



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**AGENDA OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, October 9, 1998, 3:00 p.m.**

***** 103 Bingham Hall *****

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

AGENDA ITEMS

Type	Time	Item
INFO	3:00	Remarks by Chancellor Hooker
INFO	3:15	Question Period. [The Chancellor invites questions or comments on any topic.]
ACT	3:20	Proposal to Establish an M.A. Degree Program in Russian/East European Studies. Professor Laura Janda
ACT	3:25	Annual Report of the Faculty Grievance Committee. Professor John Rubin, Chair Resolution 98-10. To Request a Study of Introducing Mediation into the Faculty Conflict Resolution Process.
ACT	3:30	Recommendations of the UNC-CH Copyright Committee. Professor Robert Peet, Chair Resolution 98-11. To Establish a Standing Committee on Copyright Resolution 98-12. To Endorse Creation of an Office of Scholarly Communication
DISC	3:45	Issues Under Consideration by the Task Force on Enrollment Planning. Provost Richard Richardson, Chair
ACT	5:00	Adjournment

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY:
ACT = Action
INFO = Information
DISC = Discussion

All documents relating to each meeting of the Faculty Council are posted on the Faculty Governance web site. The URL is <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/>.

The Agenda Committee will meet on October 22, 1998, for the November 6 Faculty Council Meeting.

Nominations for Distinguished Alumnus/Alumna Awards, to be presented on University Day 1999 should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty no later than October 9.

October 28, 1998
Faculty Committee on Athletics
(Elected Committee)
Annual Report

Members—Terms ending in:

1998: Audrey E. Johnson (chair 1997-98)
Edward J. Ludwig
1999: William Smith
Frank Stritter (retired in 1998)
2000 Anne H. Fishel (chair 1998-99)
Henry Lesesne (retired in 1998)
2001 Karla A. Henderson
Richard A. Rosen
2002 Trudier Harris
Stanley Mandel
ACC/NCAA Representative: John P. (Jack) Evans

Meetings: Fall 1997 -- Spring 1998. The Committee held monthly meetings during the 1997-98 academic year. There were four meetings a semester for a total of eight meetings.

Report Prepared by: Anne H. Fishel (Chair, 1998-99) based upon attendance at committee meetings, review of the minutes, and consultation with the Committee.

Committee Charge: "The Faculty Athletic Committee is concerned with informing the faculty and advising the Chancellor on any aspect of athletics, including but not limited to, the academic experience of varsity athletes, athletic opportunities for members of the University community, and the general conduct and operation of the University's athletic program" (Faculty Code).

Committee Functions: Subcommittees are established to take primary responsibility for issues as decided in the first meeting of the year. Committee members provided advice that was sought and used by the Chancellor and the Athletic Department. The Chancellor attended meetings as his schedule permitted. Athletic Director Baddour and/or other members of the Athletic Department were also in attendance.

The active involvement of Committee members on various Athletic Department Committees, especially the several units run by the Athletic Department's Academic Support Center, provides substantive support to the Athletic Department in maintaining state and national compliance. Committee members participate in a variety of Athletic Committee activities related to the educational and physical well being of the student athlete. Committee members may also be used in the recruitment of program staff, such as the recent search committee for the women's tennis coach. The faculty guest coach program has provided students with the opportunity to get to know faculty, and can be used as a mentoring opportunity.

Report of Discussions:

1. Appointment of new head coaches. Athletic Director Baddour summarized the process for appointment of five new head coaches. As has been the case in past coaching appointments, commitment to student academic success and appropriate student behavior, during and outside of competitions, were primary considerations in setting expectations for these new appointments.
2. Construction. Work continued on the Kenan Stadium. Negotiations regarding an architect for Finley Golf Course were completed and work began in summer of 1998. Reports were also given on the women's lacrosse and field hockey project, the soccer facility, the softball facility and a proposed new indoor track and football training facility.
3. Consideration of Equestrian as an intercollegiate sport. Information was shared about the number of schools having an NCAA Intercollegiate Equestrian Program, the costs, and the number of students projected as interested in participating if a program were started here at UNC-CH. Discussion centered around which ACC schools have equestrian sport (none) and does the NCAA have a championship in this sport (no). Issues include housing of horses, vet care, no competition in ACC, and fiscal soundness. UNC offers all women's sports that have a NCAA championship. Title IX implications of choosing not to establish such a problem were discussed also.
4. Title IX. Several members of the Title IX Committee presented information from the report (1993-94) and subsequent activity on Title IX issues. Five areas were identified for improvement in the report: compliance, scholarship, effective accountability, equivalent benefits and opportunities. Currently, UNC-CH has 15 women's sports—all that have been recognized by NCAA. Discussion noted that complete compliance with equity could not be done without the elimination of a men's sport, due to limited resources. Women's sports have been added. Locker room facilities for women are being improved. Renovations will enhance the facilities for several women's sports.
5. Support Center. Mr. Baddour provided background information that the Hiskey Report led to the establishment of the Academic Support Center. The Academic Support Center is paid for by the Athletic Academic Department. Such things as computers, tutors, and accessible study space are provided at night for students. Study hall concerns and library time were discussed.
6. Distribution of Basketball tickets to students. The process for distributing tickets is decided by students. The faculty are concerned about students missing class and camping out to be in line for tickets. Athletic Director Baddour proposed a Ticket Distribution Authority mechanism that would eliminate the lines. Student Body Reps liked the idea. (Current implementation seems to be going well).

7. Nike Contract. Professor Andrews initiated discussion about the Nike Contract and commercialization in general. Mr. Baddour informed the Committee that the Nike Contract was overseen by legal counsel and UNC's name has been safely guarded (no signage in Kenan Stadium or Smith Center). The Committee was not involved in the negotiations of the contract. The coaches' contracts with Nike are administered in accordance with institutional policy on external activities and conflict of interest. The Committee recognized that the controversy about the Nike Contract will be ongoing. Mr. Baddour reported that he and Dean Smith met with students regarding their concerns about the Nike Contract.
8. Thursday night football game. This is a contractual event in which all the ACC schools are required to host a game once in every five years. Concern was expressed about students missing class time. Discussion centered around whether to take the game to Charlotte, and getting NCSU to do the same, or to keep it in Chapel Hill. A night game was viewed as a problem for parking (for both faculty, students, and persons coming to the game). A Thursday night game on campus might also be disruptive of classes normally held in late evening. The suggestion was made to try future scheduling of the Thursday night game during fall break. The academic view was to keep the game on campus if possible because our students would have to travel and miss class time if it were moved to Charlotte. This solution was not practical because of the parking problems.
9. Graduation rates for athletes. Professor Evans noted that the more recent cohorts have a better record, looking at six rather than five years. There was an improvement in the rate for men (see attached report). NCAA does not allow reports on students who transfer. It was suggested that we need to track students who withdraw for whatever reason, and whether they complete their education at another institution. The Committee continued to examine variables that might help to explain graduation rates.
10. Freshmen Eligibility. This is a complex issue and divides NCAA schools. The NCAA has not brought this matter to the floor in four years. There is no national evidence that not playing improves academic performance.
11. Policy Statement on Arrest for Conviction of a Felony/Misdemeanor. Related to the incident involving football players in the Spring Semester of 1998, the Committee had a broad discussion of the conditions under which it would be appropriate to suspend a player who has been accused of some misbehavior. The Committee expressed support for the actions taken by the Athletic Department, i.e. to do a thorough investigation and then to suspend players who were found to have behaved inappropriately. When an investigation yielded insufficient evidence for misconduct, then student suspension prior to a court hearing would be unfair to the student.

12. Sportsmanship. This topic was discussed in almost every meeting. The Chancellor noted that there has been a general decline in civility in our society that has been expressed in athletics and elsewhere. This decline has been incremental, not abrupt, but insidious. The committee views the issue as having multiple constituencies (or contributors): players, coaches officials, fans, and members of the media. Two themes were evident in the discussion: Teaching sportsmanship is part of coaching, and fan behavior is an important part of the issue. Changing fan behavior will require an initiative to communicate and persuade.

13. Exit interviews with graduating senior student-athletes. Several themes of concern continue to occur. Balancing academic work and athletic training-competition is difficult. Training has become a year round activity and many student-athletes note "compulsory voluntary practices" during off-season time. Students indicated some dissatisfaction with the campus advising system. Student-athletes experience difficulty with registration and getting courses that are needed for graduation that also fit with their training schedules. Access to parking is limited in afternoons during training times. Positive comments were noted for the Academic Support Center, overall student-athlete experience, the benefits of learning time discipline, and race relations among student-athletes.

Topics for 1998-99:

Tracking academic progress of student-athletes, tracking inappropriate behavior of student-athletes, exit interviews for graduating student-athletes, sportsmanship, Title IX issues, registration for student-athletes, and distribution of student tickets.

In conclusion:

The committee continues to ask questions and raise issues related to the quality of life for the student-athlete. We are appreciative that the athletic programs at UNC-CH have a national reputation of being well run.

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort

1984

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	100		1218	
Enrolled (Currently)	1	1.0	6	0.5
Graduated	81	81.0	977	80.2
Suspended	11	11.0	115	9.4
Withdrawn	7	7.0	120	9.9
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.03	

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	50		2017	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	6	0.3
Graduated	43	86.0	1604	79.5
Suspended	3	6.0	178	8.8
Withdrawn	4	8.0	229	11.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.04	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Cohort

1985

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	105		1202	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	1	0.1
Graduated	83	79.0	1019	84.8
Suspended	8	7.6	106	8.8
Withdrawn	14	13.3	76	6.3
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*			

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	54		1969	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	4	0.2
Graduated	52	96.3	1617	82.1
Suspended	0	0.0	132	6.7
Withdrawn	2	3.7	216	11.0
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.23	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort

1986

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	115		1214	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	0	0.0
Graduated	89	77.4	1035	85.3
Suspended	14	12.2	102	8.4
Withdrawn	12	10.4	77	6.3
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)				

Cohort

1987

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	109		1182	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	2	0.2
Graduated	87	79.8	1022	86.5
Suspended	9	8.3	65	5.5
Withdrawn	13	11.9	93	7.9
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			1.74	

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort

1988

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	117		1237	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	3	0.2
Graduated	99	84.6	1089	88.0
Suspended	5	4.3	66	5.3
Withdrawn	13	11.1	79	6.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.60	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Cohort

1989

	Men		Women	
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	115		1193	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	4	0.3
Graduated	90	78.3	1022	85.7
Suspended	12	10.4	57	4.8
Withdrawn	13	11.3	110	9.2
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.12	

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort 1990

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	114		1184		79		1880	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	7	0.6	0	0.0	9	0.5
Graduated	79	69.3	1004	84.8	67	84.8	1590	84.6
Suspended	13	11.4	70	5.9	3	3.8	80	4.3
Withdrawn	22	19.3	103	8.7	9	11.4	201	10.7
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.10				2.20	

Cohort 1991

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	105		1095		82		1867	
Enrolled (Currently)	1	1.0	13	1.2	0	0.0	6	0.3
Graduated	76	72.4	932	85.1	72	87.8	1614	86.4
Suspended	16	15.2	53	4.8	2	2.4	76	4.1
Withdrawn	12	11.4	97	8.9	8	9.8	171	9.2
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.24				2.13	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort

1992

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	104		1144		73		1893	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	21	1.8	0	0.0	30	1.6
Graduated	65	62.5	947	82.8	65	89.0	1564	82.6
Suspended	15	14.4	53	4.6	2	2.7	59	3.1
Withdrawn	24	23.1	123	10.8	6	8.2	240	12.7
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.32				2.63	

Cohort

1993

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	115		1177		66		2010	
Enrolled (Currently)	4	3.5	48	4.1	3	4.5	97	4.8
Graduated	86	74.8	930	79.0	54	81.8	1563	77.8
Suspended	8	7.0	74	6.3	0	0.0	81	4.0
Withdrawn	17	14.8	125	10.6	9	13.6	269	13.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	2.93		2.45		2.66		2.85	

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 1998

Cohort

1994

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	117		1291		84		2011	
Enrolled (Currently)	43	36.8	236	18.3	31	36.9	257	12.8
Graduated	39	33.3	798	61.8	47	56.0	1400	69.6
Suspended	13	11.1	100	7.7	3	3.6	86	4.3
Withdrawn	22	18.8	157	12.2	3	3.6	268	13.3
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	2.48		2.63		2.77		2.80	

Cohort

1995

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	108		1146		85		1904	
Enrolled (Currently)	90	83.3	977	85.3	78	91.8	1610	84.6
Graduated	0	0.0	17	1.5	0	0.0	24	1.3
Suspended	6	5.6	39	3.4	1	1.2	56	2.9
Withdrawn	12	11.1	113	9.9	6	7.1	214	11.2
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	2		2.97		3.03		3.07	
	2.53							

Request to Establish a New MA Degree Program in Russian/East European Studies at UNC-CH

Executive Summary

(the complete text of the Request to Establish is available at our website:
<http://www.unc.edu/depts/slavic>)

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

UNC-CH has the only National Resource Center for Slavic, Eurasian, and East European Studies in the Southeast and teaches more Slavic languages than any other institution in the region. Existing faculty, course offerings, library holdings, and administrative structures require minimal enhancement (involving no new hires) to create a Master's Degree Program in Russian/East European Studies (MA R/EES) which will equal or surpass most such programs in the nation, and be the first to facilitate the combination of language and area studies expertise with scientific and technological disciplines. This degree is planned primarily as a terminal pre-professional degree for the career advancement of persons in international trade, cultural exchange, foreign policy, government service, and the military. There is no intent or reason ever to expand this program to include a PhD degree.

The MA R/EES will serve as the pilot track of an envisioned multi-track Master's Degree Program in International Studies. The MA R/EES will integrate three academic components to create tailor-made curricula for individual students. Each student will select: 1) two years of language study (in Bulgarian, Czech, Macedonian, Polish, Russian, or SerboCroatian); 2) area studies courses (including core courses); and 3) an academic disciplinary or professional concentration (from among the existing departments and schools at UNC-CH). Three hypothetical course plans illustrate how students in the program can meld these components into unique packages of career qualifications: Student #1, who studies Czech, takes area studies courses relevant to Eastern Europe, and develops a concentration in business or economics, is prepared for a career in Czech-US international trade; Student #2, who studies Russian, takes area studies courses relevant to Russia, and develops a concentration in Peace, War, and Defense/Security Studies, is prepared for a career as a Foreign Area Officer in the armed forces, as a faculty member at a US military academy, or as a defense analyst; Student #3, who studies Polish, takes area studies courses relevant to Eastern Europe, and develops a concentration in Environmental Studies, is prepared for a career as a consultant with Polish, European, and US government agencies and NGOs involved in environmental issues. Core courses are designed to bring coherence to individual course plans and to galvanize the students as a cohort. Hist 204D (Contemporary History of Russia and Eastern Europe) will be specially redesigned as a first-semester core course for the MA R/EES. A seminar focusing on discussions of guest lectures (RUES 210: Core Colloquium) will take place in the second semester. In the third semester all students will take a capstone course (RUES 230: Identities and Transitions), which will facilitate cross-country comparisons and exploratory work on the master's thesis project. In the fourth and final semester students will present thesis projects in a conference format prior to formal defense, encouraging them to hone both oral and written communication skills. All students will be expected to use sources written in the language they are studying while conducting thesis research.

The proposed MA R/EES has no equivalent in the UNC system nor elsewhere in the state, and, as attested in letters from department chairs, would not compete with or negatively impact existing MA programs at UNC-CH. On the contrary, these letters attest that the proposed MA R/EES will provide an opportunity for mutually beneficial cooperation among academic units at UNC-CH. Cooperative agreements for the provision of disciplinary and professional concentrations have been forged with Art; Biology; Business; the Carolina Environmental Program; Classics; Comparative Literature; Computer Science; Ecology; Economics; Geology; History; Journalism; Linguistics; Music; Peace, War, and Defense; Philosophy; Psychology; Public Health; Slavic Languages and Literatures; Sociology; and Statistics; and are being negotiated with the remaining academic units.

In designing the MA R/EES, we have consulted broadly with the directors of all similar programs at US institutions, the Army and the Air Force Foreign Area Officer (FAO) Program Managers, US military academies, the Intelligence Community, and multinational corporations. If the strength of our proposed MA R/EES were to be measured in terms of the traditional components of area studies MA programs (number of languages and area studies courses offered), we estimate that our program would rank approximately fourth or fifth in the nation, surpassed only by programs at Indiana U, U Michigan, and Harvard, and of equal strength with the program at U Washington. However, other programs are limited to concentrations in traditional area studies disciplines (History, Political Science, Economics, Literature/Culture; at three institutions this list includes Anthropology, Business, Geography, Music, and Sociology). UNC-CH is the first to propose a MA R/EES that will permit the development of disciplinary concentrations in the sciences and security studies (Peace, War, and Defense), making it possible to address issues of science, technology, health, and security on an international scale.

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROGRAM

The establishment of the MA R/EES is consonant with the goal of internationalizing UNC-CH, a stated priority of our Chancellor Hooker, and will bolster the global competitiveness of our state and nation by increasing the expertise available to face the challenges of security, international trade, and information technology in the post-Cold War era.

Security

The post-Cold War world is considerably more complex and less stable than it has been at any other time since WWII. The balance between two fairly predictable superpowers defined by their positions on the political and economic spectrum has been supplanted by an intricate, even chaotic, mixture of nations. Increasingly, resource management in environment, technology, and economics are dangerously out of control. This post-Cold War scenario is nowhere more acutely accurate than in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. As we enter into partnerships with these countries, which we used to study as distant enemies, we are discovering that close and mutually beneficial relationships require more fluent linguistic skills and more refined cultural awareness than we needed previously. The detachment of the Cold War is yielding to a new era of engagement in which American interests will need to be communicated in local languages

and be coherent to local cultures if they are to be influential. Russia and Eastern Europe are lurching uneasily toward democracy, with varying results, and it may take two or more generations before they complete the process of detoxifying their political environments. The US can play a unique role in preventing democracy from misfiring as NATO and the EU redraw the map of Europe. Russia and Eastern Europe pose security problems due to the growth of ethnic struggles, organized crime, international terrorist activities, and the erosion of their own military establishments. The FBI has identified the export of East European mafias to North America as one of its greatest challenges. Furthermore, Russia's stockpiles of nuclear weapons are in the hands of a military establishment that cannot adequately feed, house, and pay its troops, much less provide the necessary safeguards for its weaponry. In order to face anticipated military threats (nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare, information warfare, and terrorism), we will need specialists who can combine language and area studies expertise with computer skills and knowledge of fields such as physics, chemistry, and epidemiology. Both the Army and the Air Force are expanding their FAO training and seeking new interdisciplinary MA programs.

International Trade

The vast resources and potential market of 400 million consumers in the countries of the former Soviet Union and East Bloc lured \$15.4 billion in foreign investment to the region in 1997. However the formerly communist states pose almost as many pitfalls as venues for prosperous investment, and there have been some spectacular business failures. We will need multi-lingual, multi-skilled experts to foster productive trade relationships with the big emerging markets of Eastern Europe.

Information Technology

Will countries such as ours that led the industrial revolution recapitulate their success in the current technological revolution, or will it have a destabilizing effect, creating a new world order in which we are disadvantaged? The Internet has drastically changed the dynamics of relationships among countries and corporations, and our interdependence with foreign cultures is at an unprecedented level and growing at an exponential rate. Instantaneous channels of communication require us to apply our knowledge of languages and cultures more rapidly and extensively than ever before. We have plenty of information at our fingertips, but are unable to digest it at the rate that it is reaching us. We will need knowledge navigators who know languages and cultures and can interpret and mediate this information to our society.

Thanks to its diverse strengths in Slavic and East European Studies, UNC-CH is exceedingly well poised to address these issues with the MA R/EES, designed to integrate language study, area studies, and the development of technical and academic expertise. Professor Richard H. Kohn (Chair of the Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense at UNC-CH and Executive Secretary of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies) states: "Speaking as a former Chief of Air Force History for the USAF and as an historian involved in contemporary security studies, there is very clearly a demand for such a program. ... I believe that such a program would be quite popular and provide a real service to the people of North Carolina and the nation." Professor William H. Glaze (Director of the Carolina Environmental Program) notes that the MA R/EES will "provide students with the opportunity to work on environmental problems relevant to the

developing world. Nowhere are these problems more severe than in the countries of the former Soviet Union. ... It [the MA R/EES] would appear to be an excellent investment in an important area of study." (The full texts of these and other letters of support can be accessed at our website.)

Projected Enrollment

	Year 1 1999-2000	Year 2 2000-2001	Year 3 2001-2002	Year 4 2002-2003
1st year students	7	10	10	10
2nd year students	0	7	10	10
TOTALS	7	17	20	20

Given our resources, the maximum number of students to whom we can provide adequate advising and other educational resources is twenty, dictating ten as the ideal size of any incoming class. Since ours will be a new program and we will be recruiting on a foreshortened schedule the first year, we expect that we will fill only seven slots at first. Both the Army and Air Force have indicated that once our MA R/EES is approved by UNC, it will be listed among approved degrees for the FAO program. We will also launch an advertising campaign in 1999-2000, and expect to reach our full quota thereafter.

III. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS AND CURRICULUM

A. Admission

Applicants for the MA R/EES will submit: a Graduate School application and fee, three current letters of recommendation, all post-secondary transcripts, GRE scores (and TOEFL scores where appropriate), and a statement of purpose. For admission, applicants must meet the general requirements set by the Graduate School, and, in addition, students who wish to study Russian must have completed four semesters of Russian or must take two summers of intensive Russian, one prior to entry and one after the first year.

B. Degree requirements

At least thirty semester hours of graduate work must be completed; of these, no fewer than twenty-four semester hours of credit must be earned in courses and at least three semester hours in the completion of a thesis project. The area studies core courses (one-third of the program) will normally be open only to graduate students. The MA R/EES will observe all regulations relevant to Master's degree programs cited in the UNC-CH Graduate Record. An eighteen-month fast-track option will be available for military personnel in programs such as FAO, but most students will be expected to complete the degree within four semesters. All students must complete a minimum of three semesters in residence, plus a thesis project, and all students must complete four semesters of language study.

C. Courses (course brochure)

There are 113 courses containing 20% or more Russian/East European focus at the 100 level or above from which to choose language and area studies core courses. A complete listing of the subset of these courses to be offered the following semester is published semi-annually just prior to registration in our Course Brochure. Menus of courses available for professional and disciplinary concentrations will be published in a Course Guide for the MA R/EES.

IV. FACULTY

Twenty-two core affiliated faculty of the Curriculum in Russian and East European Studies (henceforth: "the Curriculum"), representing the Slavic, Sociology, History, Political Science, Economics, and Classics departments teach the above-mentioned 113 courses. The Curriculum also has sixteen affiliated faculty from the School of Public Health, the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, the Department of Music, the Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense, the School of Social Work, the Department of City and Regional Planning, the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, and the Carolina Population Center; all these faculty conduct research involving Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. There is no need to hire any additional faculty for the MA R/EES. The status of the Curriculum's Administrative Director will need to be extended from half-time to full-time to cover the capstone course (RUES 230) and advising for the program, and the History Department has requested a stipend of \$6K/yr as compensation for offering the gateway course (Hist 240D) every fall; these costs will be covered by the NSEP grant, if awarded.

V. LIBRARY

The Slavic and East European collection at UNC-CH consists of over 348,400 titles, and currently supports PhD level programs, with outstanding resources for advanced research and instructional needs. It is not absolutely necessary to make additional library purchases, but added strengths in science, technology, and business issues in our world region would be desirable. If awarded, NSEP funds would cover this need.

VI. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

With minor modifications (the installation of electrical outlets in one room), it will be possible to implement the MA R/EES using the 1050 square feet currently allotted to the Curriculum (five rooms on the third floor of the Coates Building at 223 E. Franklin St). However, the antiquated computer workstations currently in our possession are insufficient to meet even current needs. To support the daily operations of the MA R/EES and provide computer facilities for MA students (word processing, internet access), we will need to add five networked computers and two printers. This cost is included in the NSEP proposal.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

The Curriculum's Advisory Board (a subset of affiliated faculty) will function in the capacity of a Graduate Studies Committee, overseeing 1) recruitment, admission, and supervision of graduate students; 2) coordination and evolution of the MA R/EES; and 3) representation of the MA R/EES in administrative and public forums. The Curriculum's Chair will be an ex officio member of the Graduate Studies Committee, will report to all affiliated faculty on actions taken by the committee, and will assume leadership responsibility for administering the MA R/EES. The Curriculum's Administrative Director will likewise be an ex officio member of the Graduate Studies Committee, and will serve as the Graduate Advisor for the MA R/EES; this position will be extended from half- to full-time. The Curriculum's Administrative Assistant I position will handle all budgetary and administrative paperwork and supervise the Graduate Research Assistants.

Currently this position is paid 50% out of external funds and 50% from a temporary gift from the Office of the Provost (ending summer 1999). It is essential to maintain the AAI as a full-time position. Graduate Research Assistants (concurrently students in the MA R/EES) will maintain: the MA R/EES handbook, a database of information on similar MA programs in the US, a database of career opportunities for MA R/EES graduates, a database of financial support opportunities for MA R/EES students, and a database of alumni of the program. We have requested NSEP funds to cover the additional positions.

VIII. ACCREDITATION

The only relevant accrediting agency, SACS, has not been notified, since the MA R/EES does not constitute a "substantive change".

IX. SUPPORTING FIELDS

The MA R/EES depends upon the maintenance of current strengths in many units across UNC-CH. At present we have just adequate faculty coverage in Slavic Languages and Literatures, History, Political Science, and Economics, and any erosion of area studies faculty in these departments would seriously compromise our program. Inasmuch as it is possible, the University should encourage the hiring of new faculty members with teaching and/or research interests involving Russia and Eastern Europe in all academic units.

X. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The MA R/EES is a cost-effective plan to maximize the potential of existing resources. The proposal has received strong support, expressed in letters from twenty-four deans and department chairs at UNC-CH, the Director of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies at Duke, the Vice Dean for Education at the US Military Academy, the Title VI Program Officer at the US Department of Education, the Director of Central Intelligence, the FAO Program Manager of the US Army, a National Security Agency employee, and the Managing Director of JS Telecom Services, Inc. Job opportunities listed on our website demonstrate the abundant career choices for professionals our MA R/EES will train.

XI. Budget

Our proposal to win a grant of approximately \$450K from the National Security Education Program to offset start-up costs for the MA R/EES has been advanced to the final round of competition. Award notification is expected on November 1, 1998.

XII. Evaluation plans

We will conduct ongoing evaluations of the quality of the MA R/EES and student success, using the following measures: recruitment of qualified applicants, student progress through the program, alumni employment, reputational ranking of the program, and student/alumni evaluations. In the first and third years of implementation, we will file status reports on the MA R/EES, and in the fifth year we will conduct a full-scale external review.

CONCLUSION

The strategy of the proposed MA R/EES is to utilize existing resources to address existing needs by implementing those resources in a novel fashion. We aim to create a cooperative curriculum venture that will engage the multitude of disciplines represented on our campus. There is a significant and growing need for specialists with expertise in Slavic languages and area studies, and furthermore the training of such specialists must be reconfigured to include the development of professional/technical skills and scientific academic concentrations.

Faculty Council Agenda October 9, 1998

Faculty Grievance Committee

Annual Report

Members: John Rubin (1997-99) Chair; Joan Brannon (1998-1999); Jean S. DeSaix (1997-2000); Roberta A. Dunbar (1998-2001); Vanessa Hodges (1997-2000); Ernest Kraybill (1997-2000); Megan M. Matchinske (1996-99); Cynthia M. Powell (1998-2001); John H. Schopler (1998-2001); Dorothy Verkerk (1997-2000).

Members leaving committee during the past year: Evelyne Huber, Outgoing Chair; Frayda Bluestein (1997-98); Reginald F. Hildebrand (1995-98); Erika C. Lindemann (1995-98).

Meetings during past year: 9-25-97; 1-19-98; 4-29-98.

Report prepared by: John Rubin (Chair) and Evelyne Huber (Outgoing Chair).

Committee charge: "The Committee is authorized to hear, mediate, and advise with respect to the adjustment of grievances of all persons designated as members of the Faculty." (The Faculty Code of University Government)

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None

Report of activities: In the 1997-98 academic year, the previous chair, Evelyne Huber, followed up on one inquiry about a possible grievance that was made at the very end of the 1996-97 academic year. In addition, she received three new inquiries about possible initiation of a faculty grievance; a further inquiry came from a person with whom she was acquainted and thus was directed to Erika Lindemann as Acting Chair. Two of the five filed formal grievances. Subcommittees composed of three members were put in charge. One grievance was withdrawn at the pre-hearing meeting. A formal hearing was held on the other grievance. A report with recommendations concerning this grievance was presented to the full Committee, which adopted the report. The report was transmitted to the relevant parties and school/department authorities. The recommendations were accepted by the relevant parties.

The Committee went through an introductory mediation training provided by the Orange County Dispute Settlement Center. The members were sufficiently impressed that they decided to follow up on this experience and study the possibility of introducing a mediation process for faculty. Dick Hatfield, Director of Employee Relations at UNC Hospitals, came to talk to us about the mediation option offered by the Office of Human Resources at the hospitals. Subsequently, the Committee decided to bring the following recommendation to the Faculty Council.

Recommendations for Action by Faculty Council: Study the possibility of introducing mediation by trained mediators into the conflict resolution process regarding issues currently handled by the Faculty Grievance Committee. The reasons for this are multiple; one of the most important is that the committee felt that often conflicts are simmering for too long, and when they come to grievance, positions are hardened. Mediation at an earlier stage might go a long way toward smoothing many work relationships and reducing the need for grievance processes.

Faculty Council Agenda October 9, 1998

Resolution 98-10. To Request a Study of Introducing Mediation into the Faculty Conflict Resolution Process.

The Faculty Council resolves:

- 1 The Faculty Grievance Committee is requested to study the feasibility of introducing
- 2 mediation by trained mediators into the conflict resolution process regarding issues
- 3 currently handled by the Faculty Grievance Committee and to report its recommendations
- 4 to the Faculty Council.

Recommendations of the UNC-CH Copyright Committee

For the past two decades prices paid by academic libraries for scientific journals have increased at roughly three times the rate of inflation, owing largely to monopolistic practices by large, for-profit publishers. In essence, faculty give away copyright to their scholarly work in exchange for publication of that work, and universities buy that work back at extraordinarily high prices. The resulting crisis in library funding has led to numerous efforts to develop new models for scholarly publication wherein the rights associated with copyright ownership would be managed to protect the universities from unreasonable prices and to preserve for the faculty certain rights to use and distribute their work. The UNC Copyright Committee was formed by the Provost to examine models for copyright ownership proposed in 1994 by the Task Force on Intellectual Property Rights in an Electronic Environment, sponsored by the Association of American Universities, and to investigate other issues related to copyright policy of importance to the University.

Much has happened since the 1994 Task Force Report was released. In particular, the development and maturation of digital communication has created a host of new issues with respect to both ownership and use of copyrighted material. Class and faculty Websites, distance learning, and multimedia instruction are among the developments that present a bewildering set of legal issues about which faculty and staff are at best poorly informed and with respect to which the University is exposed to potential litigation. The Committee examined these issues in detail.

The final report of the Copyright Committee contains 14 specific recommendations. Six of these recommendations appear appropriate for endorsement or approval by the Faculty Council and specific action items are attached for each of these. In short the proposed actions are:

1. Endorsement of proposed University principles with respect to fair use.
2. Recommendation of endorsement by the University of the National Humanities Alliance principles for managing intellectual property in the digital environment.
3. Endorsement of the proposal to establish a University Office of Scholarly Communication.
4. Endorsement of the proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Copyright
5. Endorsement of the proposed University Copyright use policy for faculty, staff and students .
6. Endorsement of the proposed University policy on multi-institutional initiatives on copyright ownership

2-6942

The final report of the Copyright Committee can be found in full at <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/reports/copyright2.pdf>.

Resolutions embodying action on items 3 and 4 will be considered by the Faculty Council at its October 9, 1998, meeting. The remaining items have been tentatively scheduled for consideration at the November 6, 1998, meeting. Documents relating to all items will be found on the Faculty web site.

Faculty Council Agenda October 9, 1998

Resolution 98-11. Requesting the Committee on University Government to Consider Establishment of a Standing Committee on Copyright and to Report Its Recommendations to the Faculty Council.

The Faculty Council resolves:

The Committee on University Government is requested to consider establishment of a Committee on Copyright as recommended by the UNC-CH Copyright Committee.

Comment by the UNC-CH Copyright Committee.

Because fair use of, appropriate access to, and ownership of scholarly information is vitally important to the University community, and because the issues surrounding such access are complex, the University would benefit from the perspective of a campus-wide standing committee. This committee should be charged with proposing and monitoring the application of policies and guidelines supporting ownership and use of licensed and copyrighted scholarly works.

Draft Charge

The University Committee on Copyright is charged with representing the needs of faculty and other users of scholarly information to the Chancellor and the University community. To that end, the Committee will work with the Director of the Office of Scholarly Communication to propose and monitor the application of University policies and guidelines regarding ownership and use of copyrighted or licensed scholarly works. Specific responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following:

The Committee will monitor trends in such areas as institutional or consortial copyright use policies; changes in copyright ownership models; and guidelines for fair use of information in electronic formats. The Committee will identify new areas in which policy development is needed, and will recommend to the Chancellor new policies or revisions to existing institutional policies and guidelines in these and other related areas.

The Committee will assist in identifying educational needs of the faculty and others related to compliance with copyright policies and guidelines and will advise on appropriate ways to address those needs.

The Committee, in cooperation with the Office of Scholarly Communication, will advocate for public policy that protects the rights of creators of scholarly information while supporting its fair use, in various forums such as professional societies and organizations.

Draft Composition

The University Committee on Copyright will be a standing committee appointed by the Chancellor. Its membership will be composed of faculty in the majority, who are selected in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty, with each serving a rotating term of three years. There will be at least one graduate student member, selected in consultation with the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Association, serving a one-year renewable term. The Committee will be chaired by one of the faculty appointees.

In addition, the Committee will include voting *ex officio* liaison members from campus units that are involved in intellectual property matters. These might include, but are not limited to: Ackland Art Museum, UNC Press, Center for Teaching and Learning, Information Technology Services, campus libraries, Office of Technology Development, and the Office of Legal Counsel. It is important to maintain communication among these units on matters related to copyright, as well as between these units and the faculty. Selection of representatives from these units should be at the discretion of the unit head.

Faculty Council Agenda October 9, 1998

Resolution 98-12. Endorsing Creation of an Office of Scholarly Communication.

The Faculty Council resolves:

- 1 The Faculty Council recommends the establishment of an Office of Scholarly
- 2 Communication. Its purpose should be to support the University's teaching, research, and
- 3 service missions in matters related to the creation, dissemination, and use of scholarly
- 4 information. The Office should assist members of the University community in dealing
- 5 with copyright issues that arise in the course of creating original work and in the use of
- 6 existing copyrighted works for teaching, research, and service, and should offer legal
- 7 advice when appropriate. The director of the Office should be a licensed North Carolina
- 8 attorney reporting jointly to the associate provost for university libraries and the
- 9 university counsel.

Comment by the UNC-CH Copyright Committee.

Faculty, students, and staff at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill face complex issues related to the use of copyrighted material in teaching, research and publication. Few in the community are well versed in the fundamentals of copyright law, and many are not taking full advantage of fair use because they do not know what is legal. Faculty need help in determining fair use of copyrighted works in paper and electronic formats and legitimate uses of copyrighted material in distance learning and multimedia components, but have no clearly defined campus agency for assistance on copyright issues.

The University needs a mechanism for promoting awareness of copyright law in the community and for providing specific guidance to individuals faced with questions related to use of copyrighted materials. An office assigned this responsibility would bring greater efficiency to efforts to resolve copyright issues as well as consistency in practice across the campus. Responsible decision making requires that individuals within the community know the fundamentals of copyright and how to apply them in typical situations. The University may be open to significant liability risks if it does not attempt to provide this general awareness and specific guidance when needed.

The issues related to ownership of copyrighted materials have become too complex for individual faculty to maintain necessary awareness without assistance. If the faculty and the University are to successfully negotiate to retain or share critical rights, legal advice must be provided. The faculty also lacks a means to maintain awareness and a working understanding of ongoing judicial interpretations of copyright law and proposed changes in laws. In addition, the University needs a focal point for the development and evolution of intellectual property policy that is responsive to changes in the legal and scholarly communications environment.

Enrollment Planning: Issues, Principles, and Next Steps for UNC-Chapel Hill

A faculty discussion paper
Pete Andrews, Chair of the Faculty

Introduction

- Between 1999 and 2007, UNC General Administration projects that demand for public higher education by North Carolina residents will increase by a cumulative total of about 42,000 students.¹
- Of these, about 40,000 will be undergraduates, and 2,000 graduate and professional students.
- The number of additional undergraduates projected *per year* will rise from about 3,800 in 2000 to nearly 7,000 in 2007, then level off but probably not decline significantly.²
- These projections are expected to prove roughly correct. The issue for President Broad and the General Administration is, therefore, what combination of our 16 campuses and the community colleges will serve these students?
- President Broad has therefore requested that each campus submit an estimate by early November of how much of this demand they project they could accommodate over the 10-year period. The choice is ours—UNCGA has not required that each campus accepted a proportional share of this growth—but any choice we make, including no growth, will have significant consequences.

Goal: Can we turn enrollment-growth needs into an opportunity?

It would be easy to approach this request simply as a threat to the quality and intimacy of the Chapel Hill campus, or as yet another burden on already burdened faculty, support staff, facilities already in dire need of renovation, and the carrying capacity of the towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro.

Can we, however, identify creative ways of using these enrollment demand pressures—at some acceptable level of growth—as opportunities to enhance our mission and quality, and to improve the living and learning environment of UNC-Chapel Hill?

Examples might include

- seeking funding for classroom renovations and the proposed science complex that would also help us to better serve increased enrollments; and
- significantly developing the south campus area as a livable mix of improved housing, academic and student life facilities, and perhaps even public/private commercial ventures to provide services and amenities and lessen dependence on Franklin Street alone.
- developing more joint majors between the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools, as a distinctive opportunity of a Carolina education?
- considering programmatic initiatives that might attract funding and serve undergraduates, as well as our research mission, at the Horace Williams site?

How might UNC-Chapel Hill choose an appropriate level of increased enrollments?

This is perhaps the central question for our discussion: more on this at the end.

Scenarios for UNC-Chapel Hill

- UNC-Chapel Hill currently has approximately 24,000 students, of whom about 15,000 (63%) are undergraduates and 9,000 are graduate and professional students. Its enrollments have grown by about 2.5% over the past 10 years, and by 20% in the past 20 years (1977-97).
- For *graduate and professional* students, UNC-Chapel Hill could accommodate about 50% of this projected demand without significantly increasing its recent rate of growth. This would amount to 1% (90-98 students) per year, or perhaps 200-300 more on campus in any given year depending on the mix of one-, two-, and greater than two- year graduate degree programs. A 50% share would be consistent with UNC-Chapel Hill's status as one of the state's two Research I campuses, which offer most of its graduate and professional degree programs. Note however that this estimate does not include any increase in out-of-state students, who are a major fraction of our normal applicant pool. Adjusting for this would require either additional growth or accommodating somewhat less of the in-state demand.
- For *undergraduate* students, several scenarios need to be considered:
 - ⇒ **Scenario 1: "Natural rate of increase."** At Carolina's recent rate of growth, we would increase by about 1.2% (185-208 students) per year. Assuming a four- to five-year graduation rate, this would mean increasing by a total of 800-1,000 undergraduates in any given year. Note however that this would accommodate only 5% of the projected increase in demand, or 4% if it included the current 18% admissions of out-of-state and foreign students.
 - ⇒ **Scenario 2: Deans' projections, assuming additional resources.** Each of the deans was asked to estimate how many additional students their units could potentially anticipate in 2002, assuming additional state funding for faculty and facilities, and these growth rates were then projected forward to 2007. The sum of these estimates would add up to as much as a 12.5% increase (3,000 students) by 2007. This includes both undergraduate and graduate/professional students, and out-of-state as well as in-state students. However, particularly for the College of Arts and Sciences it does not incorporate analysis of capacity constraints, nor decisions about how that growth would (or could) be shared among academic majors—nor about how the College would want to plan its future enrollment mix among majors, and associated costs.³ It would require substantial additional state resources for both salaries and capital facilities, and careful consideration of non-academic impacts and constraints as well.
 - ⇒ **Scenario 3: Proportional share of projected increase.** If Carolina were to accept a proportional share of the projected statewide increase (13%), and continue our 18% out-of-state admissions, we would have to admit an estimated 585 additional undergraduates per year in 2000, rising gradually to 1,066 additional undergraduates per year in 2007. At 4-5 year graduation rates, this would amount to 3,500 to 4,300 additional undergraduates present at any given time. Adding the current rates of increase in graduate/professional

students, as above—and not including any additional G/P admissions to maintain current ratios of graduate to undergraduate students, or to provide more teaching assistants—the total additional student population at any given time 10 years from now would increase by 3,700 to 4,600 students, or 15-19%.

- *Quality of students:* Increasing enrollments anywhere in this range should not reduce the quality of our student body, since it represents merely an enlargement of the existing applicant pool, unless it were to erode the quality of the Carolina educational experience as perceived by the best applicants.⁴ In fact, any increase less than the statewide projection would presumably increase the quality of the student body in purely academic terms, since it would imply greater selectivity. However, any increase less than a proportional share (Scenario 3) will also make it more difficult for North Carolina's best students to get into Carolina, and cause an increasing proportion of the state's future leaders to have to attend other campuses instead. It could also affect our efforts to maintain and increase the diversity of our student body.

What would happen if we don't grow?

- We would protect somewhat the current scale of the university and the towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, and avoid some of the negative impacts of additional growth (see below).
- But it would be harder and harder for good NC students to be admitted, including our own.
- We would risk being perceived as unwilling to try to serve the state by doing our share of meeting a statewide need for higher education; and our alumni would be a declining fraction of the state's leadership.
- Greater growth would go to some other campuses in the UNC system, and some shift in capital funding priorities would probably go with it.
- Greater growth would also go to the community college system, including some shifting of capital funding, and pressure would also increase for us to admit more junior transfers from these institutions.
- Greater growth would also go to North Carolina's private colleges, who already get a state subsidy for NC students' tuition (increased this year) and would undoubtedly ask for more.

Peer comparisons

- Among our peer institutions nationwide, most are considerably larger, and one smaller. UC/Berkeley has about 30,000 students; UCLA 34,000; the University of Michigan 37,000; and the University of Texas 48,000. The University of Virginia has about 22,000.
- "Flagship" universities in other states are usually but not always one of the two largest universities. UCLA is the largest university in the University of California system, followed by Berkeley; Michigan is 2nd largest, behind Michigan State; SUNY-Albany and SUNY-Stony Brook are 2nd and 3rd, respectively, behind SUNY-Buffalo. In Virginia, UVA is virtually tied

for 3rd largest with Virginia Commonwealth, behind both Virginia Tech (27,000) and George Mason (24,000).

- Several states even support multiple Research I universities: for instance California, Michigan (U. of Michigan, Michigan State, Wayne State, perhaps soon Western Michigan U.); Pennsylvania (Penn State, Pitt, Temple), and Virginia (UVA, Virginia Tech, Virginia Commonwealth).
- Within the UNC system, NCSU is currently the largest campus, at close to 28,000; UNC-Chapel Hill is second, at 24,000; followed by ECU (18,000) and UNC-Charlotte (16,000). UNC-Charlotte actively seeks to grow at a greater than proportional rate, and could exceed 25,000 students by 2007, which would make it larger than UNC-CH is today. NCSU reportedly is considering growing to a maximum of 31,000; ECU's aspirations are not yet known.

Impacts of growth, and constraints

- *Faculty:* The legislature funds faculty positions by formula, at a ratio of one faculty member to every 15 students. Since the College of Arts & Science now has 20 students for each faculty member, receiving additional faculty at a ratio of 15 to 1 would be a net benefit to the College, all else being equal.⁵ Each new faculty member, however, also requires an office, parking, research space and equipment (especially in laboratory disciplines), and other resources. By UNCGA's own standards, UNC-CH already has a deficit of office space and a severe deficit of research space.
- *Classrooms and teaching laboratories:* According to a recent UNCGA study, UNC-CH could accommodate some additional students by increasing classroom utilization from 28 to 35 hours per week, especially in late afternoons and evenings. However, many existing classrooms are already severely in need of renovation and upgrading even to serve the existing student population adequately, and any significant enrollment increase would require additional capital expenditures for new classrooms as well as renovation of existing ones.
- *Academic support services:* Increased enrollments will also add to demands on all academic support services, such as advising and career counseling, many of which are not automatically funded by state appropriations or student fees.
- *Housing:* UNC-CH currently has on-campus housing available for less than 7,000 of its students (not including married-student housing), and off-campus student housing throughout Chapel Hill and Carrboro is fully saturated. Any significant increase in enrollment would therefore require additional on-campus housing construction, and increased commuting from outside Chapel Hill will add to existing pressures on parking. Housing is a self-financed service; UNC-CH currently could finance additional housing for up to 500 more students.
- *Transit and parking:* Any significant enrollment growth would obviously add to the campus's transit and parking needs, probably requiring even greater expansion of peripheral parking and public transit. Conversely, it would also expand the market to support better mass transit.

- *Student life:* Each additional student increases the critical mass to support currently underutilized services, but also adds an additional strain on services that are already at capacity. On campus, for example, increased enrollments would require expansion of food services (but also provide a market to offer them at more locations). Off campus, it would increase the market but also the pressures on Franklin Street. A significant expansion and diversification of student-life services on South Campus, accompanying an increase in housing there, would be a necessity but perhaps also an opportunity. Space for many student-life activities is already at or over capacity (meeting rooms for student organizations, for instance, and the workout facilities in Fetzer Gym), and some student-life facilities have little prospect for future expansion (e.g. the basketball arena).

Proposed Guiding Principles

- **Maintain the quality, traditions, and distinctiveness of Carolina degrees and educational experience.** These are its most vital assets for continuing to attract the highest quality students and faculty. They include for instance its small-campus feel, public-Ivy reputation, ease of interdisciplinary study across department and school units, active and widespread engagement in public service, and others.
- **Maintain and enhance our mission as an outstanding research university.** We are one of the best, and seek to be the best public research university. This includes nationally distinguished graduate and professional programs, as well as high-quality undergraduate education in a research-university setting
- **Maintain commitment to our distinctive mission for graduate and professional education.** Under any scenario, the University would plan to absorb about 50% of the anticipated growth in graduate and professional education, reflecting our mission and our commitment to high-quality graduate and professional programs. Enrollments in these programs should be determined on their merits, based for instance on quality of applicants, markets for their graduates, and capacity to serve them well, not on trying to maintain any fixed ratio of graduate to undergraduate enrollments. However, we will need to examine the needs and opportunities for more teaching assistants to serve a growing undergraduate student body. We will also need to balance this projected in-state increase with out-of-state students, who are a major and high-quality percentage of our normal graduate/professional applicant pool and an important resource which we attract to North Carolina.
- **Maintain and enhance our own niche in the UNC system.** We should not compete on size for its own sake, but on our mission, quality, and service to North Carolina. This may mean accepting the inevitability of other UNC institutions growing larger than we, just as some public institutions in other states are larger than their most distinguished universities. We should oppose any proposals that would erode the quality and distinctiveness of what we provide to the state as North Carolina's premier research university.
- **Manage our existing facilities and enrollments efficiently.** We will be most convincing in articulating the necessary limits on our enrollment growth if we can demonstrate efficient management of our existing facilities and enrollments. For facilities, this means correcting under-utilization of classrooms, and giving renovation priority to making more of them usable

more of the time. For enrollments, this might include such steps as shortening average time to degree (improving availability for required course sequences? increasing use of summer school? simplifying requirements? role of credit for distance-learning courses and other transfer credits? incentives?), and increasing use of study-abroad and academic year-away programs, to serve as many students as we can consistent with quality and mission.

- **Increase enrollments to the extent we can without sacrificing mission and quality.** We should do what we can to serve the state's growing needs, and not adopt a no-growth policy.
- **Increase recruitment for excellence and diversity of student body.** In a period of increasing demand for higher education, we should increase our efforts to recruit students purposefully to achieve increased quality and diversity. Possible steps might include expanding the Honors program; joining the National Merit Scholars program, and increasing merit scholarships generally; increasing personalized faculty recruitment of promising applicants; better publicizing Carolina's strengths and opportunities in the sciences; and better publicizing (and delivering on) the distinctive value of a research university that brings its research perspective to its undergraduates.
- **No enrollment growth without capital commitments in advance to serve it.**
- **No enrollment growth without commensurate commitment of additional faculty and academic support.** Carolina is currently committed to increasing its faculty commitment to direct engagement with its undergraduates, remedying what its students have perceived as important deficiencies (e.g. freshman seminars, faculty advising). President Broad herself has urged us to take these perceptions seriously and fix this. We must let additional enrollments overwhelm these efforts.
- **No significant reduction in proportion of out-of-state students.** There is nothing inherently sacred about the current 18% out-of-state enrollment cap, but our out-of-state students are a vital part of both our quality, our diversity, and our attractiveness to the best in-state students as well. They are also an important link to our out-of-state alumni.
- **No significant increase in junior transfers.** Significantly increasing junior transfers simply to meet enrollment demand could add disproportionate costs to upper-level instruction, especially perhaps in the sciences, lengthen average time to graduation, and erode many of the values of the four-year residential experience.
- **No major reliance on distance-learning to increase undergraduate enrollments.** We should actively explore its potential as it continues to develop, and use it ourselves where it adds value to our teaching. However, at this point the extent of that potential remains unproven, as does its attractiveness to the students who would be most qualified for admission to UNC-Chapel Hill, and also its efficiency: to do it well may require greater cost and faculty time than traditional courses, rather than less.⁶
- **Plan on no off-campus BA degree programs.** This is under consideration by some other campuses, but seems incompatible with maintaining the identity of a UNC-Chapel Hill degree and the residential college experience it represents.

How might UNC-Chapel Hill choose an acceptable level of increased enrollments?

- **Capacity limits:** determine key capacity constraints (housing, classrooms, and offices for additional faculty, for instance), and the time and costs necessary to solve them. These define in some sense the outer bounds of the rate at which enrollments could be allowed to grow.
- **Mission and values:** Within the limits of how much and how fast we could grow, identify how much additional enrollment could benefit UNC-Chapel Hill—both directly, in supporting program growth in areas of excellence and in recruiting an outstanding and diverse student body, and indirectly, e.g. in justifying new facilities that are needed to achieve our goals as well as serve increased numbers of students—in maintaining and increasing its value to North Carolina?
- **some reasonable share to meet the state's needs:** Given our capacity limits and our mission and value to North Carolina, how much of a share of the increased demand can we responsibly offer to serve?
- **Other suggestions?**

¹ These projections are based on expected demand for public higher education only. They are based on actual and projected counts of NC high school graduates (by NC Department of Public Instruction and Western Interstate Council on Higher Education), census data for older North Carolinians, and 7-year weighted averages of enrollment participation rates for each age group at each of UNC's campuses. They include recent and projected in-migration to North Carolina, but do not include out-of-state students; nor do they include any campus-by-campus constraints based on facility capacity limits. They also do not include any significant rise in future college-going participation rates, which could also occur.

² Enrollment demand after 2007 will depend significantly on such factors as undergraduate and graduate participation rates (i.e. will increasing numbers of North Carolinians want to go to college, and to continue on to graduate and professional degrees); and what role will competition from other institutions, such as the rising number of Internet-based programs offered by out-of-state institutions, play in serving this demand.

³ Adding science majors, for example, might require far higher costs than adding humanities majors (e.g. for new teaching laboratories), but it might be essential to the College's goals and students' demand for particular majors.

⁴ UNC-CH now has one of the highest yield rates of admitted applicants of any public university nationally, and also one of the highest retention rates for its students. Additional steps to attract the best of our applicants could include enlarging the Honors program, adding National Merit Scholar and other merit scholarships, and increasing involvement of faculty in personalized recruitment contacts.

⁵ This requires some additional analysis by field and degree levels of students, since the new UNCGA funding formula distinguishes makes distinctions among these.

⁶ Note also however that President Broad anticipates legislative approval for state funding of extension and distance-learning enrollments, replacing the current self-financing principle: this may open the door to faculty expansions to serve them, both here and elsewhere in the UNC system.

UNC-Chapel Hill Faculty Council

October 9, 1998

Enrollment Planning Discussion

- 3:45 p.m. Introduction to the issues. Richard J. Richardson, Provost.
- 3:55 p.m. Question period. [in plenary session]
- 4:00 p.m. **Small group discussions.** Each person present is assigned to one of five groups for discussion of principles and issues for enrollment planning (red dot, 108 Bingham; blue, 208; yellow, 217; green, 301; no dot, 103). Each group will be led by a member of the Agenda Committee, assisted by one or more members of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council.

Topics:

(1) What principles should guide UNC-Chapel Hill's decision as to whether and how much to increase enrollment, and which of these should be considered highest in priority?

(2) Are there any additional issues or impacts, other than those identified in the discussion paper, that should be considered in this process?

- 4:30 p.m. Reports from small group discussions. (5 minutes maximum from each)
- 4:55 p.m. Plenary discussion
- 5:10 Adjournment

- *Student life:* Each additional student increases the critical mass to support currently underutilized services, but also adds an additional strain on services that are already at capacity. On campus, for example, increased enrollments would require expansion of food services (but also provide a market to offer them at more locations). Off campus, it would increase the market but also the pressures on Franklin Street. A significant expansion and diversification of student-life services on South Campus, accompanying an increase in housing there, would be a necessity but perhaps also an opportunity. Space for many student-life activities is already at or over capacity (meeting rooms for student organizations, for instance, and the workout facilities in Fetzer Gym), and some student-life facilities have little prospect for future expansion (e.g. the basketball arena).

Proposed Guiding Principles

- **Maintain the quality, traditions, and distinctiveness of Carolina degrees and educational experience.** These are its most vital assets for continuing to attract the highest quality students and faculty. They include for instance its small-campus feel, public-Ivy reputation, ease of interdisciplinary study across department and school units, active and widespread engagement in public service, and others.
- **Maintain and enhance our mission as an outstanding research university.** We are one of the best, and seek to be the best public research university. This includes nationally distinguished graduate and professional programs, as well as high-quality undergraduate education in a research-university setting
- **Maintain commitment to our distinctive mission for graduate and professional education.** Under any scenario, the University would plan to absorb about 50% of the anticipated growth in graduate and professional education, reflecting our mission and our commitment to high-quality graduate and professional programs. Enrollments in these programs should be determined on their merits, based for instance on quality of applicants, markets for their graduates, and capacity to serve them well, not on trying to maintain any fixed ratio of graduate to undergraduate enrollments. However, we will need to examine the needs and opportunities for more teaching assistants to serve a growing undergraduate student body. We will also need to balance this projected in-state increase with out-of-state students, who are a major and high-quality percentage of our normal graduate/professional applicant pool and an important resource which we attract to North Carolina.
- **Maintain and enhance our own niche in the UNC system.** We should not compete on size for its own sake, but on our mission, quality, and service to North Carolina. This may mean accepting the inevitability of other UNC institutions growing larger than we, just as some public institutions in other states are larger than their most distinguished universities. We should oppose any proposals that would erode the quality and distinctiveness of what we provide to the state as North Carolina's premier research university.
- **Manage our existing facilities and enrollments efficiently.** We will be most convincing in articulating the necessary limits on our enrollment growth if we can demonstrate efficient management of our existing facilities and enrollments. For facilities, this means correcting under-utilization of classrooms, and giving renovation priority to making more of them usable

FACULTY COUNCIL DIRECTORY

1998-99

OFFICE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Name	Title	CB#	Phone	Email	Fax
Andrews, Pete	Chair of the Faculty	9170	2-1671	andrewsr@email.unc.edu	2-5479
Ferrell, Joseph	Secretary of the Faculty	9170	2-7609	jsferrel@email.unc.edu	2-5479
Coley, James	Deputy Secretary of the Faculty	9170	2-7748	jpcoley@email.unc.edu	2-5479
Thompson, David	Assistant to the Chair of the Faculty	9170	2-2147	dthomps3@email.unc.edu	2-5479

FACULTY COUNCIL

Name	Department	CB#	Phone	Email	Fax
Adler, Bob	Business/ECFC	3490	2-3156	rjadler@email.unc.edu	2-0054
Angel, Bonnie	Nursing	7460	6-5370	bangel.uncson@mhs.unc.edu	6-1280
Bangdiwala, Shrikant	Biostatistics	8030	2-3266	kbangdiw@bios.unc.edu	2-3265
Bender, Deborah	Health Pol & Admin	7400	6-7383	dbender@sph.unc.edu	6-6961
Black, Stan	Economics/Fac Asmby	3305	6-5926	sblack@unc.edu	6-4986
Blackburn, Richard	Business	3490	2-3162	blackbur@icarus.bschool.unc.edu	2-0054
Bluestein, Frayda	Institute of Govt	3330	6-4203	frayda.iog@mhs.unc.edu	2-0654
Bolas, Gerald	Ackland Art Museum	3400	6-5736	gdbolas@unc.edu	6-1400
Bowen, Gary	Social Work	3550	2-6542	gbowen@email.unc.edu	2-0890
Carl, Philip L.	Molec Biol & Biotech	7100	6-3544	plc@med.unc.edu	6-6821
Clegg, Thomas	Phys & Astron/ECFC	3255	2-2079	clegg@physics.unc.edu	2-0480
Collins, Edward	Microbiology	7290	6-6869	collins1@med.unc.edu	2-8103
Cordeiro-Stone, Marila	Path & Lab Med/ECFC	7525	6-1396	uncmcs@med.unc.edu	6-5046
Covach, John	Music	3320	2-1032	jcovach@email.unc.edu	2-3376
Cravey, Altha	Geography	3220	2-5157	cravey@unc.edu	2-1537
Dalton, Robert	Acad.Affs. Libraries	3922	2-5537	dalton.davis@mhs.unc.edu	2-4451
Daye, Charles	Law/ECFC	3380	2-7004	charles_daye@unc.edu	2-1277
Debreczeny, Gillian	Info & Library Science	3360	2-8361	debrecz@ils.unc.edu	2-8071
Devellis, Brenda	Health Behav & Educ	7400	6-3908	bdevelli@sph.unc.edu	6-2921
Eckel, Fred	Pharmacy/Fac Asmby	7360	2-0034	fred_eckel@unc.edu	2-0644
Eivers, Douglas	Business	3490	2-3196	elvers@unc.edu	2-0054
Estroff, Sue	Social Med/ECFC	7240	2-1136	see@med.unc.edu	6-7499
Favorov, Oleg	Biomed. Eng.	7545	6-1291	favorov@med.unc.edu	6-6927
Fishman, George	Operations Research	3180	2-3835	gfish@fish.or.unc.edu	2-0391
Foshee, Vangie	PH Nursing	7400	6-6616	vfoshee@sph.unc.edu	6-7141
Fox, Donald	ES&Eng., PH	7400	6-3054	don_fox@unc.edu	6-2583
Gasaway, Laura	Law Lib/Fac Asmby	3385	2-1049	unclng@email.unc.edu	2-1193
Graham, Mark	Medicine	7305	6-4431	gman@med.unc.edu	6-5775
Graves, Lee	Pharmacology	7365	6-0915	lmg@med.unc.edu	6-5640
Grossberg, Lawrence	Comm Studies	3285	2-4942	docrock@email.unc.edu	2-3305
Harrison, Melody	Med All Hth Sci	7190	6-1006	mharrison@css.unc.edu	6-3678
Haskill, Steve	OB/GYN	7295	6-3098	shaskill@med.unc.edu	6-6049
Hattem, David	Psychiatry	7160	6-3379	dhattem@css.unc.edu	6-6985
Hockfield, Rebecca	Student Liaison			bec@email.unc.edu	
Holmgren, Douglas	Physics	3255	2-3013	holmgren@physics.unc.edu	2-0480
Hooper, Celia	Med All Hth Prof	7190	6-1006	chooper@css.unc.edu	6-3678
Huang, Eng-Shang	Medicine	7295	6-4323	eshuang@med.unc.edu	6-5775
Jackson, William	Business	3490	2-3214	jacksonw@ icarus.bschool.unc.edu	2-0054
Johnson, Timothy	Medicine	7075	6-5201	tjohnson@card.unc.edu	6-1743
Kaufman, David	Path & Lab Med	7525	6-1396	uncdkg@med.unc.edu	6-6718
Kjervik, Diane	Nursing	7460	6-3735	diane_kjervik@unc.edu	6-1280
LeFebvre, Donna	Poli Sci/ECFC	3265	2-0429	hominy@bellsouth.net donnaled@email.unc.edu	2-0432
Lentz, Barry	Biochemistry	7260	6-5384	uncbrl@med.unc.edu	6-2852
Levine, Madeline	Slavic Ling & Lit	7400	2-7553	madeline_levine@unc.edu	2-2278

Lord, Susan	Pathology & Lab Med	7525	6-3548	stl@med.unc.edu	6-6718
Lubker, Bobbie	Education	3500	2-5579	blubker@email.unc.edu	2-1533
Ludlow, John	Dentistry	7450	6-2746	jbl@email.unc.edu	6-0705
Vadison, Donald	Social Medicine	7240	2-1136	donmad@med.unc.edu	6-7499
Maffly-Kipp, Laurie	Religious Studies	3225	2-3927	maffly@email.unc.edu	2-1567
Margolis, Lewis	Maternal & Child Health	7400	6-5974	lew_margolis@unc.edu	6-0458
Marshall, Catherine	Education	3500	2-2520	marshall@email.unc.edu	2-1533
McKeown, Timothy	Poli Sci	3265	2-0399	tim_mckeown@unc.edu	2-0432
Meehan-Black, Elizabeth	Davis Library	3902	2-1120	bmbblack@email.unc.edu	2-0484
Melchert, H. Craig	Linguistics	3155	2-1192	melchert@email.unc.edu	2-3708
Mill, Michael	Surgery	7065	6-3381	mrm@med.unc.edu	6-3475
Molina, Anthony	Prosthodontics	7450	6-2755	molinat.dentce@mhs.unc.edu	6-6761
Moreau, David	City & Reg Planning	3140	2-4756	moreau.dcrp@mhs.unc.edu	2-5206
Newton, Warren	Family Medicine	7595	6-2567	uncwpn@med.unc.edu	6-6125
Nord, Warren	Philosophy	3425	2-1544	wnord@email.unc.edu	2-6904
Owen, Bobbi	Dramatic Art	3230	2-2483, 2-1164	owenbob@email.unc.edu	2-6888
Pagano, Joseph	Med./Cancer Ctr./ECFC	7295	6-3036	Joseph_Pagano@med.unc.edu	6-3015
Panter, Abigail	Psychology/ECFC	3270	2-4012	panter@unc.edu	2-2537
Passannante, Tony	Anesthesiology	7010	6-5136	apassann@aims.unc.edu	6-4873
Pfaff, Richard	History/ECFC	3195	2-5544	pfaffrrw@email.unc.edu	2-1403
Plante, Joseph F.	Mathematics	3250	2-1268	plante@math.unc.edu	2-2568
Platin, Rick	Diag.Sci., Dent.	7450	6-2746	eplatin@email.unc.edu	6-0705
Postema, Gerald	Philosophy/ECFC	3125	2-3310	gpostema@email.unc.edu	2-6094
Powell, Christine	Geology	3315	2-0705	cap@geosci.unc.edu	6-4519
Raab-Traub, Nancy	Microbiology	7295	6-1701	nrt@med.unc.edu	2-8103
Rabinowitz, George	Poli Sci/Fac Asmbly	3265	2-0407	rabinowi.ham@mhs.unc.edu	2-0432
Raper, Julius R.	English	3520	2-4014	jrraper@email.unc.edu	2-3520
Rosenfeld, Rachel	Sociology	3210	2-1272	rfeld@email.unc.edu	2-7568
Schaller, Michael	Cell Biol & Anatomy	7090	6-0391	crispy4@med.unc.edu	6-1856
Sekerak, Darlene	Med Allied Health Prof	7135	6-4709	dsekerak@css.unc.edu	6-3678
Shea, Virginia	Physiology	7545	6-1312	vkshea@med.unc.edu	6-6927
Steponaitis, Vincas	Anthropology	3120	2-6574	vin@unc.edu	2-1613
Straughan, Dulcie	Jour & Mass Comm	3365	2-9003	dulcie@email.unc.edu	2-0620
Strauss, Ronald	Dental Ecology/ECFC	7450	6-2788	ron_strauss@unc.edu	6-6761
Taft, Timothy	Orthopaedics	7055	6-3340	ttaft@med.unc.edu	6-6730
Thorp, Holden	Chemistry	3290	2-0276	holden@unc.edu	2-2476
Tysinger, Barbara	HS Library	7585	6-1416	barbara_tysinger@unc.edu	6-1537
Vevea, Jack	Psychology	3270	2-4016	jvevea@email.unc.edu	2-2537
Weiss, Stephen	Comp Sci/ECFC	3175	2-1888	weiss@cs.unc.edu	2-1799
Werner, Francisco	Marine Sci Curr	3300	2-0269	cisco@marine.unc.edu	2-1254
White, Judy	Med. Allied Hlth Sci	7135	6-4709	jwhite@css.unc.edu	6-3678
Williams, Dennis	Pharmacy	7360	2-7122	dennis_williams@unc.edu	2-0644

-DRAFT-

AREAS OF FOCUS IN SERVING UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

Academic Emphases

- First Year Experience
- Advising
- Center for Public Service
- Sonja Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center
- Merit Scholarships (including graduate student support)
- Technology Initiatives
- Promote Pluralism on Campus
- Centers of Excellence
- Undergraduate Research Experiences
- Interdisciplinary Activity

Building Resources

- Government Relations
- Faculty/Staff Support (salaries and benefits, research, laboratories, classrooms, career development)
- Reallocation of Resources
- Capital Campaign

Planning the Future

- Master Plan
- Enrollment Planning (inc. distance learning)
- Horace Williams Tract

Summary of Discussion Groups Results

October 1998 Faculty Council

The Council divided into five groups facilitated by professors Bluestein, Harrison, Levine, Rosenfeld and Vevea. Reconvened, the Council heard and discussed the results; the following main points emerged. (Language from the enrollment planning discussion paper is incorporated into the numbered paragraphs below.)

Note: Quotes are attributed to the group facilitators by the first letters of their surnames.

- (1) We should maintain the **quality**, traditions, and distinctiveness of Carolina degrees and educational experience; maintain and enhance our mission as an outstanding research university; and maintain the excellence and diversity of the student body. There should be no enrollment increases that sacrifice mission and quality.

Each group expressed concern about "maintaining the quality ... of UNC"(R) and of the degrees it offers. There was a consensus that "any enrollment [increase] should keep that principle of quality at the forefront."(H) Overall, there was a "strong emphasis on quality."(B)

This concern extended, not only to maintaining and improving the UNC-CH experience and the intellectual climate on campus, but also to the role the town of Chapel Hill plays in student life. "One thing that attracts people here is the small-town quality and [we should try] ... to preserve that."(R) "We should actually find out [how]... the Franklin Street merchants ... feel, whether they think growth is good or bad and not make assumptions about that."(B)

- (2) Several points were made about preserving or increasing the value of **degrees** earned at UNC-CH, and about the relationships between how many degrees in various programs might be granted and the need for the various kinds of training outside the University.

"We want to go after the top North Carolina students, if we can, and make the degree as or more appealing than it is now."(L)

"We [should] work very hard to see that enrollment [is] based upon our projections to meet needs of the State; for example, [if there is] a need for mathematics teachers at the secondary level ... that would be a targeted program for increased enrollment."(H)

"It is important ... to maintain our commitment to our distinctive mission for graduate and professional education. Several of us felt that that should be done recognizing constraints of the community in terms of educating those folks. An example of that came from the professor from the School of Nursing who said that at this time we really have saturated the area for nurse preceptors to help train nurses. While we would

be very interested in increasing enrollment, [we have] to recognize what the constraints [are] outside of the University in terms of some graduate and professional programs."(H)

Pete Andrews pointed out that, if UNC-CH were to increase enrollment by somewhat less than its proportional "share" of the increase in North Carolina high school graduates "we would expect the [student academic] quality to be increasing just because the selectivity would be increasing." Dick Pfaff pointed out that this would give the University an opportunity to make academic work more rigorous. "Any enrollment increase should result in more demanding undergraduate degrees," he said. "I hope we would make the commitment amongst ourselves to increase the value of our programs."

- (3) There should be no enrollment growth without **commitments of resources in advance** to accommodate it, including additional faculty and academic support.

The view was expressed that there should be "no growth without money"(B) and "no growth without faculty, academic and staff support."(R)

A number of matters were raised about how facilities and related resources would be developed to meet any increase in the size of the student body.

"There's the question about whether the campus monitors property in terms of looking at expanding available sites and the status of the Horace Williams Tract and what things should be moved to there."(B)

"[H]owever we grow we have to do it in a way that maintains the autonomy of central campus through expansion upward rather than outward and perhaps more efficient utilization of the existing facilities rather than, for example, growing into the Horace Williams Tract and losing the cohesiveness of the feel of central campus."(V)

"A [discussion group] consensus is that in order to move ahead with enrollment increases we must absolutely maintain resources with a very special emphasis that library resources also must be counted in for maintaining quality."(L)

But facilities are only part of the picture; needed increases in faculty and staff were also discussed. Concerns were articulated about "the wave effect of having a lot more undergraduates and what effect that will have ultimately on the graduate population, but also on the need to have graduate students teach that group of increased undergraduates. And with more graduate students people felt more strongly about adding support staff as a way of using faculty that we do have more effectively."(B)

Gerald Postema made the point that, while enrollment increases may have the "silver lining" that the University will be in a good position to ask for increases and improvements in infrastructure, "it's harder to see that silver lining when it comes to faculty resources and faculty/student ratios and, if you will, quality in the classroom." He

emphasized the need for the University to work vigorously for these somewhat intangible improvements in order to make the best of accommodating any enrollment increases.

- (4) An issue related to both quality and resources is the extent to which there would be a reliance on **distance learning** to increase enrollments.

"[T]here are ways to reduce costs: distance learning, for example. But it should be under the control of faculty and not mandated from above."(R)

"[We are] concerned about not letting [distance learning] be the driving force."(B)

- (5) Questions arose about possible changes in the **composition of the student body** as a result of enrollment increases.

"[There is] a question about raising [the number of] out-of-state undergraduates to increase quality and diversity and higher tuition, although some would recognize that that also adds just to the total number in addition to the numbers we're currently working on trying to figure out."(B)

"People thought we should keep the graduate and undergraduate ratio the same -- preserve the graduate status, the ratio of graduate students, to maintain our status as a research university."(B)

- (6) There were also questions raised about the **process** by which planning and implementation for any enrollment increases should proceed.

Pete Andrews mentioned the importance of the sequence of events in the development of new resources and enrollment increases. He pointed out that the number of students and the number of dollars involved in all of this is not the only important sort of concern: "One of the other important questions is not only to try to estimate what the costs are but what would a sequence look like."

Fundamental and far-reaching questions about the process were raised. "Is this really the way we should be going about an expansion plan? Each of the 16 campuses is sort of out there fighting for itself whereas, in fact, it's possible to view the State of North Carolina and its impending expansion as a system and take a concern for the system rather than for our particular concerns at Chapel Hill. In that connection we felt that we need to consider very novel ways to deal with statewide expansion. One thing that was mentioned ... was the possibility of expanding cooperation with community colleges. There were mixed feelings about that in the group. [There is] a feeling that we need to take a system-wide point of view and work with the legislature. We're thinking at the statewide level about how to suspend our current assumptions about how education works in the State and possibly looking for a paradigm shift." (V)

ENROLLMENT INCREASE ISSUES

Summary of Discussion Groups Results

October 1998 Faculty Council

The Council divided into five groups facilitated by professors Bluestein, Harrison, Levine, Rosenfeld and Vevea. Reconvened, the Council heard and discussed the results; the following main points emerged. *Note: Quotes are attributed to the group facilitators by the first letters of their surnames.*

- (1) We should maintain the **quality**, traditions, and distinctiveness of Carolina degrees and educational experience; maintain and enhance our mission as an outstanding research university; and maintain the excellence and diversity of the student body. There should be no enrollment increases that sacrifice mission and quality.

Each group expressed concern about "maintaining the quality ... of UNC-CH"(R) and of the degrees it offers. There was a consensus that "any enrollment [increase] should keep that principle of quality at the forefront."(H) Overall, there was a "strong emphasis on quality."(B) This concern extended, not only to maintaining and improving the UNC-CH experience and the intellectual climate on campus, but also to the role the town of Chapel Hill plays in student life. "One thing that attracts people here is the small-town quality and [we should try] ... to preserve that."(R) "We should actually find out [how]... the Franklin Street merchants ... feel, whether they think growth is good or bad and not make assumptions about that."(B)

- (2) Several points were made about preserving or increasing the value of **degrees** earned at UNC-CH, and about the relationships between how many degrees in various programs might be granted and the need for the various kinds of training outside the University.

"We want to go after the top North Carolina students, if we can, and make the degree as or more appealing than it is now."(L)

"We [should] work very hard to see that enrollment [is] based upon our projections to meet needs of the State; for example, [if there is] a need for mathematics teachers at the secondary level ... that would be a targeted program for increased enrollment."(H)

"It is important ... to maintain our commitment to our distinctive mission for graduate and professional education. Several of us felt that that should be done recognizing constraints of the community in terms of educating those folks. An example of that came from the professor from the School of Nursing who said that at this time we really have saturated the area for nurse preceptors to help train nurses. While we would be very interested in increasing enrollment, [we have] to recognize what the constraints [are] outside of the University in terms of some graduate and professional programs."(H)

Pete Andrews pointed out that, if UNC-CH were to increase enrollment by somewhat less than its proportional "share" of the increase in North Carolina high school graduates "we would expect the [student academic] quality to be increasing just because the selectivity would be increasing." Dick Pfaff pointed out that this would give the University an opportunity to make academic work more rigorous. "Any enrollment increase should result in more demanding undergraduate degrees," he said. "I hope we would make the commitment amongst ourselves to increase the value of our programs."

- (3) There should be no enrollment growth without **commitments of resources in advance** to accommodate it, including additional faculty and academic support.

The view was expressed that there should be "no growth without money"(B) and "no growth without faculty, academic and staff support."(R)

A number of matters were raised about how facilities and related resources would be developed to meet any increase in the size of the student body.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL October 9, 1998, 3:00 P.M.

Attendance

Present (62): Angel, Bandiwala, Bender, Bluestein, Bowen, Carl, Clegg, Cordeiro-Stone, Covach, Cravey, Dalton, Daye, Debreczeny, Eckel, Foshee, Gasaway, Graves, Grossberg, Harrison, Haskill, Hattem, Holmgren, Huang, Hyatt, Johnson, Kaufman, Kjervik, LeFebvre, Lentz, Levine, Lord, Lubker, Ludlow, Madison, Maffly-Kipp, McKeown, Meehan-Black, Melchert, Molina, Moreau, Newton, Nord, Owen, Panter, Pfaff, Plante, Postema, Powell, Rabinowitz, Raper, Rosenfeld, Schaller, Sekerak, Shea, Straughan, Strauss, Taft, Thorp, Tysinger, Vevea, Weiss, White.

Excused absences (23): Adler, Blackburn, Bolas, Collins, Devellis, Daye, Elvers, Estroff, Fishman, Fox, Graham, Hooper, Jackson, Margolis, Marshall, Mill, Pagano, Passannante, Platin, Raab-Traub, Steponaitis, Werner, Williams.

Unexcused absences (2): Black, Favorov.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Hooker praised the search committee whose work led to the choice of Derek K. Poarch as our new chief of police. The search was thorough, professional, and extensive. Prof. Estroff did a "phenomenal job" in chairing the effort. The chancellor then introduced Chief Poarch who said that he is "deeply committed to the philosophy of community-oriented policing," an approach to police work that emphasizes customer service, problem solving, and partnerships.

The chancellor had little to report about the status of the state budget negotiations beyond what has been reported in the press. He expressed special thanks to Senator Howard Lee who has been "a great stalwart in defending this campus" as well as higher education generally. He is pleased to report that President Broad will be making faculty salary increases her first priority for the 1999 legislative session. The president is asking for a 6% increase in each year of the 1999-2000 biennium.

The chancellor reported that Prof. Julia Wood (Communication Studies) has been named this year's CASE and Carnegie Professor of the Year for North Carolina. One of our faculty has received this distinction in three of the last four years.

Chancellor Hooker reviewed in detail a draft document entitled "Areas of Focus in Serving University Priorities." The document was developed by the chancellor's cabinet at a one-day retreat held in July. [The document will be found on the Faculty Governance web site.] He regretted that the full agenda did not allow time for in-depth discussion of the document, but he invited comments via e-mail, telephone, or letter.

Prof. Jack Sasson (Religious Studies) asked whether priority is being given to finding a gathering place for faculty. The chancellor replied that plans are being set in motion to include a faculty lounge in the renovation of the YMCA Building.

Proposal to Establish an M.A. Degree Program in Russian/East European Studies

Prof. Laura Janda (Slavic Languages and Literature) presented on behalf of the Graduate School a proposal to establish an M.A. program in Russian /East European Studies. She said that this will be the first degree in the nation to facilitate the combination of language and area studies with scientific, technological, and professional training. It will prepare students for careers that address such issues as chemical, biological and nuclear weapons; international terrorism; economic development and international business ventures; environmental degradation and international public health; transnational utilization of internet technologies; inter-ethnic strife; and diversity in cultural awareness.

Prof. Timothy Taft (Orthopedics) noted that the proposal apparently depends on obtaining a \$450,000 grant, and asked what happens if the grant does not materialize? Prof. Janda said that she is working on other funding sources, and that it is possible that the program could be offered for less than the full requested amount. However, if sufficient funding is not obtained, the proposal will not succeed.

Prof. Marila Cordeiro-Stone (Pathology) asked about compensating the History Department for participating in the program. Is there a precedent for that kind of payment? Prof. Janda did not know about precedent, but she said that the payment to the department is in return for a commitment to offer a particular course every Fall rather than every other year as is now the case.

office. Prof. Tony Molina (Dentistry) asked whether other institutions in the UNC System, such as NC State, could be asked to share in the cost. Prof. Peet said that his committee thinks there is more than enough work on this campus to justify the new position.

Resolution 98-11 was adopted unanimously as presented.

Discussion of Issues Under Consideration by the Task Force on Enrollment Planning

Provost Richard Richardson summarized the background leading to establishment of the task force and the current state of its deliberations. General Administration is projecting an increase of 44,750 in enrollment throughout the System over the next ten years and has asked each institution in the System to indicate what portion of that increase it is prepared to absorb. Chancellor Hooker established the task force to make recommendations as to our response. The task force is addressing four questions: (1) by how much should this campus grow and over what time period, (2) how should growth be distributed among undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, (3) what guiding principles should be followed, and (4) what is the projected cost. UNC-CH now enrolls 15.43% of the System total. If we continue to take that share of the total, we would add between 5,000 and 6,000 students over the next decade. This is often characterized as the "fair share" approach. On the other hand, a projection based on interviews with the deans totaled about 3,000. Of those, 2,000 would be graduate and professional students. This would enable us to absorb only about 5% of the projected increase in undergraduate students. Chancellor Hooker has asked the task force to consider what the political implications of that strategy might be. Would we be disadvantaged by becoming the third or fourth largest institution in the System, perhaps trailing UNC-Charlotte and East Carolina, rather than ranking second in size after NC State? Would reducing the percentage of North Carolina undergraduates that we enroll put us at more of a disadvantage in competing for funds in the General Assembly?

Provost Richardson thought the most basic guiding principle in this matter is that growth should be tied to receiving the necessary resources as the growth occurs, not afterwards as has been the case in the past. A second important principle, in the view of many members of the task force, is that we should maintain the quality of our student body. Jerry Lucido, director of admissions, advises that we could accept another 200 students each year from our current applicant pool without changing the average SAT of entering freshmen. There is no reason to assume that the projected growth would be in disproportionately less qualified students. The provost thinks, however, that we could actually improve the quality of our student body if we were to improve our track record in attracting the top students graduating from North Carolina high schools. To recruit more of the most outstanding North Carolina high school graduates, we need to provide more merit scholarships, even if they are essentially symbolic. Also, we could usefully involve faculty in our recruitment efforts. If we can focus our attention on the top of the potential applicant pool, an overall increase in undergraduate enrollment could be beneficial for this campus.

The cost of any major increase in enrollment will be great. At the moment, our best guess is that we would need at least \$12.6 million in the College and \$23 million in the professional schools for new faculty hires alone. We will also need more residence halls, more classroom and laboratory space, more staff, and generally more infrastructure. The task force is now hard at work trying to estimate the total tab.

Prof. George Rabinowitz (Political Science) asked whether the projection of a major increase in graduate and professional students takes the job market into account. The provost replied that the deans have had this consideration foremost in their minds in developing their projections.

The Faculty Council then broke up into five small groups to discuss principles that should guide enrollment growth. A member of the Agenda Committee acted as facilitator and reporter for each group. Upon the conclusion of the small group discussions, the Council reconvened to hear a report from each group.

There was consensus that any enrollment should keep the principle of quality at the forefront. This concern extended not only to maintaining and improving the UNC-CH experience and the intellectual climate on campus, but also to the role the Chapel Hill-Carrboro community plays in student life. There was also strong agreement that there should be no enrollment growth without commitments of resources in advance to accommodate it, including additional faculty and academic support.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty