

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, February 14, 1997, 3:00 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA

<i>Type</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Item</i>
INFO	3:00	Memorial Resolution for the late Fred Seminuk: Leroy D. Werley, Chair, Memorial Committee.
INFO	3:05	Remarks by Chancellor Hooker.
INFO	3:20	Question Period. [The Chancellor invites questions or comments on any topic.]
INFO	3:30	Chair of the Faculty Jane D. Brown.
		Annual Reports of Standing Committees: Focus on Academic Life
INFO	3:40	Educational Policy: Anthony N. (Tony) Passamante, Chair.*
ACT		Resolution 97-3 Final Examination Policy
ACT		Resolution 97-4 Discontinue Catalogue Committee
ACT		Resolution 97-5 Cooperative Learning Environment
INFO	4:10	Status of Black Faculty & Students: William A. Darity, Jr., Chair. *
INFO	4:25	Research: James J. Gallagher, Chair. *
INFO	4:40	Established Lectures: Arne L. Kalleberg, Chair. *
ACT		Resolution 97-6 Concerning Established Lectures
INFO	4:45	Buildings and Grounds: David R. Godschalk, Chair. *
ACT	4:50	Old or New Business.

CLOSED SESSION

ACT	4:55	Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards: Weldon Thornton, Chair
		Presentation of a nominee for an honorary degree

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY:

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.

The minutes of the January 10 Faculty Council meeting will be mailed separately
Both the minutes and transcript will appear on the Campus Web.
The next Faculty Council meeting is on March 21.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Minutes of the Faculty Council
February 14, 1997

Attendance

Present (55): C. Anderson, J. Anderson, Bangdiwala, Barefoot, Beckman, Bluestein, Bose, Brink, Bromberg, Brown, Chambers, Conley, Dalton, Eckel, Evens, Farel, Favorov, Fletcher, Foshue, Hatterm, Hodges, Hogue, Holmgren, Howard, Hyatt, Jenkins, LeFebvre, Lentz, Leonard, Loda, Maffly-Kipp, Mandel, Mauriello, G. McNeil, L. McNeil, Owen, Pagano, Panter, Passannante, Peacock, Pielak, Platin, Rabinowitz, Rinehart, Rutledge, Salgado, Shapiro, Shea, Skelly, Stidman, Strauss, Stuck, Tauchen, Tysinger, Williams, Yankaskas.

Excused absences (24): Andrews, A. Bailey, L. Bailey, Beck, Bentley, Brice, Conover, Danis, Estroff, Fox, Frankenberg, Gless, Herman, Irene, Jackson, Ji, Lachiewicz, Matson, Mill, Renner, Sayre-McCord, Searles, Weber, White.

Unexcused absences (5): Brink, Crimmins, Dodds, Johnstone, Rosenman.

Memorial Resolution for Professor Fred T. Seminuk

Professor Emeritus Leroy D. Werley [Pharmacy] presented a memorial resolution for the late Professor Fred T. Seminuk.

Chancellor's Remarks

Rankings. Chancellor Hooker reported that UNC-CH has been named by Kiplinger's Magazine as the best public university, and that our library has moved up from 19th to 17th in rankings by the Association of Research Libraries.

Governor's budget recommendations. The Chancellor next commented on Governor Hunt's proposed budget for the 1997-99 biennium. He noted that the governor has not recommended further budget cuts for the University; reductions recommended for the University System only carry forward reductions previously approved in the 1996 session of the General Assembly. The governor's salary recommendations, however, are very disappointing. A 3% increase is inadequate to enable us to remain competitive with our peer institutions, particularly Michigan and Virginia. He will continue to press for a larger increase in faculty salary funding.

Dean searches. Searches for five deans are in various stages of progress: Medicine, Public Health, Business, Arts & Sciences, and Education. The search for Dean of the School of Medicine is nearing completion; an offer will be made soon. The search committee for Dean of the School of Public Health has reported and the Chancellor is now meeting the candidates. This will take some time due to his crowded schedule. The Arts & Sciences search committee has pared its list to 10 candidates and will soon begin the interview phase of its process. The search committee for Dean of the Kenan-Flagler Business School has just been appointed. It is chaired by former dean Paul Rizzo. The search for Dean of the School of Education, which has been on hold, will be resumed later in the spring.

Lunches with the faculty. The Chancellor has been surprised and pleased by the response to his invitation for faculty members to have lunch with him. More than 500 people responded. Perhaps the best outcome of these gatherings is that faculty members from across the institution have had an opportunity to meet each other and learn something of what colleagues are doing. He read from an email message he recently received from one of his lunch guests: "To learn that student writing skills are not declining, that the French are behind the Eurodollar, and that the eyes are the key to conducting an orchestra brings home how diverse and how incredible a resource the UNC faculty is to the State of North Carolina."

Teaching awards. The Chancellor has notified eighteen faculty members that they are the recipients of teaching awards. They will be recognized at the Wake Forest men's basketball game.

Performing arts center. The Chancellor said that he has revived the effort to obtain for the University a performing arts center. In recent conversations with President Keohane of Duke, she and he agreed that the region needs one and that neither institution currently has the resources to build one. The Chancellor is talking with development prospects and alumni about this and has found warm receptivity.

Professor Steven Bachenheimer [Microbiology] said that he regrets that most people are assuming that a new performing arts center will be located near the Friday Center. It should be located on the main campus and should

include adequate parking. Chancellor Hooker replied that he initially held the same view, but has changed his mind. We have not been able to identify a suitable location on the main campus. He had thought that the area adjacent to the Forest Theater would have been a good location, but this property carries deed restrictions that require us to maintain it in its natural state.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Elections. Professor Brown commented on the impending faculty elections and announced the three candidates for Chair of the Faculty. They are Professors Richard (Pete) Andrews, Thad Beyle, and Townsend Ludington.

Post-tenure review. Professor Brown asked for comments on the most recent version (5th) of the post-tenure review principles. Professor Barry Lentz [Biochemistry] called attention to the wording of paragraph 1.H, which says that the institution should "consider" resources needed for a meaningful system. He thought this should say "budget" instead. It is not enough to consider what's needed; resources must actually be available. Professor John Anderson [Public Health] asked about review of tenured professors who are currently holding appointments as deans or department chairs. Professor Bernadette Gray-Little [Psychology], speaking as a member of the Advisory Committee, replied that it is contemplated that review will be limited to faculty who are primarily engaged in teaching or research. Those whose current duties are primarily administrative will not be reviewed. Professor Miles Fletcher [History] said that this University's procedures should differentiate among faculty at different career stages. Professor Sarah Chambers [History] asked whether the document is on the Web page yet. Professor Brown replied that it is, and that it also has been printed in the University Gazette.

Educational Policy Committee

Professor Anthony Passannante [Anesthesiology] presented the annual report of the Educational Policy Committee. He first summarized two matters that the committee has declined to address at this time.

Projected enrollment increase. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council referred to the Educational Policy Committee a request that the Faculty Council participate in designing this institution's response to a projected increase in undergraduate enrollment. The EPC has declined to undertake this assignment because it does not have the expertise or the resources to offer helpful advice. Professor Brown asked the Provost to comment. Provost Richard Richardson announced that he has established a campus-wide committee of twelve, headed by Professor Linda Spemulli [Chemistry], to undertake this assignment. The committee has been charged to look into the possibility of creating a new undergraduate degree--BA in Liberal Studies--and to consider other alternatives such as distance learning. He hopes to have a report from the committee by this summer.

Eligibility standards for undergraduates. Dean Bobbi Owen [Arts & Sciences] brought to the EPC the question of eligibility standards for undergraduates. It is now relatively easy for undergraduates to maintain eligibility for readmission for the following semester, but the requirements are not neatly meshed with the requirements for graduation. It is possible for a student to maintain continuous eligibility for readmission for eight semesters and still not be eligible for graduation at the end of that time. The EPC has deferred action on this matter to enable sufficient time for all of the interested parties to discuss the implications of the current system and possible changes in it. The EPC intends to establish a subcommittee to consider this question and hopes to report recommendations to the Council next year.

Catalog Committee. Professor Passannante moved adoption of Resolution 97-4 to disband the Catalog Committee and transfer its functions to the Educational Policy Committee. The Catalog Committee itself asked that it be disbanded, and the Committee on University Government recommended that the function of maintaining general faculty oversight of catalogs be transferred to the EPC. The resolution was prepared by the Committee on University Government.

Resolution 97-4 was approved unanimously and has been referred to the Committee on University Government for preparation of an implementing amendment to the *Faculty Code of University Government*.

Final examination policy for undergraduates. Professor Passannante moved adoption of Resolution 97-3 which would amend the final examination policy for undergraduates to clarify the procedure for gaining approval for non-traditional examinations such as take-home exams. The EPC took up this subject upon the request of Dean Stephen Birdsall [Arts & Sciences], who indicated to the committee that an increasing number of faculty members are deviating from the examination policy or are requesting exceptions. This suggests that the policy needs to be re-examined.

After an extended discussion, it was apparent that many members of the Council were unfamiliar with the current policy and were therefore uncertain as to how the proposed changes would affect them. In particular, several Council members thought that the proposed changes would be unwieldy for multi-disciplinary courses. Professor Passannante moved to re-refer the resolution to the EPC so that it can be brought back to the Council in March with more background information and clarification. The motion to re-refer was adopted.

Policies and guidelines for a cooperative learning environment. Professor Passannante called attention to Resolution 97-5 which was distributed as a part of the EPC report. This document was first presented to the EPC in 1995 under the title "Student Bill of Rights." It was originally prepared by Stacy Brandenburg and George Jackson, who were at that time undergraduate students, and has undergone several revisions. The document now before the Council is in two parts. Part I discusses several existing University policies of which the faculty may or may not be fully aware. Part II speaks to several issues arising from the student-teacher relationship. Professor Passannante asked that members of the Council study the document carefully and be prepared to vote on it at the March Council meeting.

Committee on Black Faculty and Students

Professor William A. Darity, Jr. [Economics], chair of the Committee on Black Faculty and Students, presented the committee's annual report which focuses this year on the Carolina Minority Post-Doctoral Program. The committee studied outcomes of the program over the past fifteen years. Professor Darity said "what we demonstrate fairly clearly is that the program has not been used for its initial purpose, which is to generate additional Black faculty at the University. It really has not had much of an impact and we are hopeful that we can structure some ways to make the program more effective in achieving that goal."

At the request of Professor Brown, Vice Provost Thomas Meyer spoke to the committee's report point by point. He noted that the intent of the General Assembly in funding the program was to increase the number of Black faculty by providing post-doctoral opportunities to enhance research skills and scholarly potential. This program, however, should be seen as only one asset in a larger strategy for faculty recruitment. He is trying to bring the program back to its original purpose while at the same time encouraging other strategies as well. Vice Provost Meyer is skeptical of expanding the program, as suggested by the committee. If we are now unable to assimilate five post-doctoral fellows into the faculty each year, enlarging this program to twelve or more may not be the most effective way to use our resources to gain the ultimate objective. The administration is moving ahead on most of the other recommendations in the report.

Professor Darity called attention to the report's observation that over time the Minority Post-Doctoral Program has de-emphasized recruitment and focused primarily on enhancement of research skills and scholarly potential. He does not think these are mutually exclusive goals. "If we are going to engage in recruitment successfully, we have to simultaneously emphasize enhancement of research skills and scholarly potential, [but] we have to focus on the recruitment angle much more strongly than the program has in the past."

There was discussion of the procedure for selecting candidates and assigning them to departments. Some Council members thought that the process has been uneven in allotting candidates among departments willing to participate.

Professor Steven Leonard [Political Science] was concerned about defining success in the program solely in terms of recruitment and retention on this campus. We could be overlooking indirect contributions the program could be making to our recruitment efforts, such as good will engendered among faculty at other institutions who did post-doctoral work here. There may be a danger that the program could be eliminated or curtailed because of failure to achieve a narrowly-defined goal.

Professor Darity replied that there is no intent to eliminate or curtail the program. Also, he noted that good will runs in both directions. Many of the post-doctorals who have left here are deeply resentful of the fact that they were not even considered for faculty positions. They are not likely to encourage others to come here.

Professor Genna Rae McNeil [History] said that much of the problem of recruiting Black faculty is not the ability to assimilate but the will. She hoped that we will look at how final selections are being made and be more responsive to departments that have demonstrated their determination to change their hiring practices.

Provost Richard Richardson said that he found the data presented by the committee to be extremely disturbing. He said that the most frequent response from departments about recruiting minority post-doctoral fellows to the faculty is "if you'll give us a salary line, we'll consider hiring this person." This mindset is not going to get the job done because there are not enough faculty positions to go around. He agrees with Professor McNeil that a

change in departmental recruiting strategies is the key. "If we can keep post-docs here only by giving new lines in salaries, we will never get any better than we are in the current data."

Committee on Research

Professor James Gallagher [Education] presented the report of the Committee on Research and moved adoption of Resolution 97-6. The resolution calls on the administration to provide seed money grants of \$15,000 to \$20,000 to faculty members wishing to pursue multidisciplinary research projects. The program would be administered by the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research. The resolution was adopted.

Committee on Established Lectures

Professor Bobbi Owen [Dramatic Art] presented the report of the Committee on Established Lectures for Professor Arne Kalleberg [Sociology] who could not attend. She moved adoption of Resolution 97-7 which urges the Committee on Established Lectures to develop and report to the Council a proposal for reorganizing the coordination and planning of established lectures. The resolution was adopted.

Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards

On motion of Professor Weldon Thornton [English], the Council went into closed session for the purpose of considering candidates for honorary degrees.

Professor Thornton, chair of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards, nominated one person to receive an honorary degree at Commencement 1997, and five persons to receive honorary degrees at Commencement 1998.

There was discussion of the procedures for nominating candidates for honorary degrees.

The candidates nominated by the Committee were approved and will be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Addendum to January Minutes

Professor Miles Fletcher's remarks concerning "prestige" scholarships were the result of an investigation he had made of this topic at the request of the Chair of the Faculty, Professor Jane Brown.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Resolution 97-3. Final Examination Policy for Undergraduates

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Section 1. Except in unusual circumstances, undergraduate courses must include a
2 final assessment (i.e. final examination). A traditional final examination is written, is
3 administered at a predetermined time as specified in the final examination schedule, and
4 takes place at a designated location. Exceptions to this must be approved by the Provost.

5 Departmental Chairs (i.e. heads of instructional units) must give permission for
6 faculty to use non-traditional examinations, such as a portfolio of a semester's work or a
7 take-home examination. The chair should submit to the appropriate Dean an annual
8 summary of the exceptions that were granted.

9 Faculty employing non-traditional final examinations must adhere to the established
10 examination schedule. For example, take-home examinations should be due at the time of
11 the scheduled final examination. Faculty members have a responsibility to give students
12 adequate time for this examination, and should keep in mind that students have other
13 examinations and other responsibilities.

14 A change in the timing of a scheduled final examination must be approved by the
15 Provost.

16 Sec. 2. This resolution is effective for final examinations administered during the fall
17 semester, 1997, and thereafter.

February 14th, 1997
Educational Policy Committee
(elected standing Committee)
Annual Report

The purpose of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) is to consider issues presented to it by the Faculty Council and provide recommendations for action to the Faculty Council.

Members: James Ketch-97; Sara Mack-97; Michael Lienesch-97; Arthur Champagne-98; James Leloudis-98; Anthony Passannante-98; Paul Fullagar-99; Judith Meece-99; Jack Sasson-99; ex officio member: David Lanier (University Registrar); student member Shelly Bao-98 (undergraduate student) Members leaving committee during the past year: Linda Dykstra-98

Meetings during past year: 9/9/96, 10/7/96, 11/7/96, 12/12/96, 1/16/97

Prepared By: Anthony N. Passannante (chairman) with review by the committee

Issue #1: Final Examinations

Comment: this issue was brought to the EPC by Dean Birdsall, as many faculty were concerned that they were not in compliance with current Faculty Council policy, which states that final exams must be given in undergraduate classes, and must be taken in the scheduled examination period. There appears to be increased interest among faculty in administering non-traditional (e.g. take home) final exams. Last year the EPC heard substantial complaint from students that unannounced take-home exams were assigned in the last week of classes, which prompted our resolution last year that such assignments must be announced in the course syllabus, and should be due on the date of the examination. The EPC discussed these issues at length, and the following resolution is proposed:

Resolution on Final Examination Policy

1. Except in unusual circumstances, undergraduate courses must include a final assessment (i.e. final examination). Exceptions to this must be approved by the Provost.
2. Departmental Chairs (i.e. heads of instructional units) must give permission for faculty to use non-traditional examinations. The chair should submit to the appropriate Dean an annual summary of the exceptions that were granted.
3. Faculty employing non-traditional final examinations must adhere to the established examination schedule. For example, take-home examinations should be due at the time of the scheduled final examination. Faculty members have a responsibility to give students adequate time for this examination, and should keep in mind that students have other examinations and other responsibilities.

4. A change in the timing of a scheduled final examination must be approved by the Provost.

Issue #2: Eligibility Standards For Undergraduates

Comment: this issue was brought to the EPC by Dean Bobbi Owen. Current eligibility standards actually set up a Catch-22 for undergraduate students who are doing poorly in school. It is quite possible for a student to be eligible every semester, and for it to be mathematically very difficult for him/her to graduate. She proposes raising eligibility standards to match the standards for readmission, except for sophomores entering their second semester. This is a very complicated and somewhat arcane issue. It is important to note that the proposed standards would affect about 30-50 students per semester, clearly not a large number given the size of the University. Nevertheless, the EPC feels additional discussion is necessary before this issue can come up for action. We propose convening a subcommittee of the EPC, including Dean Owen, student representation, and athletic department representation, and giving this issue the in-depth consideration it deserves. We can bring it back to the Faculty Council next year for further debate.

Issue #3: Assumption by the EPC of Catalog Committee Duties

Comment: this issue was brought to the EPC by Jim Peacock. The Catalog Committee has expressed an interest in disbanding, because the annual workload does not require its presence as a permanent body. In the absence of a Catalog Committee, the EPC is willing to serve in its place.

Issue #4: Policies and Guidelines for a Cooperative Learning Environment

Comment: this issue was carried over from last years EPC agenda. The EPC obtained student input from George Jackson, who had a large part in the genesis of the original "Student Bill of Rights". The EPC presents the current document to the Faculty Council in an attempt to further the cause of improving the academic climate on campus.

Resolution on Policies and Guidelines for a Cooperative Learning Environment

The EPC recommends adoption of "Policies and Guidelines for a Cooperative Learning Environment" as Faculty Council Policy. (see attached document)

Issue #5: University Creation of a Non-Traditional Degree Program

Comment: this issue was brought to the EPC by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. There is going to be a significant increase in the number of high school seniors matriculating in the upcoming decade. Our educational infrastructure is already strained at our current enrollment level. It is clear that many of us think that substantially increasing undergraduate enrollment in our traditional programs is unwise. There is also significant interest within the University to begin serving markets that we have not traditionally served. For instance, we currently do not offer a part-time B.A., or a program designed for students that commute, or who are older than our 18-23 year old traditional students.

To make a long story short, the EPC declined to offer advice on how the University should respond to these pressures. We appreciate the fact that the Administration of the

University attempted to involve us in an important way in shaping the university's response to the North Carolina's needs, but we feel that it would be impossible for the EPC to respond in a useful manner. The programs are in too early a stage of gestation for the EPC to offer effective counsel. Design of new educational programs is critical to the continuing success of this University, and we felt that ineffective counsel was worse than no counsel at all.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF BLACK FACULTY AND STUDENTS
February 1997

Committee members: William Darity Jr., Chair; Roberta Ann Dunbar, D. Soyini Madison, Anita Brown-Graham, David Newbury

As of October 1996 only 85 (3.5 percent) out of 2420 faculty members at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) were black (source: Office of Institutional Research). This proportion obviously is low relative to the approximate 10 percent black presence in the general population in the USA, the approximate 25 percent black presence in the state of North Carolina, and the approximate 10 percent black presence in the undergraduate student body at UNC-CH. One of the mechanisms that has been in place for close to 15 years to increase the presence of black faculty at the University by facilitating entry at the junior level is the Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Fellowship program. Our committee determined that it would be useful to review the effectiveness of the program in achieving that objective. We have concluded that the program has not been effective and has to be strengthened to fulfill its potential for having a significant impact on the complexion of the University's faculty.

Between the fall of 1983 and the fall of 1996, a total of 65 Minority Postdoctoral fellows have entered UNC in a variety of departments and curricula (see Table 1). While the postdoctoral fellows have been spread across 28 different programs, 60 percent of them have been concentrated in only five programs: history, psychology, African and African-American Studies, English, and political science. Indeed, history, psychology, and African and African-America Studies have had 27 out of the 65 postdoctoral fellows over the entire course of the program. In contrast, some departments and curricula never have had a single Carolina Minority Postdoc, including computer science, art, drama, economics, Asian Studies, Women's Studies, and Latin American Studies. Many others have only had one.

Given the heavy concentration of fellows in a very limited set of fields, we ask whether those departments or curricula have tended to hire their postdocs as tenure track faculty members. As Table 1 indicates the record is bleak. History has had 11 postdocs who have completed their terms as fellows; none of them were hired as faculty members. Psychology has had eight minority postdocs who have finished their period of fellowship. Only one was hired to a tenure track position, and she already is gone from the University without making tenure. English has had four minority postdocs who have completed their fellowships, only one of whom was hired subsequent to her fellowship term and she also is gone from the University without making tenure. Political science and music each have had three fellows whose terms have finished, none of whom were hired here.

Table 1

Distribution of Carolina Minority
Postdoctoral Fellow, 1983-1996

Field	Total Number	Hired to Tenure Track	Hired to Instructor	Relocated Elsewhere	In Pro- gress
History	12	0	0	11	1
Psychology	8	1*	0	7	0
African & AfAm Studies	7	3**	1	2	1
English	5	1*	0	4	0
Poli Sci	4	0	0	3	1
Music	3	0	0	3	0
City and Reg. Planning	2	0	0	1	1
Medicine	2	1	0	1	0
Philosophy	2	0	0	2	0
Social Work	2	0	0	1	1
Sociology	1	1*	0	0	0
Biochemistry	1	0	0	1	0
Chemistry	1	1*	0	0	0
Mathematics	1	0	0	1	0
Astronomy	1	0	0	1	0
Anthropology	1	0	0	1	0
Physical Education	1	0	0	1	0
Biology	1	0	0	1	0
Epidemiology	1	0	0	0	1
Classics	1	0	0	0	1
Toxicology	1	0	0	1	0
Env. Science and Engin.	1	1*	0	0	0
Center for Dev. Sci.	1	0	0	1	0
School of Education	1	0	0	1	0
Nutrition	1	0	0	0	1
Env. Studies	1	0	0	1	0
Linguistics	1	0	0	0	1
Physiology	1	1*	0	0	0
Total	65	10	1	45	9

*Hired to a tenure track position but did not become a tenured faculty member at UNC-CH; no longer at UNC-CH.

**Still on the faculty at UNC-CH.

Source: Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research

The only division that has demonstrated a strong record of hiring faculty from among their postdoctoral fellows is African and African-American Studies. Out of the seven fellows who have completed their fellowships, three have been hired to tenure track positions and one has been hired as an instructor. In fact, African and African-American Studies is the only program that has retained any of the faculty members hired who formerly had been Carolina Minority Postdoctoral fellows. Overall, out of the total of 65 fellows, nine (14 percent) have fellowships that are still in progress, and 45 (close to 70 percent) have relocated elsewhere.

It is also important to recognize that many of the fellows relocated to research universities of comparable stature to UNC-CH. For example, schools where postdocs have relocated subsequent to their fellowship years include Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois-Urbana, Duke, Georgia, Iowa State, the University of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania State. Our understanding is that in virtually all of these cases, no serious effort was made by UNC-CH to compete to hire these fellows.

The low payoff in terms of faculty hires at UNC-CH is all the more striking since the pool for selection of fellows has grown dramatically over time. Recently, in a given year, four to six fellows are selected from a pool that ranges from 120 to 150 applicants. One of our committee members has served on the selection committee and informs us that the pool of applicants is so strong, it would be easy to justify choosing a much larger number of fellows each year. The candidates chosen, in her estimation, are, of necessity, exceptionally strong. Moreover, she informs us that the candidates are from a wide variety of fields and are not exclusively in the set of five areas where most of the postdoctoral fellows have been concentrated over the life of the program.

If 30 minority postdoctoral fellows had been hired (instead of a mere 10) and if half of them still were on campus (instead of the 4 located in African and African-American Studies), the black faculty share would exceed 4 percent. If 60 minority postdoctoral fellows had been hired and if half of them still were on campus, the proportion of black faculty would begin to approach 5 percent. Obviously, the larger the scale of the program and the higher the propensity to hire and retain fellows as faculty members, the greater the impact in producing an increased presence of black faculty at this University.

Our committee has several recommendations:

(1) Expand the Carolina Minority Postdoctoral program so that at least 12 fellows enter each year for the two year term.

(2) Tighten the connection between selection, the seriousness of the division about the candidate as a potential faculty member, and the commitment of the Provost's office to insure that a faculty position will be available subsequent to the period of the fellowship. In short, make the link between postdoc and tenure track faculty position more direct. This process should get underway with the existing cohort of fellows. Moreover, during its future deliberations the selection committee should consult closely with the relevant division to determine whether or not the match between fellow and department or curriculum is likely to result in a long-term relationship.

(3) Broaden the range of divisions that host fellows. Pay close attention to a division's record in hiring and retaining previous fellows in determining whether they should serve as a host for new fellows.

(4) New fellows should be paired not only with a preceptor in their field but a tenured black faculty member who also will serve as a mentor. Again this process should get underway with the existing cohort of fellows.

(5) An attempt should be made to explore the status of former fellows who relocated elsewhere immediately after completion of their fellowship term with an eye toward considering them for faculty positions here.

(6) The Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Fellowship is a mechanism for increasing the presence of black faculty at the University at the junior level. But a comprehensive strategy also is needed for recruitment of black faculty at the senior level as well. Our committee would be glad to work with the Provost to develop a plan to attract senior black faculty to UNC at Chapel Hill.

ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF BLACK FACULTY AND STUDENTS

THOMAS J. MEYER
VICE PROVOST FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
UNC-CHAPEL HILL

February 14, 1997

Faculty Council Meeting

The report of the Committee on the status of Black Faculty and Students addresses an important issue, the relatively small number of black faculty members at UNC-Chapel Hill. This is an important report, one that can help us deal with this problem, but it is only a beginning. It identifies the Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholarship Program as a mechanism for recruiting minority faculty, and then focuses most of its attention on the Program. The real issue is how we can recruit successfully, and the Program should be only part of a larger strategy. As the administrative overseer of the Carolina Minority Postdoc Program, I will first comment on the status and changes that have been made in the Program, and at the end, return to the broader issue of recruitment of black faculty.

RECRUITMENT OF BLACK FACULTY

The Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars Program has not been productive in adding Black Faculty. The Program, originally called the Carolina Black Scholars Program, was funded initially by the General Assembly in the 1983-84 academic year to "produce a significant increase in the number of Black scholars..., to increase the number of Black applicants for available faculty positions, and to provide postdoctoral opportunities to enhance the research skills and scholarly potential of prospective Black faculty members." Each year the Program funds five doctoral level scholars who have completed their terminal degrees to "work under the general direction of a senior faculty member...and participate meaningfully in departmental activities."

Over time the Program has apparently de-emphasized faculty recruitment and emphasized the enhancement of research skills and scholarly potential. This is, no doubt, a contributing factor to the relatively limited success of the Program in recruitment, in agreement with one of the findings of the Committee. However, care must be taken in analyzing these data. For example, the concern about the heavy concentration of Fellows in a limited number of fields

may be appropriate but it largely mirrors the pool of available minority Ph.D.'s. It is difficult to recruit effectively if there is no one to recruit.

It is also important to understand the limitations of the Minority Postdoc Program as a recruiting tool because of differences in culture among areas. In the physical sciences, for example, postdocs work closely with and under the supervision of faculty mentors and, traditionally, are never hired to the faculty. In the health sciences, postdoctoral assignments of 5-7 years and even longer are common.

Lastly, the Minority Postdoc Program is set up to advertise in the late Fall with selection in the Spring. This is deliberate to avoid competing with most faculty searches, which are concentrated in the Fall Semester. This means, however, that the pool of available candidates is somewhat depleted by the Spring.

SHIFTS IN PRACTICE

Although not mentioned by the Committee, significant changes were made in the Program last year to redirect it towards recruiting.

- The Program is now broadly advertised in the early and late Fall to Deans, Directors, Department Heads, and all Faculty with a very clear statement of its intended use for recruiting. Note the attached memos. In correspondence and conversations with Chairs, it is emphasized that the Program is designed to match Fellows with departments where there is at least a possibility of a faculty addition after the tenure of the fellowship.
- The participating departments now "buy-in" to the Program. A base salary of \$29,589 is provided and the Department must provide a supplement of \$3,911, for a total of \$33,500 per year. In addition, the Department is required to provide access to a computer, an office, and an appropriate mentoring scheme.
- In last year's selection process, the candidates were winnowed down to the top 10, with one of the most important criteria in picking the final 5 the possible availability of a faculty position.
- On three separate occasions in the last two years, positions in the Program have been allocated to individual departments to assist with recruiting efforts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on the Status of Black Faculty and Students has made series of recommendations including:

- "Expand the Program to 12 Fellows" — If we cannot assimilate five, I am not sure it makes sense to expand to 12. There may be better ways to invest our resources (see below).
- "Tighten the connection between selection, the seriousness of the division to hire, and commitment from the Provost's office to ensure the availability of the position" — This is at the heart of the matter, and inherent in the changes that were made in the Postdoc Program last year. To strengthen this connection will demand more awareness and attention on the part of the departments and the Provost's office. There are still problems in relying on this as the only device for recruiting. One is the skewed distribution in the Ph.D. pool, with regard to field.
- "Broaden the range of participating divisions..." — Concerted, active advertising in professional journals can help attract postdoc candidates to underrepresented fields. This is a way for interested departments to help.
- "The Fellows should be paired with...a tenured Black faculty member..." — The current Fellows agree that this is a good idea and it will be implemented immediately.
- "...Explore the status of former Fellows who are relocated elsewhere...toward considering them for faculty positions here..." — A history and impact study of the Program is being compiled by one of the current Fellows. The data are available.
- "...Recruitment of Black Faculty at the senior level..." — A systematic approach to the additions of faculty in both junior and senior levels would assist the University greatly in the recruitment of minority faculty.

RESPONSES FROM THE VICE PROVOST FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH TO THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several things that we should consider in developing a successful recruiting strategy for faculty at the junior level. I believe that the slate should be wiped clean and we should invent a new strategy. The new strategy should be devised by drawing on the ideas and energy of the Faculty, in concert with the Administration. What could emerge would be a well understood, well advertised, campus-wide strategy for minority hiring. Following the

excerpted outline of Committee recommendations, some of the principles and characteristics of a successful program might include:

- Hires should be limited to those for whom there is a reasonable chance of success in our environment.
- Interest and enthusiasm for the effort must be transmitted to and encouraged in the individual departments. They may need to be provided with incentives for using their positions in this way rather than filling sub-disciplinary vacancies, for example.
- A concerted effort should be established to identify and actively recruit nationally, graduate students in the terminal stages of their degrees.
- The Carolina Minority Postdoc Program should be continued as part of a broader recruiting portfolio.
- A parallel program could be established, designed to bring the very best students here in the terminal stages of their degrees, to study, complete their dissertations, and teach to a limited degree.

Attachments



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Office of Vice Provost For Graduate Studies and Research

Campus Box 4000, South Building
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-4000
(919) 962-1319 FAX: (919) 962-1476

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Directors, Department Chairs

FROM: Thomas J. Meyer
Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
and Research

DATE: November 4, 1996

SUBJECT: Recruitment of Minority Postdoctoral Scholars

We are pleased to announce the availability of at least five postdoctoral research appointments for the Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars Program at UNC-CH. A memo about the Program that was sent to all members of the Faculty is enclosed. I seek your help in the recruiting process and inform you of the following:

1. If you need help or advice in advertising, please let us know.
2. Departments are expected to help with financial support and to create a productive environment.
3. If there are special ways to use this Program to help with your recruiting, please let us know.
4. We might be able to help with a recruiting target who has not yet finished his/her Ph.D.

Please help with the recruitment process if you can. This is an important program for the University. If you have any questions, or need further information, please contact Sharon Windsor at 962-1319 or Sharon_Windsor@unc.edu.

enclosure

TJM/srw



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Office of Vice Provost For Graduate Studies and Research

Campus Box 4000, South Building
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-4000
(919) 962-1319 FAX: (919) 962-1476

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty Members

FROM: Thomas J. Meyer
Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
and Research

Richard Richardson
Provost

Lawrence I. Gilbert
Associate Provost

H. Garland Hershey
Vice Provost for Health Affairs

DATE: November 4, 1996

SUBJECT: Recruitment of Minority Postdoctoral Scholars

We are writing to encourage you to become actively involved in the recruitment of the next class of Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars. Each year, at least five postdoctoral research appointments are chosen and supported for two years, possibly in exchange for limited teaching responsibilities. The Program has been successful in increasing diversity in the University community for the time the Scholars are with us. We would like to increase its success at attracting potential minority tenure-track faculty as well.

The next class of Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars will begin July 1, 1997. Schools and departments that are interested can help by advertising the program and identifying possible candidates. A sample advertisement for your use is attached. Your advertisement should specify that applications must be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research by February 1, 1997. We will notify successful candidates in early March 1997.

In addition to assisting with Program advertising, there is an explicit role for the schools and departments to play in selecting the 1997 Scholars. Once applications are received, we will forward them to the appropriate school or department. If there are multiple applications for individual departments, we will ask you to rate them at that point and add any comments about the suitability of a candidate. We want to know which departments may be actively considering their applicants for a position. We will also request that some thought be given by the department to procedures that can be taken to ensure that the members of our next postdoctoral class are properly incorporated into the culture of their chosen departments. The final decision with regard to successful candidates will be made by a committee. It will review the applications and make recommendations to me. The current stipend is \$33,500. Each department with a successful candidate will normally be expected to fund \$4,000 of this amount.

Because this is an important program for the University, please let us know if you need help or advice in advertising. Also consider that we might be able to help with a recruiting target who has not yet finished his/her Ph.D. If there are special ways to use this Program to help with your recruiting, please let us know. Finally, we would also appreciate your advice about how best to maximize the benefits of the Program so that the successful candidates make the best use of their time at the University and so that the University has the best opportunity of attracting new minority colleagues.

If you have any questions, or need further information, please contact Sharon Windsor at 962-1319 or Sharon_Windsor@unc.edu. Thank you for your help.

TJM/srw

enclosure

cc: Michael Hooker

Sample Advertisement

The Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars Program The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

As part of a continuing commitment to advance underrepresented scholars in higher education, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars Program is pleased to announce the availability of Postdoctoral Scholars. Postdoctoral Scholars may teach not more than one course per year, and will spend essentially full time on research. Applications for study in any discipline represented on the campus are welcome. The School of _____ or Department of _____ at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill strongly encourages candidates interested in _____ to apply.

The stipend will be \$33,500 per calendar year. Health benefit options are available. Some funds are available for research expenses, including travel. Minority students who will have completed their doctoral degree not later than July 1, 1997, or who have completed their doctoral degree within the past four years are eligible to apply. Preference will be given to U.S. citizens and permanent residents. This program is funded by the State of North Carolina and places emphasis on Afro-American and Native Americans.

A complete application will include a curriculum vitae, sample publications and/or dissertation chapters, a statement of research plans, and three letters of recommendation. All materials should be sent to the Carolina Minority Postdoctoral Scholars Program, Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, CB #4000, South Building, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-4000, and must be postmarked by February 1, 1997.

Report of the Established Lectures Committee 1996-1997

February 14, 1997

Committee Members: Professor Arne L. Kalleberg, Sociology (Chair); Professor John J. B. Anderson, Nutrition; Professor Lawrence Grossberg, Communication Studies; Professor Norris B. Johnson, Anthropology; Professor Roberta A. Owen, Dramatic Art; Professor Elin Slavick, Art; Professor J.F. Camilla Tulloch, Dentistry; Mr. Kevin Farley, graduate; Mr. Stephen Lastelic, undergraduate; Ms. Tandy Meng, undergraduate.

Meetings during past year: September 5, 1996; September 26, 1996.

The established lectures were arranged as follows:

(1) Martin Luther King, Jr. Lecture (Civil Rights)

On January 21, 1997 at 7:30 p.m., Dr. Cornel West of Harvard University spoke to a packed audience in Memorial Hall. This lecture was co-sponsored with the Chancellor's Committee for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration.

(2) John Calvin McNair Lecture (Science and Religion)

On February 5, 1997 at 8 p.m., Dr. John Francis Ahearne, former Chair of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and current Executive Director of Sigma Xi Center in the Research Triangle Park, spoke on "Science *versus* Theology ... or Science *and* Theology?" in Carroll Hall.

(3) Weil Lecture (American Citizenship)

Representative Patricia Schroeder is scheduled to give the Weil Lecture on April 7, 1997 at 8 p.m. in Memorial Hall.

Resolution 97-3. Final Examination Policy for Undergraduates

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Section 1. Except in unusual circumstances, undergraduate courses must include a
2 final assessment (i.e. final examination). A traditional final examination is written, is
3 administered at a predetermined time as specified in the final examination schedule, and
4 takes place at a designated location. Exceptions to this must be approved by the Provost.

5 Departmental Chairs (i.e. heads of instructional units) must give permission for
6 faculty to use non-traditional examinations, such as a portfolio of a semester's work or a
7 take-home examination. The chair should submit to the appropriate Dean an annual
8 summary of the exceptions that were granted.

9 Faculty employing non-traditional final examinations must adhere to the established
10 examination schedule. For example, take-home examinations should be due at the time of
11 the scheduled final examination. Faculty members have a responsibility to give students
12 adequate time for this examination, and should keep in mind that students have other
13 examinations and other responsibilities.

14 A change in the timing of a scheduled final examination must be approved by the
15 Provost.

16 Sec. 2. This resolution is effective for final examinations administered during the fall
17 semester, 1997, and thereafter.

Resolution 97-4. Concerning Discontinuance of the Catalogue Committee and Enlarging the Charge of the Educational Policy Committee.

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Section 1. The Committee on University Government is requested to prepare for
2 consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the *Faculty Code of University*
3 *Government* discontinuing the Catalogue Committee and transferring its duties to the
4 Educational Policy Committee.

5 Sec. 2. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

**Resolution 97-5. Policies and Guidelines for a Cooperative Learning
Environment.**

Teaching and learning occur simultaneously through a partnership between instructor and student. Instructors share knowledge, experience, and ideas with their students. Students process these thoughts, generate new ones, and share them with their teachers. In most cases, students and instructors communicate clearly and effectively. However, misunderstanding does occur. In an attempt to foster a positive academic environment, the Faculty Council, upon recommendation of the Educational Policy Committee, establishes these policies and guidelines.

The Faculty Council resolves:

Part I. Policies

Section 1. The Faculty Council recognizes and affirms the following policies. This recognition is not to be interpreted as precluding modification of any policy by the appropriate authority.

The Honor Code. The faculty should inform students of the provisions of the honor code, and be aware of their own responsibilities specified in the honor code. Faculty responsibilities are stated in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance.

Student Grievance Procedures. According to UNC-CH Student Grievance Committee procedures, students may file a grievance against a UNC-CH employee, EPA non-faculty employee, staff employee, or student employee (when acting in the role of employee), when there is a violation of one of the following:

- A. The UNC-CH Sexual Harassment Policy
- B. The UNC-CH Racial Harassment Policy
- C. The UNC-CH Policy on Sexual Orientation
- D. The Americans with Disabilities Act
- E. Title IX, which prohibits exclusion from participation on the basis of sex
- F. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which outlaws discrimination on the basis of a handicap

1 explaining what constitutes proper use of these items. These rules should be established
2 at the beginning of the course and should not be changed without giving students proper
3 notice.

4 ***Assignment of Graded Work During the Last Week of the Semester.*** Instructors
5 may not assign graded work during the last week of classes unless the course syllabus
6 clearly states that such an assignment will be given.

7 ***Suggested Classroom Procedures.*** In general, instructors are strongly encouraged to
8 follow the guidelines for course design and classroom procedures recommended by the
9 Center for Teaching and Learning. When students enter into a learning relationship, they
10 have certain needs and expectations. They are entitled to information about course
11 procedures, content, and goals. Instructors should provide a syllabus, describing the
12 course, and methods of evaluation. Particular attention should be paid to several areas of
13 special concern to students, including provision of reserve readings, and grading policy.

14 Evaluated assignments should be returned to the students within a reasonable amount
15 of time. Since part of the purpose of such assignments is to provide feedback, students
16 should be given time to assess, and to learn from their mistakes. Ideally, such assessment
17 would take place while the relevant topics are still fresh in their minds.

18 Extra credit, if offered, should be announced publicly and in advance, to the entire
19 class.

20 ***Students Should Have Freedom of Expression.*** Students should be free to take
21 reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study. However, they are
22 responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.
23 Instructors may assign a grade based on incorrect facts or poorly supported arguments or
24 opinions. Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the freedom of the faculty to assign
25 grades according to appropriate academic standards.

26 ***Responsibilities of Students and Teachers.*** Just as students ought to expect
27 instructors who are knowledgeable and well prepared, so should teachers expect their
28 students to be motivated, eager to learn, and actively engaged in class. It is the
29 responsibility of teachers to make their courses serious intellectual experiences for

Appendix 1. Faculty Responsibilities per the Honor Code

Responsibility of faculty in relation to the Honor Code as stated in Instrument of Student Judicial Governance¹

- A. To inform students at the beginning of each course and at appropriate times that the Honor Code, which prohibits giving or receiving unauthorized aid is in effect. Where appropriate, a clear definition of plagiarism and a reminder of the consequences should be presented, and the extent of permissible collaboration among students in fulfilling academic requirements should be carefully explained.
- B. To identify clearly in advance of any examination or other graded work the books, notes or other materials or aids which may be used; to inform students that materials other than those identified cannot be used; and to require unauthorized materials or aids to be taken from the room or otherwise made inaccessible before the work is undertaken.
- C. To require each student on all written work to sign a pledge that the student has neither given nor received unauthorized aid. Grades or other credit should not be awarded for unpledged work.
- D. To take all reasonable steps consistent with existing physical classroom conditions-such as requiring students to sit in alternate seats-to reduce the possibility of cheating on graded work.
- E. To exercise caution in the preparation, duplication, and security of examinations (including make-up examinations) to ensure that students cannot gain improper advance knowledge of their contents.
- F. To avoid when possible, reuse of instructor-prepared examination, in whole or in part, unless they are placed on reserve in the Library or otherwise made available to all students.
- G. To exercise proper security in the distribution and collection of examination papers; and to be present in the classroom during an examination when the

¹ The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, 1994. p. 32.

Appendix 2. Student Access to Educational Records

The term "educational records" does not include:

- A. Records of instructional, supervisory and administrative personnel that are in the sole possession of their maker and are not revealed to anyone else except a substitute;
- B. Records created and maintained by the University Police for law enforcement purposes;
- C. Records relating solely to an employee of UNC-CH in his or her capacity as an employee that are not available for any other purposes (however, records relating to a UNC-CH student, who is employed as a result of status as a student, are education records);
- D. Student medical records created, maintained, and used only in connection with provision of medical treatment to the student, that are not disclosed to any one other than the individuals providing the treatment;
- E. Records that contain only information relating to a person after he/she was no longer a student, such as alumni records.

A student is not permitted to inspect the following records:

- A. Financial records and statements of his or her parents;
- B. Confidential letters and statements of recommendation that were placed in education records before 1 January 1975 and that are used only for the purposes for which they are intended; and
- C. Confidential letters and statements of recommendation concerning admissions to an educational institution, an application for employment, or receipt of an honor that were placed in education records after 1 January 1975 where the student has waived his or her right to inspect those letters and statements.

A student who wishes to inspect his or her education records must file a written request to inspect them with the individual who has custody of the records. In some cases the student will be able to review the records immediately while, in other cases, a certain amount of time will be required to assemble the records for inspection, but the student will not be required to wait more than 45 days after the date of the request before being

Resolution 97-6. Encouraging Multidisciplinary Research

There appears to be an increasing need for, and call for, multidisciplinary research that cuts across departmental and school lines. As funding agencies focus on broad problem areas such as AIDS, or the effects of poverty or mental health, it is obvious that a single discipline approach is inappropriate. Based upon information from other research universities, interviews with Center and Institute Directors and other faculty colleagues (see Faculty Committee on Research report, 1/31/97) the Faculty Committee on Research believes that additional encouragement is needed for faculty members who wish to pursue problems with colleagues from other departments and disciplines.

1 The Faculty Council resolves:

2 Section 1. *Support for Multidisciplinary Research.* Faculty members wishing to
3 pursue multidisciplinary research problems are encouraged to form working groups and
4 should be provided seed money (\$15,000 to \$20,000) to encourage the development of
5 products that could lead to formal research projects or program projects. Such seed
6 money would be used to support specific activities crucial to planning, such as summer
7 stipends, organizing symposia or colloquia around a topic, providing faculty semester
8 leaves, and providing graduate student support.

9 Sec. 2. *Administration.* The program of support for multidisciplinary research should
10 be administered by the Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.
11 Working groups of faculty would apply for seed money grants to that Office which would
12 develop procedures to review proposals. It is expected that two or three such seed grants
13 would be provided to working groups each year.

14 Sec. 3. *Finance.* This program should be funded through the Pan-University budget
15 allocation process until a permanent source of funding can be identified.

16 Sec. 4. *Report.* The Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research
17 Unit is directed to report back to the Faculty Council in the 1998-99 academic year on the
18 progress being made through this mini-program.

19 Sec. 5. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

Resolution 97-6. Concerning Established Lectures

The Faculty Council resolves:

- 1 Section 1. The Committee on Established Lectures is urged to develop and report to
- 2 the Faculty Council a proposal for reorganizing the coordination and planning of all
- 3 established lectures.
- 4 Sec. 2. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

February 14, 1997, Faculty Council Meeting

**FACULTY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH REPORT
TO
THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON
STIMULATION OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH**

Michael Caplan
Biochemistry

Arthur Champagne
Physics & Astronomy

Cora Jean Edgell
Pathology and Lab
Medicine

James Gallagher, Chair
Education & FPG Center

Arne Kalleberg
Sociology

Clayton Koelb
Germanic Languages

James LeLoudis
History

Susan Lord
Pathology & Lab Medicine

Donald Lysle
Psychology

FACULTY COUNCIL CHARGE

The faculty committee on research was asked to investigate ways in which to encourage multidisciplinary research on the campus and to make recommendations of potentially useful mechanisms and strategies to achieve that goal.

FACULTY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.

After initial discussions, the committee decided to seek three sources of information. Phone interviews with five major research universities; inquiries of major research centers and institutes on this campus, and inquiries of colleagues of faculty committee members.

Inquiries of major universities. Phone interviews were held with representatives of the University of Georgia, University of Michigan, University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Virginia. Four questions were asked of them:

1. **Does the university foster interdisciplinary research activities on campus?**
2. **Is there a formal office or structure on campus that supports the development of interdisciplinary research?**
3. **Is there a faculty reward system in place for interdisciplinary research?**
4. **How are tenure issues reviewed in accordance with interdisciplinary research?**

We are indebted to Jackie Resnick in the Graduate Studies and Research Office for her help in completing these inquiries. Appendix A contains the responses from the other universities.

Inquiries of Directors of Centers and Institutes. Informal discussions quickly established that much of the interdisciplinary research on this campus is being conducted within existing Centers and Institutes. We know of no actual way to determine the total or proportionate amount of multidisciplinary research on the campus. The chair of the Faculty Committee contacted eight of the major research centers on this campus to answer the question as to viable strategies for stimulating interdisciplinary research on this campus. Five Centers responded:

The Carolina Population Center

The Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center

The Institute for Research in Social Sciences

The Cecil Sheps Health Sciences Research Center

The Center for Gastrointestinal Biology and Disease

FACULTY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Faculty Committee on Research believes that the recommendations for action on the issue of stimulating multidisciplinary research must include two specific components. First, there needs to be a recognition of how difficult it is to design and craft a multidisciplinary approach to a specific problem area. (This may require literature reviews, extensive discussions, the availability of consultants, and, above all, time for the participants to refine and shape their vision around commonly accepted concepts and systems of ideas.)

Second, there should be an identifiable place in the administrative structure of the university where the specific interest in multidisciplinary research can be located and from which specific assistance can be requested and provided. This would match some of the other research universities whom we interviewed. We, therefore, make the following recommendations.

1. We should encourage working groups of faculty who wish to address complex problems by providing seed money and resources that will allow them to emerge from their discussions with a specific product or proposal for outside resources to allow them to pursue their long-term goal. This needs to be done in a flexible fashion which would reflect the diverse interests and capabilities of the UNC-CH faculty. This encouragement could include specific activities such as:

summer stipends to advance planning activities

organizing symposia or colloquia around a topic area

providing faculty semester leaves or mini leaves to allow for continued planning

providing graduate student support for the efforts of the working group

This would mean that seed money in the order of 15 or 20K would be made available to working groups who are judged to be serious and competent in their intent to pursue broader multidisciplinary goals. The working group would commit, on their own behalf, to produce a product at the end of an agreed upon time span. That product could be a research proposal to a state or federal or private agency, or a product such as a report or book that had merit in its own right in dealing with the issue in question.

The committee considered a number of options regarding where the core of multidiscipline support should be focused. Should it be in the Organized Research Units (ORUs) of the university? Should it be divided between Health Affairs and Arts and Sciences? Should it be housed in a central agency of the university? Our judgment was that it should be placed in the Graduate Studies and Research Unit of the University. That choice would fit with decisions made by other universities and also seems to allow the maximum opportunity to cut across the various disciplines in health affairs and the Arts and Sciences sides of the campus in the search for a viable team to address complex issues that call upon a wide range of expertise.

We believe, further, that such funds should be derived from the Indirect Costs received by the university. What would be more appropriate than to use indirect costs to increase outside funds for the university (and obtain increased indirect costs).

Faculty Council Research Committee

Interdisciplinary Research activities of Universities in the U.S.

Schools contacted:

University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA)

contact: Ann Pollack, Sponsored Research Office (310) 825-4031 apollack@ucga.ucla.edu

University of Georgia at Athens (UGA)

contact: Dr. Roof, Human Subjects Office (706) 542-6514

University of Michigan at Ann Arbor (UM)

contact: Patricia "Sandy" Whitesell, Assistant to Vice President for Research (313) 763-6048
whitesell@SMTP

University of Virginia at Charlottesville (UVA)

contact: David Hudson, Office of the Vice Provost for Research (804) 924-3606

University of California at Berkeley (UCBerkeley)

contact: Jeanne Segale, Senior Administration Analyst, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
(510) 643-7597 jmsegale@uclink4.berkeley.edu

The following information was collected in response to four specific questions:

1. *Does the University foster interdisciplinary research activities on campus?*

UCLA: Yes, it is a high priority.

UGA: It is encouraged. "We push it when we can."

UM: Absolutely. It is a high priority.

UVA: Yes.

UCBerkeley: Not particularly. Interdisciplinary research is generally encouraged but is not a strictly enforced requirement.

2. *Is there a formal office or structure on campus that supports the development of interdisciplinary research?*

UCLA: The Sponsored Research Office.

A long term goal of the Sponsored Research Office is to have staff available to work with interdisciplinary research grant recipients on a case-by-case basis. Included in the responsibilities of this expectant staff is the task of proposal development. Currently, one faculty member from the College of Letters and Sciences assists with the preparation of proposals from a satellite office. Support of research idea development is delivered on an ad hoc basis. UCLA has an electronic mail listserv (much like a regular mailing list) that has 750 subscribers. A listserv, sometimes called an email list, is an automated distribution vehicle for various types of information content distribution over computer networks. The listserv that is being referred to here enables researchers to share research ideas and contact each other via the Internet. The Sponsored Research Office is currently creating a database of UCLA faculty research and is investigating commercial database links.

- ORUs and departments are responsible for assistance with proposal development. UCBerkeley is currently sending a list of ORUs to PDI.

3. *Is there a faculty reward system in place for interdisciplinary research?*

UCLA: No, there is no formal reward system or incentive. It is a general interest of the University and is greatly encouraged by the Vice Chancellor.

UGA: No.

UM: The Vice President for Research makes budgetary decisions for the University's Schools, Centers, Institutes, and Centers. Interdisciplinary research is a University value and is taken into account while the budget is created. The University is keeping the structure that is in place and is changing their budget focus. UM is currently creating Value Centered Management. The VP for Research has found indirect cost recoveries to be a problem while funding is flowing back to individual colleges rather than being held centrally. This has made it difficult to "break the barriers" between institutes, colleges, and centers. About ten of the Centers report directly to the V.P. for Research. The V.P. for Research is responsible for generally funding the budgets of these centers and for administrative duties such as personnel hiring. In addition to these efforts, the University offers a Management Institute which consists of one week of course and is available to Business and Finance Administrators at the University. It would recognizably be more favorable to have this type of Institute available campus-wide. Part of the focus of the Institute is the topic of Interdisciplinary Research, therefore all administrators recognize and value its importance.

UVA: No. It has been discussed.

UCBerkeley: No. The University was interested in establishing seed grants to encourage interdisciplinary research before its hopes were thwarted by repeated state budget cuts.

4. *How are tenure issues reviewed in accordance with interdisciplinary research?*

UCLA: Each department is responsible for setting tenure priorities. There is not a formal University-wide policy.

UGA: Tenure procedures are decided on by individual college boards. There is not a formal University-wide policy.

UM: Tenure is peripheral, separate, not integral to the focus of interdisciplinary research.

UVA: They are not.

UCBerkeley: Faculty is reviewed on their research, how interdisciplinarity is reviewed is an *academic personnel* issue that is unknown to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research.

Faculty Council Research Committee

Interdisciplinary Research activities of Universities in the U.S.

A bibliography of interdisciplinarity publications:

1. Klein, Julie Thompson, *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1990.
2. Mayville, William V., *Interdisciplinarity: The Multiple Paradigm*, American Association for Higher Education, AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9, Washington, D.C., 1978.
3. Kocklemans, Joseph J., (ed.), *Interdisciplinarity and Higher Education*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA, 1979.

February 14, 1997
Buildings and Grounds Committee
(Appointed by the Chancellor)
Annual Report--1996

Members: *Class of 1999:* Thomas B. Clegg; JoAnn B. Dalton; David Owens. *Class of 1998:* David R. Godschalk, Chair; William D. Mattern; Wayne A. Pittman. *Class of 1997:* Thomas A. Bowers; Elizabeth Chenault, Vice-Chair; James L. Murphy; Sharon P. Turner. *Student Members:* Rachael Fuerst; Larry Smar; Kristin Komives. *Members leaving committee during past year:* Cora-Jean Edgell, Norris B. Johnson, F. Thomas McIver, Carol Reuss; John Davies; Roy Granato; Steven C. Hoffman.

Meetings during past year (1996): 1/11, 1/24, 3/6, 3/20 5/8, 5/22, 7/11, 9/12, 10/10, 11/20, 12/12.

Report prepared by: David R. Godschalk (Chair)

Committee charge: The committee advises the Chancellor on siting and external appearance of new buildings and additions, removal of facilities, changes in long term use and appearance of campus grounds, selection of architects for University projects, preparation of long-range campus plans, placement and design of signs and art works.

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of Activities:

Site recommendations: Executive Education Center, Institute for the Arts and Humanities, Soccer Center, Biomolecular Research Building, Auditorium--School of Medicine, Department of Transportation and Parking Building.

Architectural firm recommendations: Renovation and Addition--Aycock and Graham Residence Halls, Renovation of Food Service Facilities, Addition to Beard Hall (School of Pharmacy), Biomolecular Research Building (School of Medicine), Soccer Center, Graham Student Union Addition, Renovation of Lecture Facilities (Venable Hall 1st priority).

Exterior design recommendations: Kenan Stadium expansion, Addition to Institute of Marine Sciences (Morehead City), Health Affairs Bookstore, Auditorium Addition--NC High School Athletic Association Building (Mason Farm), UNC Hospitals/UNC-Chapel Hill Day Care Center, School Leadership Academy Facility, Executive Education Center, Renovation and Addition--Aycock and Graham Residence Halls, Addition to UNC Press Warehouse Building, Lenoir Hall Renovation and Addition, Hill Hall Addition, Beard Hall Addition, Graham Student Union Addition, Kessing Pool Renovation, Soccer Center, Medical Sciences Research Building Renovation.

NOMINATION FOR FACULTY ELECTIONS

[Descriptions of the positions for which this form may be used appear on the reverse.]

Office for which nominated: _____

Name of nominee: _____

Campus address: _____

Campus telephone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

Current Academic Title _____

School or department _____

Academic degrees _____

Specific Scholarly Interests _____

Number of years since first faculty appointment _____

Number of years on UNC-CH faculty _____

University faculty governance or administrative service at UNC-CH or elsewhere:

Honors and distinctions:

Nominators: (ten required; must be voting members of General Faculty)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

NOMINATION FOR FACULTY ELECTIONS

[Descriptions of the positions for which this form may be used appear on the reverse.]

Office for which nominated: _____

Name of nominee: _____

Campus address: _____

Campus telephone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

Current Academic Title _____

School or department _____

Academic degrees _____

Specific Scholarly Interests _____

Number of years since first faculty appointment _____

Number of years on UNC-CH faculty _____

University faculty governance or administrative service at UNC-CH or elsewhere:

Honors and distinctions:

Nominators: (ten required; must be voting members of General Faculty)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Chair of the Faculty
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

(919) 962-2146
FAX: (919) 962-5479
E-mail: JANE__BROWN@UNC.EDU

Office of Faculty Governance
CB# 9170, 204 Carr Bldg.
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9170

To: Faculty Council

From: Jane Brown

Date: February 6, 1997

Re: Post-Tenure Review Recommendations

Attached you will find the executive summary of the latest report of the UNC Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review. This is another opportunity to discuss these proposals and I will ask for your reactions and comments at the Council meeting on February 14. You may see the entire report on the Website or I can send you one.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.



The University of North Carolina

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

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

ROY CARROLL, *Senior Vice President and Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Telephone 919 962-4614

(FAX: 919 962-0008)

E-mail: rcl@ga.unc.edu

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Academic Officers

FROM: Roy Carroll *RC*

DATE: February 3, 1997

SUBJECT: Report from the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review

Attached you will find the latest report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review. Please see that it gets the widest distribution possible on campus.

The report will also be made available as soon as possible on the General Administration web page. It can be accessed at <http://www2.ga.unc.edu/post-tenure/>.

The committee invites comments on the report. Please send them in writing to Dr. Judith Stillion no later than February 24, 1997.

cc. Chancellors
Chair, Faculty Senate

Attachment

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

An Equal Opportunity/
Affirmative Action
Employer

**POST-TENURE REVIEW
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA**

DRAFT

**A REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA COMMITTEE
TO STUDY POST-TENURE REVIEW**

February 3, 1997

Members:

Dr. Clinton Parker, ASU
Dr. Richard Ringeisen, ECU
Dr. Glenda Griffin, ECSU
Dr. Marye Jeffries, FSU
Dr. Charles Williams, NCA&T
Dr. Ruth Kennedy, NCCU
Dr. C. Frank Abrams, NCSU
Dr. Shirley Browing, UNCA
Dr. Schley R. Lyons, UNCC

Dr. Stirling Haig, UNC-CH
Dr. Helen Shaw, UNCG
Dr. Mary Boyles, UNCP
Dr. Melton McLaurin, UNCW
Dr. Fred Hinson, WCU
Dr. Carolyn Berry, WSSU
Dr. Peter Petschauer, Faculty Assembly
Dr. Ken Chambers, Faculty Assembly
Dr. Judith Stillion, UNC General Administration

Executive Summary

In response to President Spangler's call for a study of review of tenured faculty members, a committee representing constituent institutions was appointed in August, 1996. Committee members met over a six month period and conversed by phone and e-mail between meetings. Members also read widely, studying the subject from a national as well as local perspective. To gain broader perspective on the subject, several committee members attended sessions on post-tenure review at a national conference. In addition, the committee reviewed information supplied by the constituent institutions and consulted with a national authority on the subject, Dr. Christine Licata. The committee made the following recommendations:

1. That a system of post-tenure review be developed in the University of North Carolina incorporating the following principles:

A. The purpose of the review shall be to enhance and improve performance of tenured faculty by:

- 1) recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance,
- 2) providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and
- 3) for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of serious sanctions, which may include a recommendation for dismissal.

B. The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance review while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.

C. The review procedures must provide for the evaluation of all aspects of professional performance of faculty over an appropriate period of time relative to the mission of the institution, college, department and program, but cumulative reviews shall in no case occur less frequently than every five years. Reviews for purposes of tenure and promotion will be considered comprehensive, cumulative reviews.

D. There must be peer involvement in the review.

E. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.

F. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in The Code of the University.

G. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for those faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.

H. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system.

2. That within the broad principles approved by the Board of Governors, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of the institution. Developing a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.

3. That institutions will have one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration to develop their policies and procedures.

4. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be approved by the Board of Governors and included in appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

* Note: The North Carolina School of the Arts is exempted from these recommendations because its faculty are not tenured.



The University of North Carolina

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

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

ROY CARROLL, *Senior Vice President and Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Telephone 919 962-4614

(FAX: 919 962-0008)

E-mail: rcl@ga.unc.edu

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

An Equal Opportunity/
Affirmative Action
Employer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Faculty Senates

FROM: Roy Carroll *RC*

DATE: February 3, 1997

SUBJECT: Report of the University of North Carolina
Committee to Study Post-tenure Review

Attached you will find the latest draft of the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review. Please see that it gets the widest distribution possible on your campus.

The report will also be made available as soon as possible on the General Administration web page. It can be accessed at <http://www2.ga.unc.edu/post-tenure/>.

Committee members have worked hard to prepare this draft in a timely fashion so that it can be distributed prior to submission to President Spangler. The committee invites comments on the report. However, in order to keep to the established schedule for completing its work, it will be necessary to receive all comments no later than February 24, 1997. Please send them in writing (hard copy) to Dr. Judith Stillion.

cc. Chancellors
Chief Academic Officers

Attachment

**POST-TENURE REVIEW
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA**

DRAFT

**A REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA COMMITTEE
TO STUDY POST-TENURE REVIEW**

February 3, 1997

Members:

Dr. Clinton Parker, ASU
Dr. Richard Ringeisen, ECU
Dr. Glenda Griffin, ECSU
Dr. Marye Jeffries, FSU
Dr. Charles Williams, NCA&T
Dr. Ruth Kennedy, NCCU
Dr. C. Frank Abrams, NCSU
Dr. Shirley Browning, UNCA
Dr. Schley R. Lyons, UNCC

Dr. Stirling Haig, UNC-CH
Dr. Helen Shaw, UNCG
Dr. Mary Boyles, UNCP
Dr. Melton McLaurin, UNCW
Dr. Fred Hinson, WCU
Dr. Carolyn Berry, WSSU
Dr. Peter Petschauer, Faculty Assembly
Dr. Ken Chambers, Faculty Assembly
Dr. Judith Stillion, UNC General Administration

Executive Summary

In response to President Spangler's call for a study of review of tenured faculty members, a committee representing constituent institutions was appointed in August, 1996. Committee members met over a six month period and conversed by phone and e-mail between meetings. Members also read widely, studying the subject from a national as well as local perspective. To gain broader perspective on the subject, several committee members attended sessions on post-tenure review at a national conference. In addition, the committee reviewed information supplied by the constituent institutions and consulted with a national authority on the subject, Dr. Christine Licata. The committee made the following recommendations:

1. That a system of post-tenure review be developed in the University of North Carolina incorporating the following principles:

A. The purpose of the review shall be to enhance and improve performance of tenured faculty by:

- 1) recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance,
- 2) providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and
- 3) for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of serious sanctions, which may include a recommendation for dismissal.

B. The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance review while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.

C. The review procedures must provide for the evaluation of all aspects of professional performance of faculty over an appropriate period of time relative to the mission of the institution, college, department and program, but cumulative reviews shall in no case occur less frequently than every five years. Reviews for purposes of tenure and promotion will be considered comprehensive, cumulative reviews.

D. There must be peer involvement in the review.

E. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.

F. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in The Code of the University.

G. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for those faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.

H. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system.

2. That within the broad principles approved by the Board of Governors, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of the institution. Developing a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.

3. That institutions will have one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration to develop their policies and procedures.

4. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be approved by the Board of Governors and included in appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

* Note: The North Carolina School of the Arts is exempted from these recommendations because its faculty are not tenured.

Background

In July, 1996 President C.D. Spangler, Jr. informed the Board of Governors that he had asked Vice President Carroll to "work with the University-wide Faculty Assembly and appropriate institutional representatives to examine the purpose, policies, and procedures for post-tenure review of faculty performance to be sure that they are explicit and that they are followed in all departments, colleges, and schools within the University." He called for a "serious look at how, and when, and for what purpose we review the performance of faculty members after they receive tenure." He asked that a report with findings and recommendations be submitted to him by May 1, 1997.

In August, the President sent a letter to the constituent institutions requesting that the chancellors nominate a member of the academic affairs staff to serve on the committee, that they complete a survey of current evaluation processes for tenured faculty members, and that they initiate a discussion that would lead to the development of a list of principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review. The President emphasized that "the list should be the result of a formal process of soliciting the views of the faculty."

After receiving its charge from Vice President Carroll in September, the committee began extensive reading on the subject. In addition, in cooperation with faculty leaders and other administrators on their respective campuses, members gathered information from each campus on evaluation practices and campus-based statements of principles. Faculty were provided opportunity for input through such venues as interactions with deans and department heads, faculty senates and councils, public meetings, and asynchronous electronic discussions. The committee reviewed the results of the surveys of current evaluation practices and examined the statements of principles from the constituent institutions. Members had the benefit of consultation from Dr. Christine Licata, the nation's leading authority on post-tenure review. Five members of the committee also

attended a national conference on faculty roles and rewards sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education and reported on major sessions to the full committee.

Drafts of this report are currently being circulated to chancellors, chief academic officers, members of the UNC Faculty Assembly, and chairs of faculty senates during a three week period in February. Each constituency is invited to comment on the contents of the draft. Results of the committee's work, revised to reflect comments from these constituencies, will be contained in the final draft of this report.

Introduction

Tenure was defined by the American Association of University Professors in its 1940 "Statement of Principles" as "a means to certain ends; specifically: 1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and 2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to the society" (Van Alstyne, 1993, p. 407-409). According to a more recent publication, tenure is "a statement of formal assurance that thereafter the individual's professional security and academic freedom will not be placed in question without the observance of full academic due process." (Finkin, 1996, p. 4).

The Code of the University of North Carolina affirms that academic tenure exists "to promote and protect the academic freedom of its faculty...". In its 1993 report entitled Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, the Board of Governors re-affirmed the value of tenure, stating, "The purpose of tenure is to assure faculty members academic freedom and protection against improper abridgments of the freedom of inquiry through teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activities; and to protect the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other sources of confining orthodoxies" (p. ii). The report also stated that "the quality of the University depends ultimately on the quality of its faculty," and noted that "historically, tenure has been a common feature of all major universities and colleges in the United States

and crucial to the attraction and retention of outstanding faculty members" (p. ii). In addition, the report stressed, "How that system (tenure) operates, the policies and procedures followed, and the standards applied will determine, in large measure, the quality of the faculty and of the University" (p. ii). The recommendations in this report are intended to strengthen, rather than weaken, the system of tenure and through it, the quality of the faculty and the quality of instruction and research in The University of North Carolina.

Evaluation of Faculty

As long ago as 1982, authorities agreed that tenure and rigorous evaluation are not incompatible concepts (Chait & Ford, 1982). Moreover, about that same time, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues recommended that campus administrators work closely with faculty to develop systems of evaluation for tenured faculty (Academe, 1983).

Contrary to perceptions existing outside the academy, evaluation of faculty members is a routine part of academic life. Faculty members typically are products of rigorous terminal degree programs and have undergone multiple evaluations before they receive their degrees. Faculty applying for positions also undergo thorough review and evaluation for initial appointment. As probationary members of the faculty, new professors undergo systematic reviews for reappointment, and a multi-year cumulative review (usually over a six-year period) to determine if their cumulative work to date is acceptable in teaching, research, and service. Only at the end of this prolonged review period can faculty expect to become tenured in their departments and institutions. One report has noted that "the striking thing about the university, compared to a typical corporation, is not the number of college graduates employed there with secure jobs but the number of high-level employees who don't expect to be allowed to stay." (McPherson & Winston, 1996, p. 101). Once achieved, tenure neither protects faculty from further evaluation nor obviates the need for continuing productivity and competence.

Many other forms of review are also an accepted part of academic life. For

example, the scholarly work of faculty is reviewed by peers prior to publication and/or presentation, grant proposals receive rigorous reviews from panels of experts, artistic works are reviewed before being accepted for exhibit or concert performances, teaching is judged by students in end-of-semester student rating forms, etc. Indeed, few other types of work require such constant review and assessment of worth and performance as does the work of academicians.

Tenured faculty members in North Carolina also experience annual reviews of their productivity in all aspects of their work. This process is well accepted and has been regarded by many institutions as a form of post-tenure review. However, annual reviews are generally carried out on all faculty including probationary and fixed term, as well as tenured faculty, and may have the limitation of reflecting only the accomplishments of the immediately preceding academic year while full post-tenure reviews are carried out only on tenured faculty and reflect evaluation of a body of work over a period of several years. The results of annual reviews are used in making decisions about salary increases, in providing information concerning nominations for awards, and may be a component of the record used for making tenure, reappointment, and promotion decisions. Results also become a part of the permanent record of the faculty member. Less often, the results of annual reviews may be used to assess an individual's progress on a previously established professional development plan or may become a part of a multi-year review documenting continuous progress across a faculty member's career. In contrast, the results of post-tenure reviews are often used to evaluate a faculty member's contributions as they help promote the goals of the department and institution and to provide information to each faculty member regarding his/her career development over time.

Results of Survey of Evaluation Practices in the University of North Carolina

In order to establish current practices for evaluating tenured faculty performance within the University of North Carolina, a survey was sent to each constituent institution in August, 1996. Results of the survey appear in Table 1.

Survey Concerning the Review of Tenured Faculty Members
Raw Frequencies

Total Respondents: 359

	Evaluation Measure of Tenured Faculty Members													
	Promotion		Merit Increase		Professional Development		Contribution to plans		Productivity check		Performance followup		Other	
	Count	% of total	Count	% of total	Count	% of total	Count	% of total	Count	% of total	Count	% of total	Count	% of total
Purpose of faculty evaluation?														
	348	97%	355	99%	287	80%	287	80%	283	79%	262	73%	17	5%
Frequency of evaluations occurring at regular intervals?														
One year	102	28%	339	94%	246	69%	253	70%	226	63%	103	29%	11	3%
Two years	3	1%	0	0%	5	1%	4	1%	4	1%	1	0%	0	0%
Three years	22	6%	1	0%	8	2%	5	1%	7	2%	0	0%	1	0%
Four years	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Five or more years	14	4%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	6	2%	1	0%	1	0%
Variable schedule	186	52%	7	2%	20	6%	13	4%	26	7%	122	34%	4	1%
Does not apply	12	3%	1	0%	6	2%	5	1%	5	1%	15	4%	1	0%
Is each type of evaluation mandatory or voluntary?														
Mandatory	269	75%	332	92%	235	65%	245	68%	243	68%	190	53%	12	3%
Voluntary	72	20%	12	3%	36	10%	27	8%	24	7%	31	9%	4	1%
Both	6	2%	2	1%	2	1%	1	0%	1	0%	4	1%	1	0%
Who takes initiative to trigger each type of evaluation?														
Faculty Member	182	51%	32	9%	46	13%	29	8%	32	9%	23	6%	5	1%
Department head	183	51%	277	77%	218	61%	217	60%	215	60%	198	55%	6	2%
Other	49	14%	64	18%	47	13%	51	14%	54	15%	41	11%	5	1%
All of the above	6	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Who conducts each type of evaluation?														
Department head	256	71%	316	88%	247	69%	243	68%	241	67%	216	60%	6	2%
Peer group	178	50%	91	25%	78	22%	73	20%	74	21%	48	13%	8	2%
Other	83	23%	57	16%	44	12%	50	14%	49	14%	40	11%	5	1%
All of the above	45	13%	7	2%	6	2%	6	2%	8	2%	8	2%	0	0%
How are the results communicated to the faculty member?														
Conference w/dept. head	262	73%	268	75%	246	69%	240	67%	228	64%	207	58%	5	1%
Written report	241	67%	220	61%	146	41%	147	41%	141	39%	112	31%	8	2%
Conf w/peer review group	41	11%	4	1%	18	5%	8	2%	12	3%	13	4%	3	1%
Other	40	11%	43	12%	20	6%	18	5%	21	6%	21	6%	1	0%
All of the above	8	2%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Consequences of negative post-tenure review							Consequences of positive post-tenure review							
Ineligible for merit increases	218	61%						May nominate for awards					208	58%
Draw up development plan	150	42%						May receive additional support					175	49%
May have another review	98	27%						May use for merit increase					228	64%
May begin formal disciplinary process	90	25%						Other					22	6%
Other	22	6%						All of the above					14	4%
All of the above	3	1%												

UNC-GA Planning/Per.AT022/11-21-96

Note: Percentages are based on respondents for each cell divided by the total number of survey respondents.

Responses were received from 359 departments in 15 constituent institutions (faculty employed at the North Carolina School of the Arts do not have tenure and were not asked to participate in the survey). Over 95 percent of the responding departments indicated that evaluation of tenured faculty occurs for the purposes of promotion and consideration for merit increases in salary. Eighty percent of the respondents reported that such evaluation also occurs to assess progress on professional development or growth plans and to evaluate a tenured faculty member's contribution to departmental, school, or college plans. Seventy-nine percent reported that tenured faculty are evaluated regularly as a check on their productivity and 73 percent indicated that such evaluation occurs as a follow-up when problems in performance have been identified. An additional five percent of the responding departments indicated that other types of evaluation of tenured faculty are also being carried out.

The frequency with which tenured faculty are evaluated varies according to the purpose of the evaluation. For example, 94 percent of the responding departments indicated that evaluation of faculty for merit increases is carried out annually, while evaluation for the purpose of promotion is carried out on a variable schedule by the majority of the responding departments. The variability in the schedule is largely dependent upon the level of the promotion being sought.

Most of the current evaluations are mandatory and most are initiated by administrators. Department heads are most likely to conduct evaluations, particularly those designed to make recommendations concerning merit increases and promotion. Peers tend to be more involved in promotional decisions than in any of the other types of evaluation of tenured faculty members.

In every type of evaluation, results are most frequently communicated to faculty members in a conference with the department head. The second most frequent method of communication is by written report from the appropriate administrator to faculty members being evaluated.

The most common consequence of a negative review is ineligibility for merit increases (indicated by 61% of departments responding) followed by the requirement of drawing up a development plan (indicated by 42% of respondents). It should be noted, however, that approximately one in every four responding departments indicated that negative reviews could lead to another, more detailed, review or to a formal disciplinary process that could lead to sanctions or dismissal.

Positive evaluations, in contrast, are most frequently used to award merit increases but may also be used to nominate faculty for awards or as a basis for providing additional support to maintain or increase their productivity.

In summary, the survey concerning current evaluation processes of tenured faculty members shows that a great deal of post-tenure review is currently being done. Tenured faculty are reviewed annually in every institution. Most institutions use the information from the annual review for purposes of awarding merit pay while some use positive reviews as a basis for making nominations for awards and/or for awarding additional support to the faculty member. In addition, some institutions currently use the results to help faculty become more productive by requiring them to draw up a development plan, while others utilize negative annual reviews as a trigger for a more detailed review or as a basis for beginning formal disciplinary reviews.

Post-tenure Review

Although faculty undergo evaluation for many purposes, it is nevertheless true that systematic, regular post-tenure review of cumulative faculty performance across a number of years is not universally required by universities. Three recent studies show evidence that such reviews are being widely considered nationally. The first showed that 69 percent of 280 responding institutions were in the process of changing traditional tenure (Trower, 1996). Of those, twenty-nine percent were implementing post-tenure review procedures. A second study of 680 public and private institutions showed that 61 percent of those responding reported that they had post-tenure review procedures in place, while another 9

percent reported that they had a policy under development (Harris, 1996). A third inquiry found that post-tenure review is either in the discussion or implementation stage in public institutions in 28 states (Licata, 1996).

The conflicting figures found in these studies probably reflect the fact that there is not yet a universally accepted definition of what is meant by post-tenure review. Because the subject has received much attention recently, new definitions are being proposed. For the purpose of this report, the committee adapted a definition proposed by Morreale (1996), as follows: *post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality.*

There are two major forms of post-tenure review: formative and summative. Formative reviews are carried out on all faculty members, usually on a rotating basis. They are considered developmental in nature and generally lead to no formal, immediate personnel actions. Their goal is to provide information to the faculty member concerning his/her cumulative development as it fits with departmental, school/college and university goals, and to set direction for the next specified time period preceding the next review. Summative reviews are used for a specific purpose such as promotion, merit awards, etc. Work improvement plans are generally created if a faculty member's summative review is less than satisfactory. Although these two types of reviews appear to be contradictory in nature, the committee proposes that it is possible to devise a system of post-tenure review that incorporates the strengths of both.

Results of Request for Principal Features of a Meaningful System of Post-tenure Review

Fifteen institutions responded to the request for a list of principal features of a meaningful system of post-tenure review. Each institution reported that the set of principles it was submitting had resulted from discussions involving faculty. Some sets of principles were formally adopted by faculty senates and/or other representative faculty bodies. The committee reviewed the principle statements and grouped them under seven

headings, including purposes for post-tenure review, the process, carrying out the process, details of the review, schedule for the review, outcomes of review, and other.

The most frequently stated purpose for carrying out post-tenure review was to foster faculty development, improve faculty performance, and ensure an optimum learning environment for students. A second purpose mentioned by the institutions was to recognize, encourage and reward professional growth. In addition, institutions suggested that the focus should be broad, including improvement in teaching, in research efforts and in service to the university and the community.

Issues concerning the process that were endorsed by more than one university included the following. The process should be fair and consistent with the Code of the University of North Carolina. It should contain clearly stated criteria and define minimal standards of performance, including definitions of expectations in teaching, research and service. The process must affirm the concepts of tenure and academic freedom and should incorporate and complement existing faculty evaluation procedures. The process should be sufficiently flexible to recognize the unique and various ways in which units within institutions contribute to the institutional mission. It should also respect and recognize disciplinary differences in pedagogy as well as differences in the relative weight of teaching, research, and service which faculty undertake at different times in their careers. Finally, institutions insisted that the process should include the same protections and grievance procedures as faculty now experience.

The following suggestions were made by two or more institutions with regard to carrying out the process. Faculty should be extensively involved in developing, monitoring, and/or modifying the institutional processes for post-tenure review. The review should be done by more than one person, and peers, as well as department chairs, should be involved in carrying out the process. The review should be conducted in a positive, constructive, and supportive atmosphere, with safeguards present to ensure fairness, and should be based on multiple measures. Some of the measures suggested

included peer evaluations, evidence of students' accomplishments, portfolios, student evaluations, chair evaluations, classroom evaluations and evaluations of course material. The process should result in written evaluations and should be tied to personal development plans that speak directly to goals in teaching, in research, and in service.

Some institutions included more details than did others about the nature of the review. Three institutions indicated that following a comprehensive review, time must be given to improve, and two indicated that the time to improve must differ according to the seriousness of the deficiency. Five institutions indicated that the review process must specify appeal procedures and must include due process. Three institutions indicated that the process must contain procedures for review of any performance evaluation that faculty members contest, and one suggested that the process must specify consequences for refusal to participate.

With regard to outcomes of the review, it was clear that responding institutions realized that action based on the results should occur if the review were to be meaningful. Two institutions called for consequences of the review process to be clearly spelled out in writing. Four institutions suggested that negative reviews should result in a plan for improvement that is agreed upon by the faculty member and the university and contains milestones for improvement and consequences for non-compliance. One institution suggested that raises and rewards should be negatively impacted by below average reviews and positively impacted by excellent reviews. Other consequences mentioned included significant revision of a faculty member's workload, revocation of tenure if remediation is not achieved, and procedures for application of serious sanctions leading to dismissal proceedings. Seven institutions pointed out that a meaningful system of post-tenure review will require resources both to support the development plans of faculty attempting to respond constructively to deficiencies and to reward faculty whose reviews result in exemplary ratings.

The statements of principle differed significantly with regard to the schedule for the review. Some institutions stated that the current annual review should be adequate unless it identifies specific deficiencies, in which case a more detailed review would be called for. Others believed that it should be mandated for all faculty every three to five years while one school suggested a 7 year time frame for accomplishing the reviews.

Other suggestions from the institutions included the following. The Board of Governors and each institution should periodically review the entire system of post-tenure review to assure that it is producing results. Review systems should allow for faculty members to request reviews between regularly scheduled reviews. Appropriate administrators should meet with faculty members prior to the beginning of the review to detail the expectations of the university. Finally, one institution suggested that each university should, as it creates its post-tenure review document, reaffirm its commitment to the principles of tenure and academic freedom as stated in The Code of the University of North Carolina.

Recommendations *

The University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review recommends the following:

1. That a system of post-tenure review be developed in the University of North Carolina incorporating the following principles:

A. The purpose of the review shall be to enhance and improve performance of tenured faculty by:

- 1) recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance,
- 2) providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and
- 3) for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of serious sanctions, which may include a recommendation for dismissal.

- B. The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance review while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.
 - C. The review procedures must provide for the evaluation of all aspects of professional performance of faculty over an appropriate period of time relative to the mission of the institution, college, department and program, but cumulative reviews shall in no case occur less frequently than every five years. Reviews for purposes of tenure and promotion will be considered comprehensive, cumulative reviews.
 - D. There must be peer involvement in the review.
 - E. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.
 - F. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in The Code of the University.
 - G. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for those faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.
 - H. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system.
2. That within the broad principles approved by the Board of Governors, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of

the institution. Developing a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.

3. That institutions will have one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration to develop their policies and procedures.

4. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be approved by the Board of Governors and included in appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

* Note: The North Carolina School of the Arts is exempted from these recommendations because its faculty are not tenured.

References

- Chait, R. P. & Ford, A.T. (1982) Beyond traditional tenure: A guide for sound policies and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Finkin, M.W. (1996) The case for tenure. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press of Cornell University
- Harris, B.J. (1996) "The relationship between and among policy variables, type of institution, and perceptions of academic administrators with regard to post-tenure review." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.
- Licata, C. M. & Morreale, J. C. (1996) "Post-tenure review: policies, practices, precautions". American Association of Higher Education, New Pathways Project, Working Paper No. 12. Washington, D.C.
- McPherson, M.S. & Winston, G.C. (1996) The economics of academic tenure: A relational perspective in M. W. Finkin (ed.) The case for tenure, Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press of Cornell University
- Trower, C.A. (1996) "Tenure Snapshot". American Association of Higher Education, New Pathways Project, Working Paper No. 2. Washington, DC.

**1997 FACULTY COUNCIL (AND ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE LIBRARY) DIVISIONAL NOMINATING
COMMITTEES**

FINE ARTS

1. Bobbi A. Owen, **Chair** (Dramatic Art)
2. Jon W. Finson (Music)
3. Jaroslav T. Folda, III (Art)

HUMANITIES

1. Edwin Brown, **Chair** (Classics)
2. Robert E. Johnstone (English)
3. Marilyn A. Scott (Germanic Languages)
4. Thomas A. Tweed (Religious Studies)
5. D. Soyini Madison (Speech Communication)

**BASIC & APPLIED NATURAL SCIENCES/
INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE**

1. Dirk Frankenberg, **Chair** (Marine Sciences)
2. Walter E. Bollenbacher
3. Abigail T. Panter (Psychology)
4. Slayton A. Evans, Jr. (Chemistry)
5. Laurel Elaine Dieter (Mathematics)

SOCIAL SCIENCES

1. Ronald W. Hyatt, **Chair** (Physical Ed., Exer. & Sport Sci.)
2. Rachel A. Willis (Economics)
3. E. Jane Burns (Women's Studies)
4. Sarah C. Chambers (History)
5. Stephen T. Leonard (Political Science)

LIBRARIES/SCHOOL OF INFORMATION & LIBRARY SCIENCE

1. Helen R. Tibbo, **Chair** (Schl. Of Information & Lib. Sci.)
2. Marguerite I. Most (Law Library)
3. John B. Rutledge (Academic Affairs Library)
4. Margaret E. Moore (Health Sciences Library)
5. Margareta J. Yarborough (Academic Affairs Library)

KENAN-FLAGLER BUSINESS SCHOOL (BUS. ADMIN.)

1. Debra L. Shapiro, **Chair**
2. Barry R. Roberts
3. David J. Hartzell

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

1. Bobbie B. Lubker, **Chair**
2. Gary B. Stuck
3. Carol E. Malloy
4. Judith L. Meece

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION

1. Richard J. Beckman, **Chair**
2. Ruth C. Walden
3. Sally A. Walters

SCHOOL OF LAW

1. S. Elizabeth Gibson, **Chair**
2. Charles E. Daye
3. Walter H. Bennett, Jr.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

1. Audrey M. Johnson, **Chair**
2. Dorothy N. Gamble
3. Kathleen A. Rounds

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

1. Ben F. Loeb, Jr., **Chair**
2. Janet Mason

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

1. Barry R. Lentz, **Chair** (Biochemistry & Biophysics)
2. Stuart A. Bentley (Pathology & Laboratory Med.)
3. Brian Herman (Cell Biology & Anatomy)
4. Jordan B. Renner (Radiology)
5. David J. Weber (Medicine)
6. Ann G. Bailey (Anesthesiology)
7. Melinda A. Beck (Pediatrics)

SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY

1. Ronald P. Strauss, **Chair** (Dental Ecology)
2. Sally M. Mauriello (Dental Ecology)
3. L'Tanya J. Bailey (Orthodontics)
4. Enrique Platin (Diagnostic Sciences)

SCHOOL OF NURSING

1. Anne H. Skelly, **Chair**
2. Carol C. Hogue

SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

1. Boka W. Hadzija, **Chair**
2. June H. McDermott

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

1. John J.B. Anderson, **Chair** (Nutrition)
2. Donald T. Lauria (Environmental Sci. & Eng.)
3. Carolyn P. Parks (Health Behavior & Health Ed.)
4. Jonathan B. Kotch (Maternal & Child Health)
5. Patricia Z. Fischer (Health Policy & Admin.)

OFFICIAL BALLOT

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the four vacancies on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. The nominees come from the General Faculty, but only members of the Faculty Council are eligible to vote for this Committee. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Craig J. Calhoun (*Sociology*), Sue E. Estroff (*Social Medicine*) [Alternate 1995-96 for Slayton A. Evans, Jr. (*Chemistry*)], Joseph M. Flora (*English*) [Frank Brown (*Education*), Alternate Spring 1996], Laura N. (Lolly) Gasaway (*Law School/Law Library*); 1997: Richard N. (Pete) Andrews (*Environmental Sciences & Engineering, Public Health*), Harry Gooder (*Microbiology & Immunology, Medicine*), Carol G. Jenkins (*Health Sciences Library*), James L. Peacock III (*Anthropology*) [Bonnie C. Yankaskas (*Radiology*), Alternate Spring 1996]; 1998: Pamela J. Conover (*Political Science*), Paul B. Farel (*Physiology*), Richard J. (Dick) Richardson (*Political Science*) [Carl L. Bose (*Pediatrics*), Alternate 1995-96], Lillie L. Searles (*Biology*); ex officio: Jane D. Brown (*Chair of the Faculty*) (*Journalism & Mass Communication*), George S. Lensing (*Secretary of the Faculty*) (*English*).

Please vote by checking four names return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR FOUR

- | | |
|---|---|
| (13) 12 Dent, Georgette A.
(Pathology) | tied with Strauss (10) 14 Rabinowitz, George
(Political Science) |
| (3) 24 Estroff, Sue E.
(Social Medicine) | (12) 13 Shapiro, Debra L.
(Kenan-Flagler Business School) |
| (1) 30 Gless, Darryl J.
(English) | (14) 9 Stasheff, James D.
(Mathematics) |
| (7) 18 Lacey, Linda elected to CAC
(City & Regional Planning) | tied with Rabinowitz (11) 14 Strauss, Ronald P.
(Dental Ecology) |
| (8) 15 Lentz, Barry R.
(Biochemistry & Biophysics) | tied with Lentz (9) 15 Warburton, Thomas A.
(Music) |
| (2) 27 McNeil, Laurie E.
(Physics & Astronomy) | (6) 19 Yankaskas, Bonnie C.
(Radiology) |
| (4) 24 Pagano, Joseph S.
(Medicine)
(Comprehensive Cancer Ctr.) | (5) 21 Yarbrough, Marilyn V.
(Law) |

Faculty of the Faculty
0, 203 Carr Bldg.
1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the three vacancies on the Advisory Committee. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Larry R. Churchill (*Social Medicine*), Maria A. Salgado (*Romance Languages*), Eric Schopler (*Psychiatry, Medicine*) [retired 12-31-95; Karl E. Petersen (*Mathematics*), Alternate 1-1- 6-30-96]; 1997: Jaroslav T. (Jerry) Folda, III (*Art*), Janet Mason (*Institute of Government*), Stephen F. Weiss (*Computer Science*); 1998: Paul Debreczeny (*Slavic Languages*), Bernadette Gray-Little (*Psychology*), Gregory Strayhorn (*Family Medicine*); ex officio: Jane D. Brown (*Chair of the Faculty*) (*Journalism & Mass Communication*), George S. Lensing (*Secretary of the Faculty*) (*English*).

Please vote by checking three names and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than three checks will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR THREE

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ⑤ <u>9</u> Evans, Slayton A., Jr.
(Chemistry) | ② <u>337</u> Lacey, Linda
(City & Regional Planning) | ⑧ <u>210</u> Reddick, Robert L.
(Pathology & Lab Medicine) |
| ④ <u>275</u> Haig, I.R. Stirling, II
(Romance Languages) | ★ ① <u>361</u> McNeil, Laurie E.
(Physics & Astronomy) | ⑦ <u>220</u> Sheldon, George F.
(Surgery) |
| ⑥ <u>264</u> Kelly, Douglas G.
(Mathematics & Statistics) | ⑨ <u>156</u> Mishel, Merle H.
(Nursing) | ③ <u>286</u> White, Gilbert C., II
(Medicine) |

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

★ elected to EcFC; can't serve on
both; chose EcFC

OFFICIAL BALLOT
ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the two vacancies on the Athletics Committee. The five-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Lissa L. Broome (*Law*), John P. (Jack) Evans (*Kenan-Flagler Business School*) [and ACC representative; 1997: Connie C. Eble (*English*), Frederick O. Mueller (*Physical Education, Exercise, & Sport Science*); 1998: Audrey E. Johnson (*Social Work*), Edward J. Ludwig (*Physics & Astronomy*) 1999: William W. Smith (*Mathematics*), Frank T. Stritter (*Medicine*); 2000: Anne H. Fishel (*Nursing*), Henry R. Lesesne (*Medicine*).

Please vote by checking two names and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than two checks will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR TWO

① 11 Henderson, Karla A.
(*Leisure Studies & Recreation
Administration*)

⑤ 215 Lachiewicz, Paul F.
(*Surgery*)

⑥ 191 Pielak, Gary J.
(*Chemistry*)

③ 272 Hobson, Fred C., Jr.
(*English*)

④ 252 Madison, D. Soyini
(*Communication Studies*)

② 287 Rosen, Richard A.
(*Law*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the three Academic Affairs vacancies (one from Humanities, one from the Basic and Applied Natural Sciences, and one from the Professional Schools) on the Educational Policy Committee. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: E. Jane Burns (*Romance Languages*) - *Humanities* [moved to *Women's Studies - Social Sciences*, 1-1-94]; James J. Gallagher (*Education*) - *Professional Schools in Academic Affairs*; Linda L. Spremulli (*Chemistry*) - *Basic & Applied Natural Sciences*; 1997: James E. Ketch (*Music*) - *Fine Arts*; Sara Mack (*Classics*) - *Humanities*; Michael Lienesch (*Political Science*) - *Social Sciences*; 1998: Linda A. Dykstra (*Psychology*) - *Basic & Applied Natural Sciences*; James L. Leloudis (*History*) - *Social Sciences*; Anthony N. (Tony) Passannante (*Anesthesiology*) - *Health Affairs*.

Please vote by checking one name in each division and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

HUMANITIES
Vote for ONE

NATURAL SCIENCES
Vote for ONE

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS
Vote for ONE

88 Holmgren, Beth C.
(*Slavic Languages*)

② 93 Champagne, Arthur E.
(*Physics & Astronomy*)

② 144 Beckman, Richard J.
(*Journalism & Mass Communication*)

114 Losey, Kay M.
(*English*)

① 199 Fullagar, Paul D.
(*Geology*)

③ 120 Mann, Richard A.
(*Kenan-Flagler Business School*)

239 Sasson, Jack M.
(*Religious Studies*)

③ 90 Halton, John H.
(*Computer Science*)

① 154 Meece, Judith L.
(*Education*)

Secretary of the Faculty
B# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the three vacancies (one per rank) on the Faculty Grievance Committee. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Pamela A. Cooper (*English*), Laurie L. Mesibov (*Institute of Government*), John E. Semonche (*History*); 1997: Lee G. Pedersen (*Chemistry*), John C. (Jack) Boger (*Law*), Terence V. McIntosh (*History*); 1998: Cary M. Grant (*Institute of Government*), Reginald F. Hildebrand (*African & Afro-American Studies*), Erika C. Lindemann (*English*).

Please vote by checking one name in each rank and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS Vote for ONE

332 Huber, Evelyn H.
(Political Science)

180 Rosenfeld, Lawrence B.
(Communication Studies)

271 Rubin, David S.
(Kenan-Flagler
Business School)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS Vote for ONE

① 337 Fischer, Patricia Z.
(Health Policy & Admin.,
Public Health)

② 238 Gilligan, Peter H.
(Microbiology & Immunology)

③ 204 Saye, Jerry D.
(Information & Library Science)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS Vote for ONE

③ 141 Bastow, Kenneth F.
(Pharmacy)

② 226 Edwards, Lloyd J.
(Biostatistics, Public Health)

① 367 Matchinske, Megan M.
(English)

Secretary of the Faculty
B# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY HEARINGS

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the three vacancies (one for a regular five-year term and two elected alternates available for service for one year) on the Committee on Faculty Hearings. The terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Madeline G. Levine (*Slavic Languages*); 1997: John V. Orth (*Law*); 1998: Marie M. Bristol (*Psychiatry, Medicine*) [Patriciz Z. Fischer (*Health Policy & Administration, Public Health*, Alternate 1995-96)]; 1999: Genna Rae McNeil (*History*); 2000: S. Elizabeth Gibson (*Law*) [Thomas S. Wallsten (*Psychology*), Alternate Spring 1996]; 1995-96 Alternates available for service: Jeffrey S. Koeze (*Institute of Government*), John P. McGowan (*English*), Lawrence B. Rosenfeld (*Communication Studies*).

Please vote by checking three names and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than three checks will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR THREE

⑥ 258 Fine, Jo-David
(Dermatology)

⑤ 295 Gallman, Robert E.
(Economics)

② 386 Schoultz, Lars G. Alt.
(Political Science)

③ 381 Finn, William F. Alt.
(Medicine)

④ 332 Johnson, James H., Jr.
(Geography)

① 505 Taylor, Beverly W.
(English)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY AND PROGRAM CHANGE

Arranged below in alphabetical order by Division of Academic Affairs and Division of Health Affairs are the faculty nominees for the four vacancies (two in Academic Affairs and two in Health Affairs) on the Committee on Financial Exigency and Program Change. The five-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Academic Affairs: William A. Darity, Jr. (*Economics*) [3-year Alternate], Tom K. Scott (*Biology*); Health Affairs: Philip A. Bromberg (*Medicine*), Margaret S. Miles (*Nursing*); 1997: Academic Affairs: Jennifer S. Conrad (*Kenan-Flagler Business School*), Richard W. Pfaff (*History*); Health Affairs: Marie M. Bristol (*Psychiatry*), Donald A. Madison (*Social Medicine*); 1998: Academic Affairs: Stanley W. Black, III (*Economics*); Health Affairs: William D. Huffines (*Pathology*); 2000: Academic Affairs: Michela Gallagher (*Psychology*); Health Affairs: Nancy Raab-Traub (*Microbiology & Immunology*).

Please vote by checking two names in each division and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vote for TWO

③ 173 Balthrop, Virgil W. (Bill)
(*Communication Studies*)

① 294 Kaufman, Peter I.
(*Religious Studies*)

⑥ 77 Koelb, Clayton T.
(*Germanic Languages*)

④ 167 Nonini, Donald M.
(*Anthropology*)

⑤ 129 Stidham, Shaler, Jr.
(*Operations Research*)

② 276 Wagner-Martin, Linda C.
(*English*)

DIVISION OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

Vote for TWO

⑥ 149 Bayne, Stephen C.
(*Operative Dentistry*)

④ 183 Caplow, Michael
(*Biochemistry & Biophysics*)

① 263 Dalton, Jo Ann B.
(*Nursing*)

③ 237 Dodds, Janice M. (Jan)
(*Nutrition, Public Health*)

⑤ 150 Kaufman, David G.
(*Pathology & Lab Medicine*)

② 240 Norfleet, Edward A.
(*Anesthesiology*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES AND SPECIAL AWARDS

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the two vacancies on the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Beverly W. Long (*Communication Studies*), Ruel W. Tyson, Jr. (*Religious Studies*); 1997: Stuart Bondurant (*Medicine*) [David O. Moltke-Hansen (*Special Collections, Academic Affairs Libraries*), Alternate Spring 1995 and Fall & Spring 1995-96]; Weldon Thornton (*English*); 1998: Richard J. (Dick) Richardson [William D. Huffines (*Pathology*), Alternate 1995-96], Linda L. Spremulli (*Chemistry*); ex officio: George S. Lensing (*Secretary of the Faculty*) (*English*).

Please vote by checking two names and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than two checks will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR TWO

⑥ 206 Dent, Georgette A.
(*Pathology & Lab
Medicine*)

③ 285 Gasaway, Laura N. (Lolly)
(*Law/Law Library*)

① 358 Pagano, Joseph S.
(*Medicine/Cancer Center*)

⑤ 214 Dyson, Michael Eric
(*Communication Studies*)

② 328 Klebanow, Susan A.
(*Music*)

④ 253 Tillman, Rollie, Jr.
(*Kenan-Flagler
Business School*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

FACULTY ASSEMBLY DELEGATION

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the one vacancy on the Faculty Assembly Delegation. The three-year term begins July 1, 1996. Note that only members of the Faculty Council with at least one year of service remaining are eligible to serve on this delegation.

1997:

The present delegation (terms expire June 30): 1996: William Keech (*Political Science*); Laurel A. Files (*Health Policy & Administration, Public Health*) [Nancy H. Lane (*Dramatic Art*), Alternate 1995-96], Laura N. (Lolly) Gasaway (*Law/Law Library*); 1998: W. Miles Fletcher (*History*); ex officio: Jane D. Brown (*Chair of the Faculty*) (*Journalism & Mass Communication*).

Please vote by checking one name and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than one check will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR ONE

② 238 Lane, Nancy H.
(*Dramatic Art*)

① 295 Rabinowitz, George
(*Political Science*)

② 248 Williams, Marcus L.
(*Medicine*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the faculty nominees for the four vacancies on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. The nominees come from the General Faculty, but only members of the Faculty Council are eligible to vote for this Committee. The three-year terms begin July 1, 1996.

The present committee (terms expire June 30): 1996: Craig J. Calhoun (*Sociology*), Sue E. Estroff (*Social Medicine*) [Alternate 1995-96 for Slayton A. Evans, Jr. (*Chemistry*)], Joseph M. Flora (*English*) [Frank Brown (*Education*), Alternate Spring 1996], Laura N. (Lolly) Gasaway (*Law School/Law Library*); 1997: Richard N. (Pete) Andrews (*Environmental Sciences & Engineering, Public Health*), Harry Gooder (*Microbiology & Immunology, Medicine*), Carol G. Jenkins (*Health Sciences Library*), James L. Peacock III (*Anthropology*) [Bonnie C. Yankaskas (*Radiology*), Alternate Spring 1996]; 1998: Pamela J. Conover (*Political Science*), Paul B. Farel (*Physiology*), Richard J. (Dick) Richardson (*Political Science*) [Carl L. Bose (*Pediatrics*), Alternate 1995-96], Lillie L. Searles (*Biology*); ex officio: Jane D. Brown (*Chair of the Faculty*) (*Journalism & Mass Communication*), George S. Lensing (*Secretary of the Faculty*) (*English*).

Please vote by checking four names return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR FOUR

- | | |
|---|--|
| <u>12</u> Dent, Georgette A.
(Pathology) | <u>14</u> Rabinowitz, George
(Political Science) |
| ③ <u>24</u> Estroff, Sue E.
(Social Medicine) | <u>13</u> Shapiro, Debra L.
(Kenan-Flagler Business School) |
| ① <u>30</u> Gless, Darryl J.
(English) | <u>9</u> Stasheff, James D.
(Mathematics) |
| ⑦ <u>18</u> Lacey, Linda (elected to Advisory
(City & Regional Planning) Com.) | <u>14</u> Strauss, Ronald P.
(Dental Ecology) |
| <u>15</u> Lentz, Barry R.
(Biochemistry & Biophysics) | <u>15</u> Warburton, Thomas A.
(Music) |
| ② <u>27</u> McNeil, Laurie E.
(Physics & Astronomy) | ⑥ <u>18</u> Yankaskas, Bonnie C.
(Radiology) |
| ④ <u>24</u> Pagano, Joseph S.
(Medicine)
(Comprehensive Cancer Ctr.) | ⑤ <u>21</u> Yarbrough, Marilyn V.
(Law) |

OFFICIAL BALLOT

CHAIR OF THE DIVISION OF THE BASIC AND APPLIED NATURAL SCIENCES

Nominees for Chair of the Division of the Basic and Applied Natural Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences are listed below in alphabetical order.

The term of the Chair will be from July 1, 1996, to June 30, 1999. The nominee receiving the second highest number of votes will become the Vice Chair for the same term. The current Chair, Frederick P. Brooks, Jr. (*Computer Science*) is eligible but did not wish to stand for re-election.

Please vote by checking one name and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than one check will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

VOTE FOR ONE

② 29 Feduccia, Alan
(Biology)
Vice chair

③ 24 Frankenberg, Dirk
(Marine Sciences)

① 44 Templeton, Joseph L.
(Chemistry)

Chair

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
OF THE LIBRARY

DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC
AFFAIRS LIBRARIES

OFFICIAL BALLOT

There is no vacancy for this Division this year in the Librarian/Associate Librarian/Assistant Librarian rank. The election is for alternates only. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than one check will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

The holdover member of the Board for this Division is Linda S. Drake (*Assistant Librarian*)(*Special Collections*).

LIBRARIANS/ASSOCIATE LIBRARIANS/ASSISTANT LIBRARIANS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(*Alternates Only*)

① 31 Flowers, Janet L.
(*Librarian*)
(*Technical Services*)

② 15 Hart, Andrew
(*Assistant Librarian*)
(*Technical Services*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
OF THE LIBRARY

DIVISION OF FINE ARTS

OFFICIAL BALLOT

The vacancy for this Division this year is in the Professor rank. In the Associate/Assistant Professor rank the election is for alternates only. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

The holdover members of the Board for this Division are: Mary Pardo (*Associate Professor*)(*Art*) and Terry E. Rhodes (*Assistant Professor*)(*Music*).

PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

③ 8 Folda, Jaroslav T. (Jerry), III
(*Art*)

① 12 Hammond, David A.
(*Dramatic Art*)

② 9 McKinnon, James W.
(*Music*)

ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 10 Verkerk, Dorothy H.
(*Assistant Professor*)
(*Art*)

① 16 Versenyi, Adam N.
(*Associate Professor*)
(*Dramatic Art*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

●ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
OF THE LIBRARY

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

OFFICIAL BALLOT

The vacancy for this Division this year is in the Professor rank. In the Associate/Assistant Professor rank the election is for alternates only. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

The holdover members of the Board for this Division are: Raleigh C. Mann (*Associate Professor*) (*Journalism & Mass Communication*) and Peter M. Smith (*Associate Professor*) (*Classics*).

PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

① 49 Sasson, Jack M.
(*Religious Studies*)

③ 17 Smyth, Richard A.
(*Philosophy*)

② 43 Zug, Charles G., III
(*English*)

ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 51 Ganz, David M.
(*Associate Professor*)
(*Classics*)

① 56 Matchinske, Megan M.
(*Assistant Professor*)
(*English*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
OF THE LIBRARY

DIVISION OF THE BASIC AND APPLIED
NATURAL SCIENCES

OFFICIAL BALLOT

The vacancy for this Division this year is in the Associate/Assistant Professor rank. In the Professor rank the election is for alternates only. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be counted.

The holdover members of the Board for this Division are: Paul J. Kropp (*Professor*)(*Chemistry*) and Richard Superfine (*Assistant Professor*)(*Physics & Astronomy*).

PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

(2) 32 Carter, Joseph G.
(*Geology*)

(1) 49 Peet, Robert K.
(*Biology*)

ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

(2) 30 Assani, Idris
(*Associate Professor*)
(*Mathematics*)

(1) 49 Coggins, James M.
(*Associate Professor*)
(*Computer Science*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
OF THE LIBRARY

DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

OFFICIAL BALLOT

The vacancy for this Division this year is in the Associate/Assistant Professor rank. In the Professor rank the election is for alternates only. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

The holdover members of the Board for this Division are: Evelyn H. Daniel (*Professor*) (*School of Information & Library Science*) and James A. Wilde (*Associate Professor*) (*Economics*).

PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 55 Burke, William I.
(*Education*)

① 121 Pfaff, Richard W.
(*History*)

ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

② 66 Leloudis, James L.
(*Associate Professor*)
(*History*)

① 79 Newbury, M. Catharine
(*Associate Professor*)
(*Political Science*)

③ 34 Scarry, C. Margaret
(*Assistant Professor*)
(*Anthropology*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

THE DIVISION OF FINE ARTS OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Art, Music*

represented at about the right ratio: *Dramatic Art*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/ INSTRUCTORS/LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)

tie { (2) 11 Finson, Jon W.
(*Music*)
(3) 11 Noe, Jerry L.
(*Art*)
(1) 13 Owen, Roberta A. (Bobbi)
(*Dramatic Art*)

(1) 19 Rinehart, Susanna C.
(*Lecturer*)
(*Dramatic Art*)
(2) 12 Slavick, Elin O.
(*Assistant Professor*)
(*Art*)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Classics, Asian Studies, Comparative Literature, Linguistics, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Slavic Languages, Communication Studies*

over-represented: *English*

represented at the right ratio: *American Studies, Germanic Languages, Romance Languages*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

① 61 Brown, Edwin
(Classics)

② 35 Sayre McCord, Geoffrey
(Philosophy)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

③ 32 Madison, D. Soyini
(Communication Studies)

① 39 Maffly-Kipp, Laurie F.
(Religious Studies)

② 33 Smith, Peter M.
(Classics)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 45 Boxill, Jeanette M. (Jan)
(Lecturer)
(Philosophy)

① 49 Yue, Gang
(Assistant Professor)
(Asian Studies)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

THE DIVISION OF BASIC AND APPLIED NATURAL SCIENCES OF THE COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES
INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCES

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics & Astronomy, Marine Sciences Institute*

over-represented: *Chemistry*

represented at the right ratio: *Biology, Statistics, Operations Research, Marine Sciences Curriculum, Psychology*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)	ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/ INSTRUCTORS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)	LECTURERS/ LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING
② <u>12</u> Kerzman, Norberto (Mathematics)	② <u>42</u> Bralower, Timothy J. (Geology)	③ <u>16</u> Gariepy, Louis (Assistant Professor) (Psychology)	③ <u>16</u> Brinich, Paul M. (Clinical Assoc. Prof.) (Psychology)
① <u>74</u> Petersen, Karl E. (Mathematics)	① <u>50</u> Maroni, Gustavo P. (Biology)	① <u>40</u> Lu, Jianping (Assistant Professor) (Physics & Astronomy)	② <u>42</u> DeSaix, Jean S. (Lecturer) (Biology)
		② <u>39</u> Whitney, Donna L. (Assistant Professor) (Geology)	① <u>43</u> Holmgren, Douglas E. (Lecturer) (Physics & Astronomy)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Aerospace Studies, City & Regional Planning, African & Afro-American Studies, Naval Science, Leisure Studies & Recreation Administration, Geography, Physical Education, Exercise & Sport Science, Sociology, Women's Studies, Public Policy Analysis*

more or less over-represented: *Anthropology, History, Political Science*

represented at the right ratio: *Economics*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

① 41 Henderson, Karla A.
(Recreation Admin.)

② 38 Bialeschki, M. Deborah
(Recreation Admin.)

② 28 Hall, Perry A.
(Assistant Professor)
(African & Afro-Amer. Studies)

① 38 Hyatt, Ronald W.
(Physical Education)

① 44 Mezzetti, Claudio
(Economics)

③ 18 Lanchantin, Margaret M.
(Lecturer)
(Physical Education)

① 46 LeFebvre, Donna H.
(Lecturer)
(Political Science)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES THE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND LIBRARY SCIENCE

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for three-year terms (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these "departments" will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Health Sciences Library, School of Information & Library Science*

under-represented: *Academic Affairs Libraries*

represented at the right ratio: *Law Library*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/LIBRARIANS
INSTRUCTORS/GENERAL LIBRARIANS
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

② 26 Chatman, Elfreda A.
(Professor)
(Information & Library Sci.)

③ 25 Curtis, James A.
(Librarian)
(Health Sciences Library)

① 35 Tobin, Carol M.
(Librarian)
(Public Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

③ 18 Chenault, Elizabeth A.
(Assoc. Librarian)
(Special Collections,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

① 3/ Dalton, Robert S.
(Assoc. Librarian)
(Public Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

④ 11 Whichard, Mitchell L.
(Assoc. Librarian)
(Public Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

② 25 Wildemuth, Barbara M.
(Associate Professor)
(Information & Library Sci.)

② 28 Hinton, Paula P.
(Assistant Librarian)
(Public Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

③ 16 Owen, Kevin S. (Will)
(Assistant Librarian)
(Technical Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

④ 13 Stewart, Douglas
(Assistant Librarian)
(Technical Services,
Acad.Affs.Libs.)

① 28 Tysinger, Barbara R.
(Assistant Librarian)
(Health Sciences Library)

tie
broken
by
lot

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

③ 32 Adler, Robert S.

② 17 Hoffman, David E.

③ 9 Blocher, Edward J.

① 24 O'Neill, Hugh M.

① 21 Jackson, William E., III
(Assistant Professor)

③ 6 Krapf, Fay L.
(Lecturer)

② 14 Tatikonda, Mohan V.
(Assistant Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council (for this election, alternates only, who serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

① 25 Brantley, John C.

② 8 Marshall, Catherine

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/
INSTRUCTORS/LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 13 Lubker, Bobbie B.
(Clinical Professor)

① 21 Rong, Xue Lan
(Assistant Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the nominees for election to the Council (for this election, alternates only, who serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than one check will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS

LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

(Alternates Only)

② 8 Shaver, Mary Alice
(Associate Professor)

① 9 Williams, Michael I.
(Assistant Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF LAW

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS/
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

10 Conley, John M.
(Professor)

2 8 Robertson, Michelle F.
(Clinical Professor)

3 3 Zelenak, Lawrence A.
(Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Arranged below in alphabetical order are the nominees for election to the Council (for this election, alternates only, who serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than one check will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS/
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 6 Weil, Marie O.
(Professor)

① 8 Williams, Evelyn S.
(Clinical Instructor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council (for this election, alternates only, who serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selection and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS/
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

② 10 Bell, A. Fleming, II
(Associate Professor)

① 16 Bluestein, Frayda S.
(Assistant Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for three-year terms (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee; no nominations were made by petition.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Cell Biology & Anatomy, Dermatology, Medical Allied Health Professions, Microbiology & Immunology, Ophthalmology, Pathology, Biomedical Engineering, Pharmacology, Physiology, Psychiatry, Radiology, Social Medicine, Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Emergency Medicine*

under-represented: *Pediatrics, Surgery*

over-represented: *Medicine*

represented at the right ratio: *Anesthesiology, Biochemistry & Biophysics, Family Medicine, Neurology, Obstetrics & Gynecology, Radiation Oncology*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/
INSTRUCTORS

VOTE FOR 2 BY CHECKING

LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 4 BY CHECKING

② 107 Bentley, Stuart A.
(Pathology & Lab Med.)

① 126 Mill, Michael R.
(Surgery)

③ 108 Beck, Melinda A.
(Pediatrics)
(Assistant Prof.)

⑤ 146 Favorov, Oleg
(Biomedical Engineering)
(Research Asst. Prof.)

① 111 Herman, Brian
(Cell Biology & Anatomy)

② 118 Renner, Jordan B.
(Radiology)

② 110 Brink, Lela W.
(Pediatrics)
(Assistant Prof.)

③ 171 Hattem, David M.
(Psychiatry)
(Clinical Assoc. Prof.)

③ 67 Tsui, Benjamin M.
(Biomedical Engineering)

③ 61 Van Bojurgondien, Mary
(Psychiatry)

⑤ 102 Harrison, Melody F.
(Medical Allied Health)
(Assistant Prof.)

④ 154 Pantell, Jeremy P.
(Ophthalmology)
(Clinical Instructor)

① 122 Passannante, Anthony
(Anesthesiology)
(Assistant Prof.)

② 195 Shea, Virginia K.
(Physiology)
(Lecturer)

④ 105 Weston, Brent W.
(Pediatrics)
(Assistant Prof.)

① 211 White, Judy A.
(Medical Allied Health)
(Clinical Asst. Prof.)

Secretary of the Faculty
C 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for a three-year term (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Administration, Endodontics, Operative Dentistry, Diagnostic Sciences, Oral Surgery, Pediatric Dentistry, Periodontics, Prosthodontics*

over-represented: *Dental Ecology*

represented at the right ratio: *Orthodontics*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS/ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING (Alternates Only)	LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS VOTE FOR <u>1</u> BY CHECKING
② <u>31</u> Arnold, Roland R. (Periodontics)	② <u>22</u> Dilley, Diane C. (Pediatric Dentistry) (Associate Professor)	④ <u>13</u> Beane, Richard A., Jr. (Orthodontics) (Clinical Professor)
① <u>43</u> Tulloch, J.F. Camilla (Orthodontics)	① <u>52</u> Sigurdsson, Asgeir (Endodontics) (Assistant Professor)	③ <u>17</u> Blakey, George H. (Oral Surgery) (Clinical Assistant Prof.)
		② <u>20</u> Pettiette, Mary (Endodontics) (Clinical Assistant Prof.)
		① <u>23</u> Platin, Enrique (Diagnostic Sciences) (Clinical Assistant Prof.)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF NURSING

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council (for this election, alternates only, who serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

① 21 Jervik, Diane K.
(Professor)

② 8 Miles, Margaret S.
(Professor)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS

VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)

① 18 Angel, Bonnie F.
(Clinical Associate Prof.)

② 11 Baker, Carol
(Clinical Assistant Prof.)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for three-year terms (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots will NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORS/ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

① 12 Eckel, Fred M.
(Professor)

② 10 Hadzija, Boka Wesley
(Associate Professor)

③ 8 Shrewsbury, Robert P.
(Associate Professor)

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS
LECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTS
VOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

③ 6 Bastow, Kenneth F.
(Assistant Professor)

① 14 Hanson-Divers, E. Christine
(Assistant Professor)

② 10 Williams, Dennis M.
(Assistant Professor)

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

FACULTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR 1996

OFFICIAL BALLOT

DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Arranged below in alphabetical order by rank are the nominees for election to the Council for three-year terms (alternates serve one year), beginning July 1, 1996. All candidates were named by the Divisional Nominating Committee.

In making your decision you may wish to consider the makeup of the Council's holdover membership (that is, members of the present Council who will not retire on June 30, 1996). At the ratio of 1:34 for representation to the Council these departments will stand (before this election):

with no representation: *Dean's Office, Biostatistics, Environmental Sciences & Engineering, Epidemiology, Health Behavior & Health Education, Health Policy & Administration, Maternal & Child Health, Public Health Nursing*

over-represented: *Nutrition*

represented at the right ratio: *none*

Please check your selections and return the ballot in the enclosed envelope as promptly as possible. Your ballot must reach this office by noon, Friday, April 12. Ballots containing more than the number of checks indicated in each column will not be counted. Faxed ballots NOT be accepted.

PROFESSORSVOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKINGASSOCIATE PROFESSORSVOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING
(Alternates Only)ASSISTANT PROFESSORS/
INSTRUCTORSVOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKINGLECTURERS/LECTURER-EQUIVALENTSVOTE FOR 1 BY CHECKING

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| ① <u>34</u> Fox, Donald L.
(<i>Environ. Sci. & Eng.</i>) | ① <u>36</u> Margolis, Lewis
(<i>Maternal & Child Hlth.</i>) | ① <u>31</u> Foshee, Vangie A.
(<i>Assistant Professor</i>)
(<i>Public Hlth. Nursing</i>) | ① <u>35</u> Bangdiwala, Shrikant I.
(<i>Research Associate Prof.</i>)
(<i>Biostatistics</i>) |
| ③ <u>16</u> Kohlmeier, Lenore
(<i>Nutrition</i>) | ② <u>30</u> Turnbull, Craig D.
(<i>Biostatistics</i>) | ③ <u>18</u> Moe, Christine L.
(<i>Assistant Professor</i>)
(<i>Epidemiology</i>) | ③ <u>10</u> Bowling, J. Michael
(<i>Research Assistant Prof.</i>)
(<i>Health Behav. & Hlth. Ed.</i>) |
| ② <u>21</u> Veney, James E.
(<i>Health Policy & Admin.</i>) | | ② <u>19</u> Zapata, Blanca Cecilia
(<i>Assistant Professor</i>)
(<i>Maternal & Child Hlth.</i>) | ② <u>23</u> Jackson, Ethel
(<i>Clinical Assistant Prof.</i>)
(<i>Health Behav. & Hlth. Ed.</i>) |

Secretary of the Faculty
CB# 9170, 203 Carr Bldg.
March 29, 1996

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
Office of Faculty Governance

1997 Election Schedule

January 15	Advisory Committee nominates three candidates for Chair of the Faculty
January 30	Nominating Committee appoints subcommittees for Faculty Council nominations
February 14	Candidates for chair of the faculty introduced at Faculty Council. Request indication of interest in service on standing committees
February 19	Nominating Committee chooses nominees for elective committees Assign committee members to contact nominees for consent
February 26	Nominating Committee chooses nominees for appointive committees
Mar. 5	Deadline for Faculty Council nominating subcommittees to complete work
March 31	Ballots mailed to voting faculty.
April 4	Reception for Faculty Chair candidates hosted by Jane Brown
April 11 12 noon	Deadline for return of ballots.
April 11	Count ballots for Faculty Chair. Prepare run-off ballots if needed.
April 14	Mail run-off ballots.
April 23 5:00 p.m.	Deadline for return of run-off ballots
April 25	Election results announced to Faculty Council

**1997 FACULTY COUNCIL (AND ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE LIBRARY) DIVISIONAL NOMINATING
COMMITTEES**

FINE ARTS

1. Bobbi A. Owen, **Chair** (Dramatic Art)
2. Jon W. Finson (Music)
3. Jaroslav T. Folda, III (Art)

HUMANITIES

1. Edwin Brown, **Chair** (Classics)
2. Robert E. Johnstone (English)
3. Marilyn A. Scott (Germanic Languages)
4. Thomas A. Tweed (Religious Studies)
5. D. Soyini Madison (Speech Communication)

**BASIC & APPLIED NATURAL SCIENCES/
INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE**

1. Dirk Frankenberg, **Chair** (Marine Sciences)
2. Walter E. Bollenbacher
3. Abigail T. Panter (Psychology)
4. Slayton A. Evans, Jr. (Chemistry)
5. Laurel Elaine Dieter (Mathematics)

SOCIAL SCIENCES

1. Ronald W. Hyatt, **Chair** (Physical Ed., Exer. & Sport Sci.)
2. Rachel A. Willis (Economics)
3. E. Jane Burns (Women's Studies)
4. Sarah C. Chambers (History)
5. Stephen T. Leonard (Political Science)

LIBRARIES/SCHOOL OF INFORMATION & LIBRARY SCIENCE

1. Helen R. Tibbo, **Chair** (Schl. Of Information & Lib. Sci.)
2. Marguerite I. Most (Law Library)
3. John B. Rutledge (Academic Affairs Library)
4. Margaret E. Moore (Health Sciences Library)
5. Margaretta J. Yarborough (Academic Affairs Library)

KENAN-FLAGLER BUSINESS SCHOOL (BUS. ADMIN.)

1. Debra L. Shapiro, **Chair**
2. Barry R. Roberts
3. David J. Hartzell

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

1. Bobbie B. Lubker, **Chair**
2. Gary B. Stuck
3. Carol E. Malloy
4. Judith L. Meece

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION

1. Richard J. Beckman, **Chair**
2. Ruth C. Walden
3. Sally A. Walters

SCHOOL OF LAW

1. S. Elizabeth Gibson, **Chair**
2. Charles E. Daye
3. Walter H. Bennett, Jr.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

1. Audrey M. Johnson, **Chair**
2. Dorothy N. Gamble
3. Kathleen A. Rounds

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

1. Ben F. Loeb, Jr., **Chair**
2. Janet Mason

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

1. Barry R. Lentz, **Chair** (Biochemistry & Biophysics)
2. Stuart A. Bentley (Pathology & Laboratory Med.)
3. Brian Herman (Cell Biology & Anatomy)
4. Jordan B. Renner (Radiology)
5. David J. Weber (Medicine)
6. Ann G. Bailey (Anesthesiology)
7. Melinda A. Beck (Pediatrics)

SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY

1. Ronald P. Strauss, **Chair** (Dental Ecology)
2. Sally M. Mauriello (Dental Ecology)
3. L'Tanya J. Bailey (Orthodontics)
4. Enrique Platin (Diagnostic Sciences)

SCHOOL OF NURSING

1. Anne H. Skelly, **Chair**
2. Carol C. Hogue

SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

1. Boka W. Hadzija, **Chair**
2. June H. McDermott

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

1. John J.B. Anderson, **Chair** (Nutrition)
2. Donald T. Lauria (Environmental Sci. & Eng.)
3. Carolyn P. Parks (Health Behavior & Health Ed.)
4. Jonathan B. Kotch (Maternal & Child Health)
5. Patricia Z. Fischer (Health Policy & Admin.)