



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, October 5th, 2001, 3:00 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA

Type	Time	Item
	3:00	<i>Call to Order. The Secretary of the Faculty.</i>
DISC	3:00	Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time. Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments on any topic.
INFO	3:15	Presentation of the Hettlemann Awards.
INFO	3:20	Remarks. Provost Robert Shelton.
INFO	3:30	Greetings. Justin Young, President of the Student Body.
INFO	3:35	Greetings. John Heuer, Chair of the Employee Forum.
DISC	3:40	Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty. Professor Sue Estroff invites questions or comments on any topic.
ACT	3:55	Resolution 2001-6 on Terrorism. Professor Estroff.
DISC	4:00	Topics Raised by Council Members.
ACT	4:20	Resolution 2001-7 on Information Technology. Professor Bill Balthrop.
INFO	4:45	Annual Report of the Committee on Instructional Personnel. Executive Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little.
INFO	4:50	Annual Report of the Faculty Hearings Committee. Professor Frayda Bluestein.
INFO	4:55	Annual Report of the Faculty Grievance Committee. Professor Roberta Ann Dunbar.
ACT	5:00	<i>Adjourn.</i>

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY: ACT = Action, DISC = Discussion, INFO = Information.

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



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2001-6 on Terrorism

October 5th, 2001

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill:

condemns all acts of terrorism and military aggression;

expresses its anguish for the victims of the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11th, 2001 and for all victims of terrorism;

condemns the persecution of Arabs, Muslims and others by those who target them in the wake of these attacks;

reaffirms the values of free speech and tolerance in the University community as well as in the larger society.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL
OCTOBER 5, 2001

This report covers the activities of the Committee on Instructional Personnel for the academic year 2000-2001.

For personnel matters the Committee on Instructional Personnel operates through two subcommittees: the Subcommittee for the College of Arts and Sciences chaired by the Dean, and the Subcommittee on Professional Schools chaired by the Provost. All recommendations from the Schools or departments and curricula in the Division of Academic Affairs involving tenure track appoints of any kind and all reappointments at the rank of lecturer or above were reviewed. In making these reviews both subcommittees sought to ensure uniformity of procedural practices and consistent attention to the respective roles and missions of each of the appointing units.

The Committee also considers academic calendar, and some of the appointments to the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions are the responsibility of this Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Cole
Connie Eble
Jaroslav Folda
Madeleine Grumet
Joanne Marshall
Gene Nichol
Risa Palm
Karl Petersen
Robert Shelton, Chair (effective 2/1/01)
Michael Smith
Robert Sullivan

October 5, 2001
Faculty Hearings Committee
Annual Report

Members: Chair (as of September, 2001), Frayda S. Bluestein (Institute of Government, 2005); Barbara J. Harris (Women's Studies, History, 2003); Lawrence Rosenfeld (Communication Studies, 2004); Laurel A. Files (Public Health, 2006); Stephen Allred (Institute of Government, Chair until September, 2001).

Report prepared by: Frayda S. Bluestein (Chair) with review by full committee

Committee charge: According to *The Faculty Code of University Government*, the Faculty Hearings Committee is composed of five faculty members with permanent tenure, serving five-year terms. The committee performs functions assigned to it in the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*. Those duties include conducting hearings (a) on the request of a faculty member who has been notified before the end of his or her tenure or term of appointment that the University intends to discharge him or her, and (b) on the request of a faculty member for review of a decision not to reappoint him or her upon expiration of a probationary term of appointment. In the case of a discharge hearing, the committee's duty is to determine whether one of the following permissible grounds for discharge has been established: A misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the faculty member is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, incompetence, and neglect of duty. (*Trustee Policies* section 3.a.). With respect to review of nonreappointment decisions, the committee is limited to determining whether the grounds for such action are impermissible under section 4.a. of the *Trustee Policies* or whether the decision was affected by material procedural irregularities. (*Trustee Policies* section 4.c.).

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of activities: There were no appeals or other matters for the committee to consider during the 2000-20001 academic year.

Recommendations for action by Faculty Council: None.

Respectfully submitted,

Frayda S. Bluestein, Chair
Barbara J. Harris
Lawrence Rosenfeld
Laurel A. Files

Faculty Grievance Committee
Annual Report
October 5, 2001

Members: William L. Andrews (2004), Roberta Ann Dunbar (2001) *Past Chair*, Eugenia Eng (2002), Beverly W. Ferreiro (2003), Lynn Fuller (2002) (resigned December 2000), Robert P. Joyce (2002) *Chair*, Melody F. Harrison (2003), Mary R. Lynn (2004), Melanie Mintzer (2003), Cynthia M. Powell (2001), Melissa Saunders (2003), John Schopler (2001), John B. Stephens (2004), Todd W. Taylor (replaced Lynn Fuller) (2002)

Members leaving the Committee: Roberta Ann Dunbar, Cynthia M. Powell, and John Schopler (deceased).

Report prepared by: Robert P. Joyce (Chair) and Roberta Ann Dunbar (Past Chair).

Committee Meetings: September 29, 2000; November 29, 2000; March 5, 2001; May 14, 2001, July 12, 2001.

Committee Charge: "The committee is authorized to hear, mediate and advise with respect to the adjustment of grievances of all persons designated as members of the Faculty. . ." (The Faculty Code of University Government, July 1999, p. 13).

Report of Activities: In the 2000-2001 academic year, the previous chair, Roberta Ann Dunbar received 15 inquiries, one of which was a carry over from the preceding year. Three were processed by full, formal Grievance Committee procedures; one formal grievance was begun but withdrawn before the hearing; three others involved extended discussions but did not lead to a formal grievance; one was resolved after one meeting; and six did not proceed after the initial inquiry. One is carried over.

Comment on Resolution 99-8 Endorsing the Recommendations of the Faculty Grievance Committee Concerning Mediation: On September 10, 1999 the Faculty Council adopted a resolution authorizing the Faculty Grievance Committee to introduce mediation, through the Orange County Dispute Settlement Center, into the conflict resolution process. As an interim arrangement, the Committee recommended with the support of the Office of the Provost the services of the Dispute Settlement Center of Orange County. The experience of the Committee has been that by the time most grievances reach the stage of a formal hearing, the parties on both sides are unprepared to consider compromise, which is a vital component of the mediation process. It is the view of the committee that there should be some mechanism to review complaints before the issues have festered over a number of years. The Committee welcomed the opportunity to discuss with Vice Chancellor Susan H. Ehringhaus last November the draft report and recommendations of the University of North Carolina Task Force on Internal Resolution of Disputes Concerning Faculty Employment. In anticipation of the final report (which has not yet been prepared), no recommendations were made before the end of the 2001 year. However, the Committee stands ready to work with the Vice Chancellor to review the process of faculty grievance when the University's report is available.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL October 5, 2001, 3:00 P.M.

Attendance

Present (64): Adimora, Adler, Allison, Ammerman, Barbour, Bollen, Bouldin, Bowen, Boxill, Bromberg, Cairns, Carelli, Chenault, Clegg, Colindres, Cotton, Crawford-Brown, Daye, Drake, Eter, Elvers, Files, Fishel, Foley, George, Giliand, Henry, Janda, Kessler, Ketch, Kjervik, Kupper, Langbauer, Lefebvre, Lubker, Malizia, McGraw, Meyer, P. Molina, A. Molina, Nonini, Orthner, Owen, Pfaff, Raab-Traub, Raasch, Rao, Reinert, Retsch-Bogart, Rowan, Schauer, J. Smith, Straughan, Strauss, Tauchen, Tresolini, Tulloch, Vaughn, Wallace, Walsh, Waters, Watson, Williams, Yopp. Excused absences (20): Bynum, D'Cruz, Fowler, Granger, Kagarise, Kalleberg, Kopp, McCormick, Meece, Metzguer, Otey, Poole, Robinson, Shea, Sigurdsson, Slatt, W. Smith, Sueta, Walsh, Willis. Unexcused absences (4): McQueen, Nelson, Pisano, Sams.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor James Moeser called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He said how proud he was of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during the events stemming from the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack and how well the campus community has responded to the adversity, the uncertainty, and the challenges which have been faced in a positive and constructive manner. There have been malicious attacks, mostly from outside of the State, on Carolina, demanding that we curtail the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly and abrogate our most cherished principles of academic freedom. Carolina had been maligned on some websites as having staged anti-American demonstrations and readers of those sites were urged to send the chancellor E-mails and telephone calls along with demands that the organizers of the activities be censured, fired, or as one suggested, "shot as traitors." "Let me be clear to those outside the academic community who do not understand what is taking place here," he said. "First, I do not by any means subscribe to all of the views that have been expressed in some of these forums. How could I when the views run the gamut of public opinion in this country? Second, the University is not the particular sponsor of any particular point of view. Carolina does not have a foreign policy. I'm not afraid to state my own views with conviction and I do so expecting that my colleagues here on campus respect my right to hold them. I believe our nation should respond to eliminate the evil in our world that would attack not just the structures of our society but the very foundations of freedom itself in order to impose on the world their vision of a theocracy that denies all of our basic freedoms. I understand that not all of you share that view. Regardless, I shall continue to defend those that have a contrary view, who challenge authority and orthodoxy. That is the role of the academy and the right of all of us as individual citizens." He read a statement by Congressman Bolick of New York in support of academe and its influence.

The Chancellor said that although we must be appropriately concerned with the safety or our community, the University should not be closed either to physical access or to the exploration of ideas. Earlier this week he wrote letters to both North Carolina Senators asking them to oppose a proposal from Senator Dianne Feinstein of California to establish a six-month moratorium on foreign student visas, in order to give the INS opportunity to fully develop its foreign-student tracking system. The impact on graduate education would be devastating while the positive impact in immigration patterns would be minimal. Student visas account for only 2% of all visas granted in any normal year. Students and higher education would be short-changed unfairly at a time when we cannot afford to harm the economic engine that is American higher education. Many of the best graduate programs would be harmed by limiting the number of foreign students. Some of the best students are the foreign students, who carry home with them to their home countries American values of personal freedom and democracy.

The Chancellor believes that the University should remain committed to the pursuit of an agreement with the Qatar Foundation which will establish a University presence in the Persian Gulf. This is the time for American institutions to establish relationships with moderate Islamic states. The Foundation opportunity is an invitation to the University to transplant the values of America's first public university to the Middle East. That is in the best interests of not only of the University and Qatar, but also of our nation and the free and democratic world. Yesterday, the Emir of Qatar met with President Bush, who has expressed his support for this project, and the Chancellor had, this morning, expressed the University's continued interest in developing this program to help the Qatar authorities understand why the process is slowing down. The Chancellor said that Provost Shelton will continue to lead our efforts, in close coordination with Dean Sullivan of the Kenan-Flagler School of Business and Dean Palm of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The September 11 tragedy has prompted postponement of the public kickoff of the Carolina First Campaign, which had been scheduled to take place on University Day. The campaign is going extremely well. Our goal for the "quiet phase" of the Campaign was \$600 million. As of today, we have commitments totaling \$621 million.

The Development Plan was approved by the Chapel Hill Town Council by a vote of 8-1. The Chancellor said this would not have been possible without Mayor Waldorf's willingness to support the Joint Town/Gown Committee, and he thanked the Mayor for her outstanding leadership. He said the University and the Town had learned a great deal about how to work more closely together in the future. For example, there is to be joint retreat of the planning staffs of both entities to share perspectives on the plan and its implications.

In consultation with the Chair of the Faculty, the President of the Student Body, and the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation, the Chancellor has decided to appoint a special task force to review the Code of Student Conduct and the Honor Court. At issue is whether the current system represents the best possible expression of the principles of honor, integrity, and community standards which all have agree should be part of the Carolina experience.

As of October 1, the Institute of Government has become the School of Government. The Institute has served as a national model of how a great public university should be engaged with the state it serves. The formal announcement is planned for University Day.

Dr. Oliver Smithies, Excellence Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, has received the Albert Lasker Award for basic medical research. The Award recognizes Dr. Smithies' pioneering role in the development of the technology that has permitted scientists to create animal models of human disease. The Lasker Award is considered America's Nobel Prize.

Prof. Richard Pfaff (History) asked the Chancellor to comment on figures recently reported in *The News and Observer* predicting a student, faculty and staff population of 25,000 in activities conducted on the Horace Williams tract when it is fully developed. The Chancellor said that this could be a best or worst case scenario, depending on one's perspective. He feels that the numbers are inflated. Vice Chancellor Waldrop will be developing the academic plan for this property. All we have done at this point is to posit where buildings and roadways might go and what green spaces would be preserved. Until we decide what activities will be located there, these figures are extremely hypothetical.

Hettlemann Awards

The Chancellor presented the Phillip and Ruth Hettlemann Awards, recognizing artistic and scholarly achievement by young faculty, to Prof. Sharon Campbell (Biochemistry); Prof. Marisol De La Cadeña (Anthropology); Prof. Ken Hillis, (Communication Studies) and Prof. James Morgan (Chemistry).

Provost's Remarks

Provost Robert Shelton reported on the effects of the recently finalized State budget for the 2001-03 biennium.

Taking all reductions into account, this campus will lose about \$10 million in permanent State appropriations, or about 3.1% of the total. Budget cuts necessary to absorb this loss will be severe and painful. Based on various conversations with several groups on campus, and discussions at a retreat, the cuts were not assigned on an "across-the-board" manner, but had small variations. For academic units the maximum variation was plus or minus one-half of a percent all clustered around the average. For non-academic units there was an additional one-quarter percent added. Provost Shelton said he had asked all the leaders to be very strategic in their cuts.

With respect to salaries, the University has received \$625 per head for all SPA, EPA non-faculty and faculty positions. This increase will be awarded uniformly to SPA and EPA non-faculty personnel. Units that have available funds in the right category may award a larger increase to EPA non-faculty personnel, but due to the overall budget situation, any such increases will have to be very small. All faculty increases will be merit-based as usual. For faculty there are additional monies from the campus-based tuition increase (\$300 per student). Thirty-five percent of that has been committed for need-based aid. The remaining 65%, about \$3 million, will be allotted to the deans for merit-based faculty salary increases. These funds will be allocated with each dean receiving a certain base level amount. The remainder will be allocated to units that have demonstrated substantial disparities between their faculty salaries and their peer salary group.

The budget act gives the University additional flexibility in (1) appointing and compensating senior administrators, academic officers and tenured faculty, (2) setting tuition rates, and (3) purchasing and handling information technology. The act also charged the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee with studying the possibility of granting additional flexibility in the areas of personnel, property, and purchasing to UNC institutions, including Carolina. The Committee must make its report to the General Assembly in 2003.

The Personnel Flexibility Committee has begun its work. It is made up of a cross-section of faculty and staff and is charged with reviewing personnel systems at other public research universities, gathering input from a broad range of campus employees, and submitting recommendations about the general qualities the system should have. The goal is to have the group complete its work in time to share the results with the Legislative study committee.

The University Insurance Committee has voted to go forward for a bid for an employee-paid health insurance plan for spouses, dependents, partners, and part-time employees. The plan design has been left open to enable potential bidders to proposed a wide range of solutions. We will also be contacting other institutions in the region to see if there is interest in partnerships.

The State budget fully funds the University for its enrollment increase. This amounts to \$11.167 million. This money cannot be used entirely to offset the \$10 million budget cut because we have in fact sustained an enrollment increase and will need to meet the needs of those students. Notices of allocation of these funds has been sent to the deans and vice chancellors—funds will be available to support units as well as academic units. Provost Shelton urged caution in spending the allocations, since he believes that the State's revenue growth projections are too high and that the likelihood of mid-year budget reductions is great. He is advising deans to exercise caution in making permanent allocations of these funds.

Provost Shelton next turned to the Academic Plan now in preparation. The State budget reductions and enrollment increase funds will have a clear impact on academic programs, and the University needs an overall Academic Plan to give guidance in resource allocations. An initial draft has been circulated with a request for input, and there has been extensive response. He plans to appoint an Academic Planning Task Force, charged with articulating the priorities and developing a document informing internal communities and external audiences. He expects this to be completed during this academic year.

Greetings from the President of the Student Body

Prof. Estroff welcomed Justin Young, President of the Student Body, and invited him to address the Council. Mr. Young began by introducing Rudy Kleystauber, Vice President of the Student Body, and Josh Bosin, Student Government Liaison to the Faculty Council. Mr. Young thanked everyone for coming together during the aftermath of the terrorist attacks. There were many different views expressed during the weeks following, and he commended the University for holding true to its ideals of free expression, discussion, and debate. Student Government is continuing to work with the faculty on issues of mutual importance. He mentioned in particular a review of the Honor Code and of campus-based tuition increases.

Greetings from the Chair of the Employee Forum

Prof. Estroff invited John Heuer, Chair of the Employee Forum, to address the Council. Mr. Heuer said that he had three reasons for wanting to serve as Chair of the Employee Forum. First, he wanted to highlight the roles the Carolina staff perform as educators. Examples include services provided by ATN, Human Resources classes, the work of the Center for Teaching and Learning, staff mentoring of students in the Carolina Environmental Program, and the 62 staff members who served as discussion leaders in the summer reading program. He said that it is important that staff be recognized for their functions as teachers as well as learners and doers. He said that Chancellor Moeser ushered in a new day for University employees when he spoke to the Forum of shared governance among faculty, students and staff.

While applauding collaboration among faculty, staff, and students, Mr. Heuer pointed to one major difference in perspective. He had taken note of Prof. Estroff's remark at a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees that Carolina's faculty is here by choice, not by chance, having sought the particular collegiality that scholars and educators enjoy here. The same can be said of our students—they choose Carolina. A large number of our staff do not necessarily choose to migrate to Chapel Hill. Many are long-time local residents whose families have lived in this area for generations. Our community issues extend beyond the reach of the immediate campus to adjacent neighborhoods and watersheds. As a University community we need to engage the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, as well as and Orange County, in a way that promotes mutual respect and trust.

The third reason that Mr. Heuer sought the Forum chair was to promote the cause of sustainability. For the past thirty years attention to sustainability has waxed and waned in response to the crisis of the hour. By now it should be obvious to all that half-measures and short-lived efforts will not result in ecological balance for future generations. Once we begin to examine our decisions through the lenses of environmental sustainability, social equity, and economic feasibility, our future will become brighter. Carolina's environmental program has international stature, but it will require a campus-wide effort for the University to fulfill its potential and become a true leader.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Prof. Estroff spoke of her immediate reactions upon hearing of the September 11 terrorist attacks, comparing her feelings with those that arose upon hearing that President John Kennedy was assassinated. She said that what she will remember most from the gathering on Polk Place is the silence. At the end, the Chancellor asked us to leave in silence and in peace. And 10,000 of us did it, just as when she was in 7th grade, she and her classmates had walked home in silence. It was the silence of respect, grief, disbelief, and of determination to somehow understand. She said there was, as usual, disagreement about the nature, meaning, and rightful response to the violence and loss of life. In the disagreements, a most compelling case is made for the preciousness and worth of the academy. In these debates the faculty teaches our students lessons for a lifetime. She said she had read, with dismay, some of the E-mails received by the Chancellor, some from our own graduates. She wondered how students could leave the University, conferred with a degree, and be unable to distinguish between anger and hatred. She said, looking at these responses of hate, the faculty needs to question how and what it teaches. She said it was a time for the faculty to be mindful of the values, principles, and moral analytic skills of those who study at the University. Prof. Estroff thanked the Chancellor for his unflinching defense of the rights of the faculty and the responsibility of each to speak his/her minds and hearts in these difficult days.

Prof. Estroff said she had asked the Educational Policy Committee to examine the University's practices regarding the scheduling of examinations and graded assignments on major religious holidays for substantial minorities of the students. She cited a recent Pathology mid-term exam for the entire Medical School first-year class that had been scheduled on Yom Kippur. The date was changed but with difficulty. She said that this is not just a question of allowing individual students to re-schedule; it is a call for a proactive stance that might have avoided the problem in the first place. It has been suggested that the University calendar note major religious observance dates so that those who are planning exams can take this into account.

Prof. Estroff said that it is time to uncouple the matters of faculty salaries and tuition increases. Making this linkage does not serve the University well.

Prof. Estroff reminded the Council that every department should have in place a faculty salary policy. As the budget cuts are implemented at the department level, faculty members should be vigilant to see that their departmental salary policies are being observed.

Prof. Estroff invited faculty input on the proposed establishment of a business administration degree program based in Qatar. She thinks this project should have the full consent and support of the faculty before it goes forward.

Resolution 2001-6 on Terrorism

Prof. Estroff asked Prof. Ferrell, Secretary of the Faculty, to preside during consideration of Resolution 2001-6 since she was the principal sponsor of the resolution.

Prof. Ferrell explained the rules of discussion and voting privileges for Resolutions and opened the floor for discussion.

Prof. Estroff moved to amend line 2 by striking the words "and military aggression" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "directed at civilians," so that line 2 as amended would read "condemns all acts of terrorism directed at civilians." Prof. Emil Malizia seconded the amendment.

Prof. Dennis Orthner (School of Social Work) questioned why that should be done; would we not want to condemn terrorism directed at anyone, civilian or otherwise?

The amendment was rejected by voice vote.

Mr. Ridley Kessler (Academic Affairs Libraries) moved to amend line 2 by striking the words "and military aggression." Prof. Robert Adler (Business School) seconded. Prof. Estroff agreed with Mr. Kessler. She suggested, for those opposed to the use of military aggression, that a separate resolution could be proposed to speak affirmatively about the issue. She wanted the issue separated from the other issues in the Resolution. She said she was speaking in favor of the amendment.

Prof. Orthner said he was in favor of the amendment.

Without objection, Vice President of the Student Body, Rudy Kleysteuber, was granted privileges of the floor. He suggested that "military aggression directed at civilians" was a form of terrorism.

The amendment moved by Mr. Kessler was adopted.

Prof. Estroff moved to amend line 2 by adding the phrase "and military aggression directed at civilians."

Prof. Anthony Meyer (Medicine) opposed the amendment on grounds of ambiguity.

Prof. Orthner agreed.

Chancellor Moeser asked for clarification of the word "aggression."

Prof. Bruce Cairns (Surgery) replied that there is no accepted definition of "aggression" in international law; instead, the terms "aggressive war" and "wars of aggression" are used in the United Nations Charter, but these, too, lack precise definition.

Prof. Harry Watson (History) spoke against the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Amendment 2001-6, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Resolution 2001-7 on Information Technology

Prof. Estroff called up for consideration Resolution 2001-7, presented by the Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee. Prof. Bill Bathrop (Communication Studies), Chair of the Committee, spoke in favor of the resolution. He reminded the Council that in presenting the annual report of the Committee in September, he had said that there were two fundamental purposes driving the report: (1) to institutionalize the role of faculty in decision-making processes with respect to information technology, and (2) to form a framework for ongoing discussion. He said that Resolution 2001-7 is intended to further the first of these purposes, and that, judging from the number of E-mails that he has received in the past week, it has certainly accomplished the latter.

Prof. Kay Lund (Cell and Molecular Physiology), President of the Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars, speaking on behalf of the Academy, voiced grave reservations about many aspects of the Resolution. In particular, Academy members are concerned that teaching should not be subordinated to technology. To begin to reward one aspect or tool of teaching, information technology, with development leaves is of grave concern. Second, we are facing difficult fiscal times with no permanent rewards for teaching. The Academy does not favor doing anything that will direct or redirect resources to any particular teaching tool.

Prof. Donna Lefebvre (Political Science) moved to divide the Resolution. [The effect of this motion is to put each section of the resolution as a separate question.] The motion to divide the Resolution was adopted.

Prof. Estroff called up for consideration Section 1 of the Resolution. [Recommending that measures of academic excellence be expanded to include, but not require, creative uses of information technology in educational and scholarly endeavors.]

Prof. Praff pointed out that the phrase "information technology" is open to interpretation. Is not a book a form of information technology? Or a blackboard? He opposed Section 1 as currently worded.

Prof. Charles Daye (Law School) asked if there is an authoritative source of information as to what constitutes "measures of academic excellence"? Prof. Estroff replied that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee struggles with this question often. She said she understands that every department is required to state its criteria for appointments, tenure and promotion. These criteria are, in effect, the "measures of academic excellence" in place in each department.

Prof. Adler commended Prof. Bathrop for the way he had dealt with the many E-mails he had received, but he said he shared the concerns of Prof. Daye. He said that Section 1 calls for expanding every measure of excellence everywhere to include information technology. This is both too vague and too all-encompassing. He supported the spirit of the resolve, but was unable at the moment to suggest an amendment to allay his concerns.

Prof. Laura Janda (Slavic Languages and Literature) said that she supports the entire Resolution as it stands. It says nothing about excluding anything or anyone. It speaks only to rewarding faculty for extra effort. She felt that the opponents are over-reacting. No one stands to lose anything as a result of adopting this resolution; we all stand to gain.

Prof. Adler disagreed. He said that the Committee is trying to increase consciousness of and devotion to technology and to urge that it be given more resources.

Section 1 was put to a vote and defeated.

Prof. Estroff called up for consideration Section 2 of the Resolution. [Calling on the Provost to include, among appointments to the University Committee on Teaching Awards, faculty innovators in the use of information technology in teaching.]

Prof. Celia Hooper (Medical Allied Health Professions) spoke as a past chair of the Teaching Awards Committee. She reported that the custom has been for the chair of the Teaching Awards Committee to consult with the Provost in choosing members of the Committee. It has been the practice to draw on faculty at all levels and all schools. We have usually relied on past teaching award winners in making appointments. That always includes faculty who are innovators in information technology. She thought Section 2 was unnecessary since the action it calls for is already being done.

Prof. Lund said that her experience has been that there are fewer volunteers for service on the Teaching Awards Committee than open seats. She said that faculty who are innovators in information technology and who have an interest in serving on the Committee need only make their interest known to her or the Provost.

Section 2 was put to a vote and defeated.

Prof. Estroff called up for consideration Section 3. [Recommending the establishment of teaching awards that consider teaching innovations with information technology as criteria for excellence.]

Prof. Lefebvre read a statement into the record, which was unanimously adopted by Academy for Distinguished Teaching Scholars Advocacy Committee:

"No special consideration should be given for appointment to the University Teaching Awards Committee or in the determination of recipients of university teaching awards to individuals who are 'faculty innovators in the use of information technology' or 'creative users of information technology in educational and scholarly endeavors.' Information technology is simply one of many sources that instructors use to communicate effectively with students. An instructor who uses the most sophisticated technology may not be an effective teacher, while a teacher who uses little or no technology may be an exceptional teacher. If students or colleagues judge a faculty member as deserving of a teaching award, they will recommend that award on the basis of overall teaching excellence, regardless of the methods and tools used by the faculty member."

Without objection, the President of the Student Body, Justin Young, was granted privileges of the floor. He spoke in favor of considering teaching innovation with information technology as one criterion, but certainly not the only one.

Prof. Bathrop said that no one on FITAC disagrees with the Advocacy Committee's statement that "an instructor who uses the most sophisticated technology may not be an effective teacher, while a teacher who uses little or no technology may be an exceptional teacher." The Committee is not asking for an award that considers only the use of technology. Instead, the Committee had discovered the perceived lack of appropriate recognition and rewards for faculty who do invest enormous amounts of time and energy in intellectual investment in developing and using I.T. effectively in order to improve their teaching. One of the things the Committee wanted was to recognize this through one or two teaching awards. The Committee is not advocating the elevation of technology over effective teaching.

Prof. Joel Schwartz (Political Science) said that he has been teaching here for over 30 years. Since 1984 he has been teaching service learning courses seeking to combine community-based experiential learning with the classroom experience. He has put much time into developing his courses and placing students. This amount of time equals or exceeds the amount of time required to make effective use of information technology. We should not be singling out one particular methodology and giving credit for the amount of time it takes to use it effectively. This simply opens a Pandora's box. We would have special teaching awards for a wide variety of techniques, including community-based service learning.

Prof. Doug Eivers (Business School) agreed with Prof. Schwartz that we should not begin to base teaching awards based upon certain methodologies. For example, why not give one for effective use of the Socratic method?

Prof. Adler also agreed and related the case of a colleague who makes amazingly effective use of the blackboard. He said that this colleague puts in much more time developing his blackboard plan than Prof. Adler does in developing his PowerPoint presentations.

Prof. Laurel Files (School of Public Health) said she did not share the concerns expressed by the opponents of these resolutions. She reads the resolution as pointing out that information technology is "something different" that is worthy of recognition. We have devoted much attention in recent years to distance education. One cannot provide distance education without a good command of information technology. She felt that some of the resistance to getting involved in distance education is a perceived lack of reward for doing it. It is inconsistent to urge more involvement in distance education and deny special recognition for obtaining proficiency in the technology that makes it possible.

Prof. Cairns said, as a surgeon, that he was very excited about the Resolution. In his field, information technology has revolutionized both what we teach and how we teach it. Whether we are talking about medical students, residents, or colleagues across the globe, this technology is evolving so rapidly that it has changed how medicine is practiced. In his field, there is a reason to single out information technology.

Prof. Lund said that the Academy is not opposing the creation of new awards that recognize specific teaching methodologies. The fundamental concern is that there are very few awards to recognize excellence in teaching. For example, there is only one award to recognize mentoring students outside the classroom. Information technology is already factored into the existing awards. She opposes Section 3 simply because it is unnecessary.

Justin Young said that the University has recognized the importance of the relationship between technology and traditional learning by requiring every student to acquire and use a laptop. He recognizes that there is hesitancy to embrace new technology, but we should be acknowledging innovations in education. Students today recognize and accept the importance of technology.

Prof. Lefebvre said that most of the faculty are neither Luddites nor neophytes with respect to information technology. She uses information technology as one tool among many. She opposes singling it out for special consideration.

Rudy Kleysteuber said students support teaching with the new technology. He wondered whether teaching awards are supposed to encourage successful implementation of existing pedagogy or to encourage the development of new pedagogical techniques, like service learning or information technology. This seems to be the philosophical question underlying much of the discussion.

Section 3 was put to a vote and defeated.

Prof. Bobbi Owen (Dramatic Art) was troubled by the discussion, which she thought to some extent was misleading. She moved to re-refer the Resolution to the Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee in hopes that the Committee would be able to bring back for consideration measures that the Council can support.

Prof. Adler said there were portions of the Resolution that he could support.

Prof. John Smith (Computer Science) said the intent is to promote innovation in I.T. in the creative use of technology. He spoke in support of Section 4 which recommends the designation of faculty leaves for I.T. development.

Prof. Ferrell pointed out that if the motion to re-refer is adopted, the entire resolution will go back to FITAC, including the sections that were voted down today. Thus, some of the substance those provisions might appropriately reappear in a reworded resolution.

Prof. Pfaff asked what the procedural alternatives were. Prof. Estroff said the alternative was to continue to discuss the Resolution paragraph by paragraph until the time ran out, and then to continue on at the next meeting.

The motion to re-refer Resolution 2001-7 was adopted by a vote of 24-19.

Prof. Daye said he did not want to appear to be opposed to I.T., but it should take an appropriate place, and he would vote for excellence in I.T. along with other things which create excellence in teaching.

Prof. Gerald Bolas (Ackland Art Museum) said that when rewriting the document he would hope that the word "faculty" would be expanded in appropriate places to include other educators or staff, non-faculty, and other innovators in the area.

Prof. Schwartz said he opposed the Resolution because he detected underneath the sense that information technology has gotten short-changed in the allocation of resources at the University. He said that this is not the case.

Prof. Estroff said it was important not to make a distinction between people who teach and people who use technology. She added that all of the faculty need to speak on behalf of their own teaching, but she did not want to let stand the divide that what the whole discussion was about was the trumping of teaching by technology. She thanked the faculty for a thoughtful discussion and thanked Prof. Balthrop for his hard work.

Annual Report of the Committee on Instructional Personnel

The report was presented by Senior Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little. There were no questions or comments.

Annual Report of the Faculty Hearings Committee

The report was presented by Prof. Frayda Bluestein. There were no questions or comments.

Annual Report of the Faculty Grievance Committee

The report was presented by Prof. Roberta Ann Dunbar. Prof. Ferrell asked about the pilot project for work with the Chapel Hill Mediation Center. Prof. Dunbar said that one matter had been referred to mediation. The Committee feels that this is a complex issue that needs more study. She noted that the Office of the President is currently studying dispute resolution in the University System. This is an important matter for future consideration, but that should be done in concert with all parties involved.

Adjournment

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

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty