



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, February 22nd, 2002, 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	<i>Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time.</i>
		Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments on any topic.
DISC	3:15	<i>Remarks by the Provost.</i>
		Provost Robert Shelton.
DISC	3:30	<i>Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty.</i>
		Professor Sue Estroff invites questions or comments on any topic.
INFO	3:50	<i>Greetings from the Chair of the Employee Forum.</i>
		Mr. Thomas H. Griffin, Jr.
ACT	3:55	<i>Resolutions 2002-1 and 2002-2 Amending the Faculty Code (Second Reading).</i>
		Professor Janet Mason, Chair of the Faculty Committee on University Government.
DISC	4:00	<i>Discussion of Transportation and Parking Issues.</i>
		Nancy Sutfenfield, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.
		Bob Knight, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.
		Chair of the T-PAC (Transportation and Parking Advisory Committee).
INFO	4:10	<i>Annual Report of the Faculty Assembly Delegation.</i>
		Professor Barbara Moran.
INFO	4:15	<i>Annual Report of the Faculty Welfare Committee.</i>
		Professor Douglas Elvers, Chair.
ACT	4:20	<i>Resolution 2002-3 on Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees.</i>
		Professor Estroff, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council.
DISC	4:30	<i>Open Discussion of Topics Raised by Faculty Members.</i>
ACT	4:50	<i>Closed Session: Honorary Degree Nominations for 2003.</i>
		Professor Joseph Ferrell, Secretary of the Faculty.
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/faccoun/.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2002-1. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the composition and selection of members of the Administrative Board of the Library.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Sections 13-1 and 13-2 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* are rewritten to read:

- “§ 13-1. **Administrative Board of the Library; composition.** (a) There shall be an Administrative Board of the Library composed of twenty-two members. Fourteen members shall be elected by and from the following electoral divisions:
- (1) The Division of Fine Arts of the College of Arts and Sciences—one member.
 - (2) The Division of the Humanities of the College of Arts and Sciences—three members.
 - (3) The Division of the Basic and Applied Natural Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Institute of Marine Sciences—three members.
 - (4) The Division of the Social Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences—three members.
 - (5) The School of Journalism and Mass Communication, the Kenan-Flagler Business School, the School of Education, the School of Law, the School of Information and Library Science, the School of Social Work, and the School of Government—three members.
 - (6) The Academic Affairs Libraries—one member.
- (b) The chair of the faculty shall appoint six members of the Administrative Board of the Library, as follows:
- (1) one member from the Division of Health Affairs.
 - (2) two members from the faculty at large.
 - (3) one undergraduate student, on recommendation of the president of the student body.
 - (4) two graduate students, on recommendation of the president of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation.

1 (c) The University librarian and the dean of the Graduate School shall be members ex
2 officio.

3 **§ 13-2. Administrative Board of the Library; election and terms of members;**

4 **meetings.** Elected members of the board shall be nominated and elected by the process
5 employed for the Faculty Council. It is preferable that no more than one elected member be from
6 any single school or department. Student members of the board shall serve one-year terms. All
7 other appointed and elected members shall serve three-year terms. No elected or appointed
8 member shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

9 The board shall elect a chair from among its members annually. The board shall meet at
10 least six times each year upon the call of the chair or of the University librarian.”

11 Sec. 2. This Resolution shall become effective July 1, 2002.

As amended.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2002-1. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the composition and selection of members of the Administrative Board of the Library.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Sections 13-1 and 13-2 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* are rewritten to read:

"§ 13-1. Administrative Board of the Library; composition. (a) There shall be an Administrative Board of the Library composed of twenty-two members. Fourteen members shall be elected by and from the following electoral divisions:

1. The Division of Fine Arts of the College of Arts and Sciences—one member.
2. The Division of the Humanities of the College of Arts and Sciences—three members.
3. The Division of the Basic and Applied Natural Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Institute of Marine Sciences—three members.
4. The Division of the Social Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences—three members.
5. The School of Journalism and Mass Communication, the Kenan-Flagler Business School, the School of Education, the School of Law, the School of Information and Library Science, the School of Social Work, and the School of Government—three members.
6. The Academic Affairs Libraries—one member.

