



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

March 23rd, 2001 at 3:00 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA

Type	Time	Item
	3:00	<i>Call to Order by the Chancellor.</i>
DISC	3:00	Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time. Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments on any topic.
DISC	3:20	Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty. Professor Sue Estroff.
INFO	3:35	Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council.
INFO	3:50	Annual Report of the Administrative Board of the Library.
INFO	4:00	Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee.
ACT	4:15	Resolution 2001-2 Calling for Funding of the New Survey for the Student Evaluation of Teaching.
INFO	4:20	Remarks by GPSF President-Elect Milkisha Brown.
DISC	4:30	Discussion of Unionization, Living Wage & Other Graduate Student Issues.
DISC	4:45	Topics Raised by Council Members.
ACT	5:00	<i>Adjourn.</i>

KEY:

ACT = Action

DISC = Discussion

INFO = Information

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Documents pertaining to meetings of the Faculty Council can be found at www.unc.edu/faculty/facount/.

March 23rd, 2001

Executive Committee of the Faculty Council

(Elected by Faculty Council)

Annual Report to the Faculty Council

Members: Robert Adler (Business, '02); Thomas Clegg (Physics & Astronomy, '02); Marlia Cordeiro-Stone (Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, '01); Charles Daye (Law, '01); Noelle Granger (Cell Biology & Anatomy, '03); Donna LeFebvre (Political Science, '03); Abigail Panter (Psychology, '03); Richard Pfaff (History, '03); Nancy Raab-Traub (Microbiology, '02); Ronald Strauss (Dentistry, '01); Stephen Weiss (Computer Science, '01); Gilbert White (Medicine, '01).

Ex Officio: Sue Estroff (Chair of the Faculty); Joseph Ferrell (Secretary of the Faculty).

Meetings: The ECFC met twice monthly throughout the year. The Chancellor, the Provost, and other administrators have attended many of the meetings. Other guests have included student representatives, and the Mayor of Chapel Hill and a fellow Town Council member. The ECFC also had regular dinner discussions with Chancellor Moeser.

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

Activities This Year: The ECFC this year has devoted continuing attention to several major issues and initiatives, and has also advised the University administration on faculty concerns with respect to other matters, including those noted below under the three main categories of the Proposed Long-Term Agenda.

The Academy

- Review process for deans and other administrators
- Review of the tenure and promotion process
- Student evaluation of teaching
- Student Honor Court system
- Commencement ceremonies

The Workplace

- Impact of construction on campus
- ASG Campus Master Plan
- Horace Williams grounds
- Transportation issues
- Benefits issues

Community and Diversity in our Social Community

- Report of the Chancellor's Minority Affairs Review Committee
- Proposals for a LGBT center at the University
- BCC Director Search and BCC development

February 28, 2001

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS LIBRARY

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE LIBRARY

(Elected by the General Faculty)

2000-2001 ANNUAL REPORT

MEMBERS: John Hammond, Chair (1998/9-2000/1); Anne MacKay Coble (2000/1-2002/3); Alice Cotten (1998/9-2000/1); Beth C. Holmgren (2000/1-2002/3); William M. Kier (1998/9-2000/1); James L. Leloudis (1998/9-2000/1); Gregory B. Newby (1999/00-2001/2); Roberta A. Owen (1999/00-2001/2); Karl E. Petersen (2000/1-2002/3); Richard W. Pfaff (2000/1-2002/3); Lillie L. Searies (1999/00-2001/2); James Seay (1999/00-2001/2); Thomas A. Stumpf (1998/9-2000/1); Brent W. Wissick (1998/9-2000/1); *Graduate Student representatives:* Paul Delamar (2000/01), Lora Holland (2000/01); *Undergraduate Student representative:* Antoinette Grier (2000/01); *Ex officio:* Linda Dykstra, Robert Shelton, Joe A. Hewitt

MEMBERS LEAVING DURING PAST YEAR: Howard E. Aldrich, Chair (1997/8-1999/00); Lucia Binotti (1997/98-1999/00); Louise A. Dolan (1997/8-1999/00); Dorothy Verkerk (1997/8-1999/00)

NUMBER OF ANNUAL MEETINGS: Four

REPORT PREPARED BY: John Hammond and Joe A. Hewitt

Reviewed by Board.

CHARGE: Shall advise the University Librarian on the administration of the University library system; formulate, together with the University Librarian, the basic policies governing the acquisition of library materials and the use of such materials; allocate, with the advice of the University Librarian, the book funds which are not specifically designated; submit to the Chancellor, through the University Librarian, its advice on the establishment or discontinuance of library service units outside of the general library building; review the University Librarian's budget request; and report annually to the Faculty Council.

Overview of Activities

The failure of library materials budgets to keep pace with the growth of electronic resources and with rising prices for journals and other print materials increasingly threatens the Library's ability to acquire the broad and deep research collections that support scholarship. In 2000/01, the Library is again relying on substantial one-time funding to supplement insufficient recurring allocations. Even as materials allocations present a growing challenge, the Library made a substantial investment in its services. With the restoration of funding for the Undergraduate Library renovation through the Higher Education Bond Referendum, the Undergraduate Library closed at the end of the fall term and its collections, services, and personnel were successfully relocated to Davis and Wilson libraries. The Library has instituted additional security measures in Davis Library in light of the extended hours and larger number of users. The Library also created and filled the new position of Coordinator for Instructional Services to expand the Library's instructional programs and to implement innovative services. By reallocating positions

internally and redefining several vacancies, the Library was better able to deploy its human resources to meet changing demands and emerging needs. Low librarian salaries continue to make recruitment of skilled staff difficult, despite last year's welcome tuition-based salary increases. The Library realized an extremely successful year in terms of development, and benefited from the Lockwood-Greene campus wiring project sponsored by ATN.

Ranking

Last year's rankings from the Association of Research Libraries showed a slight decline in the Library's position in 1998/99 from 17th to 18th place among ARL's 111 member libraries. The 1999/00 index is not yet available, but preliminary data suggest that the Library will maintain its standing in at least several of the five component categories (Volumes Held, Gross Volumes Added, Current Serials Subscriptions, Total Library Expenditures, and Total Professional and Support Staff) used to derive the overall ranking. However, total expenditures, which are more heavily weighted in the indexing process, declined by 2.3% from 1998/99.

Although not worrisome by itself, the 1998/99 drop on the ARL index could be problematic if permitted to continue as a trend. Reductions in the materials budget would certainly have a negative impact on UNC-CH's standings and, more importantly, on the Library's ability to support the students, scholars, and researchers who rely on our historically strong collections.

Materials Budget

In terms of overall budget, the Library held its own in 2000/01 following a year marked by substantial cuts. The outlook, particularly for the accession of library materials, nevertheless remains precarious. In recent years, the number of volumes purchased by campus libraries has fluctuated, based largely on the availability of one-time funds:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Vols. Purchased</u>
1995	63,414
1996	63,560
1997	73,030
1998	60,746
1999	70,029
2000	60,744

Non-recurring funding is again playing a critical role in 2000-01. State continuing appropriations for the year represent an increase of \$293,508 (or 5.6%) over the previous year for the Academic Affairs Library. This is a permanent increase based on enrollment change and the permanent allocation of 1999/00 reversion funds to the materials budget. At the same time, the Library is relying on one-time funding of \$718,217 from a variety of sources in order to maintain the mid-90s accession rate of approximately 63,000-64,000 volumes. This level allows the Library to acquire serials and monographs which meet the highest priority teaching and research needs. It does not allow in many cases for the purchase of deep research collections to support both existing and emerging programs beyond the core level. Continuing increases in scholarly communication costs coupled with the growing cost of access to information in electronic format, both described below, threaten the Library's long-term ability to build the collections which distinguish a top-ranked research university.

The Library now spends more than \$1.5 million annually to license access to electronic resources. This represents an important value-added service to students and faculty, who are able to take advantage of powerful search engines and who now have the ability to access selected research materials at any time from locations outside the library, including the home, office, and lab. However, these information resources require substantial added investment and present a serious threat to print collections. In only a few cases have electronic publications actually supplanted their print counterparts, and in nearly all instances, electronic versions involve significant add-on costs to the price of print subscriptions. This increase in price has long been the rule with indexes, abstracts, and serials. As online monographs make their appearance, we expect them to become an added cost center as well.

The Library is further hampered in its ability to purchase materials by a continuation budget that no longer includes an inflationary increase. This is especially problematic given the skyrocketing cost of certain journals, especially those in the sciences, as detailed in last year's Board report. The departmental science libraries, the Health Sciences Library, and the Law Library have been especially hard hit in this regard, with certain titles increasing in price by 80% or more in just a few years. In light of this continuing inflation, the projected state budget shortfalls for the upcoming year are a cause of particular concern.

Services to undergraduates

Passage of the Higher Education Bond Referendum in November, 2000, enabled the Academic Affairs Library to proceed with the renovation of the Robert B. House Undergraduate Library. The comprehensive renovation will create a state-of-the-art teaching library designed to support student learning and to prepare undergraduates for today's information-rich academic and work environment. House Library closed at the end of the Fall semester and its collections, personnel, and services were successfully relocated to Davis and Wilson libraries following a detailed transition plan. Construction in the House facility is expected to begin this spring and to last approximately eighteen months. Davis Library has taken on the Undergrad's normal 24-hour operating schedule for the duration of the renovation period. In light of the extended hours and increased traffic, the Library implemented new security measures in Davis, including stationing a guard at the front desk, with a second guard roaming the stacks in evening hours. Closed-circuit television monitors have been placed at the front and rear entrances, and emergency intercoms with a direct connection to the Circulation Desk are being installed at two locations on every stack level.

In September, the Library welcomed Lisa Stimatz as Coordinator of Instructional Services to support the Library's mission to teach users to find, evaluate, and interpret information and to assist users in the development of lifelong learning skills. Among the Coordinator's initial activities was a review of current instructional programming, the implementation of a training program for library instructors, and the expansion of instructional services to previously underserved constituencies, including international and transfer students. In response to growing concern over students' inability to access library resources, the Coordinator is overseeing the development of a Web-based tutorial and course-related information literacy modules, and an expanded program of instruction for first-year students.

Internal Reorganization

The Library redefined several positions and reallocated vacancies in order to improve and enhance services. Reallocated positions have come principally from the Cataloging Department, where new technologies, streamlined procedures, and increased use of vendor services have resulted in considerable efficiencies, including the elimination of nearly the entire cataloging backlog. Among the changes being implemented are the following:

- Three administrative positions have been redefined and the incumbents promoted in recognition of increased management responsibilities. The Senior Associate University Librarian is now the Deputy University Librarian; the Library Personnel Officer is now the Director of Library Personnel; and the Library's Head of Fiscal Services and Facilities is now the Director of Financial Planning and Administrative Services.
- Two positions were redefined following retirements in 2000 and recruitment is underway. The position of University Bibliographer and Head of Collection Development is now the Assistant University Librarian for Collections and Resource Services, with greater administrative, budgetary, and leadership responsibility. The position of Associate University Librarian for Special Collections and Planning has been converted to Director of Library Digital Publishing, assuming management of the Library's *Documenting the American South* digitization project and responsibility for developing related initiatives.
- To strengthen its Web presence, the Library is recruiting for the new position of Web Development Coordinator. Two vacant positions have been reallocated to a Web Design Group reporting to the Coordinator, and several existing positions will be assigned half-time.
- Recruitment is underway for librarians to head the library of the School of Information and Library Science and the Music Library, and for a new Instructional Projects Librarian who will report to the Coordinator for Instructional Services. Planning for a new librarian position with responsibility for Geographic Information Systems is underway.

Development

The Library closed FY 2000 with more than \$3.3 million in gifts, its second-highest year ever and the fourth largest total among the schools and fund-raising units on campus. This total includes several planned gifts, including one from Cedio and Melba Remig Saltarelli, Class of 1957, which is of a size to name the rare book exhibit area in Wilson Library the Melba Remig Saltarelli Exhibit Room. The House Library campaign added substantially to the total dollars raised. Members of the Friends of the Library Board in particular made significant commitments.

Planning for the Library's ambitious \$35 million goal in the upcoming campaign was a major activity for the development program. Peggy Myers joined the Library as Associate Director of Fundraising on January 2, 2001, and will concentrate on major gifts. A donor relations coordinator is also being added to manage stewardship of the Library's 136 named funds. This personalized attention is critical to attracting repeat giving.

Friends of the Library programs included the spring book sale, various talks by campus and off-campus speakers, and the 68th annual Friends of the Library meeting at which novelist Gail Godwin, Class of 1959, spoke. Friends membership remains at about 2,000 donors, although we hope with effort to increase the number of members this year.

North Carolina Literary Festival

Following the successful 1998 North Carolina Literary Festival, sponsored by the Center for the Study of the American South, the Library and the Friends of the Library agreed with the libraries and friends groups at North Carolina State and Duke universities to collaboratively produce this event on a regular basis. The festival will rotate among the campuses, with the first to be held at UNC-CH on April 5 and 6, 2002. The festival's broad goals are to encourage reading and writing among North Carolinians and to spotlight the literature produced in and about the state through readings, discussions, signings, workshops, performances, and exhibits, as well as through a virtual festival conducted online. The Library hired Caroline Martens as North Carolina Literary Festival Director in January; she will oversee all aspects of the 2002 festival.

Computer Networking and Infrastructure

During 2000/01, construction began in Davis Library as part of the ATN-sponsored Lockwood-Greene project. This initiative is intended to rewire the campus for current data communications standards and will accommodate growth in connectivity and bandwidth for the next decade. The Davis Library phase, when completed by August, 2001, will provide for the replacement of all existing network connections in Davis, and for many new connections in faculty and graduate student carrels, group study rooms, and open seating spaces in the library. Over 2,300 network connections will be available in Davis as a result, and future networking will require far less investment in infrastructure.

Phillips Hall was also included in this phase of the project, resulting in a significant upgrade in network connectivity for the Brauer Math/Physics library. Other Academic Affairs libraries that have benefited from earlier phases of the construction include the Kenan Chemistry Library, the Music Library, the Geological Sciences Library, and the Biology Library (Botany and Zoology Sections). The next phase of the project will include Wilson Library; planning should begin in fall, 2001, and construction within two years.

The Library has also been a leading participant in pilot projects for the implementation of wireless technology on campus. Wireless connections are now available in Davis Library in the Taylor Reading Room of the Reference Department, in the Class of 1991 Study Area on the second floor, and in the seventh- and eighth-floor stack levels. Wireless network cards for laptop computers are available for checkout from the Circulation Desk. In Wilson Library, wireless connections can be made in the Reading Room of the Rare Book Collection; wireless cards for checkout to students will be available there soon. The Undergraduate Library, before its closing, also had wireless connections which served not only the Library, but also helped to provide connectivity in the Pit and at the Daily Grind. Since the closing of House Library, these areas are being served by transmitters located in the Student Stores and Lenoir Hall.

Campus planning

The Library and the Library Administrative Board, along with many others, continue to monitor campus planning proposals with great interest. During the year, it was decided that plans for the renovation of the Health Sciences Library, included in the November bond package, would go forward as planned. The University will also soon begin advance planning for a combined biological and health sciences library as part of a new science complex. Construction of a Digital

Multimedia Instructional Center was approved as part of the bond referendum; this facility will include a new Music Library

Board Activities

In addition to advising the Library on operations and issues affecting faculty, the Administrative Board of the Library provided its approval in September, as outlined in the Faculty Code of Governance, for the Library's state-allocated collections budget. The Collections Committee also reviewed and prioritized research fund requests, and the Board, acting on behalf of the Collections Committee, approved the expenditure of \$8,500 from the Pogue fund for the purchase of a collection containing letters and documents by and about poet Carl Sandburg. The Board is preparing to review a report, now being written by the Library, on the status of the departmental libraries. In many cases, the agreement between the Library and individual departments is poorly understood or appears to be inequitably administered. In addition, developments such as the emphasis on interdisciplinary studies and the growing availability of electronic resources may call for re-examination of the basic arrangement under which the Academic Affairs Library supplies the collections budget, staff, and technical processing for departmental libraries, while the departments provide space, movable equipment and furniture, and operating supplies.

Librarians' Salaries

Salaries of librarians at UNC-CH improved slightly in 2000/01 with the addition of funding for librarian raises. Below are salary and rank comparisons with other ARL libraries for Beginning, Median, and Average salaries in 1999/00 and 2000/01. Statistics for specific peer and counterpart institutions in 2000/01 have not yet been released.

	1999/00		2000/01	
	Rank	Salary	Rank	Salary
Beginning	65th	\$30,000	41st	\$33,000
Median	85th	\$42,050	74th	\$46,000
Average	80th	\$44,869	73rd	\$48,631

The Library experienced a 30% loss of funding from positions vacated by retiring librarians in 1999/00. In addition, replacing those librarians proved expensive; many of these positions require subject specializations, management skills, instructional expertise, and technological competencies unheard of a decade ago. Since Library salaries compared so poorly in national rankings, it was decided not to list salary minimums in vacancy announcements in 1999/00. As a result, applicant pools are smaller and we are increasingly concerned about recruitment, realizing that we regularly compete with other colleges and universities at the national level in order to attract and retain skilled librarians. Three librarian vacancies were advertised after the first round did not yield successful candidates. The Library has resumed listing minimum salaries in vacancy announcements and hopes that this may yield different results, especially since rankings are somewhat improved.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTIONS BY FACULTY COUNCIL: None

February 23, 2001
Educational Policy Committee
Annual Report

Committee Members: Douglas J. Crawford-Brown (Chair), 2001; Melissa M. Bullard, 2003; Edward Carlstein, 2002; Jean S. DeSaix, 2001; Shannon Ghadiri, 2001; Randall Hendrick, 2002; George W. Houston, 2003; David C. Lanier (ex officio); Catherine A. Lutz, 2001; Bobbi Owen, 2003; Heidi Schultz, 2002

Meeting Dates: February 7; March 7; April 4

Report prepared by: Douglas Crawford-Brown (chair) from materials prepared by Committee members.

Charge to the Committee: "The committee is concerned with those matters of educational policy and its implementation which have significant impact upon graduate and undergraduate instruction within the Division of Academic Affairs, and as to which the Faculty Council possesses legislative powers by delegation from the General Faculty under Article II of the Code. The committee's function is advisory to the Faculty Council in respect of such matters."

During this past year, the Educational Policy Committee (the EPC) considered several issues remaining from the previous year, as well as several new issues. Each of these is discussed below.

Issue #1: Grading Policies

This issue remained from the previous year. It concerns the practice of grading at UNC-CH, whether this practice currently conforms to stated guidelines, and whether grades have been rising inappropriately over the past several decades. The EPC prepared a report on this issue last year and sent it to the Faculty Council (to view the report, see www.unc.edu/~drawfor/edupolicy.htm). In response, the Faculty Council appointed a Grading Standards Committee to further review the issue. The EPC is represented on the Grading Standards Committee by Douglas Crawford-Brown, and no further action was taken by the EPC on this issue.

Recommendation: Since the Grading Standards Committee report clearly will have implications for aspects of campus life falling under the charge to the EPC, we expect to review their report and offer comments next academic year.

Issue #2: Length of the Academic Year

This issue remained from the previous year. It concerns the length of the academic year at UNC-CH in relation to the length at peer campuses. The EPC prepared a report on this issue last year and sent it to the Faculty Council (to view the report, see www.unc.edu/~drawfor/edupolicy.htm). It included a recommendation that the length

of the academic year be shortened by the General Administration to remove problems associated with lack of coordination with peer institutions, adverse effects on summer research, etc. This recommendation was forwarded by the Chancellor's Office to the GA, with inclusion of a memo by Boone Turchi (the then-chair of the EPC).

A response was received from Gretchen Bataille, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, on May 26, 2000. In her memo, she pointed out that there is large variation in academic length across peer institutions (which she takes to be public universities) and, therefore, no "standard practice" to which the UNC-CH campus could point. She indicated that her office remains committed to helping on this issue. At the same time, it seems clear that this help is tempered by a need for UNC-CH to conform to requirements placed on the UNC system through the GA, and the further need to coordinate changes across more than a single campus if these are desired by those campuses (i.e. perhaps across the entire system, or at least across the research universities).

The EPC considered this issue further and has determined that it remains sufficiently troubling to warrant additional action by the Faculty and Administration. An additional recommendation was prepared as follows:

The Issue. In July of 1996, C.D. Spangler, Jr., then President of the University of North Carolina, recommended to the Board of Governors that the University adopt a calendar that would provide a "minimum of 75 class days per semester, excluding final examinations, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays." This represented an increase of five class days per semester over the calendar then in place. President Spangler's recommendation was adopted by the Board of Governors at their July 12, 1996, meeting and became effective in AY 1997-1998. We have now had five years of experience with the lengthened calendar. The Educational Policy Committee, along with other groups on campus, is interested in the calendar because it has an impact upon the educational experience of our students in a number of ways. Several groups have pointed out tensions created by the policy. The Committee reviewed the reports of these groups and, without repeating them in detail, would note the following.

Effects of the Policy

- The need to return in mid-August has decreased the number of options in internships, summer work, and summer educational experiences open to our undergraduates. We do not believe that students have been completely excluded from such experiences, but it is clear that they have fewer options. Some students have missed days of instruction at the beginning of the fall semester while they complete internships, rotations, or jobs.
- The 150-day calendar, when combined with the Summer School schedule, leaves very short periods of time between the end of Summer School and the opening of the school year, and also between the end of fall semester examinations and the opening of the spring semester. This has a number of undesirable consequences. The Registrar's office cannot process grades in the time between fall and spring semesters rapidly enough to inform students who are academically ineligible before they begin

classes in the spring. The period for final examinations must be reduced to six exam days, meaning that students have less time to read, reflect, and learn. There is less time for orientation and training sessions before semesters begin, and some such programs have been shortened. Housekeeping finds it difficult to carry out needed maintenance.

- The summer is the best and only concentrated time for our faculty to revise their courses and learn new teaching techniques, including those pertaining to instructional technology. The 150-day policy cuts into this time and may have an adverse effect upon the quality of undergraduate instruction.
- The summer is also the best time for students and faculty to carry out research. Ultimately, the reputation of the University, and the quality of the students' educational experience, rests upon the quality (and quantity) of its students' and faculty's research, and it is quite clear that, over time, both will suffer as a result of the extended academic year.
- Our calendar does not correspond to that of Duke, thus discouraging inter-institutional collaboration and cross-registrations.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends:

1. That the Faculty, through its elected officers and through the Faculty Council, continue to urge the Administration of the University to return to our traditional 140-day academic calendar. Such a calendar is currently in use at most of our peer institutions across the country; none, so far as we know, has a 150-day calendar or longer. Some have calendars of fewer than 140 days. The data on this issue are displayed in the original EPC report (to view the report, see www.unc.edu/~dcrawfor/educpolicy.htm).
2. That the officers of the Faculty Council put this matter before the University-wide Faculty Assembly, and lead an effort by the Assembly to change the 150-day policy. It is our belief that other institutions within the University system will share our concerns about the adverse effect of the policy upon the educational experience of our students.

As can be seen in the above recommendations, the EPC considers this issue of sufficient importance to the academic mission of UNC-CH to warrant further action by the Faculty Council. We considered first the possibility that UNC-CH could live within the letter of the rule (150 days of instruction), while finding a creative way to work within this limit and still meet all of our other goals. This proved infeasible since the campus already makes maximal use of the flexibility allowed. The sole remedy, then, is to lower the requirement from 150 days back to the traditional 140 days. While the letter from Gretchen Bataille is a fair statement of her position and that of the General Administration, it does not state categorically that changes are impossible, and in fact offers hope that her office can assist in such changes if there is sufficient support within the UNC system and a compelling argument can be made that the 150-day calendar is detrimental to the educational mission.

Issue #3: Double Minors

This issue remained from the previous year. It concerns the awarding of a double minor for those undergraduates completing the requirements for both minors. The issue was reviewed by the Administrative Board of the College in March and April of 2000 and concluded that no compelling reason had been provided to approve such a change (i.e. a change to awarding both minors). They noted that it would complicate advising, would not necessarily assist the student in gaining employment or entry into graduate school, and that a better option would be for interested students to obtain a double major (allowing more in-depth study of disciplines). The EPC also noted the possibility that time to graduation could be increased.

At the same time, there will be cases of students who have completed all of the requirements for a second minor. When this happens, it may be unfair to restrict awarding of the second minor. It also was noted that, in some cases, it might be preferable for a student to focus studies in a second minor rather than spreading themselves across a number of electives. A counter argument is that such elective courses are necessary for broadening the perspective of a student, and is an essential part of a liberal arts education.

Recommendation: In the end, the EPC did not find a compelling reason to push for the awarding of a double minor. The established procedure is that such matters are considered first by the Administrative Board and their recommendations sent to the Faculty Council (and presumably the EPC) for review and comment. The Administrative Board has not issued any firm statement to date, and to the extent “no firm statement” is equated with denial of the policy change we see no reason to overrule that denial. The EPC stands ready, however, to review the issue in more detail if the Administrative Board issues a final policy statement.

Issue #4: Student Stipends and Wages

This issue concerns the salary of teaching assistants at UNC-CH. It stems from an ongoing concern by teaching assistants that salaries are too low to support them without finding outside employment or taking on large loans. The issue was highlighted by a report sent to the EPC by the Association of Graduate English Students (to view the report, see www.unc.edu/~drawfor/educpolicy.htm). In that report, they detail the difficulties faced by TAs receiving \$4,100 per section (before taxes), and with a limit of three sections per academic year. They detail the costs of living in Chapel Hill, and note a difference between costs and wages of several thousand dollars per year. They conclude by recommending the stipend be raised to \$5,000 per section.

The EPC considered this report in conjunction with a larger discussion of living wages for TAs on campus. We note that low wages are common in many departments, and that there also is great variation in wages (particularly between TAs and RAs). We also note that TAs who are forced through circumstances to take an additional outside job to meet

living expenses not only suffer in completing their own thesis research, but may have less time and energy to devote to their tasks of teaching undergraduates. When combined with the very modest assistance provided to graduate students in the form of tuition remissions, it seems clear that the University must reconsider the package of financial awards we provide to TAs, particularly in departments (such as English) where these TAs carry a large burden of the teaching responsibilities. Fortunately, such revisions already have been undertaken by the College, and should bring the stipends in line with student needs within 2 years.

Recommendation: If the revisions to stipends currently approved by the College are inadequate, the Faculty Council should call for a review of the financial system (including salaries, tuition costs and remissions) as it relates to graduate TAs. The EPC might serve in some capacity in that review (e.g. considering the impact of wages on teaching quality and progress towards degree), but the issue also involves aspects of fairness, budgets, etc, that go beyond the charge to the EPC. It should be noted, however, that the current revisions, once they go into effect, should remove this issue and so there may be no need for further consideration by either the EPC or the Faculty Council.

Issue #5: Decision Processes on Campus

This issue remained from the previous year. It concerns the ways in which decisions that affect educational practice are made on campus, and the relative power of faculty to control these changes. The EPC raised the issue last year, and began a report. The final report became available this year (to view the report, see www.unc.edu/~drawfor/educpolicy.htm). It reviews three historical instances of significant change: the demise of the Department of RTVMP, the creation of the Carolina Computing Initiative (including the requirement of laptops for entering first-year students), and the creation of the Carolina Environmental Program.

The EPC feels this is a significant issue given what appear to be currents in educational reform on campus and throughout the nation. These currents include development of more interdisciplinary degree programs, greater reliance on the internet (e.g. web-based courses), greater use of technologies in the classroom, increased focus on student research, an increased role of study abroad and other experiential forms of learning, etc. While many of these reforms may ultimately be beneficial to education, they are in many cases introduced into the University community from the outside and represent a changing relationship between the University and communities such as the business world and funding sources. It is important that faculty review these changes periodically and determine if they meet our vision of the best educational process.

The previous EPC report detailed the three historical instances noted above and concluded that, in all three cases, there was a mixture of input from Administration and Faculty. This mixture seems appropriate in these past instances, although it also is clear to the EPC that it has been evolving. The EPC received comments from past Chairs of the Faculty indicating that the role of the Faculty had not been significantly eroded in the

recent past, and may even have improved. These pieces of information seem to suggest that the role of the Faculty in significant educational decisions has been strong in the past.

Still, the landscape has been changing rapidly over the past several years. The College, for example, is stressing interdisciplinary study, inter-departmental hires, study abroad, student research, student internships, etc. It is time for a review by the Faculty of all of these changes, and so the following recommendation is made:

Recommendation: The EPC, acting on behalf of the Faculty Council, should conduct next year a full review of the changes in educational practice at the University, including the mode of teaching, policies on majors and minors, interactions of the University with outside organizations, etc. The EPC should prepare a report on these changes and how they affect the quality of education on campus. The report should propose any necessary revisions in decision processes to ensure that faculty have primary control over the educational process, and should propose any necessary revisions in University policies to ensure these policies meet Faculty standards of educational practice.

Issue #6: Curricular Revisions

The University is conducting a review of the existing General College curriculum, and has appointed a committee to perform the review and recommend changes if needed. That committee has issued a “Statement of the Goals of Undergraduate Environmental Education at UNC-CH” which will serve as the foundation upon which they will “proceed to design a structure, and a specific set of requirements”. This issue is of direct importance to the EPC, and so a member of the EPC (Bobbi Owens) is serving as liaison to the review committee. The Curriculum Committee is rather new, and so there is nothing to report on from the EPC at present. Still, the EPC will discuss the issue in the remaining meetings of this academic year.

Recommendation: The EPC should review, in the next academic year, the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee. This review should have two parts: one focused on the specific recommendations for reform and their conformance with educational policy, and one focused on the process of reform. The latter issue should be part of the report on decision processes mentioned in Issue # 5 above. The process of defining the issue, and the EPC position on it, will begin in the 2000-2001 academic year.

Addendum to the
Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee
 March 23, 2001

Table 1. Summary of Instructional Days

Year	Instructional Days	Fall Holidays	Exam Days	Instructional Days	Spring Holidays	Exam Days
68-69	88	17	9	86	4	9
69-70	74	13	9	71	3	9
70-71	74	12	9	70	5	9
71-72	70	2	9	72	5	9
72-73	70	2	9	72	5	9
73-74	70	2	9	72	5	9
74-75	69	3	9	71	6	9
75-76	69	3	9	71	6	9
76-77	71	3	9	71	6	9
77-78	71	3	9	71	6	9
78-79	72	5	9	71	6	9
79-80	70	5	9	71	6	9
80-81	70	5	9	71	6	9
81-82	70	5	9	71	6	9
82-83	70	5	9	71	6	9
83-84	70	5	8	71	6	9
84-85	70	5	9	71	6	9
85-86	70	5	10	71	6	9
86-87	70	5	10	71	6	9
87-88	67	5	8	65	7	8
88-89	67	5	8	67	7	8
89-90	67	5	8	67	7	8
90-91	69	5	7	69	7	7
91-92	72	5	7	71	7	7
92-93	72	5	7	71	7	7
93-94	71	6	7	71	7	7
94-95	71	5	7	71	7	7
95-96	71	5	7	71	7	7
96-97	71	5	7	70	7	7
97-98	75	5	6	75	7	6
98-99	75	5	6	75	7	6
99-00	75	5	6	75	7	6
00-01	75	5	6	75	7	6
00-02	75	5	6	75	7	7
02-03	75	5	7	75	7	7



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2001-2 Calling for Funding of the New Survey for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

WHEREAS, by Faculty Council legislation (November 21, 1975), "all departments and schools should provide for a periodic and systematic student evaluation procedure for all teaching faculty over the entire range of courses offered," and

WHEREAS these evaluations are to be used in connection with appointments, promotions, and awards of tenure, and

WHEREAS a University-wide survey instrument would benefit departments and schools in providing systematic procedures for the student evaluation of teaching, and

WHEREAS the former Carolina Course Review was an inadequate survey instrument for these purposes, and

WHEREAS the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching and the Center for Teaching and Learning have developed a new survey instrument, and

WHEREAS this new survey instrument allows for flexibility in the selection of questions by individual departments, schools, and instructors,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

The Faculty Council recommends to the administration that adequate funding be provided for the new survey instrument for the student evaluation of teaching for a University-wide trial period of two years, and

The Faculty Council recommends that the new survey instrument be administered by the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Report on the Need for a Livable Wage for Teaching Fellows in the Department of English

Compiled by Melissa Bostrom, Michael Everton, Andrew Leiter, and Laura Mielke
on Behalf of The Association of Graduate English Students (AGES)

November 2000

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Cost of Living
- III. Timely Progress
- IV. Justification for Requesting a Livable Wage from the University
- V. Appendix 1: Generic Teaching Fellow Budget
- VI. Appendix 2: Survey Excerpts

I. Introduction

Teaching Fellows in the Department of English (T.F.s)¹ propose a pay increase that will reflect the cost-of-living in the UNC-Chapel Hill area. Currently, T.F.s in this department receive \$4,100 per section (before taxes), with a three-section limit per academic year. However, in order to offset living expenses in Chapel Hill and surrounding areas, approximately 80% of T.F.s are forced to take on significant work in addition to our work as graduate students and teachers.² Thus, we propose that this stipend be raised to \$5,000 per section. While even this proposed increase will not eliminate the need for students to work outside jobs in order to meet the cost of living, it will be a step closer to a liveable wage for the department's T.F.s.

We recognize the recent generous support of the State of North Carolina and of the University of North Carolina system in eliminating tuition and in offering Teaching Fellows health care. However, these developments have not changed the fact that it is nearly impossible to live in Chapel Hill (or surrounding areas), work toward a Ph.D. in English, and teach for the University without resorting to outside employment. Considering the service English Department Teaching Fellows provide the university, it seems appropriate that we be compensated fairly.

The following report is based on 80 responses to an anonymous AGES survey of students teaching and studying within the English Department. In the report we will examine the urgent need and justification for a livable wage for T.F.s in the Department of English.

¹ It is important to note that Research and Teaching Assistants are in the same pay situation as Teaching Fellows and that their concerns are also expressed by this report.

² See Section V for cost-of-living figures. See section VI for anecdotal evidence from these surveys.

II. Cost of Living

In response to a question about living on T.F. wages in Chapel Hill, one respondent simply writes, “This is a life of penury.” While this statement may seem an exaggeration, the simple reality is that compensation for T.F. work in the English Department—more specifically, the compensation of \$12,300 for the standard 2:1 teaching contract—does not come close to providing instructors with enough money to cover housing, utilities, food, and clothing.

- **The Compensation Gap—\$6,538:** Appendix 1 contains a “Generic Teaching Fellow Budget” compiled by English T.F. and former AGES President Robert Spirko in Spring 2000 and updated for the 2000-01 school year.³ In this modest estimation, the average Teaching Fellow in the English Department must generate approximately \$6,538 per year in addition to his/her English Department stipend simply to meet the basic costs of living.

Responses to our survey confirm the budget’s depiction of a substantial gap between a T.F.’s salary and the cost of living in the Chapel Hill area. Responding students in the English Department need an additional median income of \$400 per month, or \$530 per academic month. (Note that this means \$4,800 per year in addition to the stipend, excluding summer—a more conservative estimate than that in the Generic Student Budget in section V, perhaps because the pool surveyed includes those who are married or have substantial savings from previous work.) To meet this need, T.F.s work one or more additional jobs, receive assistance from parents and spouses, and take out loans. Respondents express frustration over needing to tap these other financial sources and share their experiences of stretching scant stipends to cover growing costs.

- **Increased Cost of Housing:** Housing costs are high and increasing rapidly in Chapel Hill, and housing proves to be the greatest financial burden of respondents. Some T.F.s estimate that housing and utilities take 2/3 of their stipends. Another notes that graduate student housing at Craige Dorn is not adequate for “mature singles.”⁴ Other options mentioned for saving money on housing involve living outside of Chapel Hill (one respondent reported paying \$675 for a double-occupancy residence 20 minutes from campus), but then T.F.s must pay for bus passes and/or parking. The more affordable housing in Chapel Hill is not necessarily safe, two respondents note. Another T.F. reminds us that he/she needs a warm, dry living space because his/her residence also “serves as a place of business where papers are written, papers are graded, books stored, etc.”

- **Spousal Support:**⁵ Many respondents note that spouses make their graduate studies financially feasible. However, not all feel dependence on a spouse is favorable. One instructor explains, “[A]t my age and as a woman ... I’m bothered by the fact that I could

³ See section V.

⁴ We should note also that the cost-of-living at Graduate Student Housing is not significantly cheaper than at off-campus housing. More importantly, living on-campus would prevent students from applying for in-state residency and, as a result, the Department of English would have to compensate the difference between the out-of-state and in-state tuition rates for its graduate-student teachers. The department, however, assuredly cannot to do this for all its T.F.s. Finally, there is not enough on-campus housing for graduate students in the first place. See <http://housing.unc.edu/grad/index.html>.

⁵ Also see “Parental and Spousal Support” in section IV.

not live independently and support myself before I got married.” In contrast, married T.F.s with children find it very difficult to make ends meet. One respondent remarks that she and her husband have difficulty affording childcare. Another notes that the UNC graduate employee health plan requires a \$3,000 fee to cover his wife and two children. This accounts for more than a quarter of his T.F. stipend after taxes.

- **Health Insurance:** Health insurance requires further consideration. While instructors appreciate the somewhat recently acquired benefit of health insurance, respondents to our survey point out that it does not cover all of health expenses. Multiple respondents mention the \$44 fee to receive healthcare in one of the summer sessions. Further, respondents note that insurance does not cover dental and eye-care visits, and that supplementary dental coverage for a single person is \$35 per month. As a result, many T.F.s go without regular eye and dental exams. Another respondent describes the burden of personally covering approximately \$4,800 a year for an uncovered medical condition. Finally, we should not lose sight of the fact that T.F.s do not earn enough in order to save against medical and other emergencies that might occur to themselves or to their families.

An increase in compensation of \$900 per section would be a modest raise considering that Teaching Fellows in the English Department have not received a stipend increase for six years. Further, as we have demonstrated above, even this raise would not enable graduate instructors to cover living expenses in full: that worthy goal would require a raise of approximately \$1,600 per section. However, an additional \$900 per section would greatly improve the standard of living of graduate instructors and represent a move toward adequate, humane compensation for institutionally crucial work.

III. Timely Progress

“Normally,” the Department of English’s *Guide to Graduate Studies, 2000-01* advises, “the Ph.D. degree is completed in four to five years of study beyond the M.A.”⁶ Why then does it take students in English seven years, on average, to complete their degrees? Typically, T.F.s must work outside jobs to compensate for the unlivable wage they receive, work that critically retards what the department considers to be “normal” progress toward the degree. “Everyone here is more interested in academics than in earning money,” one student writes, “but the reality is that . . . you have to prioritize those things that demand immediate attention in your life, like paying rent, buying food, and fixing your car. With teaching stipends at their current level, this too often means that graduate students have to go to work rather than get [academic] work done.”

From the perspective of a T.F. in the Department of English, then, the framework for timely progress is a myth. Based on our survey responses, we estimate that working outside jobs consumes 320 to 640 hours per academic year,⁷ time that could be devoted to working toward the degree. When approximately four out of every five graduate students work second jobs (that is, a job in addition to teaching a full load of courses), and many even work third jobs, the

⁶ UNC Writing Program, *Staff Manual, 2000-2001* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Department of English, 2000): 26.

⁷ This figure is based on a range of 10 to 20 hours per week. It is important to note that some students work both less and more than this range.

English Department is going to take significantly longer to produce Ph.D.s than it ideally should. An increase in the T.F. stipend would significantly aid T.F.'s timely progress toward degrees.

- **The Potential for Research with a Livable Wage:** A \$900/section pay increase translates to approximately 90 hours of time at \$10/hour. That is 90 hours per section (or 270 hours in a typical 2-1 teaching contract) which could be devoted to studying for doctoral comprehensives or writing the dissertation. In other words, over the course of two semesters, the time saved from not being forced to work an outside job in order to meet bills could mean the difference between taking one year to write a dissertation or taking two to three years (accounting for fatigue from working and writing at the same time).

- **Fair Compensation for Teaching:** The degree to which we are fairly compensated for our work as teachers directly impacts how long it takes us to complete our courses of study. However, the amount we teach is not at issue (indeed, most students value our rigorous training as teachers) but rather the degree of compensation for that teaching. It is no coincidence that the Department of English has won a significant number of graduate teaching awards yet has brutally long completion rates for the Ph.D.

A sample break-down of time commitments reinforces the need for a livable wage. If a typical T.F. teaches one section of English 11, he/she spends approximately 15-20 hours per week on that course. Remember, during this semester he/she earns \$4,100 before taxes. Thus, considering that this student then must work 10-15 hours per week at a second job in order to meet minimum living expenses, there is little time left over for the 30-50 hours per week necessary for his/her own degree work. What suffers? Because we cannot cheat our students out of instructional time or attention to their needs as writers, and because we must pay our bills, our studies suffer—and our progress is not timely. Furthermore, when a Teaching Fellow teaches two sections, the time devoted to teaching can sometimes double, while the amount of academic work often remains constant.

- **The Unreality of Summer Research:** The English Department Ph.D. framework also assumes that students have time during the summers in which to research exclusively. This is not the case. Many students noted on surveys that they work 30-40 hours per week during the summer to help meet bills during the school year. This situation is particularly disturbing for Ph.D. students studying for their doctoral comprehensive exams (usually taken in the Fall) or writing their dissertations. Progress toward exam readiness and dissertation completion is radically checked when one must come to these tasks after working an 8 to 5 summer job. Not surprisingly, it is often at these two points—when responsibilities as a student most severely clash with bills—that students withdraw from their degree programs.

- **Unlivable Wages and Job Placement:** The administration should consider the quality of the candidate that the University is producing in this field. Faculty we hire usually have taught less than we do as graduate students, have been better compensated for what teaching they did do, and usually have had substantially more fellowship time in which to produce scholarship. At the Conference on the Future of Doctorate Education held at The

University of Wisconsin, Madison in April 1999, Robert Irwin suggested that any program which would not consider its own candidates for its own junior faculty openings is doing something wrong.⁸ It is safe to say that the Department of English at this university would not consider one of its own Ph.D.s for an entry-level faculty position.

If UNC-Chapel Hill wishes its English graduate students to remain competitive with those of other top tier schools in English—when to do so means producing high-quality articles and dissertations—UNC must reduce the amount of time students devote to making and worrying about money.

In conclusion, because the vast majority of students must work outside jobs in order to subsidize the unlivable wage they receive as T.F.s in this department, progress toward the degree is severely hindered. Many T.F.s say that they don't mind being poor; they just want to earn a wage that allows them to concentrate on making progress toward the degree and an academic job.

IV. Justification for Requesting a Livable Wage from the University

Why should the University take on the financial burden of increasing the compensation for Teaching Fellows at this time? Some T.F.s have the opportunity to obtain needed funds from alternative sources, such as parents, spouses, or loans. Why not shift the burden from the University to other possible funding sources? And why give T.F.s a pay raise when health insurance and tuition remission have been added to their compensation packages in the past six years?

- **Parental and Spousal Support:** Our data shows that many instructors do, in fact, rely on the support of parents and/or spouses already. While it is generous for parents to contribute to T.F.s' financial well-being by supplementing their teaching income, parents' contributions can hardly be seen as expected. Many parents cannot afford to offer support, and many students feel it unfair to ask for that support. Even the FAFSA, the federal government's standardized form for reporting income sources and requesting loan money, does not consider parental contributions when determining a T.F.'s eligibility for funds. If the government does not view parents as a source for funding graduate education, neither should the University.

As for spousal support, many of the married instructors in the English Department have expressed their relief at the decreased economic burden of being a T.F. when married to an individual working outside academia. For those students married to a fellow T.F., however, the additional income provided by a spouse does little to augment the household treasury. While our data indicates that married instructors seem to feel more financially secure if they have a spouse who works outside academia (because they do not have to live from one paycheck to the next), married instructors comprised only 26% of our sample, and those partnered with someone holding a non-academic job an even smaller number.

⁸ Robert McKee Irwin, "A Participant's Report," *Proceedings of the Conference on the Future of Doctoral Education, Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 115 (October 2000): 1256-57, 1257.

- **The Inadequacy of Loans:** Perhaps the most logical sources of funding, ones that are accessible to all graduate instructors, are student loans. Why shouldn't T.F.s simply take out loans to cover the costs of living above and beyond the T.F. salary? First, since the majority of first year M.A. students are neither funded by the department nor in-state residents for tuition purposes, they face a double liability: they must find funds for both tuition and living expenses. Many take out between \$18,000 and \$20,000 in loans their first year alone. Second, if, on average, T.F.s in the English Department need an additional \$530 per month during the academic year to make ends meet, they would have to take out \$4770 per year if they relied on loans to make up the difference between their cost of living and University compensation for instruction. Given that the average time to degree in the department is approximately seven years, the additional years of loans would total between \$28,620 and \$33,390. Added to the figure for the first year of graduate study, such practices would result in a total of \$46,620 to \$53,390 in loans at the completion of the degree. (Furthermore, this number does not account for the loans T.F.'s often still owe from their undergraduate programs.) Reported starting salaries for UNC English Ph.D.s as junior faculty hover around the \$30,000 mark.⁹ Entering the job market with loans that total better than 150% of the starting salary seems, at the very least, unreasonable. Last year only 25% of our department's Ph.D. job-seekers found the security of tenure-track jobs.¹⁰ With a 75% chance that our post-Carolina employment will not lead to a stable job, most T.F.s find the prospect of taking out additional loans extraordinarily risky, at best.

- **"Real" Pay:** UNC T.F.s have benefited from two measures in the past few years: the addition of health insurance to the compensation package for graduate instructors and relief from in-state tuition through tuition remission. While both steps are commendable on the part of the legislature and the University, they simply bring Carolina's compensation in line with other institutions of our caliber. Tuition remission has represented a relief from approximately \$1100 in yearly tuition bills for graduate instructors (less for those who are no longer taking classes); it has not, however, provided relief from \$840 in fees. Tuition remission has meant an increased ability for graduate instructors to deal with cost-of-living issues; it certainly has not, however, closed the gap between T.F. compensation and the price of living in Chapel Hill. Health insurance, on the other hand, has provided no increase in "real" pay for T.F.s, as the cost for insurance (currently \$832 per year for those who do not qualify as T.F.s) was simply so prohibitive that many chose not to purchase it at all.

Thus, over the course of the past six years, T.F.s have received an increase in real pay of \$1100 (generously assuming that the average graduate instructor pays that much in tuition). Such an increase represents a raise of approximately \$61 per section taught for each year (\$20 per month). While our survey responses indicate that any raise is helpful

⁹ Salary data is reported only anecdotally; there are no consistent statistics on starting salaries for UNC English Department Ph.D.s. This figure is reported as the best estimate of the current UNC English Department Placement Committee.

¹⁰ See Shelly K. Schwartz, "Working Your Degree," *CNNFN*, 1 September 2000, 31 October 2000 <http://cnfn.cnn.com/2000/09/01/career/q_degreetenglish/>. English Department Professor Jeanne Moskal was one of the interviewees for this CNNFN feature.

in meeting the rising cost of living in Chapel Hill, a 1% increase per year hardly meets the challenges of paying bills in a place where rent jumps 5% (or more) annually.

Right now, T.F.s in the English Department teach 67% of the undergraduate course offerings.¹¹ We provide a valuable service to the department and our instruction should be compensated in a way that, *at the very least*, allows us to meet the basic costs of living. If the University values the contribution T.F.s make to the UNC community, it should enable T.F.s to afford living in the UNC community. We ask the University to affirm its commitment to excellent instruction, scholarship, and service by increasing the T.F. stipend.

¹¹ Fall semester 2000. See the Registrar's On-Line Directory of Classes.

V. Appendix 1: Generic Teaching Fellow Budget

Income: 12300 (teaching contract; before taxes, which would be c. \$800 federal and \$400 state)
11100 (after taxes)

Expenses:	Alone	With Roommate	
<i>Monthly</i>			
Rent	540	400	(These are among the cheapest apartments)
Power	80	50	(not including long distance)
Phone	30	15	
Internet	20	10	
(cable)	40	20)	(Basic cable: 20/month; 10/month w/roommate)
Groceries	200	175	(50/wk [2.75/meal], -25/month for common staples w/ roommate)
Entertainment	60	60	(15/wk for 1 movie, 1 play, 1 CD or 1 concert)
Food	100	100	(25/wk for 1 dinner and 2 lunches out)
Laundry	25	25	(paper, pens, printer ink, photocopies, notebooks, etc.)
Office Suppl.	40	40	
Car Insurance	50	50	(If no car pmt, probably old car: at least 50/month for upkeep)
(Car payment	250	250)	
Car upkeep	65	65	(Includes gas, oil changes, budgeting for minor repairs)
<i>Month Total:</i>	1500	1260	
<i>Year total:</i>	18000	15120	

<i>Yearly</i>			
Student fees	840	840	(\$417.12/sem. for 6-8.9 hours)
Bus pass	175	175	(or F.Lot parking permit, which is \$190)
Books (class)	750	750	(\$15/book, 9 books/class, 5 classes/yr)
Books (other)	180	180	(1 book/month, or 3 magazines/month)
Conference	500	500	(included since dept. funds run out quickly; alternately, this could be for 1 good suit/outfit, or 1 major car repair)
Lang test fee	40	40	(\$44/summer session for care at Student Health Services)
SHS Summ. Fee	88	88	
Car insp	20	20	
Car tax	175	175	(will probably need a new one in 4 years; 1200/4=300 per year)
Computer	300	300	
Clothing	250	250	(for man; women's clothes more expensive)
Medical	250	250	(not covered by insurance: physical, glasses, dental)
Emergency	250	250	(or miscellaneous expenses)
<i>Totals:</i>	3418	3418	
<i>Grand Totals:</i>			
<i>Alone</i>	21418	18538	<i>Amount needed from loans or outside work</i>
	17638	14758	(Old car, no cable, no comp)
		6538	7438
			3658

Average cost of living: **\$17,638 - \$11,100 = \$6538** from loans or outside work.

VI. Appendix 2: Survey Excerpts

“With the necessity of working 15-20 hours a week in addition to teaching and studying, I have been working 60-80 weeks for almost four years. These long hours in and of themselves might not be so bad if it weren’t also the case that I still can’t afford to go to the dentist, fix my car, or replace worn out clothes. This year I had to borrow money from a family member for the first time in order to purchase a ticket to attend my grandfather’s funeral. This incident very nearly drove me out of graduate school in disgust over my financial situation. It is no wonder so many of our most talented teachers and students leave for greener pastures.”

“For me, the most expensive part of living in Chapel Hill is housing—it is very hard to find inexpensive lodgings in the town itself. I currently live in Carrboro, where there are some large, less expensive apartment complexes. I do not always feel safe in the complex where I live, and would like to move closer to campus; however, I am not sure that I will be able to afford it in coming years.

“If we want to be competitive with top-ten schools, we need time to produce great articles and dissertations. To do this, we need more fellowships. And during teaching semester, we should be earning enough money so that we don’t have to find half-time employment to pay the rent. How can we be expected to be excellent teachers, meaningful scholars, and committed colleagues if we have to spread ourselves so thin? This kind of environment makes people selfish—and they often have to be—not volunteering for conferences, graduate student organizations, etc. Raising our salary and increasing fellowships will make us better professionals.”

“Living on grad student income means giving up certain things—sometimes even safety. My second year here I did not work in addition to my RA-ship. To live on the stipend, I rented an apartment with three others at one of the most affordable complexes in town. Over the course of our first fall there, we had one attempted break-in, one successful break-in, and one botched break-in (the police nabbed the guy crawling out of our window). When we moved to a safer (though not necessarily fancier) complex, our rent increased by 68%. This is specifically why I began working part-time during the school year in addition to full-time during the summer.”

“At my age and as a woman, a feminist, who does not like to feel completely dependent on others, I’m bothered by the fact that I could not live independently and support myself before I got married. I was still taking money from my parents, and as soon as I got married, I became dependent on my husband. Decent housing in Chapel Hill is too expensive for a T.F. living alone, and a stretch for one with a roommate, as I’ve seen with single friends. The stress of living from paycheck to paycheck certainly isn’t good for one’s mental state and certainly doesn’t encourage healthy study habits and full attention devoted to academics.”

“I dedicate a lot of time to my teaching. I WANT to dedicate a lot of time to it, since I like it and since my students are depending on a good class. (I am a first year teaching fellow, and I am developing a lot of brand-new lesson ideas. I mention this because it means that work takes a lot of time, and also because it means I am living on less money than teaching fellows who can teach more than one class per semester.) This leaves less time for my own classes. My new job

should leave even less time and energy for either. I am here to teach and study, and I want to do these well. As expenses seem to be going up, however (have you tried to buy a tank of gas lately??), I have decided I have to take this extra job, which should run between ten and fifteen hours a week and will definitely cut in on my school time. Nobody benefits if I come to work every day exhausted from trying to teach well and keep up myself and still pay the rent. The more money the university can spare, the better a chance I have of doing well the work I am here to do, both for my students and for myself.”

“The most frustrating situation that my wife and I will face while I am in grad school is that although my health insurance is paid for through my fellowship, I have to pay an additional \$3000 a year to place her and our two children on the policy. When you make \$12,300 and pay \$3000 for health insurance, an already financially difficult situation becomes worse. Loans help; my spouse working helps; any kind of raise in the stipend will also help—a lot.”

“I really enjoy teaching. It’s why I (and most of my colleagues) have chosen this profession in the first place. Without earning enough to survive on a Teaching Fellow’s stipend, however, I continually find myself in the disheartening position of having to take on second and third jobs in order to get by. This prevents me from contributing as much time as I would like to my students, and inevitably my own academic work suffers as well.”

“Everyone here is more interested in academics than earning money, but the reality is that (since a day is only 24 hours) you have to prioritize those things that demand immediate attention in your life, like paying rent, buying food, and fixing your car. With teaching stipends at the current level, this too often means that grad students have to go to work rather than get their own work done.”



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

March 23, 2001, 3:00 P.M.

Attendance

Present (55): Allison, Ammerman, Angel, Bender, Bollen, Bowen, Boxill, Bromberg, Carelli, Chenault, Clegg, Cordeiro-Stone, Cotton, Crawford-Brown, Daye, D'Cruz, Drake, Elvers, Fishman, Gilland, Glazner, Granger, Grossberg, Henry, Janda, Kagarise, Kaufman, Kjervik, Kopp, Levine, Lubker, Ludlow, Madison, McCormick, McKeown, Metzguer, Meyer, A. Molina, Moran, Nord, Panter, Pfaff, Raasch, Reinert, Slatt, Steponaitis, Stewart, Strauss, Sueta, Taft, Tauchen, Vaughn, Walsh, Weiss, White.

Excused absences (27): Adler, Bell, Blackburn, Bolas, Bynum, De La Cadena, Files, Fowler, George, Huang, Kessler, Ketch, Kupper, Lefebvre, Meece, Meehan-Black, P. Molina, Nelson, Otey, Raab-Traub, Rao, Rosenfeld, Savitz, Sekerak, Straughan, Werner, Williams.

Unexcused absences (3): Assani, Graham, McQueen.

Chancellor Moeser called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Moeser announced that fiscal 2000-01 funding at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for contracts and grants awarded for research, teaching, and public service topped the \$375 million mark, a 9% increase over fiscal 1999-2000. Critical for this achievement was a surge in funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). We rank 13th in the top 20 institutions nationally in NIH funding, which increased by more than 20% --- from \$171.3 million in 1999-2000 to \$207 million this year. All of the health affairs schools are in the top 25 in the NIH funding and the College of Arts and Sciences also received a significant amount from this source. The chancellor said these research dollars were coming at a time when there was much competition for NIH funds, and the need is critical. The \$245 million committed to genome sciences will make the University a leader in this field, and will leverage increasingly larger amounts of federal support. He commended the success of the faculty in attracting research dollars, and what is being done with the funding to improve the human condition in North Carolina and beyond. He thanked the faculty and commended the leadership of Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Graduate School Linda Dykstra.

Chancellor Moeser continued his remarks and reported:

- He recently visited Monterey Technical University in Monterey, Mexico with several of the academic deans. He said there are tremendous potentials for collaboration. The School of Public Health and the School of Journalism and Mass Communication have programs already underway. The chancellor said he gave an address that was seen in fifteen sites in Mexico, Chile, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Chapel Hill. Monterey Tech is among the most advanced technological institutes in the western hemisphere. He thanked Dean Sullivan for making this trip possible.
- At a Board of Trustees meeting yesterday, the Master Plan for UNC-CH was unanimously approved. He said this plan was a 50-year vision for the future of the Chapel Hill campus. The first phase of the Science Complex was approved as was, the development of the Arts Corridor, and the Ram's Head Parking Deck. The latter project will have green space on the top.
- He noted that March is Women's History Month and two programs are planned, recognizing the importance of women on this campus.

Professor Steven Bachenheimer (Microbiology and Immunology) asked how the chancellor saw the interaction of the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carboro, and Orange County to the expansion plans of the University. He said the expansion would clearly impact the surrounding towns.

Chancellor Moeser said the University was in conversation with the towns, especially the Town of Chapel Hill, and said the Board of Trustees feels that the renovations and construction will not only benefit the University, but the surrounding towns as well, especially the Arts Corridor. Consultant Adam Gross had remarked that in all his experiences with universities, he had never seen such interaction between a university and its neighbors and local government in addressing their concerns as he had seen in Chapel Hill. The Plan has been adjusted several times to address these concerns. The chancellor said there were no plans to expand anywhere beyond the existing campus, with the exception of seven properties on the southern perimeter. He said it was in the interest of the University to see the surrounding neighborhoods preserved and kept beautiful.

Chancellor Moeser said the University would play a responsible role for the growth, especially in issues affecting the public schools. He mentioned the possibility that certain University-owned property on Franklin Street might be sold and returned to the private sector, thereby enhancing the local tax base. That property could be placed in commercial use or perhaps in affordable housing which will also be addressed in the development of the Horace Williams property. The chancellor said that in return, the University is requesting relief from the excessive regulations that the Town imposes on the campus. Under the present regulations the University will be unable to undertake the renovations and new construction funded by the recent bond issue. He pointed out that although the capital improvements plan calls for doubling floor space, the faculty and staff will not be doubling; many of the projects simply enable units to carry out existing programs in adequate quarters. He is asking the Town for changes that will eliminate the need for lengthy, extensive, and costly reviews of every single project. He is also seeking an amendment to the special use permit that allowed construction of the Smith Center to enable relocation of married student housing to a site not currently approved for that kind of development. The chancellor said that he and Mayor Rosemary Waldorf have a very cordial relationship, as do Town Manager Cal Horton and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Nancy Suttentfield, all of whom meet on a regular basis. The Town/Gown Committee meets on a regular basis and all the meetings are open. The chancellor said he was optimistic that the complicated and complex issues could be resolved to the satisfaction of both the Town and the University.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Chair Sue Estroff said the University is experiencing growing pains and pleasures. The University has outgrown its buildings and transportation and parking system, and is faced with new designs for the future. She feels that there is a subtle and gentle discomfort, which will last for some time, but which is ameliorated by the promise of long-term progress. She congratulated the faculty on their internal funds of moral and intellectual spirit, and the response to requests for help during the difficult times. She thanked the chancellor for arranging for her to speak to the Board of Trustees on behalf of the faculty. She reported that she had raised with the Board of Trustees at its March meeting the problems of parking, health insurance, and the University calendar:

On other matters, Professor Estroff

- Thanked the staff in Human Resources for their participation in the Health Insurance survey. The raw data is being evaluated and will be discussed at a later time.
- Proposed to the Board of Trustees that the University be self-insuring for employee health insurance, and work with other organizations to form a Preferred Provider Organization.
- Reported on the recommendations of the Traffic and Parking Advisory Committee for (1) increased remote-site parking, (2) increased shuttle service to the remote-site parking, (3) increases in various sources of revenues to help fund campus improvements, (4) transit to park and ride lots until 8:00 p.m., and (5) fare-free transit

In response to Professor Estroff's request for reactions to the TPAC recommendations, Professor Timothy McKeown (Political Science) said he would prefer a higher level of service with low fares, rather than a lower level of service and no fares.

Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council

Professor Bachenheimer asked for comment on whether the two committees, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and the Chancellor's Advisory Committee, functioned independently with the chancellor, or if they overlapped. Professor Estroff agreed that there has been overlap and some ambiguity with respect to the roles of the two committees, but the Advisory Committee's principal work continues to be advice with respect to faculty personnel decisions.

Annual Report of the Administrative Board of the Library

Professor John Hammond (Pathology and Laboratory Medicine), Chair, presented the report:

- Ranking: Last year's rankings from the Association of Research Libraries showed a decline from 17th to 18th place among the 111 member libraries. (1998/99 data) This drop on the index could be problematic if it continues. Reductions in the materials budget would have a negative impact on UNC-CH's standings and on the Library's ability to support students, scholars, and researchers who rely on its historically strong collections.
- Materials Budget: Over the past five years, the Library has been able to acquire between 63,000-73,000 volumes. The State continues its appropriations with an increase of 5.6% for this year based on tuition growth. This is a permanent increase. The Library is relying on one-time funding of \$718,217 from a variety of sources in order to maintain the accession rate of volumes, allowing the Library to acquire serials and monographs to meet the highest priority teaching and research needs. The Library needs a reliable source of money in which inflation is taken into consideration.
- The Library is undergoing a significant amount of change because of the Higher Education Bond Referendum, which is allowing resumption of the House Undergraduate Library renovation. The Davis Library has taken on the House Library's normal 24-hour operating schedule for the duration of the renovation period.
- Development: The Library received more than \$3.3 million in gifts this year, the second-highest year ever. Planning is in place for a \$35 million goal in the upcoming capital campaign. The Friends of the Library, with 2,000 members, remains an active and high-valued resource.
- Improvement in the campus network continues with the rewiring of a number of the buildings.
- The Library and the Library Administrative Board, along with many others, continue to monitor campus planning proposals with great interest. During the year, it was decided that plans for the renovation of the Health Sciences Library, included in the bond package, would go forward as planned.
- The budget for special acquisitions is severely limited. This year the Library was able to fund only 10% of the requested acquisitions.
- Salaries for libraries continue to lag behind peer institutions. Our median salary in 1999/00 placed us 85th in the nation. Increased salary funding in 2000-01 brought us up to 74th.

Prompted by Professor Hammond's remark that funding for special acquisitions came from overhead funds, Professor Philip Bromberg (Medicine) asked if the NIH overhead rate was renegotiated periodically every few years. Provost Robert Shelton said libraries typically account for from 1% to 2.5% of the rate. Federal agencies are under instructions to drive a hard bargain in negotiating changes. As a result, there is a compromise between the government agency rate and what the faculty feels is necessary to remain competitive.

Professor Hammond remarked that what has been built into the overhead rate for library services is not necessary what is actually made available to the Library System. He asked the Provost if the Library could expect to receive the full amount of funding that it generates from this source. The Provost replied that the amount made available to the Library would approximate but not necessarily equal the amount generated.

Professor Bachenheimer said that some states take a large percent of the overhead money back because they argue that the state is already covering some of the expenses for which reimbursement is being received. He felt it would not be in the interest of the University to argue over percentages. He said there are new requests for journals, and the faculty needs to request that the library system supports its academic work.

Professor Bromberg agreed that it is important to have online access to journals published electronically.

Professor Joe Hewitt (Academic Affairs Library) said the Academic Affairs Library has a fixed annual allocation of about \$300,000 to meet the continuing obligations for serials and journals. The variable allocations from overhead did not help as much. He said that the journal *Nature* was being boycotted by many institutions because of its outrageous cost.

Professor Hammond said if research enterprises increases, the dollars of funding do not increase to support the requirements of these research enterprises.

Professor Richard Pfaff (History) pointed out that it is often essential to the scholarly career of young faculty members that the Library have resources to acquire materials, such as foreign-language newspapers or special collections, needed in particularly scholarly fields. He urged that increased funding for special acquisitions be given high priority.

Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Professor Douglas Crawford-Brown (Environmental Sciences and Engineering), Chair, reviewed the report and highlighted a number of points:

- Grading Policies: The Task Force on Grading Standards, created in response to EPC's 2000 special report, is due to be presented to the Faculty Council in April.
- Length of the Academic Year: The Committee recommended last year that the academic year be shortened. This recommendation was sent to the Chancellor's Office and the General Administration (GA), which responded that the University had not made a compelling argument just for the UNC-CH campus. The Committee requested that the Faculty Council take the issue up with the Faculty Assembly and get some sense of the buy-in from all the campuses.
- Double Minors: A request for double minors was referred to the Administrative Board of the College, which did not approve such a change. The EPC did not find any compelling reason to disagree with the Administrative Board.
- Student Stipends and Wages: A request for review of stipends for teaching assistants was referred to the provost. The EPC will continue to monitor this issue.
- Decision Processes on Campus: In the coming year the EPC intends to continue its review of how the University's educational policy decisions are being made.
- Curricular Revisions: The EPC will review the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee. A member of the EPC, Bobbi Owen, is serving as liaison from the EPC to the Curriculum Committee. Recommendations will be issued jointly by the Committees.
- The final page of the Report provides a tabular summary of instructional days from 1968 through 2003.

Professor Vincas Steponaitis (Anthropology) asked about the large decrease in the number of instructional days between the years 1968-69 and 1969-70. Professor Douglas Elvers (Business) said that this was due to discontinuation of Saturday classes in 1969-70. Mr. David Lanier, University Registrar, confirmed that statement. He pointed out that the number of holidays in the Fall semester was greatly reduced by moving the end of the semester to a date prior to the Christmas recess in 1971-72 and also noted that the number of instructional hours actually increased after Saturday classes were discontinued even though the number of instructional days decreased.

Professor Estroff asked if the recommendation #2 under "Length of the Academic Year" was an action item. Professor Ferrell suggested that the Agenda Committee be asked to prepare a Resolution regarding this issue for the next Faculty Council Meeting. A motion was made by Professor Steponaitis, that the Agenda Committee prepare a resolution. The motion was seconded by Professor Bobbie Lubker (Education). The motion carried, with two opposed.

Resolution 2001-2 Calling for Funding of the New Survey for the Student Evaluation of Teaching.

This Resolution was withdrawn, and will be presented at the next Faculty Council Meeting.

Remarks by GPSF President-Elect Mikisha Brown.

Mikisha Brown, graduate student in the School of Public Health, said that she was interested in being the president of the Graduate Professional Student Federation (GPSF) because she felt it was important for graduate students to have a vehicle for adjusting to graduate life on the campus. She wants to work with students, faculty, and administrators, and feels that she has the leadership qualities, gained through experiences in her undergraduate years. She feels she has the skills for dealing with transition and diversity. She said she would be working on the development of GPSF as an organization and its functions. Ms. Brown said she planned a one-day retreat at the beginning of the semester to discuss issues based on the needs of graduate students. She feels that bringing about change need not be a conflict. She stressed the importance of planning programs and activities to help foster the intellectual, cultural, and social activities for the graduate students.

Discussion of Unionization, Living Wage & Other Graduate Student Issues

Professor Lawrence Grossberg (Communication Studies) was Moderator for the discussion. He said that the graduate students are very important to the faculty in terms of teaching and research, and the faculty recognizes that the University should be attentive to the needs of its graduate students. There has been a move across the nation to address these needs. On this campus, some of our graduate students have organized and sought formal affiliation with the labor union that represents the housekeepers, among others.

Representatives of the Graduate Students Union, Brian Thomas (Philosophy) and Jon Lepofsky (Geography), addressed the Faculty Council. Mr. Thomas said the organization had been formed in February 2001. Some of the issues being addressed are: health care for families; better health care options, including medical and dental; and tuition remission. Mr. Lepofsky said the graduate students are attempting to define themselves as being graduate employees. They are asking for implementation of a living wage for all graduate students, in order to remain competitive with other universities. The graduate students wish to see a grievance procedure established in order for the graduate students to function as employees, and for the union to play a role in increasing the diversity of the University.

Professor Ferrell said he believes that the graduate teaching students have access to the Faculty Grievance Committee for grievances that relate to academic freedom and arise out of teaching duties.

Graduate students in the Department of English, Andrew Leiter and Michael Everton, discussed the Report on the Need for a Livable Wage for Teaching Fellows in the Department of English. Mr. Leiter said they were encouraged by discussions on the issues of pay raises.

Professor Timothy Taft (Orthopaedics) asked how the graduate students see these issues applying to those students receiving degrees other than a Ph.D., who are not compensated by the University. Mr. Leiter said they were considering only the teaching fellows in the English Department. Professor Taft said he feels that student employees were different than full-time University employees, and were still students. Professor Hammond suggested that they would be comparable to residents in the Medical School. Professor Crawford-Brown said that medical students did not teach. Professor Taft said some of the medical students did teach, but were not compensated. Mr. Everton said the graduate students consider themselves as students, but they do spend a great deal of time in teaching 37% of the undergraduates. They are trying to seek a livable wage for the hours spent teaching. Mr. Thomas said that teaching undergraduates was the core of the graduate student's being at the University.

Professor Vincent Kopp (Anesthesiology) asked if this was not part of the skills training process and were they not supervised in the process of their teaching courses. Mr. Leiter said they were highly trained in teaching before they taught courses. This is part of the graduate students' training, but they are asking for a living wage so they would not have to get a second job.

Professor Linda Dykstra (Psychology), Dean of the Graduate School, said that while she is supportive of the graduate students efforts, there would be certain consequences to classifying teaching assistants as employees and not students. For example, students are not subject to social security taxes, are not required to make contributions to retirement plans, and are allowed to defer principal and interest payments on loans. These benefits would be lost if status changed to that of employees.

Professor Crawford-Brown asked about the shifting relationship that would occur by moving to employee status as opposed to student status. Students benefit from a protective environment. Mr. Lepofsky said that although he wants to remain a student, he feels that he is already being treated as an employee in research centers. Professor Crawford-Brown said that is an important issue and the faculty needs to look at whether they are putting graduate students into the position of serving only as employees. Mr. Thomas responded that this makes students better teachers.

Professor Estroff asked how the two groups interrelated—the English Department graduate students and the GPSF. Mr. Leiter said each department sent their union representatives as liaison, but there was no formal tie. Ms. Brown said that is an issue she would be working on—to get representatives from the various departments to attend the meetings of the GPSF.

Professor Madeline Levine (Slavic Languages) asked if there is a difference in the teaching remuneration in the departments. Mr. Thomas said the English Department graduate students had not taken into consideration the other departments, but they were talking about a base line of \$6,000 per semester. Professor Crawford-Brown said there had been rulings at some private universities allowing the graduate students to take on the identity of employees and to unionize. He hopes that will not be the Carolina way, but there should be a way to work through the complexities of the treatment of graduate students as students as well as employees.

Honorary Degrees

On motion of Professor Ferrell, the Council went into closed session to consider an additional person for the award of honorary degree. Professor Ferrell reported that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, acting on behalf of the Council, had recently approved a fifth honorary degree for this year's Commencement.

Adjournment

The business of the day having concluded, the Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty