the time we've had to look at the draft, if we were setting out to write it again, we'd write some parts differently from the draft that you have in front of you. And we will revise it, but we don't want to do that without also having the benefit of your comments and suggestions about it. And later, if you want, I'd be glad to summarize the gist of the main concerns or comments we've had from the people we have heard from. Next Wednesday the Committee will meet to revise the draft, and then it's due to General Administration by next Friday.

Third, and related to that, I want to tell you about continued opportunities for input, as those of us who are here from the Committee will stay after this meeting, and if you don't have time to have your say during the time that we have right now. In addition, we'd be happy to hear from you by any means between now and the end of the day Tuesday, so that we'd have the benefit of your suggestions before we sit down to draft the final. And then, most importantly, even after this draft is given, the document is given to General Administration, I encourage all of you to keep in mind Stirling's role as a member of the System-wide committee for any input you want to have, not just about this document, but, too, directly to General Administration about what they do with this and the other 15 they'll receive.

Finally, the things that I think were the Committee's guiding principles, and I also think these are consistent with what the Chancellor said when he spoke about this topic. Because this is going to General Administration, presumably for use in development of the directive that then will come from General Administration back to all the campuses, the Committee deliberately kept this draft on a fairly general level. We wanted to encourage General Administration to leave each campus the room and flexibility that it needs to devise a post-tenure review system that recognizes the needs and uniqueness of each campus. And, similarly, we hope when it gets to the campus level that that same recognition of uniqueness and special needs be given to every department on campus. So, there are a lot of details that one would want to talk about if you were having a comprehensive discussion of post-tenure review that are not in this document. They're not there deliberately, because our Committee didn't want General Administration to provide all the details. Rather, we hope there will be a large tent within which we will later be comfortable filling in the details about what post-tenure review should be here. Second, the Committee wanted to encourage a process that is supportive of tenure. I know that some people think that what really is going on is an attack on tenure. So we felt it very important that this draft be written in a way that is supportive of tenure. We wanted to encourage and to emphasize the faculty development aspect of a post-tenure review process, and that is consistent, in fact, with what President Spangler says in his letter asking the campuses to do this, that. And, finally, we wanted and tried to envision in general a system of post-tenure review that is both compatible and consistent with existing review procedures. As the Chancellor said, we don't want to add a layer to all the things people have to do already, but hope, we would hope, pulling those things together. Next, we hope to have a procedure that is compatible and consistent with existing standards and procedures for disciplinary action and dismissal. So we don't view this, and hope General Administration won't view it, as either contradicting or replacing the standards and procedures that already exist for disciplinary action. So, as a Committee, we really invite and want your reactions and suggestions about the draft. We want to know whether those are the correct guiding principles to use to put the final draft together, and if they are, how this draft could be improved to reflect that. So let me ask first if there's anything Committee members would like to add to what I've just said, and if not, I would invite whatever comments or questions you have.

Professor Miles Fletcher (History): I did contact members of the History Department by email and asked them to relay their comments to me about the proposed post-tenure review, and I appreciate all the work that the Committee has done on it, so I'll just convey some of those concerns. One is, I think the emphasis on peer review is very important. That is embedded in the culture of this Institution, and I think that post-tenure review should be peer review -- the faculty should be reviewing each other. Secondly, I think the greatest concern of my colleagues is the time that this will take, and I was urged to convey to you the necessity that this process take

as little time as possible. People are just concerned that they're going to have to take time away from the primary missions of teaching and research. And I see some conflict here between activities of the Intellectual Climate Committee. It seems to be distressing to faculty to think that we want to spend more time with students and to do more things in the classroom, and yet here comes another burdensome administrative demand. And there's the conflict. The time to do this is going to come from teaching and research, and so that should be kept to a minimum.

Professor Mason: Can I come in on that? I wish I had brought with me a written comment I received from a professor who said, "Dear Professor Mason, I'm sorry I don't have time to comment more fully to your draft, but I am too busy" and then he went on for half a page with the things he's too busy doing to comment. Now I think that concern is broadly shared.

Professor Fletcher: Right. I think time is the most precious commodity of people here right now, and so that's a concern here. Finally, I'll just add very quickly I hope what whatever criteria are used are as flexible as possible. I think that faculty go through different stages in their careers and what they contribute to the University. There's a danger in a formalized review system of using a cookie cutter approach and thus, in a way, negating the strengths that people develop at different stages. And I know developmental plans are mentioned in the report, and I have some concerns about those, because of know of faculty who rather quickly get opportunities, or rather suddenly get opportunities to develop new interests. And I would hate to see a three or five year developmental plan inhibit faculty from taking advantage of those opportunities. I know in the last two years I've become very interested in using computer technology in my classes - something I wouldn't have dreamed of three years ago. If I had a developmental plan filed and I thought a review committee was going to ask me two years hence, well, why haven't you fulfilled those goals, I might not be doing some of the things in the classroom which evidently are now, as Chancellor Hooker said, University goals. And so I'm very fearful that this process might induce people to think in rather rigid terms about their careers and their contributions to their community. I'm also concerned about the service component of a faculty member's career. If faculty members know that they're being reviewed every x number of years and are expected to meet certain goals, this might inhibit the tremendous contributions that faculty make for service that is unrewarded or under-rewarded.

Professor John Anderson (Nutrition): I was wondering what the definition of faculty peer is for tenured faculty members. Is it another tenured faculty member or is it any faculty member?

Professor Mason: A chair of a department on our Committee who raised the same issue, and he said he didn't know whether he was a faculty peer, so that's a piece of this. We've gotten a number of other comments on that, both what is a faculty peer and what a number of people perceive as our failure to adequately address the role of administrators. So, I'm not sure we had a uniform assumption about what a faculty peer is. Would you like to, would anyone like to propose how this might read to clarify that issue?

Professor Anderson: I was wondering whether a department chair who is also a full professor, let's say, would that person be a peer or would that person be a departmental administrative representative? Because they're the ones usually who do the reviews, anyway, with the full faculty or some category, full professors, or whatever. So I'm a little bit confused about this.

Professor Mason: Right. I think at the very least we need to work on what the fact, acknowledged fact, that obviously department chairs and deans have a role in this process, which I think we took so much for granted that we didn't say it. I'm not sure, I think there's general agreement that faculty, that this does have to include an aspect of peer review. And I don't know whether we need for General Administration to say more than that or whether we prefer to say that when we get to the level of providing the details. Thank you.

Professor Debra Shapiro (Business School): The document assumes that there will be criteria that will be applied consistently, and there will be missions that I assume will also be known [to] all. I think it also needs to include a grievance procedure available to people in the event that this, in fact, is not happening and there may be partiality guiding people's assessments of faculty.

Professor Ferrell: Do you mean a departmental grievance procedure in addition to the one already available generally?

Professor Shapiro: Is there a grievance procedure now for post-tenured faculty, for these kinds of assessments?

Professor Mason: There is a Grievance Committee that has broad jurisdiction to entertain grievances on almost anything except something involving the grant of tenure or promotions. Denial of tenure or promotion.

Professor Shapiro: Thank you. I had not made that connection.

Professor Larry Benninger (Geology): Partly echoing Professor Fletcher's comments, I think there are a number of problems of definition and, of course, we're at an early stage and I appreciate that. Just to begin at the beginning, do we know who is going to decide what counts as faculty productivity and what is counted under faculty accountability?

Professor Mason: I think we assumed, and maybe we need to state, that we're talking about, at the very least, the three main areas of faculty activity: research, teaching, and service, and view this not focusing on only one or two of those, but on all three. As far as what the standards are, again, I think our position was those should be developed at the campus and in the detailed way at the departmental level. And I'm not sure I'm responding to your question.

Professor Benninger: Well, it seems that one of the issues on the campus now is that activities are counted differentially, and sometimes it comes down to merely counting the publications, as opposed to looking at contributions in the area which you serve. And I'm just wondering whether we are ever going to have from on high an explicit policy about what needs to be taken into account in doing these kinds of assessments.

Professor Mason: I think that's a very important question, but a different one from what this is designed to do.

Professor Carl Bose (Pediatrics): I'm comforted by the lack of specificity in this document, because I think we have diversity of missions. And you pointed this out, and the Chancellor did as well. And this document permits flexibility of the review process. The only concern I have, the risk in it is, that you go to GA with this and it's passed through to the Legislature without specificity, and they aren't sufficiently satisfied. And so they impose their scheme upon this framework which includes a lot of specificity, and I think that's where it's going to take a deft hand at passing this through GA with enough support of a lack of specificity that it can be sold to the Legislature. The risk, of course, is that it can't be and they turn around and impose their own framework. If the framework and specificity is going to be imposed, I think this is the group and people on this campus are the people to develop it. I hope that we'll have that opportunity, if we get down the road and we find that things are heading in a different direction than we would like.

Professor Mason: I agree, and that's certainly the Committee's view, and I know that in Stirling on that System-wide committee we have a strong advocate for exactly what you said. In fact I think he already has made a difference in their conversations for emphasizing the need for flexibility and local determination of those standards. I don't view this, and I don't know what other people are thinking, but I don't view it as something

that's going from here to General Administration to the General Assembly. At least, I hope not. I hope it's going from here to General Administration, where it will be worked on, come back to here and the other 15 campuses, and that what we can give the General Assembly or anyone else who has concerns in this area is a "look, this is what we're doing." And that test will come in our performing well at that next level of setting the standards and filling in the details. And the risk is if we don't do that.

Professor Haig: After the General Administration, the next body to look at it will be the Board of Governors.

Professor Mason: That's true. President Spangler's letter said that he had promised a report to the Board of Governors in May.

Professor Brian Herman (Medical School): I guess what I'm a little bit concerned about is what I don't see here is where the buck stops. In other words, there are very general plans about how this should be carried out, and define who a faculty peer is. There's some suggestion about the department chairs having to help the faculty develop faculty plans in the event that they're not reviewed in a positive way. But it's not clear from any of this where the actual end point is and who says, you know, this is what has to be done, this isn't done and this is the consequence of not putting that into action. Is that still supposed to be at the level of the chair, is that the level of the faculty peers, or the level of the School to be aware of this - where is this going to come from?

Professor Mason: I think our view, and Committee colleagues help out if I get this wrong, our view is that much of what you just asked about is, and remains, in the hands of the department chair or other administrator that has supervisory responsibility. There are two questions we've had before today that relate to that. One is how does this relate to salary policy procedures, and how the other is whether we have dealt adequately with possible negative consequences. So I think we can do a better job of tying this together: one, by making it clear that the department chair and other similar administrators are key players in this; that not, we sort of said they "deliver" the results, and we don't mean that that's all their role is. Clearly, they're the ones responsible for seeing that this is carried out in their departments, and for using the results; possibly, as well, in creating the results. But at the very least, using the results as part of what is weighed in decisions about salary, work assignments, other things, other kinds of decisions that administrators make. In the early part of the draft we were very intent on saying that this is separate from and does not abrogate either the standards or procedures for disciplining a faculty member. What we failed to say, though, is that certainly the outcome of a review would be relevant. I don't think this needs to be spelled out, but if someone is a candidate for being disciplined or dismissed, it's just incredible to think that the results of any review process, this or any other, wouldn't be part of what are looked at there. So we, I think, assumed more than we spelled out those kinds of connections.

Professor Barry Lentz (Biochemistry & Biophysics): What happens to these reviews? Do they become a part of one's record? And if that's the case, I think I'm still thinking about the issue that you raised. And, you know, if you think that a review was unfair, you don't want to go to the Grievance Committee with that. There must be some way of a discussion, some way of initiating a discussion and challenging a review if you, because it's going to become a part of your permanent record. And there should be some mechanism for challenging it, short of a formal grievance against the University. And I think that's maybe what you were getting at.

Professor Fletcher: I would just second that. Unfortunately I don't know much about the grievance process, but I gather it's a very time-consuming, exhaustive procedure, that we might want to set up some other procedure for handling complaints about a review for someone who felt they didn't get a fair review. Something that could be handled more expeditiously than a true, formal grievance procedure. So I just back those comments.

Professor Mason: Is that something you think should be different from the more structured and formal is needed than what exists now? Because one thing we kept running into in thinking about this whole issue is we have review. We have pre-tenure and post-tenure review. We have reviews every year before salary decisions are made. But do you think because we're talking about a more consistent, formal process that we also need a more formal.....

Professor Fletcher: A lot to me would depend on what kind of a procedure comes out, and so if it's a true just bundling together of things that happen already, then maybe there's less need for a formal procedure. But it depends a lot on what happens.

Professor Lentz: Our, at least in my department, the existing yearly review procedure is nothing but an accounting process. I mean, this sounds like more of a process. What papers have you published, what courses have you taught, put one in column A, one in column B, and one in another column.

Professor Mason: I'm not sure that's all it is in many departments.

Professor Lentz: Well, in many departments it may not be, but this sounds like a much more exhaustive procedure. It will be evaluative rather than just accounting. And if you disagree with the outcome of that, there ought to be some mechanism for a dialogue, at least for that discourse.

Professor Brown: I think there's a great variety across the University about what's being done now. The School of Business, I know, does a very elaborate process, of every professor every year. Is that right? One unit evaluating and guiding each other. And the survey that was done on the campus illustrates this. I put some copies back there, a summary of all that's being done. So some units do very comprehensive reviews already - for all faculty. And some, it sounds like mere accounting.

Professor Ron Strauss (Dental School): In talking about this with my colleagues, they largely felt as though this is happening already, and that this needs to be recognized. But they also were quite pleased with the self-assessment component of their annual review, where each faculty member uses scales and assesses their work for the year and outlines their goals for the following year. That's identical for pre- and post-tenure reviews. Just an annual thing. And then, with, in consultation with, the department chair, their evaluation and the chair's evaluation are reconciled essentially. Now, there is no grievance procedure I know of, though I'm sure you could go to the Dean if you had concerns. People were proud of that, and proud that they were engaged in self-assessment, at least as much as having some other committee or group of peers identify challenges for them. So I would hope as we think about specifics, we would at least look at that option or methodology.

Professor Mason: Of the survey results that was much more typical in Health Affairs than in other areas. But a number of them have a strong component of self-assessment. Other comments, questions?

Professor Bachenheimer: The discussion has centered around peer review, evaluation, but I was disturbed to hear that there are many administrators who are representatives of the units at the System-wide level. Are we unique in sending faculty, and what does this say about how other campuses view this process? And are we sort of whistling in the dark?

Professor Mason: Stirling, would you be willing to come up and talk for a little bit about both, not just the composition but the process of that committee?

Professor Haig: Well I do feel somehow like I need a star on my cap when I sit down with those people. But, you know where my heart lies. And speaking also very much as a very ex chair of a department. But I don't think that there's a particular concern that the views that I hear expressed by the deans and the vice

chancellors who are on that General Administration committee differ substantially from the kinds of discussions that we have had in our subcommittee that was assigned the task of post-tenure review, or in the Chancellor's Advisory Committee at large. I think the tenor of the discussions has been rather pretty much the same all around. You might be wondering what this committee of administrators is doing, and what it is doing is much what we have done, which is to receive and seek out information on post-tenure review throughout the nation. We've had a workshop that was led by a national authority on post-tenure review. We've had email exchanges of information on an email site that was set up for us. We've seen models of post-tenure review that have now been actually voted on some of the campuses. East Carolina, for example, has adopted a policy on post-tenure review. We've seen copies of policies that have been adopted at other campuses, small, large, and also other systems. The University of Maryland system has just adopted a post-tenure review policy. The University of Georgia system has done the same. I'm hoping that what will come of the policy at the GA level will be a set of principles that will be flexible enough so that our campuses, each with a different mission and a different character, and background, history, and everything, will be able to largely use existing processes where we think that they're sufficient, or, and, therefore, to address the time question, to be able to merely add in where necessary. For example, I think it's true that in Arts and Sciences full professors are not currently reviewed in this context with the same thoroughness that Assistant or Associate Professors are when they're candidates for promotion, for example. But now this would be extended to full professors. But I think that many of the questions regarding detail and specificity will have to be worked out at the departmental or unit level.

Professor Bose: I just want to ask one question about your investigation and your discussion about applications or review systems in other areas of the country, other educational institutions. I think people are studiously avoiding the whole issue of whether a result of the review would be loss of tenure, a dissolution to some extent, of the whole tenure system. Is that coming up in the discussions at GA, amongst the campuses, amongst administrators, and is that part of review systems in other institutions?

Professor Haig: Well, I think Jane mentioned President Spangler's view that this was a, would you say, a preemptive strike? Yes, a preemptive strike to try to self-inoculate against future attacks on tenure, and that if we do this, and we can then, and I think quite appropriately and properly, claim that we are being good stewards of this system that's served the academic academy so well, and that we are also accountable to our state Legislatures and overseeing boards. So I think it will help ward off the hostility that does exist in some quarters toward the tenure system.

Professor Bose: Well, I can well imagine some legislators would take a very dim view of this, the depth of this attempt, and, in fact--I hate to make an unpopular statement--there are some failures of the tenure system. I think we all recognize that. There are people that get mired down in mediocrity and aren't productive anymore. Might we be better stewards if we at least admitted that the option of removing tenure, losing tenure, is an option in the system? I mean, then that would respond to everyone's desires, I suppose, even those that don't see the tenure system as a valuable system anymore, which all of us, I think, here do.

Professor Brown: So do you think it should be more specific?

Professor Bose: I don't know. I'm not suggesting that.

Professor Mason: That, no doubt, is someone's agenda out there somewhere. Our approach to this has been to assume that this is not what this is about, and that's why, again, why we made the statement that it is our view that a system of post-tenure review should be separate from and shouldn't affect or abrogate the standards and procedures for discipline. And I view a loss of tenure as one more in a range of kinds of discipline short of dismissal. So my view would be if people are concerned about kinds of sanctions that are available, whether they're applied when they ought to be applied, that needs to be dealt with the Trustee's tenure regulations and that we need to try to avoid contaminating review processes by either having that be the reason that we're doing

them, or having them too closely linked. We may have gone too far in the other direction in this document trying to stress the developmental side, partly because we were reacting to concerns about going the other direction. But, you know, if you look at the Trustees' policies, you've got it already. Grounds for dismissal are misconduct, unfitness to continue on the faculty, failure to perform, and incompetence. Now, those are pretty conclusive. And if we're not using them, I don't think it's because we don't have a post-tenure review system. And I would just hope people who want to address that kind of issue would do it in the right place and not tack it on to this.

Professor Genna Rae McNeil (History): I'm not clear exactly where it should go but I think certainly before matters come to the point of needing to go to a grievance committee, there ought to be some place at which it is made clear that faculty members may have an opportunity to respond to anything that is in writing regarding about his or her performance, and that there ought to be a manner in which something can be expunged from the record if it is invalidly or illegitimately placed in a person's record, and that, in fact, perhaps with the Provost's Office or the Dean's Office there should be a place to which a faculty member can go if he or she has a real problem in terms of communicating with the chairperson in regard to his or her post-tenure review. I think we know that there are things that can arise that means that there needs to be another person with whom someone can speak and perhaps even someone to talk about the possibility of litigation.

Professor Mason: Well, it sounds like several of you are saying that a list of principal features should include a review or appeal process, without going the next step and saying what that looks like, but that at the very least we should say that that should be a feature. I think that's, we'll add that. Any other comments or questions?

Professor Gil White: I don't feel like I've gotten a good feeling from the group whether they feel peers should be doing this or non-peers. And I wonder if we could get anymore discussion on that.

Professor Brown: For what is a peer?

Professor White: Well, no, not what is a peer, but who the faculty would like being their reviewers. Maybe that's the question. Should it be administrators, should it be peers. To a certain extent that means you have to define who a peer is. But I don't mean defining what a peer is for purposes of this particular document. I just mean who does the faculty want reviewing themselves.

Professor Fletcher: The way we do everything, and I think a lot of units in Arts and Sciences are this way, is a committee of faculty do reviews and their advice is advisory to the chair, who makes the final determination, but that report of the committee is usually determinative. So....

Professor Brown: And is it different levels of faculty doing that, or...?

Professor Fletcher: It would depend on the rank of the person. Right now we use it mostly for promotions, so for Assistant Professors it would be a committee of tenured professors, for Associate Professors, it would be a committee of full professors, so it's not exactly peers; it's faculty, but of a higher rank than the person being reviewed. For Full Professors, it would be a committee of other Full Professors.

Professor Brown: of chaired professors? [laughter]

Professor Fletcher: I wouldn't go that far.

Professor Ferrell: Would you consider that peer review might on occasion include faculty from other institutions? Or is your understanding that peer review means persons, colleagues, on this campus?

Professor Fletcher: Persons or colleagues on this campus. Whether, I mean a review process usually, particularly for promotion, involves getting letters from the outside. That would be a big step for this. I mean, again, it would take a tremendous amount of time. There are a lot of faculty in Arts and Sciences, and you put a five-year review committee, you're going to be reviewing, or a five-year review period, you're going to be reviewing in Arts and Sciences I imagine 70 to 100 professors a year. And so, I don't know how extensive, how time consuming people want to make this process. I would argue for as little time consuming as possible.

Professor Ferrell: You don't mean also to limit it to persons in that individual's department? Some of your departments in Arts and Sciences are very small.

Professor Fletcher: Well, I don't know if we have to work out that level of detail here.

Professor Brown: Not for this document.

Professor Fletcher: That's right. But as a general matter if in the larger departments, it would be just people in your department. I'm in History. I'm also in Asian Studies, which has a very small core of faculty, and that would have to involve, pull from outside of that core faculty. So for some small departments it might involve faculty outside the immediate unit.

Professor Bill Smith (Mathematics): I think just the gist of the last little train of discussion supports the position of this committee, right? In general terms. And I think peer is fairly general but adequately specific. I think peer could include someone from outside, appropriately, under appropriate circumstances. Peer does not mean rank. You're not going to find that in the dictionary. A sort of rank as a definition of peer. I think you're not going to find a classification as to whether one is teaching all the time or perhaps doing a little administrative work on the side, or something that eliminates you from being a peer. I think peer is exactly the right word to use here, it being one of the basic principles of AAUP and all of our scholarly groups have thought about this over the years. That basically evaluations of scholarly work should be supported by people of similar areas of scholarly work looking at it. And I think peer review captures that completely. It doesn't eliminate anything. It does somewhat set the standard, and I would be afraid of the document being more specific.

Professor Maria Salgado (Romance Languages): I was wondering whether any of those other documents that you talked about, like the University of Maryland or East Carolina, do they say anything about who's doing the reviewing, or do they specify who their peers are?

Professor Mason: Stirling would need to answer that. I assume that do since they are documents for specific institutions, but ..

Professor Haig: I don't have it here, I'm sorry.

Professor White: But there are instances of both. There are some cases where the review is done administratively, and some instances where the review has been peer review.

Professor Phil Bromberg (Medicine): I just wondered whether we might take elements of the existing system. In the Department of Medicine there is, in essence, self-review that is prepared each year and sent to the chairman. If everyone did that, the next step would be if the chairman is concerned about performance in specific cases, there can be a committee of peers, however that is ultimately defined, who review that situation. Or it might be that that would be begun right away. It would be a year or two, in which after discussion with the faculty member of those concerns, if they still remain in the mind of the chairman, that there would be at the end of that time if there is a lack of progress.... Instead of having to formally review every single faculty member regardless of what their self-assessment, and in a recently documented track record.

Professor Brown: That's something that's been brought up in response to Miles' concern, as well, about time consuming - does everyone have to be reviewed even if they had stellar work and everybody knows it is stellar work. That possibility has a different kind of system.

Professor Mason: Can I just add to that, because I think fairly consistently we have taken the position that everyone should be reviewed sometime. And you could make, you can change the outer limit - every five years, every six years. But one point some of the comments we received made is that this should not be just, you know, a checkup to make sure people are working hard enough, but it also should be a basis for documenting and rewarding extremely meritorious work. So, in that sense, I think our Committee felt that some periodic review, maybe not with the same frequency for everybody, but at some point for everyone, was important, and it would be, I think, quite possible to say that a certain kind of outcome or concern would trigger a speedier next review.

Professor Bromberg: But if you're having an annual review, then maybe merit is rewarding, although in my humble opinion, there's only one coin of the realm that gets rewarded. That's when you have competing offers and you take the road of saying, well, this is a very attractive offer. If you don't have that, then merit doesn't cut much ice.

Professor Terry Evens: A quick suggestion. It seems to me that given an auspicious point about time consumption and all, and external reviews, that some reviews might be included as a possibility in reviews in appeals cases for recourse. That would be a good place.

Professor Fletcher: I hate to keep making comments, but the topic interests me. I really like the idea just proposed about self-reviews and, because I think it's, I mean it's silly to spend time reviewing people that are doing a good job. I just don't see the point in it, and as to the issue of compensation, if you have a good salary policy in place, then the merits should be rewarded. And that, in a way, is a separate concern. And so, the point of this review is to, the review process, is to correct problems that one may see, so that idea has a lot of appeal to me.

Professor Mason: Do you think that idea is doable within the draft we have. If General Administration sent us this draft and said, develop your process, would there be anything in these general principal features to keep us from doing that?

Professor Fletcher: Offhand, well I'd have to read it again, but I don't think so.

Professor Gray-Little: Just a comment. In the systems that do have post-tenure review, there can be one of the two models that we're talking about, either a system where everyone is reviewed on some kind of basis, or a system where there is a trigger for review, and that trigger can sometimes be the annual review that's already in place, and then more extended review is done on the basis of that. So those both of those approaches exist in current post-tenure review systems.

Professor Brown: Here?

Professor Gray-Little: No, not in our review. Generally. Generally in discussions that I've seen of post-tenure review. It seems that both of those systems are viable and are in different places. Some people take their current review procedures and build an extra step onto them, that uses what's going on, and that triggers a then more extended review where it seems appropriate.

Professor Brown: Okay, final comments.

Professor Sarah Chambers (History): Just following up on that, and I don't want to be nitpicky about it because the language is good in general. But on #3 where you say the tenure review procedures you supplement; for procedures I get the sense that what you meant was that we already have procedures, and we shouldn't duplicate. But it almost seems to say that, yes, we do need additional. I don't know if there's a way to word that, if there is in fact adequate procedures, then maybe all they need is a trigger and not a supplement. And that in units where perhaps there isn't already a regular review, from our end, that they would need to.

Professor Mason: Thank you. That's consistent with some other comments. But one thing I hope we'll do is to in the Preamble and throughout, put much more emphasis on how much review already occurs, and how we hope parts of that will suffice and be part of this.

Professor Brown: Anything else? Thank you very much.

Old or New Business.

Professor Brown: Old or new business?

Professor Bachenheimer: I commend you on the change in the way these meetings are being conducted.

Professor Brown: The agenda? You like the new Agenda?

Professor Bachenheimer: Yes, I do.

Professor Brown. Good. I'll thank our Agenda Committee, too, for suggesting this.

Now we need to go into closed session. I will now entertain a motion that the Council go into closed session to consider recommendations to the Board of Trustees for Distinguished Alumnus(a) Awards. [so moved] Thank you. [seconded] Thank you. The Council is now in closed session, and would those of you who are not voting members of the faculty or Faculty Council, please step outside so we can complete this item of business, and as far as I know this is our last item of business.

Closed Session (to non-faculty persons)

Presentation of Candidates for Distinguished Alumnus(a) Awards for October 12, 1997 University Day:
Weldon Thornton, Chair, Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards.

[Professor Thornton read the slate of five candidates and a brief biographical paragraph about each one. The slate was adopted unanimously.]

[At the conclusion of this item of business, the Council on motion returned to open session.]

Professor Brown: Do I hear a motion to adjourn? [So moved, seconded, and adopted.]

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL
1996-97

Date	Action	Destination
September 8, 1996	-----	
October 11, 1996	Seconding reading of Amendments to Faculty Code of University Government to allow fixed-term faculty to serve on and vote for certain standing committees.	Secretary of the Faculty.
	Resolution on Privatization	Chancellor.
	Resolution on Student Recruitment	Office of Undergraduate Admissions.
November 15, 1996		