



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY COUNCIL Friday, January 17th, 2003 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
DISC	3:00	Call to Order. The Secretary of the Faculty.
DISC	3:00	Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time.
		Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments.
INFO	3:15	Remarks by the Provost.
		Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert Shelton.
		<i>Including:</i>
		Progress Report on the Academic Plan.
		Annual Report of the University Priorities and Budget Advisory Committee.
DISC	3:35	Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty.
		Professor Sue Estroff invites questions or comments.
ACT	3:55	Resolutions Amending the Faculty Code of University Government.
		<i>Second Reading:</i>
		Resolution 2003-1 on the Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences.
		Resolution 2003-2 on the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.
		<i>First Reading:</i>
ACT	4:00	Resolution 2003-3 to Establish a Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.
		Resolution 2003-4 Concerning Gender Equity in Faculty Salaries.
		Professor Etta Pisano, Chair of the Status of Women Committee.
ACT	4:15	Resolution on Honor System Reform.
		Resolution 2003-5 On Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code.
		Resolution 2003-6 Amending the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance.
		Professor Judith Wegner.
ACT	4:25	Report of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure.
		Resolution 2003-7 Endorsing Certain Recommendations of the Task Force.
		Professors Paul Farel and Barbara Harris, Co-chairs.
INFO	4:40	Annual Report of the Advisory Committee.
		Professor Frederick P. Brooks Jr., Chair.
INFO	4:45	Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council.
		Professor Estroff, Chair.
DISC	4:50	Open Discussion of Topics Raised by Faculty Members.
ACT	5:00	Adjourn.

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

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Draft

Academic Plan for The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

January 14, 2003

Introduction

We stand at a key crossroad as Carolina enters its third century. Through the official launching of the Carolina First Campaign, implementation of the Campus Master Plan, development of Carolina North, renewal of the undergraduate curriculum, and the exercise of leadership that fosters the best ideas of our exceptional faculty, we seek to become the leading public university in the United States. The University of North Carolina has helped transform the State and the South; has emerged as a leading research university; has developed a deep tradition of public service; and has demonstrated a persisting commitment to excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and professional teaching.

At the same time, we face significant challenges. Carolina occupies a region undergoing rapid demographic changes, requiring us to become more demographically diverse and to increase our international presence. North Carolina's economic base is shifting rapidly from agriculture, furniture and textile manufacturing to services, banking, and biotechnology. While the State has suffered economically in the last two years, its population has continued to grow at a remarkable rate, imposing unprecedented demands on State government and on the University system.

The University has taken substantial budget cuts in the last two years, and prospects for adequate state funding for the next two years are dim. We assume that over the next five years we will see a slow improvement in the State's economy, with (at best) only incremental growth in the University's budget. Although following plan is presented with these realities in mind, we are also certain that Carolina's long-term future will surpass its distinguished past.

Purpose of the Plan

This plan describes our overarching goals and provides a template for budget allocation for the next five years. Many of the steps suggested in this plan can be implemented without additional funding, and some require only minimal support. Those that require more substantial funding will not be implemented unless funds from the Carolina First Campaign, from judicious resource reallocation, and - in time - from additional State support make those changes possible. Whether increases come or not, the Academic Plan will serve as a primary guide to the Provost for resource allocation.

All the goals described below should be read in the context of one overarching criterion: given limited budgets, we will favor programs that are intellectually substantive, exert broad educational impact, and promise significant advances in research. The fundamental goal of this academic plan is to preserve and strengthen what Carolina already does well while also enabling the University's faculty and leaders to grasp appropriate new opportunities when sufficient funds, public or private, become available.

The Academic Plan is to be read in conjunction with the Report of the Intellectual Climate Task Force of 1997, the Carolina First Campaign Report of 2002, and the Curriculum Review Project in the College of Arts and Sciences of 2001-03.

Priorities

Carolina has six priorities for the period 2003-2008: In order of importance, they are: (1) to provide the strongest possible undergraduate, graduate, and professional academic experience, (2) to make significant gains in faculty recruitment, retention, and development, (3) to foster both of the previous goals by increasing faculty, student, and staff diversity, (4) to better integrate interdisciplinary research and education, (5) to enhance public engagement, and (6) to extend the University's international research, teaching, and presence. These priorities are discussed in detail below. Each section includes metrics by which we will measure our progress over the next five years.

Priority One: To Provide the Strongest Possible Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Academic Experience.

Carolina enthusiastically embraces its public identity and its public mission, yet embodies a standard of excellence equal to that of great private universities. The recommendations for strengthening the undergraduate and graduate experience are addressed sequentially in this section.

A. The Undergraduate Experience

One of Carolina's enduring strengths is its capacity to provide an exceptional liberal arts education for undergraduates in a research university setting. Exemplary strengths in many departments and schools, the requirement that all students complete a single, strong General College curriculum, an "out of class" campus environment that complements students' in-class experience, and an unwavering commitment to excellent teaching are among Carolina's defining features.

Against this background, we must limit enrollment expansion. Carolina has reached a size at which it is both large enough to attain a critical mass of competing and complementary thought, and a national and international visibility and voice. Yet unlike some of its larger public peers, Carolina has retained a sense of place, philosophy, and collegiality that defines it as "Carolina." Enrollment growth funding from the State does not match the true cost of providing an excellent education. We therefore will expand modestly and incrementally, adding no more than 1,000 students in total to our undergraduate and graduate population over the next five years. Although we will not dramatically increase enrollments during the next five years, we will reallocate resources among schools and departments to meet the changing needs of our students and society. We will not expand into new areas without providing adequate infrastructure, faculty, staff, and funding.

We must make five key changes to strengthen the undergraduate academic experience at Carolina: (1) Increase the number of small-group student experiences; (2) Better integrate student living and learning space; (3) Strengthen the culture of honor; (4) Broaden and improve the means of teaching; and (5) Continue to improve undergraduate advising. A discussion of these five recommendations follows.

First, the University must provide more small-group and experiential learning experiences, and make them available throughout our students' courses of study. The well-received first-year seminar program, now serving about half of our first-year students, should be fully implemented to ensure that every first-year student has at least one such seminar. Enrollment in the Honors Program should be doubled over the next five years from the current level of 200 students.

At every level, more courses should adopt innovative formats, including interdisciplinary seminars and inquiry-based seminars that in some cases are student-initiated. Students must have greater opportunities to participate actively and frequently in class and in on-line discussions, and to express and test their ideas in conversation with other instructors and fellow students.

At the same time, students should be provided more opportunities to learn by doing and observing outside of the classroom. That will require more service-learning classes, more independent study opportunities, more internships, and more study-abroad options — as well as scholarships to make overseas experiences affordable for more of our students. Our goal is to enable every Carolina student to have the opportunity to participate in seminars, to study abroad, to engage in research projects, to perform public service, or to write a senior thesis.

Second, we must explore appropriate ways to integrate Carolina's living and learning environments. Although the emerging mixed-use orientation of south campus development is starting to address this concern, the connection between intellectual life and living environments might be enhanced if first- and second-year students were primarily located in the residence halls nearest the classrooms and the faculty of the liberal-arts core classes that they take. A cadre of faculty directors of study might also maintain offices in campus residence halls and fraternity and sorority houses. They would serve as advisors and activities directors, fostering intellectual growth outside of the classroom.

Moreover, first-year orientation programming should be reviewed to ensure that it contributes directly to the intellectual engagement of first-year students. Fraternity and sorority rush must be re-examined to ensure that it does not impede the intellectual engagement of first-year students. Finally, more residential spaces should be organized around academic themes.

Third, we must make honor, integrity, and ethics a stronger part of the fabric of undergraduate life. We must commit ourselves to a campus-wide conversation dedicated to demonstrating the importance of ethics and personal responsibility to a strong intellectual community. We must implement the proposed revisions to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance. But we must move beyond mere issues of policy revision to the more difficult task of ensuring an environment of honor and integrity for the entire campus community. Beginning with orientation and continuing throughout the undergraduate experience, we must provide courses, reading and discussion programs, lecture and colloquium programs, leadership development initiatives, and other steps to ensure that a culture of honor pervades our campus.

Fourth, we need to broaden and improve the means of teaching. Departments must have the means to provide incentives that take into account the extra knowledge and skills needed to excel in problem-based learning, service learning, interdisciplinary education, and to adopt effective uses of instructional technology. Sustainable funding should be available for curricular innovation grants. Particular attention must be paid to the use of electronic technology, for both on-campus and distance education, and to faculty involvement in the integration of technology into teaching.

Fifth, we need to continue to improve the undergraduate advising system. Recent advances in our computer-based audit system to help students meet formal requirements for graduation have been helpful, as has the hiring of full-time advisors. We need to increase the number of advisors by one-third, and they need better pay and improved career prospects.

Metrics to measure our progress towards providing a more intensive academic experience for undergraduate education include (1) The proportion of courses enrolling fewer than 20 students; (2) First-year retention rates; (3) Four, five, and six-year graduation rates; (4) Student satisfaction with the quality of teaching and advising and their level of engagement as measured by NSSE and CSEQ annual surveys; (5) The rate of student participation in intensive academic programs (e.g., research, independent studies, internships, honors); (6) The number of honors courses and service-learning courses available; (7) The number of students who study abroad each year; (8) External rankings of the undergraduate program; and (9) The amount of annual grant funding provided for faculty curriculum innovation.

B. The Graduate and Professional Experience

Many of our graduate and professional programs have emerged as national leaders over the past half-century, both in health affairs and in academic affairs. We must continue to attract the most productive and prestigious faculty in our areas of traditional strength. We must also, however, aggressively pursue development of first-rate programs in genomics, proteomics, materials science, and other emerging areas of the biological sciences and medicine. The proposed joint venture in materials science with the NCSU School of Engineering holds great promise for both of our institutions.

Critical to the continued excellence of the graduate and professional experience at Carolina is the implementation of the Five Year Strategic Plan for Research and Graduate Studies recently submitted by the Vice Chancellor for Research. As that plan explains in detail, we must take six steps to ensure our role as a leading Research One university: (1) Invest for sustained growth and leadership in the research enterprise; (2) Enhance technology transfer and economic development; (3) Attract and retain top faculty and graduate students; (4) Protect Carolina's reputation and avoid the risks of noncompliance; (5) Increase the effectiveness of the research infrastructure; and (6) Develop support for research through outreach and communication.

In addition, we need to integrate graduate and professional students more fully into the life of the University. The presence of exemplary graduate and professional students immeasurably strengthens Carolina's undergraduate programs, just as the undergraduates help enliven and enrich graduate and professional studies. But graduate and professional study often focuses students on distinct disciplines located on a single part of the campus. That situation should not deprive graduate or professional students of the opportunity to engage with people in other disciplines. To alleviate this isolation, we should create a graduate student center in the heart of campus — a place in which students may gather informally and participate in interdisciplinary seminars. Graduate and professional students should also be recruited to serve as advisors and role models for undergraduates in dormitories, extracurricular activities, and within departments and schools. Carolina must attract the best graduate students. To do so requires a commitment to provide greater support, in the form of increased stipends for TAs, improved opportunities for research, support for development of teaching, and superior research facilities.

Metrics to measure our progress towards providing a strong academic experience in graduate and professional education include (1) The percent of new research and lab space created to support graduate education and research; (2); Passing rates for professional examinations; (3) External rankings for graduate and professional schools; (4) Placement of doctoral and master's recipients; (5) Student evaluation of quality of instruction, research supervision, and professional training; (6) The

average level of graduate student TA compensation versus our AAU peers; and (7) Ranking of our library system by the Association of Research Libraries.

Priority Two: Strengthening Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Development

Sustaining Carolina's strengths and becoming the nation's leading public university will require successes in recruiting, retaining, and developing extraordinary faculty members. With respect to recruitment, the University will see unprecedented levels of retirements over the next decade, and must therefore compete vigorously for the best talent in the entire national and international intellectual pool. Faculty retention may be an even more urgent issue. Over the past few decades, the pressure has grown on many faculty to generate revenue via external research funding and, in some health science schools, by providing clinical services. The University now depends heavily on these faculty to provide a significant portion of its budget. The stress on these faculty members has recently become so severe that some are leaving the University and others are reluctantly focusing less on teaching than on their revenue-generating endeavors.

Consequently, both to address faculty retention and to support Priority One, we must take the following seven steps: (1) Streamline the recruitment process and combine it with an effective spousal hiring program; (2) Create a fully funded sabbatical program (3) Expand resources for course development; (4) Build sufficient infrastructure and provide adequate staff support for faculty research and teaching; (5) Fully fund the libraries; (6) Increase funding for graduate student teaching assistants and research assistants, and (7) Create a faculty center. These steps are discussed in turn below.

First, we need to have searches that are flexible and continuing, that allow rapid identification of new talent, completion of negotiations, and formulation of offers. Because faculty members increasingly come as pairs, we need to use the strong base of colleges, universities, and businesses in the Triangle to enable Carolina to recruit both partners simultaneously. We must also acknowledge and respond to the special challenges of recruiting women and minorities, including adopting a tenure and leave process that recognizes the difficulty of starting families while establishing research and teaching programs.

Second, faculty members need opportunities for recurrent retooling and development. The sustained intellectual life of the faculty requires time dedicated to research and, especially, for starting new research and teaching directions. Because of the information explosion and technologies that provide unprecedented access to research opportunities, productive faculty in all disciplines are obliged to devote increasing amounts of time simply to keeping abreast of new developments. Changing funding patterns also oblige them increasingly to devote their energy to competing for external funding. New research and teaching directions require time devoted to study, often in the partnership with collaborators.

The single fundamental improvement that will enable Carolina to begin to confront these challenges more effectively is to develop a true sabbatical program. Although a patchwork of leave programs has increased research opportunities in recent years, the lack of a formal sabbatical program is a huge impediment to faculty development, one that increasingly puts Carolina at competitive disadvantage in contrast to the well-funded private institutions and our peer public institutions.

Third, recognition of superb teaching must be increased, rewarded, and made more firmly a basis for tenure, promotion, and salary increments. Faculty teach through advising, mentoring, directing independent study, and guiding students' research. This array of activities needs to be better

appreciated and promoted within the university and better reported and explained to the broader community. And above all, opportunities for course development need to be increased, to enable faculty to design or redesign courses in ways that make most effective use of their research and of ever-improving instructional technologies. Expanded resources must be provided for course development and instruction.

Fourth, campus infrastructure is critical for the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty. This is especially true for centralized research facilities, and it includes not only equipment but also well-qualified and well-compensated staff. The University needs to devote resources to developing the physical, chemical, biological and computational facilities on this campus - facilities that are considered part of the normal operations required for the science programs on other campuses. The science complex provides an historic opportunity for this campus, and the physical space that it provides should be complemented with a long-range plan for the establishment and maintenance of these resources.

Fifth, our libraries need to be better funded in order to keep up with the explosion of information and the reduction in purchasing power occasioned by unprecedented increases in costs, especially of scientific journals. There are dramatic changes looming in scholarly communication, brought about by the rising cost of traditional publishing; commercial and governmental pressures that restrict access to intellectual property; and the power of online technology to bring current information quickly to the point of use, as well as to archive and make available vast amounts of information in multiple formats. Carolina must begin to sort out what this means to its success, and be willing to take a leadership role.

Sixth, the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty who are excellent in research requires the recruitment and development of first-quality graduate and professional students. Funding for graduate and professional students at Carolina must become much more competitive. We lose too many top candidates because other institutions — our peers as well as many lesser ones — can offer much better support for graduate education.

Seventh, a stronger sense of community within the faculty, and between the faculty, students and staff will also aid in faculty recruitment, retention, and development. It will also invigorate research and teaching that occurs when faculty and graduate students are able to get together frequently and informally. A sense of departmental isolation inhibits new intellectual initiatives and an appreciation of the larger life and contributions of the university. Creating a faculty center would mitigate this problem. And as the campus master planners pointed out, the University needs a series of indoor and outdoor social gathering places across the campus. Such spaces should be included in plans for future buildings.

The metrics for achieving these seven steps include (1) Average time for completion of recruitment, from announcement of position to completion of hiring agreement; (2) Number of spousal or partner hires per year; (3) Number of faculty receiving sabbaticals; (4) The amount of funds allocated for course development; (5) The percentage increase in physical, chemical, biological and computational facilities; (6) The level of TA funding among our AAU peers; (7) The creation of a faculty center; (8) Faculty awards and prizes (e.g., NEH, NEA, NHC, ACLS, Fulbright, Humboldt, Guggenheim); (9) Faculty memberships in research, scholarly, and creative societies (e.g., American Academy of Arts and Letters, National Academy of Science, Institute of Medicine); (10) Faculty leadership roles in professional, disciplinary, educational and service societies; (11) Total external funds for research, scholarship, and artistic creation; (12) Number of postdoctoral appointees; (13) Number of intellectual

property disclosures; (14) Number of patents issued times the frequency of citations; and (15) Number of faculty we retain against competing offers from peer institutions.

Priority Three: Furthering Diversity

In order to assemble and retain the best faculty who will provide all our students with the best possible education at every level, we must increase Carolina's capacity to draw upon, welcome, and benefit from the nation's and the world's most able researchers, teachers, and public servants. We must ensure that people of all abilities, races, and cultures feel welcome as students as well as members of the faculty and staff. We must also continue the successful minority student recruitment efforts and the excellent support programs that have resulted in favorable national attention for Carolina. We should also implement the proposed US Diversity requirement for undergraduates, since diversity is critical to the University's effectiveness as an educational institution, one that fully prepares its students for the world they will inhabit and lead.

We must integrate into the curriculum and daily life the needs and concerns of Black Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, and Asians. To do this, we need to create an atmosphere in which individuals are welcomed and enabled fully to realize their abilities, without regard to race, ethnicity, disability, gender, or sexual orientation. We need to implement the recommendations made in March 2000 by the Minority Affairs Review Committee that have not yet been accomplished. These include (1) centralizing in the Office of Minority Affairs minority concerns as they relate to outreach, recruitment, retention, and scholarships; (2) implementing the recommendations of the Intellectual Climate Task Force of special concern to minorities (e.g., English as a second language, sickle cell anemia research, immigration and naturalization issues, minorities and the media); (3) sustaining excellence in African American studies; (4) continuing to support and publicize the accomplishments and activities of the Sonja Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center and the Institute of African-American Research; (5) increasing support for Native American studies and other area studies; and (6) making better use of established minority organizations in the recruitment of minority faculty. A recent successful model that bears further examination is the School of Medicine's Minority Faculty Recruitment Program.

Finally, we need to expand our intra-university programs that call on the unique historical perspectives or special opportunities at the state's six historically black and minority universities. These could include joint research efforts, cross-listed courses, teleconferences, distance-learning opportunities, and shared lectures, conferences and seminars. Funding might be sought to create programs like the Robertson Scholars Program with our minority sister institutions. At a minimum, we should identify additional opportunities to cross-list courses with minority institutions in our area.

Metrics for achieving these steps include: (1) The percentage increase in the number of minority faculty and students; (2) The number of minority faculty retained despite offers from other institutions; (3) The rate of minority student retention and graduation; (4) The number of collaborative programs established with HBCUs; and (5) The number of students enrolled in U.S. diversity courses.

Priority Four: Furthering Interdisciplinary Education, Research, and Service

Four steps must be taken to further interdisciplinary collaboration at Carolina. We must (1) review policies to reduce barriers to interdisciplinary work; (2) encourage development of academic initiatives cutting across school boundaries; (3) increase central funding for interdisciplinary research; and (4) provide common spaces for interdisciplinary exchange.

Carolina has a well-deserved reputation for excellence in interdisciplinary education, research, and service. As a campus with a broad range of disciplines in close geographic proximity, the successes of inter-school, inter-center, and pan-university linkages among fields of inquiry provide a strategic opportunity for interdisciplinary research and education. To make that happen, the University's policies and structures must permit students and faculty to collaborate across disciplines and to maximize the possibility of creativity and innovation.

Although solid disciplinary knowledge in a field of inquiry remains an essential element of success, many complex problems require the ability to work beyond one's own specialty. Our graduates will be expected to work in teams comprising people who represent varied backgrounds, and Carolina's ability to model interdisciplinarity in the educational setting will better equip them to succeed in their careers. Similarly, interdisciplinary educational and service endeavors provide opportunities for further innovation, for developing non-traditional methodologies, and for sharing campus resources. Therefore, increasing the array of collaborative, scholarly activities in education, research, and service of faculty and students from different professional schools and different departments in Arts and Sciences will further distinguish Carolina as a leader among universities

Metrics for achieving these steps include: (1) The amount of funding reserved by central administration to support interdisciplinary education (curricula, area studies, institutes, etc.); (2) The amount of common space available for interdisciplinary activities; and (3) The number of undergraduate dual degree and interdisciplinary certificate programs offered; and (4) The number of interdisciplinary courses provided through partnerships of various graduate and professional schools.

Priority Five: Enhancing Engagement

As Chancellor Moeser said in his State of the University Address of September 4, 2002, Carolina's tradition and history of engagement and service to North Carolina are "part of our genetic code, a core value." Engagement with North Carolina, he added, "transcends public service, linking our research and creativity to the felt needs of the state." Through engagement with communities and individuals, Carolina improves lives far beyond this campus while enriching the education of our students and the professional lives of our faculty and staff. Carolina will reach her goal of being the leading public university in America only if engagement remains one of our highest priorities and only if we can demonstrate its beneficial effects, tangible and intangible, for the University itself and the communities we serve.

Four steps to enhance engagement include (1) providing senior leadership in public engagement; (2) developing strategic initiatives to meet major challenges facing the State; (3) shifting our focus from public service to public engagement; and (4) building partnerships for engagement within and outside the University. These steps are discussed in turn below.

First, public engagement must be assigned a high priority, with the Chancellor taking the lead in communicating its importance to people inside and outside the campus. Under the leadership of the Chancellor and the Provost, each Dean will be asked to design a plan for facilitating and advancing our public service mission in North Carolina. The status of our engagement with North Carolina will be a regular topic of discussion with the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Dean's Council, and the Faculty Council.

Second, we must identify the major challenges facing North Carolina and develop campus proposals to address those challenges. Starting with a series of regional town meetings in which the Chancellor listens to North Carolinians talk about how the University might work with them to improve their lives, we will signal that our approach to service is shifting from public service to engagement that requires responsiveness and greater respect for community partners. We will also identify major challenges through a diverse and representative advisory board composed of government officials, business and community leaders, foundation directors, students, faculty, and campus administrators. That board, in turn, could evaluate proposals for projects that have a broad impact in North Carolina and that involve multiple academic units and disciplines. The Provost would take the lead in trying to improve faculty proposals by encouraging partnerships on campus and in the community.

Third, we must shift our focus gradually from public service to public engagement. We will invite the people in the State to tell us what their needs are and how we might help and learn from them, rather than deciding on our own what they need and how it should be provided. We will engage in partnered research and provide relevant continuing and non-degree educational programs that support North Carolina businesses, non-profits and government in economic and community development, based on the needs they define. We will make long-term commitments to solving the problems of the State, rather than simply sending students out on short-term service projects.

The Chancellor should appoint a task force of campus and statewide leaders to study the concept of engagement and to recommend strategies for making it an integral part of our campus plan. The Chancellor would lead the task force, which would make recommendations to insure that engagement becomes more central to the lives of students and faculty at Carolina.

Fourth, we should develop partnerships within the University and with outside groups to help meet the challenges facing North Carolina. As we make progress in becoming an institution more fully engaged with North Carolina, it will be important to develop partnerships with business, government, nonprofits, and other campuses. Decisions about how faculty spend their time are appropriately made at the school and unit levels. By soliciting faculty proposals, selecting the best, and providing resources to support their work, the university will ensure that it is investing in the projects that best foster engagement and achieve its goals.

To help develop internal and external partnerships, we must enhance the role of the Carolina Center for Public Service. The Center has made a good start in providing grant funding for student and faculty public service projects, and has created a clearinghouse for public service information for the citizens of the State. But much more could be done, from increased funding for service learning to expanded opportunities for faculty engagement.

Metrics by which engagement may be measured include: (1) The number of engagement partnerships formed with outside groups; (2) The number and success of educational programs and research partnerships with businesses, governmental agencies, and non-profits; (3) The amount of funding provided to faculty for engagement proposals; (4) The number of client / patient contacts; (5) The number of students enrolled in service learning courses; (6) The level of volunteer participation by faculty, staff and students; and (7) The amount of external funding received for public service initiatives.

Priority Six: Strengthening Carolina's International Focus and Presence

Carolina is a global institution, but more needs to be to become an institution recognized for it's

global participation and presence. To develop a global presence that is not only broad, but also deep and sustained, we must increase our partnerships with non-U.S. universities and agencies and our programmatic initiatives in non-U.S. locations. We must include global issues and perspectives in our curriculum whenever appropriate. We also must encourage individual students and faculty to engage in study, fieldwork, and research outside the United States. We must provide excellent programs in foreign languages and cultures, substantially increase the number of international educational opportunities for undergraduates, reward those units that encourage students to engage in international study, find financial aid to make education in other countries possible for all wishing to do so, and build more exchange opportunities with universities abroad.

All students graduating from Carolina must be endowed with intercultural competence and prepared to be leaders in a global community. Six steps needed to strengthen Carolina's international focus and presence include: (1) increasing funding to support international activities at all levels; (2) expanding Study Abroad programs; (3) implementing the Global Citizenship requirements of the proposed General Education Curriculum; (4) expanding other international programs at all levels (graduate, undergraduate, research, faculty exchanges, visiting scholars, etc.); (5) increasing support for existing and new initiatives regarding international research and teaching (from area studies centers to novel integrative research and teaching approaches); and (6) providing tuition remission waivers for foreign students.

These measures should extend beyond undergraduate education. The university should foster graduate international education in many ways, providing intensive fieldwork and research opportunities overseas, increasing tuition remission waivers for graduate foreign students, expanding support for advanced research centers, reinvigorating area-studies institutes, and developing strategies for the establishment of an international presence for Carolina through projects and partnerships. In these ways, Carolina can contribute to the study and solution of pressing social issues, including those resulting from genomics research, environmental change, and the increasingly urgent need to preserve peace and reduce conflict under conditions of globalization.

Metrics to assess progress toward internationalizing Carolina include: (1) The rate of student participation in international and study abroad programs; (2) The number of programs and/or initiatives Carolina has with non-U.S. partners or in non-U.S. locations; (3) The number of faculty projects providing service to foreign nations; (4) The number of faculty engaged in international research and creative activities; (5) The level and trend of Title VI and USAID funding; (6) The amount of funding provided to foreign students; and (7) The number of international visitors, students and faculty.

Next Steps

The Academic Plan serves as a broad statement of our priorities. Once the Board of Trustees has approved the Plan, these priorities will become the basis for a University-wide solicitation of specific proposals - from both within and across disciplines - that will move our schools and departments in particular ways and on specific timetables in directions the Plan highlights. A new planning task force will manage the solicitation and evaluation of these proposals. A selection of proposals the task force considers most significant, innovative, and compatible with the Plan will be referred to the Chancellor and Provost with a recommendation for funding and implementation.

Thereafter, a subcommittee of the Task Force should be appointed to monitor newly funded projects and to make an annual report to the Provost and Chancellor that assesses progress in implementing

each of the Academic Plan's recommendations.

UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Annual Report

January 6, 2003

Members (October 1, 2001-September 30, 2002)

Robert N. Shelton (Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; UPBAC Chair); William Campbell (Dean, School of Pharmacy); Jen Daum (Student Body President); Sue Estroff (Faculty and Chair of the Faculty); Judith Farquhar (Faculty and Chair, Department of Anthropology); Tommy Griffith (Chair, Employee Forum); Joanne Marshall (Dean, School of Information and Library Science); James Peacock (Faculty and Director, University Center for International Studies); Ronald Strauss (Faculty and Chair, Dental Ecology); Nancy Sittenfield (Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration); Tony Waldrop (Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies); Gil White (Faculty and Director, Center for Thrombosis and Hemostasis). Non-voting ex-officio staff support: Elmira Mangum (Associate Provost for Finance and Human Resources); Roger Patterson (Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance).

A current membership roster is attached.

During the month of April, Provost Shelton and his staff met with each dean and vice chancellor to discuss budgets for fiscal year 2002-03. The materials provided by each dean and vice chancellor included data on funding resources, strategies for dealing with a budget reduction of 5%, challenges particular to that unit, and future opportunities that might exist for the benefit of the unit. On May 9, 2002 the members of UPBAC received a compilation of the 2002-2003 budget planning process, which formed the basis for meetings on May 13 and May 28. In preparation for those meetings, members were asked to review the one-page budget summaries provided and the suggested criteria for differential budget cuts.

During the individual meetings, each of the deans and vice chancellors was asked whether we should make across the board cuts or differential cuts. There was broad-based, but not universal, support for differential cuts. Each dean and vice-chancellor was then asked what criteria we should use in making cuts. The responses included the following:

1. We should take greater cuts from centers and institutes than from academic units, and we should consider outright elimination of some centers.
2. We should take into account the added impact of the substantial reduction in state grant or receipt funds that normally flow to some units (e.g., the School of Social Work or the School of Government); they will be hit especially hard. Conversely, the ability of a unit to offset the loss of state funds through other resources (federal grants, private funding, etc.) should be considered.
3. Academic units that are not highly rated should bear a greater reduction than those that are nationally regarded. We should not cut nationally ranked programs. We have to protect the crown jewels. There are some programs that are truly outstanding and can be made even better with additional resources. We have others that are not so good. As painful as it is, we need to cut out programs that are not strong.
4. Areas that have been designated for growth and development (e.g., genomics) should be preserved.
5. We should look for opportunities to achieve efficiencies through cuts.

6. We should strive to maintain quality. We should build on our strengths and focus on what ought to be funded by the State.
7. We need to evaluate the ability of the unit to function at a high level if cuts are made. We should not damage any unit to the point that we can't bring it back.
8. Our first obligation is to protect the "basic contract" with undergraduate and graduate students to provide instruction. This means that we should save the English Department rather than hiring a computer support person or paying to cut the grass.
9. Larger schools can absorb bigger cuts more easily than smaller schools.
10. We need to avoid creating mediocrity, and we should cut programs that are not serving students or the State.
11. Although it is essential that we make differential cuts, it is very difficult to define the criteria for cuts. In the end, this requires subjective judgments about which units are making real progress and which are less valuable to the University.

After careful consideration of the data provided, and following discussions of the impact of budget reductions, the Committee recommended criteria on which differential budget reductions could be assigned. The factors identified by UPBAC were:

- delivery of the instructional mission
- proportion of a unit's budget comprised of state funds
- ability of a unit to generate alternative resources

These recommendations influenced final budget decisions that resulted in assigning differential budget reductions.

UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(UPBAC)

October 1, 2002-September 30, 2003

upbac@listserv.unc.edu

Shelton, Robert 2-2198 Exec. VC & Provost CB #3000 Perm
robert_shelton@unc.edu (Cmte Chair)

Robert Adler 2-3156 Associate Dean CB #3490 2002-05
bob_adler@unc.edu Kenan-Flagler Bus School

Daum, Jen 2-5202 Student Body President CB #5210 2002-03
daum@email.unc.edu Ex-officio

Estroff, Sue 2-1671 Chair of the Faculty CB #9170 2000-03
sue_estroff@med.unc.edu Ex-officio

Farquhar, Judith 2-8090 Chair, Anthropology CB #3115 2002-04
farquhar@email.unc.edu

Griffin, Tommy 2-1086 Chair, Employee Forum CB #3488 2002-03
tgriffin@fac.unc.edu Ex-officio

Kalleberg, Arne 2-6306 Senior Assoc. Dean CB #4010 2002-05
arne_kalleberg@unc.edu Graduate School

Mangum, Elmira 2-1091 Assoc. Provost, Finance CB #8000 Perm
elmira_mangum@unc.edu (non-voting member)

Marshall, Joanne 2-8363 Dean, School of Information
marshall@ils.unc.edu & Library Sciences CB #3360 2000-03

Patterson, Roger 2-7242 Assoc. VC for Finance CB #1000 Perm
roger_patterson@unc.edu (non-voting member)

Stamm, John 6-2731 Dean, School of Dentistry CB #7450 2002-05
john_stamm@unc.edu

Strauss, Ronald 6-2788 Chair, Dental Ecology CB #7450 2000-03
ron_strauss@unc.edu

Suttenfield, Nancy 3-7241 VC for Finance & Admin CB #1000 Perm
nancy_suttenfield@unc.edu

Waldrop, Tony 2-1319 VC for Research & Graduate CB #4000 Perm
twaldrop@unc.edu Studies & Research

January 6, 2003



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution # 2003-1. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the specification of officers of Arts and Sciences Divisions and eligibility to vote for and hold such offices.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Section 8-5 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

§ 8-5. Divisional faculties. (a) The faculty of each Arts and Sciences Division shall be composed of the faculty members of its component departments. Each Division shall have a chair, a vice chair, a secretary, and an Advisory Committee consisting of at least one representative from each of the component departments; all shall serve terms of three years and such other officers as its by-laws specify. The chair and other officers shall be elected by members of the voting faculty holding primary appointments in departments and curricula assigned to the Division. ~~The faculty of each Division shall elect a chair.~~ Each Division, in consultation with the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, shall adopt appropriate rules and regulations governing its functions and procedures, including procedures for the selection of a vice chair, a secretary, and departmental representatives on the Advisory Committee electing its officers. ~~The faculty of each Division shall meet at least once each year upon the call of the chair.~~

(b) Each Division, within its area and in cooperation with the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, shall concern itself with the courses and curricula, shall originate and develop educational objectives and implement these policies, and the chairs of the several Divisions shall be members of the Committee on Instructional Personnel. In addition, they shall serve in an advisory capacity, upon request or upon their own initiative, to the respective departments and to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in matters involving budgetary, personnel, and instructional problems.

(c) ~~Only members holding the faculty ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor have the right to vote for and hold the offices of Division chair and vice chair.~~

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution # 2003-2. Amending *The Faculty Code of University Government* as it relates to the responsibilities and membership of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. Section 4-24 of *The Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

§ 4-24. Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. (a) The Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions shall consist of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the General College or the dean's designee as chair; the associate dean for academic advising in the College of Arts and Sciences of the General College; the vice-chairs of the Divisions of Fine Arts, Humanities, Basic and Applied Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences; and two other academic deans from outside the College of Arts and Sciences and seven faculty members engaged in undergraduate instruction, all appointed by the provost. At least five of these faculty members shall hold primary appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences. The two academic deans shall be selected by the Committee on Instructional Personnel and shall be rotated on three-year terms; if their terms as dean end before their terms on the committee, the Committee on Instructional Personnel shall make other appointments. The committee may add ad hoc members (who shall be faculty members engaged in undergraduate instruction) as it deems necessary. The university registrar, the director of undergraduate admissions, and the vice chancellor and dean of for student affairs shall be ex officio, non-voting members of the committee. The committee shall meet at least once each semester or more on call of the chair. The chair shall call a meeting whenever requested by the university registrar or the director of undergraduate admissions.

(b) The committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the director of undergraduate admissions. In particular, it shall address the design and application of admissions policy, recommend guidelines for special talent and exceptional admissions, and monitor and respond to the national college admissions environment.

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution # 2003-3. Amending the Faculty Code of University Government to Establish a Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.

The General Faculty resolves:

Section 1. The *Faculty Code of University Government* is amended by inserting a new section as follows:

“§4-5.1. **Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.** (a) The Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure is composed of twelve members of the faculty holding permanent tenure at the rank of professor. Four members shall hold primary appointments within the College of Arts and Sciences, four shall hold primary appointments in the School of Medicine, and four shall hold primary appointments within professional schools other than the School of Medicine. Members shall be elected by the voting faculty at large for three-year terms. Terms shall be staggered so that at least one term from each of the three constituencies expires each year. Members of the Advisory Committee, the Faculty Hearings Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee are not eligible to serve on the committee. The committee shall hold regular meetings once each month throughout the calendar year. It shall choose its own chair.

(b) The committee is advisory to the provost in any faculty personnel matter deemed important by the provost or the committee, and particularly with respect to:

- (1) appointments, reappointments, and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure;
- (2) promotions to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure at the rank of associate professor or assistant professor; and
- (3) appointments to distinguished professorships that are not restricted by the terms of the endowment to a particular school or department.”

Sec. 2. Section 4-5 of the *Faculty Code of University Government* is rewritten to read:

“§ 4-5. **Advisory Committee.** (a) The Advisory Committee shall consist of nine elected members, the chair of the faculty, and the secretary of the faculty.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall be advisory to the chancellor in faculty personnel decisions, program planning and assessment, resource planning and allocation, and other matters

1 ~~which are in any matter deemed important by the chancellor or the committee, and particularly~~
2 ~~with respect to:~~

3 (1) proposed amendments to the trustee policies and procedures governing academic
4 tenure;

5 (2) review of school and departmental statements of criteria for appointment,
6 promotion, and tenure;

7 (3) academic program planning and assessment;

8 (4) appointment of vice chancellors, deans, and other senior administrators; and

9 (5) recommendations for corrective action

10 (i) pursuant to a report of the Faculty Hearings Committee with respect to a decision
11 not to reappoint a probationary-term faculty member, or

12 (ii) pursuant to a report of the Faculty Grievance Committee with respect to a
13 decision not to promote to a higher rank a person holding permanent tenure at the
14 rank of associate professor or assistant professor."

15 No faculty member shall serve simultaneously as an elected member of the Advisory Committee
16 and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, the Committee on Appointments,
17 Promotions, and Tenure, the Committee on Faculty Hearings Committee, or the Faculty
18 Grievance Committee.

19 (c) ~~It shall elect a chair for a term of one year, the chair to be chosen from the members who~~
20 ~~are serving the final year of their three-year terms, if there be such. The secretary of the faculty~~
21 ~~shall serve as secretary of the committee.~~

22 (d) It shall hold regular meetings once each month, at such time and place as may be fixed
23 by the committee and the chancellor. The presiding officer shall be the chancellor, or, in his or
24 her absence, the chair of the Advisory Committee. Special meetings may be called by the
25 chancellor or the chair of the Advisory Committee on written request of three of its members.
26 Notice of a special meeting called by the chair shall be given to the chancellor. Whoever calls the
27 special meeting shall preside."

28 Sec. 3. Nominations and elections for the initial Committee on Appointments, Promotions,
29 and Tenure shall be conducted at the regular faculty elections in the Spring semester 2003. To
30 implement a system of staggered terms, the secretary of the faculty shall assign one-year, two-
31 year, or three-years terms to those elected in 2003 in the order of the number of votes received.

32 Sec. 4. Except as otherwise provided herein, this Resolution is effective July 1, 2003.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2003-4. Concerning Gender Equity in Faculty Salaries.

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Section 1. The Provost is requested to establish an ad hoc faculty advisory panel to review
2 faculty salaries that are not predicted by the multiple regression model developed as part of the
3 recent salary equity study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and to recommend
4 appropriate redress on a case-by-case basis for those members of the faculty who can be
5 identified as having been compensated with inappropriately low salaries because of their gender.
6 The panel should include faculty members with appropriate statistical expertise and
7 representatives of groups especially concerned with the status of women faculty.

8 Section 2. The College of Arts and Sciences, each professional school, and each center or
9 institute that initiates tenure-track or fixed-term faculty appointments shall establish a Committee
10 on Salary Equity with no more than 5 members. The committee shall be elected by the unit's
11 faculty for three-year terms. At least two members must be women, and at least one member shall
12 be a member of a recognized minority group. The committee shall (1) review annually all faculty
13 salaries (including one-time payments) within the unit; (2) issue a written annual report of its
14 work to the unit's faculty; (3) review gender equity reports submitted by the dean or director to
15 the provost; and (4) make recommendations to the provost for correction of salary inequities
16 disclosed in the annual gender equity report.

17 Section 3. The provost is requested to ensure that all publicly available faculty salary
18 information includes all compensation received from the University during the previous year,
19 including distinguished professor stipends, administrative stipends, bonuses, supplements, and
20 any other items in addition to base salary.

1 Section 4. The provost is requested to require that the annual reports of deans, chairs or
2 directors of all units that make tenure-track or fixed-term faculty appointments include specific
3 data on the unit's efforts to achieve gender equity. Specifically, annual reports should include at
4 least the following information:

5 1) Salaries, supplements and bonuses of men and women by rank and length of time at rank.
6 2) Percentage of male and female faculty who are tenure-track versus fixed term
7 appointments.

8 3) Percentage of newly hired faculty who are men and women. Percentage of applicants for
9 the position who are men and women. Percentage of those interviewed who are men and
10 women. Percentage of those offered second interviews who are men and women.

11 Composition of all search committees.

12 4) Percentage of men and women faculty who stay in the department through their first
13 tenure review. Percentage of men and women who reach tenure review and who are
14 awarded tenure. Percentage of men and women faculty who are promoted to Professor.

15 5) Percentage of men and women faculty who have been nominated and awarded
16 distinguished professorships, endowed chairs and university and national prizes.

17 6) Description of non-salary compensation in start-up packages, including summary of
18 efforts to obtain employment for their domestic partners, for all new faculty members.

19 7) Description of non-salary compensation provided to all male and female faculty
20 members, including space (square footage provided per dollar of overhead receipts,
21 where appropriate), secretarial support, and discretionary funding, etc.

22 8) Percentage of time spent by men and women faculty, subdivided by rank, doing research,
23 teaching, committee work, clinical work, and other responsibilities.

24 9) Description of retention strategies employed for all faculty who have left UNC in the last
25 year.

26 The provost is further requested to set benchmarks for success over defined periods of time
27 for each administrative unit, based on its unique circumstances. If deans, chairs or directors did
28 not meet these pre-determined goals, an explanation regarding why the goal was not met should
29 be included in that unit's annual report to the provost. Decisions on reappointment and raises for
30 administrators should be based in part on their achievement of their unit's gender equity goals.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2003-5. On Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code.

Whereas, faculty members and students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill share a commitment to the pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of knowledge to succeeding generations of citizens devoted to the high ideals of personal honor and respect for the rights of others; and

Whereas, these goals can only be achieved in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued; others are trusted, respected, and fairly treated; and the responsibility for articulating and maintaining high standards is widely shared; and

Whereas the University can effectively set and maintain high standards for academic integrity only through the individual and collective commitment of its faculty to this end; and

Whereas the Faculty Council, on behalf of the faculty, wishes to provide renewed guidance to colleagues on how best to achieve this important objective; now therefore

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Academic work is a joint enterprise involving faculty and students. Both have a fundamental
2 investment in the enterprise and both must share responsibility for ensuring its integrity. Therefore, the
3 specific actions enumerated below are declared to be those which are included in, but do not exhaust the
4 responsibility of the faculty in relation to the Honor Code.

5 1. **Awareness.** To assure that community-wide expectations regarding academic integrity are
6 understood and communicated, and that students are held accountable for conforming their
7 conduct to such expectations, faculty members, teaching assistants and other instructional
8 personnel should become familiar with the University Honor System (embodied in the
9 Instrument of Student Judicial Governance and related documents) and other sources of
10 information about instructional practices that foster a strong commitment to academic
11 integrity. Deans, department chairs, advisors, and others responsible for academic units and
12 support services related to the University's academic mission should aid instructional
13 personnel in achieving this objective.

14 2. **Good Instructional Practices in Providing Guidance.** To assist students in complying
15 with their responsibilities relating to academic integrity, faculty members, teaching
16 assistants, and other instructional personnel should use adopt good instructional practices
17 that set and communicate clear ground rules for academic work conducted under their

supervision (for example by stating expectations as part of course syllabi, identifying materials that may or may not be used in completing assignments, and indicating the extent of collaboration that is or is not permitted).

3. **Good Instructional Practices in Administering Examinations.** To reduce the temptation to engage in academic dishonesty and the opportunities to do so, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should adopt good instructional practices included but not limited to the following

- a. Require students to sign the honor pledge as a condition of submitting academic assignments.
 - b. Take steps to prevent unauthorized access to examinations during development, duplication, and administration.
 - c. Avoid re-using prior examinations in whole or part where possible unless placed on reserve or otherwise made available to all students.
 - d. Take all reasonable steps consistent with physical classroom conditions to reduce the risk of cheating during the administration of examinations.
 - e. Maintain proper security during the administration of examinations including as appropriate overseeing distribution and collection of examinations and proctoring the examination session.
4. **Oversight.** To reinforce expectations that students conduct themselves in keeping with high standards of academic integrity, and to bolster the integrity of the fact-finding and sanctioning process, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should
- a. Report to the appropriate student attorney general any instance in which the instructor has reasonable basis to conclude that a student under the faculty member's supervision has engaged in academic dishonesty or substantially assisted another to do so in connection with academically related work. Such reports should include a brief description of the suspected academic dishonesty including surrounding facts and circumstances, and possible recommendations as to the appropriate sanction or disposition from among those available.
 - b. In the instructor's discretion, notify the student of the instructor's intention to report the suspected academic dishonesty and permit the student to provide relevant further information if the student chooses to do so.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
- c. Recognize that private action as a sanction for academic cheating, including the assignment of a failing grade in the course, is inconsistent with faculty policy and shall not be used in lieu of or in addition to a report of the incident.
 - d. Cooperate with representatives of the student judicial system (including the appropriate student attorney general, defense counsel, honor court personnel, and the judicial program officer) in conducting necessary investigation, providing testimony or other evidence, recommending appropriate sanctions, or otherwise bringing the matter to prompt conclusion.
 - 5. **Involvement.** To bring to bear requisite faculty judgment regarding the nature and importance of academic integrity, and to nourish a strong campus-wide understanding and commitment to associated intellectual and personal values, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should
 - a. Explore issues of integrity in connection with instructional activities where relevant and appropriate;
 - b. Encourage their academic units to take matters of academic integrity seriously, become informed regarding related problems and advisable means of preventing problems from arising, and provide requisite training and support to instructional personnel;
 - c. Participate upon request as part of educational initiatives, faculty advisory panels, and University Hearing Boards designed to create, nurture, and enforce high standards of academic integrity within the University community.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2003-6. Comprehensively Amending the Instrument of Student

Judicial Governance.

WHEREAS at its January 10, 2003 meeting the Faculty Council received the recommendation of the Committee on Student Conduct, dated December 31, 2002, to adopt a comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Council believes that successful pursuit of the University's mission depends on the shared commitment of faculty members, students and staff to the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge to succeeding generations of citizens who will be devoted to the high ideals of personal honor and respect for the rights of others; and

WHEREAS these goals can only be achieved in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued; other individuals are trusted, respected, and fairly treated; and the responsibility for articulating and maintaining high standards is widely shared; and

WHEREAS the campus Honor System, as embodied in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, is the long-standing means by which members of the University community express their desire to hold themselves and others accountable for pursuing these goals on a daily basis; and

WHEREAS important improvements in the Honor System can be achieved through periodic comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance; and

WHEREAS the Chancellor's Task Force on the Student Judicial System offered important recommendations for such improvements; and

WHEREAS the Committee on Student Conduct has reviewed these and other ways in which the Honor System might be improved and has submitted a comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance to achieve related significant goals; now therefore

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 Section 1. The amendments to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance
2 submitted by the Committee on Student Conduct by its action of December 31, 2002 are
3 approved and the Student Congress and the Chancellor are urged to approve this
4 comprehensive revision as soon as possible.

5 Sec. 2. The Council asks the Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for
6 Student Affairs, deans, department chairs, unit heads, faculty members, students, staff,
7 and all other members of the University community to embrace a broad goal of making
8 Carolina's program for fostering student commitment to honor and integrity the most
9 effective and widely respected in the country through strengthened and coordinated
10 efforts of students, faculty, and staff in the contexts of both academic and student affairs.

11 Sec. 3. The Council urges the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Chancellor for Student
12 Affairs, working with the Committee on Student Conduct and other campus leaders, to
13 develop, implement, and report upon an action plan that will

14 (a) create an intellectual culture that places honor and integrity at the center of all
15 aspects of the University enterprise and involves all members of the
16 University community in an active partnership for wide-ranging reflection
17 and discussion of related themes;

18 (b) empower faculty and students to understand and implement the Honor
19 System at UNC in an exemplary fashion; and

20 (c) provide infrastructure needed to achieve these goals.



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2003-7. Responding to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.

The Faculty Council resolves:

I. Flexibility in the Process of Promotion and Tenure.

I.1. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill should seek appropriate funding to support a system of paid parental leave for full-time faculty holding tenure-track appointments who bear primary responsibility for the care of a newborn or newly-adopted child.

I.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department chairs assume responsibility for explaining to new faculty appointed to probationary-term positions the provisions of the tenure regulations concerning special provisions for extending the maximum probationary period.

I.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department chairs take steps to ensure that faculty members who take advantage of special provisions for extending the maximum probationary period are not subjected to stricter requirements for reappointment and promotion than those expected of colleagues who do not choose to take advantage of those provisions.

I.4. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to Section 2.c.(6)(iii) of the tenure regulations¹ to increase from one year to two years the maximum extension of the probationary period that may be granted.

¹ For reasons of health, requirements of childbirth or child care, or similar compelling circumstances, a faculty member holding a probationary term of appointment at the rank of assistant professor or associate professor may request that the maximum probationary period be extended for a period not to exceed 12 months (including any extension that may have been granted under subsection (ii) above), with no resulting change in normal employment obligations, in order to provide the faculty member additional time to demonstrate fully his or her professional qualifications for reappointment or permanent tenure.

1 I.5. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
2 prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations
3 that would permit a probationary-term faculty member and the head of the appointing
4 unit to mutually agree to delay the decision on reappointment until the final year of the
5 probationary period, with the proviso that in such case the faculty member is not entitled
6 to 12-months notice of a decision not to reappoint.

7 **II. Policies and Procedures for Appointment and Promotion of Fixed-Term**
8 **Faculty.**

9 II.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
10 prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code of
11 University Government establishing an elected standing committee on Non-Tenure Track
12 Faculty.

13 II.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit
14 develop a plan that defines the desired mix of tenure-track and fixed-term faculty
15 appointments in that unit.

16 II.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that all appointments to
17 fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, contain provisions relevant to
18 the possibility that funding to cover the full duration of the contract may not be available
19 due to funding rescissions.

20 II.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that, to the maximum
21 feasible extent, no person should be appointed to more than three consecutive one-year
22 terms in a fixed-term rank before appointment to a longer term is made available.

23 II.5. The Faculty Council urges the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to
24 rescind the administrative rule now in effect that links the term of fixed-term faculty
25 appointments to the term of appointment of the department chair.

26 II.6. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
27 prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code
28 stating the expectation that all appointments and reappointments to fixed-term faculty

1 positions, whether full-time or part-time, will be made with the same consultations within
2 the appointing unit as is the case for appointments to tenure-track positions.

3 II.7. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
4 prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations
5 creating the rank of senior lecturer.

6 II.8. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each appointing unit
7 develop descriptions of the evaluation and criteria for appointment and promotion within
8 fixed-term ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in
9 tenure-track appointments.

10 II.9. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that promotions within
11 fixed-term ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in
12 tenure-track appointments follow the same time line for review as is prescribed for
13 tenure-track appointments.

14 II.10. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit
15 include fixed-term faculty in school and departmental decision-making and advisory
16 venues, except those relating to evaluation and promotion of tenure-track faculty.

17 II.11. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department
18 heads make every effort to include fixed-term faculty in professional development
19 activities.

20 II.12. The Faculty Council requests the Provost to examine the criteria for awards,
21 particularly those related to service, to ensure that fixed-term faculty are eligible for
22 consideration unless disqualified by the terms establishing the award.

23 III. Review of Tenure-Track Appointments and Promotions

24 III.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
25 prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code
26 expressing the expectation that deans and department chairs will consult all tenured
27 faculty in the appointing unit in appointments and promotions that have the effect of
28 conferring permanent tenure, except initial appointment at the rank of professor for which
29 consultation with the professors alone is sufficient.

1 III.2. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
2 prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code
3 establishing a University-wide system for review of all appointments and promotions that
4 have the effect of conferring permanent tenure and all promotions from the rank of
5 associate professor to the rank of professor. The system should provide for at least three
6 levels of review, culminating with the Advisory Committee. The intermediate level of
7 review should be conducted either by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to
8 consult on the action in question or by an elected committee of the unit's faculty, as may
9 be appropriate for the size and complexity of the appointing unit.

10 III.3. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to
11 prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code
12 enlarging the membership of the Advisory Committee to twelve, and specifying that it is
13 advisory to the Provost with respect to faculty personnel matters and to the Chancellor on
14 all other matters.

15 III.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that a decision not to
16 reappoint a probationary-term faculty member should be forwarded by the dean or
17 department chair to his or her immediate administrative superior for review as to the
18 adequacy, consistency, and coherence of the evidence supporting the decision not to
19 reappoint. In conducting that review, the reviewing officer should seek the advice of the
20 faculty advisory committee that would have reviewed the decision had it been positive.

Chancellor's Advisory Committee
Elected Committee
Annual Report for 2002; January 9, 2003

Membership:

Class of 2003

Frederick P. Brooks, Jr., Computer Science – Chair
Lawrence I. Gilbert, Biology
S. Elizabeth Grabowski, Art

Class of 2004

Philip A. Bromberg, Medicine
Debra L. Shapiro (acting in place of Della Pollock, 2002-2003), Business
Lars Schoultz, Political Science

Class of 2005

David K. Guilkey, Economics
Madeline G. Levine, Slavic Languages and Literatures
Barbara B. Moran, Information and Library Science

***Ex officio*, with vote:**

The Chair of the Faculty, Sue E. Esnoff, Social Medicine
The Secretary of the Faculty, Joseph S. Ferrell, Government

Report prepared by: Fred Brooks, Chair, with review by full committee.

Committee charge:

The Faculty Code of University Government states that the Advisory Committee “shall be advisory to the Chancellor in faculty personnel decisions, program planning and assessment, resource planning and allocations, and other matters which are deemed important by the Chancellor or the Committee.” The Code also directs the committee to nominate candidates for open seats on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and for the positions of Chair of the Faculty and Secretary of the Faculty.

Previous Faculty Council questions or charges: None.

Report of Activities:

The Committee meets monthly. Before each meeting, a rotating subcommittee of three members reviews personnel actions and reports to the full Committee, which makes recommendations to the Chancellor regarding promotions or the granting of tenure, including initial appointments conferring tenure. We did this, as well as starting the nomination process for Faculty Chair.

Besides these personnel matters, this year the Committee discussed at length the discrepancies between the appointment, promotion, and tenure criteria for tenure-track faculty in the School of Medicine and those elsewhere in the university. We discussed these concerns with Dean Houpt, and we discussed the new criteria document adopted and forwarded by the School of Medicine. These discussions continue.

We also discussed the report of the Task Force on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure and will present our views at the relevant Faculty Council meetings.

Two questions discussed at length concerned the role of the Advisory Committee itself, as set forth in any forthcoming modification of the Faculty Code of University Government:

1. Given the new administrative structure, with an Executive Vice Chancellor, should the Committee be advisory to that office, to the Chancellor, or to both? At what stage in the personnel process should its advice be sought?

We have recommended that there should be a new Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure committee, with 12 members elected approximately proportionately from the College of Arts and Sciences, the other Academic Affairs professional schools, the School of Medicine, and the other Health Affairs professional schools. It should be advisory to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, and should replace the Advisory Committee as the top-level professional review of individual personnel dossiers. This recommendation is now before the Committee on University Government.

2. With respect to policy advice, as opposed to personnel advice, what are the proper roles of the Advisory Committee, which is elected by the Faculty, and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, which is not?

We have recommended that the Advisory Committee should continue to be advisory to the Chancellor on planning and policy matters, including personnel policies and procedures as provided in our current charter, but not on individual cases.

January 17th, 2003
Executive Committee of the Faculty Council
(Elected by the Faculty Council)
Annual Report to the Faculty Council

Elected Members: Alice Annmerman (Public Health, '05); Steve Bachenheimer (Medicine, '05); Charles Daye (Law, '04); Noelle Granger (Niche, '03); Lloyd Kramer (History, '05; on leave for academic year); Margaret Leigh (Medicine, '05); Bobbi Owen (Dramatic Art, '04); Abigail Panter (Psychology, '03); Richard Pfaff (History, '03); Ross Simpson (Medicine, '03); Ronald Strauss (Dentistry, '04); Steve Weiss (Computer Science, alternate for Kramer); Jan Yopp (Journalism, '04).

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

Meetings: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council (ECFC) meets twice monthly throughout the year. The Provost regularly attends alternate meetings. Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Nancy Sutfenfield has been another regular visitor. Other guests at ECFC meetings in the last year have included: representatives of the Faculty Committee on Athletics, Nancy Davis and Mike McFarland, various faculty committee chairs as needed, and various consultants visiting the campus. The ECFC also has regular meetings with Chancellor Moeser to discuss topics of importance to the faculty and to the chancellor.

Charge: 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 Past Year: The ECFC last year 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 categories of the ECFC Long-Term Agenda. Of special concern were the perilous state of the University budget and uncertainties about the Legislature's and the Board of Governor's actions. Those concerns were justified when the BOG over rode the proposed campus tuition increase and added one of its own, while distributing most of the funds so generated on this campus to other campuses. There was ongoing discussion of various plans in process: the Academic Plan, the Parking Plan, the tuition plan. The committee debated and discussed the issues of: tiered parking permit prices; faculty contributions to staff salaries; town/gown relations; the advisability of development at "Carolina North;" enrollment growth and enrollment growth funding; the sorry state of faculty benefits; faculty roles in relation to the BOT; the respective roles and functions of ECFC and CAC; the nominations process; TA stipends; the meager wages of many staff; and, other topics as they arose. Much of the summer was taken up with the reading program controversy.

The Academy

- Review process for deans and other administrators
- The Academic Plan
- Faculty Code revision
- Review and reform of the Student Honor Court system
- College curriculum revision
- Student evaluation of teaching
- Honorary degrees
- The place of athletics in the University

The Campus as a Workplace

- Impact of state budget cuts
- Academic calendar
- Relations with the General Assembly
- Impact of construction on campus
- Carolina North
- Transportation issues
- Library budget and overhead costs
- Teaching assistant unionization and living wage
- Health insurance
- Child-care services and facilities
- State Personnel Act

Community and Diversity in our Social Community

- Race issues on campus
- Gender salary disparity
- Priority registration for student-athletes
- Town/gown relationships

The committee has in addition nominated numerous faculty to serve on administrative and faculty committees, and has provided invaluable advice to the Chair of the Faculty. While few of the issues and initiatives above have come to a conclusion, progress has been made in many, and efforts are ongoing in several.

Possible Campus-Wide Initiative on Integrity, Honor and Ethics

The Impetus. Over the past two years, campus leaders, faculty, students, and staff have devoted considerable energy to thinking through the campus Honor System and the premises on which it rests. The Preamble of the revised Instrument of Student Judicial Governance states that our Honor System is based upon

[T]he University community's shared commitment to the pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of knowledge to succeeding generations of citizens devoted to the high ideals of personal honor and respect for the rights of others. These goals can only be achieved in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued; other individuals are trusted, respected, and fairly treated, and the responsibility for articulating and maintaining high standards is widely shared.

These commitments, goals, and notions are fundamental to our collective enterprise, yet they sometimes slip from day-to-day view.

The Possibility. The Committee on Student Conduct, building on the report of the Chancellor's Task Force on the Student Judicial Process, recommends that faculty, students, and staff at Carolina seize this moment to mount a campus-wide initiative that places questions of integrity, honor, and ethics on our shared intellectual agendas during the 2003-2004 academic year. We believe that doing so would enhance our intellectual culture by spurring engaged conversations and activities, and position Carolina as a national leader in building cross-disciplinary strategies that emphasize the centrality of ethics and personal responsibility to a strong intellectual community. The goal would not be to prescribe moral education, but instead would invite all members of the academic community into an extended conversation about fundamental questions such as those listed below.

The Questions. Core questions that could serve as a central focus for discussion might include:

- How is the academic enterprise shaped by ethics and integrity?
- What does it mean to be an ethical individual in an academic community?
- Do words like "ethics," "integrity," and "honor" have stable meanings that apply to all members of the University community equally?
- Is "honor" ever "dishonorable"—or vice versa?
- How do cultural differences impact our understanding of ethics?
- What personal responsibility do students, faculty, and staff bear for academic integrity?
- How does the University encourage integrity and ethical behavior?
- Should ethics and integrity be part of the undergraduate or graduate curriculums?
- Is it possible to teach honor, ethics, and integrity?
- What role, if any, should the University play in the moral education of an individual?
- What responsibility does the individual have for the moral climate of his or her intellectual community?
- Why raise these questions: what is our purpose as a community in investigating such ideas and building a consensus view?

The Approaches. These and other questions might be engaged and productive campus-wide conversations commenced using a variety of forums and approaches. We have had very good preliminary discussions with the leaders of the Johnston Center for Undergraduate Excellence and others regarding

the ways in which undergraduate, graduate, and professional school students and faculty might be brought together across disciplines to learn from and engage with each other around key themes.

Speakers might be featured as part of a campus-wide series, round-table discussions or brown-bag lunch groups could be organized, and films or other performances of varied sorts might play a role. Such events need not be newly created—we believe many such talks are already given on campus on related matters that could be highlighted and showcased. Fundamental issues of personal responsibility and integrity face those involved in medicine, business, or sports. We may not realize that our understandings of plagiarism rest on differing philosophical, disciplinary, and cultural dimensions as new battles over theft of intellectual property in cyberspace arise and scholars in diverse fields endeavor to clarify norms regarding attribution of primary courses. We continually confront the interplay between altruism and self-interest in our decisions about how we spend our time and energy. Members of our campus community face a host of difficult ethical choices depending on their circumstances and stage of life. We believe that many individuals across campus have been pondering these questions, and addressing them through lectures, research, or classroom conversations. If we committed ourselves to rendering our discussions and activities more visible and built stronger lines of communication across disciplinary and organizational boundaries, we might find we had a remarkably powerful range of opportunities that would allow us as an academic community to engage each other actively about issues such as these.

While extant events might be linked and promoted as part of a campus-wide dialogue on ethics and integrity, we might also create program events that help students and faculty alike reflect on the core concept of personal responsibility as a constituent element of good citizenship not just in an intellectual community, but in any community in which the student may subsequently find himself or herself. Such events should and must reach out to all members of the University community, and include the voices of all. Some possibilities for doing this include the activities already described but might also include working with the Summer Reading program, inviting a Convocation speaker who can kick off a year's worth of discussion on intellectual character, and creating a "Service Day" around an ethics and personal responsibility theme. We might also encourage faculty teaching ethics-related courses in the First Year Seminar program discuss issues specific to personal responsibility at Carolina. We might also spur more active conversation among graduate students and faculty about "research ethics" and "teaching ethics," or encourage those from various professional school programs which incorporate required ethics courses to make their insights available to those in other disciplines across campus. We might also provide opportunities for student groups (Morehead, Robertson, Carolina, and Johnston Scholars, the Greeks, and a variety of other student organizations) to assume leadership roles in creating discussions among undergraduate, graduate, and professional school students in diverse ways.

Next Steps: At an appropriate time, a distinguished steering committee could be appointed to refine this initial intellectual vision; narrow the core questions that could serve as a central focus; conceive approaches and activities that would assist members of the University community to engage with these issues in a variety of formal and informal conversations and forums across disciplinary boundaries and roles; develop a cohesive year-long program of related events through work with a coalition of individuals and groups on campus; and suggest how these efforts might be sustained in future years. Pending endorsement by key constituencies and campus leaders, the Committee on Student Conduct will seek to invite student and faculty leaders into preliminary discussions about the viability of such an initiative and how it might best be framed.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Council
FROM: Professor Judith Wegner, Chair, Committee on Student Conduct
RE: Proposed Amendments to Resolutions Relating to Honor System
DATE: January 17, 2003

I am submitting for your consideration proposed amendments to Resolution 2003-5 (on Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code), Resolution 2003-6 (the revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance (comprehensively revising the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance), and the underlying revision of the Instrument. This memorandum briefly summarizes the reasons for the changes.

Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code (Resolution 2003-5). The amendments:

- Tone and emphasis: Removed language relating to "best instructional practices," and other language thought to be excessively legalistic or confusing; combined previous sections 2 and 3 and renumbered accordingly
- Reuse of examinations in certain instances: Added language explicitly permitting reuse of pre-tested and validated multiple choice questions, and retained policy emphasizing that in the interest of fairness care should be taken to assure security and even-handed access to all students if exam questions are to be used (section 2. d)
- Imposition of failing grade in instances of academic dishonesty. Integrated language in statement regarding reporting of suspected academic dishonesty to reflect revisions in the Instrument itself, which in the proposed revision explicitly acknowledges the "right of an instructor to recommend a failing grade (as to a particular assignment, course component, or the course as a whole) and to have the recommended penalty imposed in the event that the accused student is found guilty as charged." (section 3. a.)
- Action outside the Instrument: Simplified language and restated long-standing policy that faculty members are expected to deal with academic dishonesty by referring the matter for action under the Instrument rather than through unilateral punitive action

Amendments to COSC Proposal for Revised Instrument (and new reference to such amendments in Resolution 2003-6). The proposed amendments address questions raised by members of Faculty Council:

- Clarification regarding failing grade: As noted above, language has been incorporated regarding the scope of the failing grade in instances of academic dishonesty; it was tweaked to accommodate varying course structures (reference to include not only failing a course assignment or course as a whole, but also a course "component" or "aspect") (III.B.1.a; IV.B.5.a) (*booklet page 16, 22*)
- Graduate student issues. Two revisions were made to clarify handling of cases involving graduate and professional school students. One (III.B.1.d) clarifies that if, as the result of a finding of academic dishonesty, a graduate student fails a course, the intended sanction is that the student receive no credit for the course and does not represent a determination that the student is automatically to be expelled from the academic program as a whole. The other (V.A.2) adds slightly more detail regarding appointment of student officers for the graduate student honor system, and elaborates upon the system for creation of satellite honor systems in professional schools upon request.¹ (*booklet page 16, 25*)

¹ The Business School has recent requested creation of its own system and COSC intends to inquire whether other professional schools have similar interests, as part of its overall review of this area later in the spring. If Faculty Council wishes to express its interest in these matters, it might pass a simple resolution to that effect ("The Committee on Student Conduct is requested to study the implementation and administration of the Honor System in the Graduate School and any of the professional schools for which special honor courts have been or may hereafter be established.")

(DRAFT) REPORT OF SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY VIOLATION

(COSC 12/31/02)

1. Student and Course Information

Student Name: _____ PID: _____
Dept. & Course No.: _____ Section No. _____

2. Type of Violation

- ☐ **Plagiarism** ("deliberate or reckless representation of another's words, thoughts or ideas as one's own without attribution in connection with submission of academic work, whether graded or otherwise")
- ☐ **Falsification, fabrication, misrepresentation** of data, other information, or citations in connection with an academic assignment whether graded or otherwise
- ☐ **Unauthorized assistance or unauthorized collaboration** in connection with academic work, whether or not for a grade
- ☐ **Cheating on examination or other academic assignment** ("using unauthorized materials or methods"), violating or subverting rules and requirements governing administration of examinations or other academic assignments; compromising the security of examinations or academic assignments; representing another's work as one's own; engaging in other actions that compromise the integrity of the grading or evaluation process)
- ☐ **Other** (providing false information, misusing University resources, violating other University policies, assisting another to engage in acts of academic dishonesty)

3. Circumstances. Briefly summarize what happened and related facts and circumstances:

4. Recommended Sanctions. The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance includes several types of sanctions in instances of academic dishonesty. *Instructors are invited to make recommendations regarding the following types:*

Grade Penalty: (a required sanction if student is found guilty)
☐ F for the course ☐ F for the assignment or course component ☐ Defer to Honor Court determination

Educational requirements: (optional sanction)
☐ Additional assignment (explain) _____ Other requirement (specify) (special course, workshop)

Penalties of record which are flagged on transcript during time they are in effect (a required sanction if student is found guilty)
☐ Suspension for a full academic semester (usual sanction)
☐ Probation for a full academic semester (minimum sanction)
☐ No recommendation on this matter

I prefer to make no recommendation because:
☐ I need more information
☐ I prefer to defer to the Honor Court in all respects

5. Notification of Student
☐ I have already met with the student to discuss this matter.
☐ I have not met with the student but would be willing to do so to if the student chooses to do so.
☐ I have not met with the student and would prefer not to.

Instructor Name: _____ Dept. _____ Address: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____ Phone: _____ E-mail: _____

NOTICE TO FACULTY MEMBERS: For additional assistance please contact xxxx (include list of advisory committee)
NOTICE TO STUDENT: You are receiving a copy of this report to notify you that a report of suspected academic dishonesty has been submitted in connection with the conduct described above. You may review additional information concerning Honor Code and your rights under the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance as explained in the attached letter and as explained at (website). You should contact the relevant Student Attorney General or the Judicial Program Officer at xxxx at your earliest convenience. If the complainant has indicated a willingness to do so and you elect to do so, you may then contact the complainant to set up a meeting after reviewing your rights under the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance.

III.B. 1. Academic sanctions including but not limited to the following:

- a. **Failing Grade.** Receipt of a failing grade in a course, a component or aspect of a course, or on an assignment;
- b. **Educational Assignment.** Requirement of satisfactory completion of an additional educational assignment, course, or program with or without credit.
- c. **Other Requirements.** Other requirements or conditions designed to assure that prior academic misconduct is remedied and does not recur in the future.
- d. **Implications for Academic Retention of Graduate or Professional School Students.** In the case of graduate or professional school students, the imposition of an academic sanction in the form of a failing grade in a course shall not in itself be grounds for terminating the affected student's enrollment in the academic program in which he or she is enrolled, except when the pertinent academic authorities independently determine that such termination is warranted pursuant to pertinent academic rules and requirements.

IV.B. 5. **Additional rights in certain cases.** In certain types of cases, the complainant shall have additional rights as stated below.

- a. **Academic dishonesty.** The right of an instructor to recommend a failing grade (as to a particular assignment, course component or aspect, or the course as a whole) and to have the recommended penalty imposed in the event that the accused student is found guilty as charged.

V.A.2. **Graduate and Professional School Honor Systems.**

- a. **Graduate Student Honor System.** The graduate student governance agency shall appoint a graduate school attorney general, and the chair and members of the graduate school honor court, in accordance with its governance and judicial structures. The Graduate School Honor System shall be responsible for charges against students enrolled in a degree program in the University's Graduate School or any course in post baccalaureate study except as provided in paragraph b. Except as provided in Appendix C all other sections of this Instrument shall apply.

b. **Honor Systems for Graduate Students Enrolled in Designated Professional School Programs.**

- i. The student government agencies of the Schools of Dentistry, Law, Pharmacy, and Medicine shall operate their own courts and devise their own judicial structures, and shall be responsible for charges against students enrolled in their respective programs for the degree of DDS, JD Pharm.D. or MD. Except as provided in Appendix C, all other sections of this Instrument shall apply.
- ii. The student government agencies and academic authorities of other professional schools may request authorization to appoint a professional school attorney general and the chair and members of a professional school honor court, and to operate a judicial system responsible for operation of the Honor System as it applies to students enrolled in specified post-baccalaureate programs, by filing a proposal describing the proposed judicial system and arrangements for its operation with the Committee on Student Conduct. After consultation with the affected parties, the Dean of Students, and the graduate student governance agency, the Committee on Student Conduct may recommend that this Instrument be amended to authorize the establishment of the proposed professional school honor court, in accordance with procedures set forth in section VII.B of this Instrument. Except as provided in Appendix C, all other sections of this Instrument shall apply to all professional school judicial systems applicable to post-baccalaureate students.



MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL

January 17, 2003, 3:00 p.m.

Attendance

Present (72): Allison, Ammerman, Bachenhaimer, Bane, Barbour, Bollen, Bouldin, Bowen, Cairns, Carter, Chenault, Colindres, Crawford-Brown, Daye, Diette, Elter, Elvers, Files, Fishell, Gerber, Giliand, Gollop, Granger, Henry, Holditch-Davis, Janda, Kagarise, Kelley, Kjervik, Leigh, Lohr, Malizia, McGraw, Meece, Meyer, Miller, Molina, Moran, Morris-Natschke, Nelson, Norini, Orthner, Owen, Panter, Parkh, Praff, Pisano, Pittman, Poole, Reinert, Rippe, Rock, Rong, Rowan, Salmon, Schauer, Shea, Sigurdsson, Simpson, Straughan, Strauss, Tauchen, Toews, Tresolini, Tulloch, Vandemeer, Vick, Wallace, Watson, Weiss, Wilson, Yopp.

Excused absences (16): Adimora, Carelli, Cotton, D'Cruz, Foley, Fowler, Kessler, Langbauer, Metzguer, Nicholas, Porto, Reisner, Retsch-Bogart, Smith, Sueti, Willis.

Unexcused absences (2): McQueen, Sams.

Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time

Chancellor James Moeser thanked all those who worked on the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, especially Prof. Marilyn Yarbrough (Law), who chaired the special task force, and Prof. Judith Wegner (Law), chair of the Committee on Student Conduct. The proposed revision makes not only practical recommendations for a more efficient system but emphasizes the importance of the concept of honor. The chancellor said that the primary focus should be the positive value of honor and integrity as an integral part of the culture of excellence at Carolina rather than just the necessary system of sanctions and penalties for violators. The lofty goals of the honor system can be achieved only in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued, other individuals are trusted, respected, and fairly treated, and the responsibility for maintaining and articulating high standards is widely shared.

Chancellor Moeser thanked the co-chairs of the Task Force on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure, Professors Paul Farel and Barbara Harris, for their leadership. He applauded the work of the task force and was pleased with its report. One important side benefit of its recommendations is that the Advisory Committee can now return to its original charge to be an elected council of advice to the chancellor in a broad range of issues, not just personnel decisions. He welcomed the opportunity to consult the Advisory Committee on a regular basis, as well as the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, and to focus the discussions entirely on major policy decisions facing the university.

Chancellor Moeser said that one of the most important issues to be discussed this year is the development of the academic plan. Initially, our goal was to develop a document that would be a general guide to future investments in academic programs. That continues to be an important purpose for the plan, but the worsening State budget situation points to a second purposes, which will be to provide a plan of work that will guide us in making difficult decisions about our future priorities. Over the past several years we have experienced a cumulative reduction in State support of 13%. If this trend continues, we must be prepared. In that light, the academic plan takes on a greater sense of urgency and importance.

Chancellor Moeser commented on pending litigation in the United States Supreme Court challenging the University of Michigan's admissions policy as impermissibly based on racial considerations. He noted that President Bush has publicly supported the plaintiff's position in the case, thus going on record in opposition to the policies now in place at Michigan. The chancellor wanted to make it clear that while we use race as a factor in the admissions process at Carolina, it is one of many areas considered in evaluating a candidate. The admissions office focuses on academic preparation and the ability of prospective students to contribute to and benefit from the student body and the campus community. Unlike Michigan, we do not use a point system or formula. We will be monitoring the situation

carefully and will comply as appropriate with the Court's decision. He reported that Dean Gene Nichol and several faculty members of the School of Law are preparing an *amicus curiae* brief to support our position that achieving a diverse student body is a compelling interest for a public law school and a public university.

At the conclusion of his formal remarks, Chancellor Moeser asked for questions or comment.

Prof. Larry Rowan (Physics & Astronomy) noted the recent study of gender salary equity and said that he would like to see further studies that investigated the relationship between faculty salaries and extent and quality of faculty activity in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Such a study might also investigate whether there are negative effects on salary stemming from the university's attitude toward teaching certain subjects. The chancellor said that we are a university that values teaching and service, but the difficulty in implementing Prof. Rowan's proposal would be categorizing the faculty into research faculty, teaching faculty, or service faculty. Most of our faculty excel in at least two of these areas, if not all three. He did agree that we need to have a rewards structure that rewards our faculty for doing what they do best.

Prof. Sue Estroff, Chair of the Faculty, asked for clarification on the university's position on the recent FBI request for information on faculty and students who do not hold United States passports. Prof. Richard Praff (History) added his concern that records of library borrowings can be subpoenaed. The chancellor replied that he had only incomplete knowledge on this subject and would ask the general counsel to brief him as to what the law is. He indicated that his position would be to protect privacy to the extent allowed by law.

Prof. Thomas Shea (Medicine) noted that Sen. Elizabeth Dole has been making a favorable impression in Washington. He hopes that the university would seek to establish a good working relationship with her. The chancellor replied that he has recently been in contact with Sen. Dole, Sen. John Edwards, and Congressman David Price on current issues before Congress that are of concern to the university.

Prof. Noelle Granger (Cell Biology & Anatomy) asked for comment on the apparent dichotomy between the goals outlined in the academic plan and the fact that funding for them would necessarily lag behind by up to five years. The chancellor said that this point is currently under discussion. While the plan needs to set goals and visions, it also needs to set criteria about who will make critical decisions and what we want to protect if we need to make cuts due to budget reductions.

Prof. Donald Nonini (Anthropology) spoke of his deep concern at the way federal immigration regulations are impacting not only our international students but also some of our visiting scholars. The chancellor replied that we are trying to remain on top of those issues in collaboration with other major national universities with the same concerns.

Remarks by the Provost

Provost Robert Shelton said he would address four topics: teaching assistant compensation, Carolina North, the academic plan, and the University Priorities and Budget Advisory Committee.

The provost reported that the Teaching Assistant Advisory Task Force has issued its final report. The task force was given three assignments: (1) make a comprehensive assessment of the current state of teaching assistant compensation in all units, (2) recommend an appropriate level of compensation, and (3) develop a reasonable means to reach the recommended compensation level. The task force recommends an increase over the next four years in the average teaching assistant salary from the current \$11,300 to \$14,300. This increase will bring Carolina to the top quartile of our peer institutions in this regard. The Office of Institutional Research will monitor teaching assistant salaries and our standing in comparison to peer institutions and will report findings each year in May. The minimum stipend, now \$5,000, will be incremented by \$500 annually for four years until it reaches \$7,000. It is anticipated that funding will come from campus-based tuition and State appropriations.

Provost Shelton said that Vice Chancellor Tony Waldrop has appointed four advisory groups to assist in planning for the development of Carolina North. The groups will address external relations, infrastructure, university uses, and new business development. The advisory groups are working with a broad cross-section of faculty, staff, and administrators, and with liaison committees appointed by the Town of Chapel Hill.

The provost welcomed faculty input into the proposed academic plan and emphasized that there will be multiple opportunities to do so. He anticipates bringing the plan to the Board of Trustees on March 26.

The provost said that the University Priorities and Budget Advisory Committee has been very useful in these times of financial retrenchment.

Prof. Emil Maizlia (City & Regional Planning) said that he did not understand the logic of the recommendations of the Teaching Assistant Advisory Task Force if our ultimate goal is to attract the best and brightest graduate students using fixed resources. Raising the average compensation will actually reduce the number of graduate

students we can recruit if additional funding does not materialize. Provost Shelton said that the task force's recommendations are predicated upon our ability to raise additional funds.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Prof. Sue Estroff said that we need to have a thoughtful conversation about balancing the needs and values of the university's core educational mission with those of UNC Hospitals, which functions in many ways like a very large business operation. UNC Hospitals has a different vocabulary, a different sense of urgency, and a different set of needs than the rest of the campus. She wanted to underscore that faculty members in the School of Medicine take great pride in our health care system and that the School of Medicine is the foundation of our clinical care system, but it is important the perceived needs of "customers" of the hospital not be allowed to overwhelm the needs of the faculty. She called for a sense of proportions and priorities.

On the matter of salary equity, Prof. Estroff said that she was disturbed by comments at the last Council meeting implying that some faculty are fearful of discussing compensation with either their direct supervisors or their deans. She said that this is intolerable. She called for ideas as to how to address the problem.

Prof. Ron Strauss (Dentistry) observed that individuals whose salaries are under review as a result of the gender equity study need to be informed of that fact. It is not acceptable that this be a topic of private discussion by administrators alone without the faculty member being involved in any way. Prof. Estroff asked whether the Council agreed that a faculty member whose dossier is being reviewed as a result of the gender equity study should know that the review is taking place and should have an opportunity to review material that will be used to determine if the salary is appropriate. There appeared to be general assent to that proposal.

Prof. Camilla Tulloch (Dentistry) expressed frustration and distress about the disruptions being caused by construction in the area of the campus near the Dental School. She said she did not think that the university has adequately addressed the human side of planning and development.

Resolutions Amending the Faculty Code of University Government

A resolution amending the *Faculty Code of University Government* entitled "On Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences," having passed its first reading on Dec. 6, 2002, was placed before the General Faculty for passage on second reading. The resolution was adopted unanimously and will be enrolled as Resolution 2003-1.

A resolution amending the *Faculty Code of University Government* entitled "On the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions," having passed its first reading on Dec. 6, 2002, was placed before the General Faculty for passage on second reading. The resolution was adopted unanimously and will be enrolled as Resolution 2003-2.

A resolution entitled "To Establish a Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure," having been reported favorably to the General Faculty by the Committee on University Government, was placed before the General Faculty for passage on first reading. Prof. Estroff asked Prof. Joseph Ferrell, secretary of the faculty, to explain the resolution and to preside during its consideration.

Prof. Ferrell explained the rationale of the structure proposed for the APT Committee. He said that roughly one-third of the faculty hold appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences, one-third in the Medical School, and one-third in all the remaining appointing units combined. Hence, the recommended apportionment of the committee tracks faculty strength in these three major constituencies and therefore the workload. Members of the Advisory Committee, the Faculty Hearings Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee would not be eligible to serve on the committee because of potential conflicts of interest. The APT Committee is to be advisory to the provost, rather than the chancellor, because the practical locus of final action of faculty personnel matters is at that level of administration. The committee's charge is broadly worded to encourage the provost to consult the committee on any important issue affecting faculty appointments, not just decisions with respect to specific individuals. The resolution removes from the charge of the Advisory Committee responsibility for advising the chancellor on specific faculty personnel decisions and adds charges to advise the chancellor on amendments to the tenure regulations, departmental statements of criteria for appointments, promotions, and tenure, and proposed corrective action in response to recommendations of the Faculty Hearings Committee or the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Prof. Diane Klervik (Nursing) asked how the APT Committee will relate to the Health Sciences Advisory Committee. Prof. Ferrell replied that the resolution now before the General Faculty does not affect review of faculty personnel decisions at the department, school, or divisional level. The Task Force on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure has made recommendations that do affect lower-level reviews, but those recommendations are not embodied in the resolution now under discussion.

Prof. Strauss expressed concern at the appointment of the APT Committee. He noted that only four members are apportioned to represent 11 of the 12 professional schools. He hoped that a way could be found to insure at least periodic representation of each school without necessarily enlarging the committee's membership. Prof. Ferrell replied that the Committee on University Government had discussed this issue extensively and felt that the recommended apportionment was both fair and practical. The professional schools other than Medicine range in faculty strength from 29 (Information & Library Science) to 203 (Public Health). At present, the Advisory Committee has nine members and is not apportioned at all. The Nominating Committee, however, attempts to develop a slate of candidates each year that will enable the electorate to keep the membership relatively well-balanced. The Committee on University Government assumes that the Nominating Committee will continue to be attentive to the need for diversity in the future.

Prof. Paul Farel (Cell & Molecular Physiology) spoke to the proposal to assign to the Advisory Committee rather than the new APT Committee responsibility for in-depth review of departmental statements of criteria for appointments and promotions. He said that an argument could be made that the APT Committee is best suited for that task since the criteria are best understood in the context of individual cases. On the other hand, during his service on the Advisory Committee, the committee had not been able to effectively address departmental criteria due to the press of other business.

Prof. Fred Brooks (Computer Science) agreed that the APT Committee is unlikely to have the time to review departmental criteria. He agreed that individual cases often raise policy questions. Perhaps good lines of communication between the two committees might be the answer, he said.

Prof. Estroff observed that review and evaluation of departmental criteria should be done in consultation with both committees. She also expressed her concern that the inaugural membership of the APT should appropriately represent the diversity of the faculty. As for the apportionment among professional schools, she pointed out that the number of dossiers originating from the School of Medicine is so large that it is important to have members who are familiar with the wide range of disciplines and academic cultures found there.

Prof. Ferrell offered his view that the smaller professional schools could actually be better served by the new apportionment than by the existing arrangement for electing the Advisory Committee.

Prof. Brooks moved to amend the resolution to make the chair of the APT Committee an ex officio member of the Advisory Committee. The amendment was adopted.

Prof. Richard Pfaff (History) observed that resolution and reports currently under consideration by the Council and General Faculty are likely to result in the establishment of several new standing committees, which means we will be looking for members to serve on them. He hoped that these would not be all the same people; we should be trying to find younger and newer members of the faculty to serve on them.

Prof. Pfaff moved to amend the resolution to make members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council ineligible for service on the APT Committee. He said that the rationale of his amendment is that ECFC is advisory to the provost, as is also the APT Committee. The amendment was adopted.

Prof. Estroff returned to the issue raised by Prof. Strauss. She said that in discussing this proposal with the co-chairs of the APT Task Force, she has envisioned a review process in which primary and secondary readers, and perhaps a third reader, are assigned to each appointment or promotion dossier. The readers would produce a summary report and, if they felt the need, would consult with someone familiar with the candidate's area of work. The readers would also have access to the chair of the school's review committee. She thought we need to be planning a very different review process than what has been customary here.

Prof. Bruce Cairns (Surgery), speaking as a junior tenure-track faculty member, asked for comment on what is the driving force behind the proposal for a new APT Committee and revising review procedures. Is it simply a matter of the extent of the work to be done, or is something about the review process broken and in need of fixing?

Exec. Assoc. Provost Bernadette Gray-Little said that it is her impression that most of the people who have served on the Advisory Committee feel that they needed to spend more time on reviewing individual dossiers and on the larger issue of faculty personnel policies. At the same time, they have been elected to a committee whose historic function is to advise the chancellor on a wide range of important issues facing the university. Many faculty members who have been elected to the committee in the past thought the general advisory role would be their primary work, rather than personnel review. She thought the proposal addresses all of these threads.

The discussion having concluded, Prof. Ferrell put the resolution to a vote. It was approved by a wide margin. The resolution having passed its first reading, it remains on the calendar for second reading at the next meeting of the General Faculty.

Resolution Concerning Gender Equity in Faculty Salaries

A resolution entitled "Concerning Gender Equity in Faculty Salaries," having been reported favorably by the Committee on the Status of Women, was placed before the Faculty Council for action.

Prof. Etta Pisano (Radiology), chair of the Committee on the Status of Women, said that the committee had held five open meetings with faculty members during November and December organized by Prof. Kjerlvik, head of the Carolina Women's Center. A proposal was then developed and distributed to the women's groups who had asked to be involved in its development. The proposal has the endorsement of the Association of Professional Women in the School of Medicine, the Carolina Women's Center, and the Association of Women Faculty and Professionals. Prof. Pisano modified the resolution as presented to add at the end of Section 1, "Faculty whose salaries are under review will be so informed." She said this amendment was in response to Prof. Strauss' remarks earlier in the meeting.

Prof. Ferrell noted that some of our appointing units have relatively few faculty positions. He asked whether a small unit which found it difficult to establish a separate elected committee to carry out the functions specified in the resolution could be permitted flexibility to accomplish the same result some other way.

Prof. Pisano said that she understood the point and thought that the resolution as drafted allowed the provost sufficient flexibility to do that.

Prof. Jan Yopp (Journalism & Mass Communication) asked if a school's elected faculty salary committee could be designated its gender equity committee as well. Prof. Pisano replied that that would be permissible. Prof. Pisano added that the principal reason for insisting on an elected committee is to ensure that faculty members know who is on the committee and have input into who is chosen to serve on it.

Referring to Section 4 of the resolution, Prof. Yopp asked how much of the specified information is already being reported to the provost. Prof. Estroff said that almost all of it is readily available and will not require much work to assemble.

Prof. Kenneth Bollen (Biology) expressed concern that the resolution addresses only salaries that are inappropriately low. Discussion ensued on various ways of rewording the resolution to address Prof. Bollen's comments. When it became clear that consensus on an appropriate amendment was proving elusive, Prof. Wesley Wallace (Emergency Medicine) moved to postpone further consideration of the resolution until the Feb. 7 Council meeting. The motion to postpone was adopted by a vote of 43-18. Prof. Pisano said that she would revise the resolution in the light of the discussion.

Resolutions on Honor System Reform

A resolution entitled "On Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code," having been reported favorably by the Committee on Student Conduct, was placed before the Faculty Council for action.

A resolution entitled "Comprehensively Amending the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance," having been reported favorably by the Committee on Student Conduct, was also placed before the Council for action.

Prof. Wegner, chair of the Committee on Student Conduct, spoke to both resolutions. She said that the statement of faculty responsibilities in relation to the Honor Code has long been included as an appendix to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance. The resolution improvements or clarifies the statement in several particulars:

- Re-use of examinations is recognized as appropriate when warranted as part of an assessment system that relies on recurring use of a pool of pre-tested and validated multiple-choice questions administered with appropriate safeguards;
- Faculty members are explicitly empowered to recommend an appropriate sanction or disposition from those available if the student is found guilty; and
- Faculty members are enjoined to refrain from taking unilateral punitive action rather than reporting suspect conduct.

As to the resolution endorsing the revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, Prof. Wegner pointed out a change that makes it clear that a graduate student who is assigned a failing grade as the result of academic misconduct is not automatically dropped from his or her program; that judgment is left to the school or department.

Prof. Kjerlvik noted that the task force had recommended changing the burden of proof before the Honor Court to "clear and convincing evidence," whereas the Instrument now being presented for endorsement retains "beyond a reasonable doubt." Prof. Wegner explained that the Committee on Student Conduct felt that the difficulties that have been experienced with "reasonable doubt" have stemmed not from the concept but from erroneous understandings as

to what it means. The committee has addressed that by including an elaborated definition of "beyond a reasonable doubt."

Chancellor Moeser pointed out that he had raised the question of whether a student who had been convicted of a major violation of the Honor Code could be eligible for graduating with distinction. Prof. Wegner replied that the Instrument as revised permits as a sanction withholding special recognition or distinction, including awards, prizes, or any other type of special recognition. Chancellor Moeser asked that the minutes reflect his interpretation that a student conviction of an Honor Code violation would be ineligible to graduate with distinction. Prof. Ferrell noted that degrees are conferred by the chancellor on recommendation of the faculty and stated his opinion that as chief academic officer of the institution, the chancellor has authority to make such a ruling.

Prof. Douglas Elvers (Business) expressed pleasure at seeing that the revision sets a goal of 30 days for resolving cases. He has heard of cases that took 18 months to be resolved. He asked to what extent an accused student could delay proceedings. Prof. Wegner pointed out that the revision does provide for expedited proceedings for first offenses when the student does not contest the charge.

Discussion having concluded the resolutions were put to a vote and adopted without dissent. Having been adopted, the resolution entitled "On Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code" will be enrolled as Resolution 2003-5. The resolution entitled "Amending the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance" will be enrolled as Resolution 2003-6.

Report of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The hour having grown late, the report of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure was postponed until the next regular meeting of the Council on Feb. 7, 2003.

Annual Reports

The annual reports of the Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council were also postponed until the next regular meeting of the Council on February 7, 2003.

Adjournment.

Its business having been completed or rescheduled, the Council adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Resolutions Adopted January 17, 2003



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Resolution 2003-5. On Faculty Responsibilities in Relation to the Honor Code.

Whereas, faculty members and students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill share a commitment to the pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of knowledge to succeeding generations of citizens devoted to the high ideals of personal honor and respect for the rights of others; and

Whereas, these goals can only be achieved in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued; others are trusted, respected, and fairly treated; and the responsibility for articulating and maintaining high standards is widely shared; and

Whereas the University can effectively set and maintain high standards for academic integrity only through the individual and collective commitment of its faculty to this end; and

Whereas the Faculty Council, on behalf of the faculty, wishes to provide renewed guidance to colleagues on how best to achieve this important objective; now therefore

The Faculty Council resolves:

Academic work is a joint enterprise involving faculty and students. Both have a fundamental investment in the enterprise and both must share responsibility for ensuring its integrity. Therefore, the specific actions enumerated below are declared to be those which are included in, but do not exhaust the responsibility of the faculty in relation to the Honor Code.

Awareness. To assure that community-wide expectations regarding academic integrity are understood and communicated, and that students are held accountable for conforming their conduct to such expectations, faculty members, teaching assistants and other instructional personnel should become familiar with the University Honor System (embodied in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance and related documents) and other sources of information about instructional practices that foster a strong commitment to academic integrity. Deans, department chairs, advisors, and others responsible for academic units and support services related to the University's academic mission should aid instructional personnel in achieving this objective.

Good Instructional Practices in Providing Guidance. To assist students in complying with their responsibilities relating to academic integrity, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should use adopt good instructional practices that set and communicate clear ground rules for academic work conducted under their supervision (for example by stating expectations as part of course syllabi, identifying materials that may or may not be used in completing assignments, and indicating the extent of collaboration that is or is not permitted).

Good Instructional Practices in Administering Examinations. To reduce the temptation to engage in academic dishonesty and the opportunities to do so, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should adopt good instructional practices included but not limited to the following

1. Require students to sign the honor pledge as a condition of submitting academic assignments.
2. Take steps to prevent unauthorized access to examinations during development, duplication, and administration.
3. Avoid re-using prior examinations in whole or part where possible unless placed on reserve or otherwise made available to all students.
4. Take all reasonable steps consistent with physical classroom conditions to reduce the risk of cheating during the administration of examinations.

5. Maintain proper security during the administration of examinations including as appropriate overseeing distribution and collection of examinations and proctoring the examination session.

Oversight. To reinforce expectations that students conduct themselves in keeping with high standards of academic integrity, and to bolster the integrity of the fact-finding and sanctioning process, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should

1. Report to the appropriate student attorney general any instance in which the instructor has reasonable basis to conclude that a student under the faculty member's supervision has engaged in academic dishonesty or substantially assisted another to do so in connection with academically related work. Such reports should include a brief description of the suspected academic dishonesty including surrounding facts and circumstances, and possible recommendations as to the appropriate sanction or disposition from among those available.
2. In the instructor's discretion, notify the student of the instructor's intention to report the suspected academic dishonesty and permit the student to provide relevant further information if the student chooses to do so.
3. Recognize that private action as a sanction for academic cheating, including the assignment of a failing grade in the course, is inconsistent with faculty policy and shall not be used in lieu of or in addition to a report of the incident.
4. Cooperate with representatives of the student judicial system (including the appropriate student attorney general, defense counsel, honor court personnel, and the judicial program officer) in conducting necessary investigation, providing testimony or other evidence, recommending appropriate sanctions, or otherwise bringing the matter to prompt conclusion.

Involvement. To bring to bear requisite faculty judgment regarding the nature and importance of academic integrity, and to nourish a strong campus-wide understanding and commitment to associated intellectual and personal values, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should

1. Explore issues of integrity in connection with instructional activities where relevant and appropriate;
2. Encourage their academic units to take matters of academic integrity seriously, become informed regarding related problems and advisable means of preventing problems from arising, and provide requisite training and support to instructional personnel;
3. Participate upon request as part of educational initiatives, faculty advisory panels, and University Hearing Boards designed to create, nurture, and enforce high standards of academic integrity within the University community.

Resolution 2003-6. Comprehensively Amending the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance.

WHEREAS at its January 10, 2003 meeting the Faculty Council received the recommendation of the Committee on Student Conduct, dated December 31, 2002, to adopt a comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Council believes that successful pursuit of the University's mission depends on the shared commitment of faculty members, students and staff to the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge to succeeding generations of citizens who will be devoted to the high ideals of personal honor and respect for the rights of others; and

WHEREAS these goals can only be achieved in a setting in which intellectual honesty and personal integrity are highly valued; other individuals are trusted, respected, and fairly treated; and the responsibility for articulating and maintaining high standards is widely shared; and

WHEREAS the campus Honor System, as embodied in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, is the long-standing means by which members of the University community express their desire to hold themselves and others accountable for pursuing these goals on a daily basis; and

WHEREAS important improvements in the Honor System can be achieved through periodic comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance; and

WHEREAS the Chancellor's Task Force on the Student Judicial System offered important recommendations for such improvements; and

WHEREAS the Committee on Student Conduct has reviewed these and other ways in which the Honor System might be improved and has submitted a comprehensive revision of the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance to achieve related significant goals; now therefore

The Faculty Council resolves:

Section 1. The amendments to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance submitted by the Committee on Student Conduct by its action of December 31, 2002 are approved and the Student Congress and the Chancellor are urged to approve this comprehensive revision as soon as possible.

Sec. 2. The Council asks the Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, deans, department chairs, unit heads, faculty members, students, staff, and all other members of the University community to embrace a broad goal of making Carolina's program for fostering student commitment to honor and integrity the most effective and widely respected in the country through strengthened and coordinated efforts of students, faculty, and staff in the contexts of both academic and student affairs.

Sec. 3. The Council urges the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, working with the Committee on Student Conduct and other campus leaders, to develop, implement, and report upon an action plan that will

- a. create an intellectual culture that places honor and integrity at the center of all aspects of the University enterprise and involves all members of the University community in an active partnership for wide-ranging reflection and discussion of related themes;
- b. empower faculty and students to understand and implement the Honor System at UNC in an exemplary fashion; and
- c. provide infrastructure needed to achieve these goals.