(b) The chair of the faculty shall appoint six members of the Administrative Board of the Library, as follows:

1. one member from the Division of Health Affairs.
2. two members from the faculty at large.
3. one undergraduate student, on recommendation of the president of the student body.
4. two graduate students, on recommendation of the president of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation.

(c) The University librarian and the dean of the Graduate School shall be members ex officio.

§ 13-2. Administrative Board of the Library; election and terms of members; meetings. Elected members of the board shall be nominated and elected by the process employed for the Faculty Council. It is preferable that no more than one elected member be from any single school or department. Student members of the board shall serve one-year terms. All other appointed and elected members shall serve three-year terms. No elected or appointed member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. The three members elected in 2002 representing professional schools in the Division of Academic Affairs will be allotted three-year, two-year, and one-year terms in the order of the number of votes received.

The board shall elect a chair from among its members annually. The board shall meet at least six times each year upon the call of the chair or of the University librarian."

Sec. 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2002-2. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* to reflect a change in University organization and title and to authorize the Committee on University Government to effect amendments to reflect current titles and names of academic and administrative units and titles.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. *The Faculty Code of University Government* is amended to substitute "School of Government" for "Institute of Government" in every place the latter appears.

Sec. 2. Section 4-23 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

"§ 4-23. Committee on Instructional Personnel. (a) The committee shall consist of the deans of all the undergraduate, graduate, and professional colleges and schools (except those in the Division of Health Affairs); ~~the director of the Institute of Government;~~ and the chairs of the divisions in the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee may add such consultants and delegate such authority to sub-committees as it deems necessary. The provost shall serve as chair of the committee.

(b) The committee shall review the recommendations of the chairs of the respective departments and of the deans of all the undergraduate, graduate, and professional colleges and schools (except those in the Division of Health Affairs) with respect to additions, promotions, and advancements in personnel and with respect to courses of instruction. It shall review, improve, and implement the educational and research program of the University. The arrangement of the University calendar shall come within its purview, and such other matters as the chancellor shall from time to time refer to it."

Sec. 3. Section 1-7 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

"§ 1-7. Code amendments. (a) Proposals to amend this Code must be passed on two separate readings. At the meeting at which it is introduced, the proposal must receive the affirmative votes of a majority of the voting members of the General Faculty present and voting. Upon such tentative approval, the proposal shall be referred to the Committee on University Government, which shall consider the proposal and report its recommendations to the next regular or special meeting of the

1 General Faculty. When the proposal is reported by the Committee on University Government, those
2 present shall first determine whether to submit the proposal to a general referendum, which shall be
3 done upon motion of one-third of those present and voting. If the proposal is not submitted to a
4 general referendum, passage shall require the affirmative votes of two-thirds of those present and
5 voting. Before the final vote is taken on a proposal that is not submitted to a general referendum,
6 any faculty member present may ask for a ruling of the presiding officer as to whether the proposal
7 has been so materially amended that the text of the proposal as tentatively approved does not
8 constitute a fair representation of the substance of the proposal as amended. If the presiding officer
9 so rules, final action shall be deferred until the next meeting of the General Faculty, or the proposal
10 shall be submitted to a general referendum, as may be decided by a majority of those present and
11 voting. When a proposal is submitted to a general referendum, the secretary of the faculty shall mail
12 a ballot and a copy of the proposal, together with any written report or explanatory material
13 accompanying it, to each voting member of the General Faculty. Ballots must be returned to the
14 secretary of the faculty not later than 15 days after the date of mailing. In a general referendum,
15 passage shall require the affirmative votes of three-fifths of those voting.

16 (b) The Committee on University Government may amend this Code as needed to reflect
17 current titles and names of academic and administrative units and positions. The committee shall
18 report such amendments promptly to the secretary of the faculty, who shall report them to the
19 General Faculty.

20 Sec. 4. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.

REPORT TO THE UNC-CH FACULTY COUNCIL

FACULTY ASSEMBLY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

February 22, 2002

The Faculty Assembly is the elected body of representatives of the faculty of the sixteen campuses of the University of North Carolina. It serves as a kind of faculty council for the entire system. According to its Charter, the Faculty Assembly has the following objectives:

1. The Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina shall gather and exchange information on behalf of the faculties of the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina.
2. The Assembly shall, through appropriate channels, advise the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina, the General Assembly, and other governmental agencies and officers on matters of university-wide importance.
3. The Assembly shall advise and communicate with the President of the University of North Carolina with regard to the interests of the faculties and other matters of university-wide importance.

The Assembly is dedicated to upholding and exercising the principles of academic freedom, permanent tenure, shared governance, and the faculty's primary responsibility for the university's curriculum.

The Faculty Assembly traditionally meets four times per academic year in the UNC General Administration Building in Chapel Hill. The meetings so far this year have been on September 20th and 21st, November 16th, and February 15th. The last meeting of the year will be held on April 19th.

The size of each campus's delegation to Faculty Council is determined by the number of full-time faculty and professional staff members employed by an institution. UNC Chapel Hill has five delegates: Sue Estroff, Philip Bromberg, Diane Holditch-Davis, William Smith, and Barbara Moran. Joseph Ferrell, Carol Pardun, and Flenning Bell serve as alternates. Gretchen Bataille, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs is the primary liaison from the Office of the President to the Assembly. Richard Veit from UNC-Wilmington serves as chair of the Assembly, David Claxton from Western Carolina serves as vice-chair and Ralph Scott from East Carolina University is secretary.

INITIATIVES AND ACTIVITIES

To date the primary focus of the Faculty Assembly this year has been on three issues:

- 1) the budget for public senior higher education, and the anticipated and actual cutbacks to the UNC budget as a result of the state's growing budget deficit,
- 2) public-records law and e-mail privacy issues as they pertain to faculty,
- 3) long range planning issues for the UNC System.

Of special interest to Faculty Council members will be the Assembly's work on the length of the academic year. The UNC-CH delegation took forward to Faculty Assembly in September the resolution passed by the Chapel Hill Faculty Council last April regarding the length of the academic year. That resolution urged flexibility in allowing each campus to set its own academic calendar, a calendar that should not exceed the current 150 days, and that should meet all applicable accreditation standards. The resolution was adopted by the Faculty Assembly in November, 2001. The UNC Board of Governors approved a change in the length of the academic calendar at its February 2002 meeting. The new minimum requirements will allow universities to count the one-week exam period each semester as part of their instructional time, reversing a 1996 decree by former UNC President C.D. Spangler Jr. who had lengthened the academic year to 150 days.

Under the leadership of its Chair, Richard Veit, the Assembly has been able to move a great deal of information to its web site and to do more of its work using the Internet. The web site includes minutes of meetings and information about issues and resolutions before the Assembly. Anyone who wishes to learn more about the Faculty Assembly and its activities should consult this website at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/facassembly/facassembly.cfm>.

Barbara B. Moran



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2002-3 on Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees

WHEREAS the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has a long and great tradition of consultative governance; and

WHEREAS the members of the faculty have an important long-term interest in the well-being and future direction of the University; and

WHEREAS the members of the faculty devote their intellectual energies to the teaching, scholarship, and service that enable the University to carry out its mission to the State; and

WHEREAS the members of the faculty have valuable perspectives, information, and insight that will be beneficial to sound governance and deliberation;

THEREFORE, be it resolved:

The Faculty Council calls upon the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to provide for a seat and voice on the Board of Trustees for the Chair of the Faculty.

Projected Population Growth By Development Plan Build Out

- UNC Employees: 44%
- Health Care Employees: 16%
- Commuting Students: 8%
- Resident Students: 27%
- Visitors: 50%

Development Plan Net Parking Space Changes

- All Employees: + 435
- Commuting Students: +2
- Resident Students: -239
- Student Family Housing: +31
- Visitors: +1361
- Other: -40

Present Transportation Modes

	Employees	Students
Drive Alone	77%	16%
Local Transit	5%	20%
Regional Transit	1%	1%
Rideshare	4%	4%
Bicycle	3%	16%
Walk	2%	25%
Park-and-Ride	5%	6%
Other	3%	12%

Transportation Modes at Development Plan Build Out

	Employees	Students
Drive Alone	60%	15%
Local Transit	14%	21%
Regional Transit	2%	1%
Rideshare	5%	4%
Bicycle	3%	16%
Walk	2%	25%
Park-and-Ride	11%	7%
Other	3%	12%



**The UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL**

Carolina Center for Public Service

Bank of America Center
137 East Franklin Street, Suite 201
Campus Box 3142
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3142
Phone 919-843-7568 Fax 919-843-7379
Email cps@unc.edu
www.unc.edu/cps

2002 PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS AND GRANTS

The Carolina Center for Public Service is pleased to announce its spring 2002 awards and grants for UNC students, staff and faculty. There are several exciting changes to highlight:

- 1) University units and student organizations engaged in outstanding public service are now eligible to be nominated for the Office of the Provost Awards.
- 2) The Center has doubled the individual award amount for staff and faculty grants. Individual staff and faculty can apply for grants of up to \$10,000 from a pool of \$50,000.

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AWARDS

These awards honor extraordinary public service by a University unit or student organization with up to three awards of \$2,500. The Provost Awards are for discrete activities, not a set of activities by a unit. Nomination format and selection criteria are available on the Center's website.

Nomination deadline: March 8

ROBERT E. BRYAN AWARDS

These awards honor individual students, staff or faculty for outstanding public service projects with up to two awards of \$2,500 for staff and faculty and up to two awards for students of \$1,000. Nomination format and selection criteria are available on the Center's website.

Nomination deadline: March 8

GRANTS TO STAFF AND FACULTY

One-year grants of up to \$10,000 are available to faculty and staff to initiate or enhance public service projects in North Carolina. Grant recipients will be selected according to five selection criteria: significance, University engagement, feasibility, community partnership and lasting impact. Funds may be requested for any costs related to the proposed public service project.

Application deadline: March 8

Detailed information on these awards and grants is available at www.unc.edu/cps or from Amy Gorely, MPA, Program Officer, at 843-7566 or agorely@email.unc.edu. For purposes of these awards and grants, the public service activity must benefit the community outside of the University. All recipients will be honored at the University Public Service Awards Banquet on April 24, 2002.

The Center administers a Public Service listserv as part of its mission to support students, faculty, and staff as they carry out the University's public service mission. You can subscribe to the listserv and submit information to be included in the weekly public service message at www.unc.edu/cps.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

February 22, 2002

Attendance

Present (60): Allison, Barbour, Bouldin, Bowen, Boxill, Bromberg, Bynum, Cairns, Chenault, Colindres, Crawford-Brown, Daye, D'Cruz, Drake, Elter, Elvers, Files, Fishell, Foley, George, Gilland, Granger, Janda, Kagarise, Kalleberg, Ketch, Kjervik, Kopp, Kupper, Langbauer, Lubker, Malizia, McCormick, McGraw, Meece, Meyer, A. Molina, P. Molina, Moran, Nonini, Orthner, Oley, Owen, Pfaff, Raab-Traub, Rao, Reinert, Robinson, Rowan, Schauer, Sigurdsson, W. Smith, Straughan, Tresolini, Tulloch, Vaughn, Walsh, Waters, Williams, Yopp.

Excused absences (24): Admiora, Bollen, Carelli, Clegg, Cotton, Fowler, Henry, Kessler, LeFebvre, Metzguer, Nelson, Panter, Pisano, Poole, Raasch, Retsch-Bogart, Shea, Slatt, J. Smith, Strauss, Sueta, Tauchen, Wallace, Watson.

Unexcused absences (3): Adler, McQueen, Sams.

Chancellor's Remarks

Athletics. Chancellor Moeser called attention to the men's soccer team. They won the NCAA championship this year and Coach Elmar Bolowich was named Coach of the Year. The chancellor complimented the team for their academic performance and good sportsmanship. The team has an overall grade point performance of 3.0, and last fall was one of 77 varsity programs with grade point averages of 3.0 or better. He added that the men's team has not had a red card for three years, and leads the Atlantic Coast Conference in the smallest number of yellow cards. In response to a question he explained that a red card signals a sportsmanship infraction while a yellow card is a warning of such.

The chancellor called Coach Bolowich to the podium. Mr. Bolowich said that he places high value on good sportsmanship and high academic performance. He meets with each incoming freshman class on his team, along with their parents, to explain this. Each team member must achieve a cumulative 2.0 GPA to remain on the team.

Currently, no team member is in academic trouble. He and his staff try to prevent problems and to help before they become insurmountable. In the fall season the team plays in about 20 contests. They miss only 1.5 days of class due to the schedule. Practice time in the fall is about 15 hours a week, and in the spring they practice early in the morning, between 11 and 12 hours a week. He thanked the faculty for its support.

Qatar. Chancellor Moeser said one of the remarkable things about this University and its culture is the way in which we all can engage each other in discourse, debate, disagreement, and dissent in an atmosphere of civility and collegiality, and he thanked the faculty and students for their contributions to the debate on the Qatar proposal.

Parking. Chancellor Moeser said he was concerned about the tenor of the debate regarding parking. Some of it has had ugly qualities tending to divide and pit one group against another. He is concerned about reports of personal attacks against individuals or groups. He encouraged the faculty not to lose sight of the value of a culture that enables us to engage in the difficult discussions and disagree with one another while still maintaining the spirit of collegiality.

Tuition. Chancellor Moeser reported that the Board of Trustees has accepted the recommendations of the Tuition Task Force and has forwarded to the President and the Board of Governors a proposal for a campus-initiated tuition increase of \$400 for the coming year. Of the roughly \$9 million to be realized from the increase, 40% is earmarked for need-based financial aid, 30% for faculty salary increases, 24% for additional faculty to lower the student-faculty ratio, and 6% for stipends for graduate teaching. The chancellor then turned to proposals that are under consideration for tuition increases across the University System. One of these proposals is for a 4.8% across-the-board that would be essentially for need-based aid. Nearly all of this would go to other campuses because many of them are now unable to meet their needs for need-based aid from their own resources. Another proposal is for a 10% increase across-the-board increase to provide about \$40 million to address enrollment growth. Of this total, \$10 million would go for need-based aid and the remaining \$30 million for enrollment growth. Carolina students would contribute \$9 million of the total, but under the allocation formula being used to distribute the proceeds among the UNC campuses, Carolina would receive \$2.3 million for enrollment growth and \$900,000 for need-based aid. Thus, our students and their families would be expected to provide \$5.8 million to fund need-based aid and enrollment growth on other campuses in the System. The Chancellor said this is obviously a controversial proposal. He feels strongly that it is the obligation of the General Assembly to provide for enrollment growth, even though he acknowledges that the State is having serious financial difficulty with a budget short-fall approaching \$1 billion in the current fiscal year and probably a similar amount in 2002-03.

Prof. Doug Elvers (Business) asked about the recent action of the Board of Governors rescinding the requirement of a 150-day academic calendar. He asked if there would be a change in the published calendar for 2002-03 and, if so, when might those in the process of planning know. Chancellor Moeser said there may be a minor adjustment for 2002-03 but the fundamental change will be in the academic year 2003-2004. By then our calendar will be almost completely synchronized with Duke's, which will facilitate implementation of the Robertson Scholars Program.

Dean Risa Palm (Arts & Sciences) asked the chancellor to repeat the figures he had given as to the amount of money that would be taken from and returned to the UNC-CH campus. She thought they were rather stunning. The chancellor repeated the numbers, emphasizing that the proposal would effectively transfer tuition receipts from our students to other campuses to the tune of \$5.8 million. He said that two other concerns with that tuition plan are (1) it increases both in-state and out-of-state tuition by the same percentage (10%) even though our out-of-state tuition is much closer to national norms than in-state tuition, and (2) it would add 10% to the previously-approved substantial tuition increases for graduate and professional programs in the Kenan-Flagler Business School and the Schools of Dentistry, Public Health, Medicine, and Law. The \$400 increase campus-initiated does not apply to those schools. Furthermore, the need-based aid that would come back to this campus would be only \$900,000 and would be available only to in-state students.

Prof. Richard Pfaff said that he regretted that the faculty frequently appears in the media as petulant, overpaid, and/or negligent. He cited as recent examples published figures as to average faculty salaries and graduation rates for athletes. He pointed out that due to the vastly different conditions prevailing in, for example, the College and the Medical School, such "average" salary figures are essentially meaningless. As for graduation rates for athletes, the NCAA requires reporting the data in a format that is not representative of the situation here. Given these facts, why don't we distribute meaningful statistics in advance? The chancellor agreed that this would be desirable.

Sr. Assoc. Dean Richard Soloway (Arts & Sciences) returned to the proposed 10% System-wide tuition increase. He said he is still trying to absorb the figures and finds them truly stunning. What are the implications for faculty salary increases, given how little would be returned to this campus? Chancellor Moeser said that it is obvious that this campus would receive very little from this proposal that could be directed toward salary increases. As for the allocation formulas used by the Office of the President, he said he has been reminded that Carolina has not complained when they worked in our favor. Nevertheless, that admonition will not deter him from pointing out the flaws in the current proposal.

Provost's Remarks

Provost Robert Shelton reported on the status of on-going searches for deans:

- School of Social Work—negotiations with a candidate continue.
- School of Pharmacy—about to begin a search, with input from the faculty of the School.
- School of Education—about to begin the process and will meet with the faculty of that School.

Budget Process. Provost Shelton said he had met early in the week with the deans and vice chancellors, and will meet Monday with the ECFC to talk about the budget. He said that Vice Chancellor Tony Waldrop has been leading an examination of the use of overhead funds in an effort to clarify for the legislature how these funds are used and why it is essential that they not be captured for general State budget purposes.

Academic Planning Task Force. Provost Shelton reported that a committee of faculty and administrators is working hard to produce a draft academic plan. Among other sources, the task force will consult the case statement for the Carolina Campaign and the Curriculum Review. He hopes the work can be completed by the summer. He said all the senior people in his office are engaged in an active or support role in this undertaking.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Chair of the Faculty Prof. Sue Estroff congratulated Jen Daum, Student Body President-elect. She also congratulated the Graduate and Professional Student Federation president-elect Branson Page, a medical student.

Prof. Estroff said there was some talk of the Board of Governors reducing our campus-based tuition increase by nearly half to \$200 or \$250. She emphasized that the System-wide tuition increase being considered will result in \$6 million of the money generated on this campus being lost to this campus. Money paid by our students will go to other campuses to cover increased enrollment cost. She said this would be an intolerable move and one that is the faculty's responsibility to oppose with logic and with passion. She said the faculty recognizes that the campus is part of the University System and wants to be an engaged partner in the System, but we do not want to be penalized because we are a research institution that does not want essential increases in enrollment, or for seeking to recruit and retain faculty who are leaders in their fields. We do want to provide our students with the finest possible educational experience, and the faculty with a challenging and nourishing scholarly environment. She said that while we do need our Board of Governors to be gladators on our behalf, it is disheartening to see a proposal that has the potential to turn the sword on us. She said that the University is well on the way to having a bed for every head, but the faculty needs to have a head for every bed. She said it is time to have a serious conversation about capping enrollment at Chapel Hill somewhat short of what the demands of application and eligibility requires. At some point we have to say "no." At some point we will do a disservice to the students who come to Chapel Hill expecting and deserving the kind of educational experience that we can no longer offer. Nothing will diminish the ranks of the faculty of the best and brightest faster than the deadly combination of teaching overload and shrinking resources. Prof. Estroff said that the revenue sources at the University were transforming from legislative appropriations to resources generated by the faculty through research grants, from tuition, and from fund-raising. She said that at some juncture the University needs to consider how and if it can continue to claim that it is a public institution when we are increasingly expected to generate our own revenues while remaining at risk for losing some of these self-generated funds to a State government that is in fiscal trouble. She said she takes this as the most serious challenge the University has ever faced.

Prof. Estroff said that the faculty views regarding parking are being taken seriously and taken into account. She expressed admiration for Assistant Vice Chancellor Bob Knight, who has taken on this difficult task, and she urged the faculty to let the process work. The ECFC has been pushing for a tiered plan for parking permits, one that will graduate the cost of parking permits according to salary with those making the least paying the least. Prof. Estroff said she needs to know the faculty's feelings on that idea.

Prof. Janet Mason (School of Government) asked whether other campuses would also experience a negative cash-flow from the 10% System-wide tuition increase. Provost Shelton said that four of the sixteen campuses would collect more in increased tuition than they would receive back, but no other campus would experience a negative impact comparable to Carolina's. Prof. Estroff said it wasn't clear to her what the allocation formula is being proposed. She said that the chancellor has argued strenuously that is not State-appropriated money and should not be allocated in the same manner. It is tuition money coming out of the pockets of our students and their families to be reallocated to other campuses and the system.

Prof. Nancy Raab-Traub (School of Medicine) asked about the article in the *News and Observer*, stating that the Chapel Hill campus was putting all of the tuition increase money into professors' pockets. She hoped a way could be found to counter that inaccurate allegation.

Prof. Estroff said the other campuses that stand to lose are North Carolina State, North Carolina School of the Arts, Winston-Salem State, and UNC-Asheville.

Provost Shelton said the proposed allocations are based on a formula that classifies the institutions in the system into four different categories (Research I being the highest) and classifies the type of students being educated at each institution from more expensive to less expensive. He said that President Broad asserts that the allocation formula is the same as has been used in the past. What is different is that the money that is being collected to allocate in this instance is not State appropriations but tuition receipts. We get hurt because we have a large number of students and therefore generate a large amount of tuition dollars. We provide need-based aid from our own resources and therefore do not need a lot of that money back for that purpose. Finally, we have chosen to have a more moderate growth curve than some other campuses.

Ms. Elizabeth Chenaut (Academic Affairs Libraries) asked how the proposal is being justified to the students and their families.

Prof. Ferrell said that policy issues related to point of collection versus point of expenditure continually arise in public finance. The local-option sales tax offers a good example. Large counties argue that all of the sales tax revenue collected in their borders should come back to them. Smaller surrounding counties point out that they have to bear much of the cost of public schools and other infrastructure for people who live in their borders but commute to work outside. The discussion we have been engaged in invokes the same issues with regard to the funding of the University System. He said that he does not know what the allocation formula is, nor the policies that it is intended to implement. Without that information, he felt unable to express an informed opinion on the matter in debate.

Prof. Noelle Granger (Cell Biology & Anatomy) said that she had the feeling that the University was being used to bail out the State, and she felt it would be the impression that a lot of people had.

Prof. Estroff introduced Mr. Tommy Griffin, the new president of the Employee Forum. Mr. Griffin, who has worked at the University for 29 years, expressed great respect for the faculty, staff, and students. He said the staff at the University takes great pride in working at a great University. He said he believes that if everyone works together we can do anything and will continue to keep this a great University.

Resolutions 2002-1 and 2002-2 Amending the Faculty Code (Second Reading)

Prof. Janet Mason, Chair of the Committee on University Government, presented Resolution 2002-1 on second reading. The resolution amends the Faculty Code with respect to the composition and selection of members of the Administrative Board of the Library.

Prof. Mason moved to amend the resolution by adding a clause providing that the three members elected in 2002 representing professional schools in the Division of Academic Affairs will be allotted three-year, two-year, and one-year terms in the order of the number of votes received. She said the purpose of the amendment is to stagger terms of members in this category. As the initial terms expire, all subject elections will be for three-year terms. The amendment was adopted.

Prof. Mason further moved to amend the resolution by adding a clause making it clear that the amendment will take effect for elections conducted in 2002. The amendment was adopted.

There being no discussion or debate, Resolution 2002-1 was adopted as amended on second reading and will take effect according to its terms.

Prof. Mason presented Resolution 2002-2 on second reading. There being no discussion or debate, the resolution was adopted on second reading and will take effect according to its terms.

Discussion of Transportation and Parking Issues

Vice Chancellor Nancy Sutfenfield said the basic issues being addressed in transportation and parking are all related to access. She said that because of all of the issues which have developed over the years, the Traffic and Parking Advisory Committee (T-PAC) has worked very hard to come to consensus on change strategies that need to be considered in order to provide safe access. She said one of the struggles is to find a right balance for allowing the University community to have input and involvement. Once T-PAC concludes its work, she intends to form an *ad hoc* group to advise her about potential changes in T-PAC's role, structure and composition.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Bob Knight, Chair of T-PAC, discussed the access, safety, convenience, and reliability, of transportation and how funds will be generated to cover the cost.

Prof. Vincent Kopp (Anesthesiology) asked whether parking for construction crews has been included in T-PAC's deliberations. What provisions are being made to collect fees from the companies to offset the parking spaces that are allocated to them and their crews? Vice Chancellor Knight said they pay for the spaces they reserve. Also, a charge of \$15,000 per parking space eliminated is assessed against each construction project. This is the average cost per space of parking decks. Prof. Kopp asked at what point are the fees collected. Mr. Knight said that collection and construction of new spaces is not closely correlated.

Prof. Barbara Moran (Information and Library Science) asked about the tiered parking plan and what the differential was. Mr. Knight said that a detailed proposal plan has not yet been worked out. The idea needs to be studied very carefully.

Prof. Charles Daye (Law) spoke in favor of a tiered plan.

Sr. Assoc. Provost Bernadette Gray-Little asked if the tiered permit fee proposal assumes that access to a permit will be based on the same factors, such as seniority, that are used now. Vice Chancellor Knight said this is under discussion.

Prof. Donald Bynum (Orthopaedics) observed that the Triangle Transit Authority bus service seems to him a totally bankrupt program. He estimated ridership at 1% or less. Much improvement is needed if mass transit is to be an important part of the solution to our parking problems. Vice Chancellor Knight said as a community we need to press for more use of the regional transit.

Prof. Diane Kjevrik (Nursing) said the nursing faculty and staff work shifts that include both the early morning and late evening hours. For them, access to parking is also a safety issue. These safety concerns are, she said, an important part of the question of value placed upon parking rates whether they are tiered or not.

Prof. Wendell Gilland (Business) said he lent his support for the notion of tiered parking, especially for those people who earn less and live the farthest away.

Ms. Chénault said that car-pooling could be increased if work schedules could be arranged conveniently. Vice Chancellor Knight said a Transportation Demand Coordinator had been hired to help people find a way for access to the campus, and it was her sole job to help people find alternative ways of transportation.

Prof. Kathleen McGraw (Health Sciences Library) said she felt the issue of safety should be brought into the picture for those who had to ride the bus to an empty parking lot at night. She asked about the night parking issue. Vice Chancellor Knight said that was one of the most contentious issues, as was visitor parking and parking for those who attend night performances on campus.

Prof. Donald Nonini (Anthropology) said he thoroughly supported the equity issue, but whenever tiers were supported inequity within tiers happen. He suggested a modified structure.

Resolution 2002-3 on Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees

Resolution 2002-3 was moved, seconded, and adopted unanimously.

Closed Session: Honorary Degree Nominations for 2003

Prof. Joseph Ferrell, Secretary of the Faculty, presented the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards with respect to honorary degrees to be awarded at Commencement 2003.

Adjournment

The business of the day having concluded, the Council was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty