MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, March 28th, 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.
INFO	3:25	**Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty.** Professor Sue Estroff.
INFO	3:40	**Report on the Five-Year Transportation Plan.** Chief Derek Poarch.
ACT	3:45	**Resolution 2003-7 Endorsing Certain Recommendations of the Task Force on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.** Professors Paul Farel and Barbara Harris, Co-chairs of the Task Force.
INFO	4:10	**Annual Report of the Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee.** Professor Jim Noblitt, Chair.
INFO	4:15	**Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee.** Professor George Houston, Chair.
INFO	4:30	**Report on the Revision of the General Education Curriculum.** Professor Laurie McNeil.
DISC	4:45	**Open Discussion of Topics Raised by Faculty Members.**
ACT	5:00	*Adjourn.*

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY: **ACT** = Action, **DISC** = Discussion, **INFO** = Information.
Documents pertaining to meetings of the Council may be found at www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun on the Web.

Third edition engrossed 2/7/03

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

The Faculty Council resolves:

1 **I. Flexibility in the Process of Promotion and Tenure.**

2 I.1. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that the University of North Carolina

3 at Chapel Hill should seek appropriate funding to support a system of paid parental leave for full-

4 time faculty holding tenure-track appointments who bear primary responsibility for the care of a

5 newborn or newly-adopted child. [Amended 2/7/03. Adopted as amended 2/7/03.]

6 I.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department chairs

7 assume responsibility for explaining to new faculty appointed to probationary-term positions the

8 provisions of the tenure regulations concerning special provisions for extending the maximum

9 probationary period. [Adopted 2/7/03]

10 I.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department chairs take

11 steps to ensure that faculty members who take advantage of special provisions for extending the

12 maximum probationary period are not subjected to stricter requirements for reappointment and

13 promotion than those expected of colleagues who do not choose to take advantage of those

14 provisions. [Adopted 2/7/03]

15 I.4. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

16 consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to Section 2.c.(6)(iii) of the tenure

17 regulations[1] to increase from one year to two years the maximum extension of the probationary

18 period that may be granted. [Adopted 2/7/03]

19 I.5. [Concerning mutual agreement between chairs and probationary-term faculty to delaying

20 tenure decision until the final year of appointment. Defeated 2/7/03.]

---

[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) [pertaining to less than full-time employment for up to 12 months for similar reasons], 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.

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

1

2 II.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

3 consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code of University

4 Government establishing an elected standing committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

5 II.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit develop a

6 plan that defines the desired mix of tenure-track and fixed-term faculty appointments in that unit.

7 II.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that all appointments to fixed-term

8 faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, contain provisions relevant to the possibility that

9 funding to cover the full duration of the contract may not be available due to funding rescissions.

10 II.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that, to the maximum feasible

11 extent, no person should be appointed to more than three consecutive one-year terms in a fixed-

12 term rank before appointment to a longer term is made available.

13 II.5. The Faculty Council urges the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to rescind the

14 administrative rule now in effect that links the term of fixed-term faculty appointments to the

15 term of appointment of the department chair.

16 II.6. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

17 consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code stating the expectation

18 that all appointments and reappointments to fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or

19 part-time, will be made with the same consultations within the appointing unit as is the case for

20 appointments to tenure-track positions.

21 II.7. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

22 consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations creating the rank of

23 senior lecturer.

24 II.8. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each appointing unit develop

25 descriptions of the evaluation and criteria for appointment and promotion within fixed-term ranks

26 that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in tenure-track

27 appointments.

28 II.9. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that promotions within fixed-term

29 ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in tenure-track

30 appointments follow the same time line for review as is prescribed for tenure-track appointments.

31 II.10. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit include

32 fixed-term faculty in school and departmental decision-making and advisory venues, except those

33 relating to evaluation and promotion of tenure-track faculty.

1 II.11. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department heads

2 make every effort to include fixed-term faculty in professional development activities.

3 II.12. The Faculty Council requests the Provost to examine the criteria for awards,

4 particularly those related to service, to ensure that fixed-term faculty are eligible for consideration

5 unless disqualified by the terms establishing the award.

III. Review of Tenure-Track Appointments and Promotions

7 III.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

8 consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code expressing the

9 expectation that deans and department chairs will consult all tenured faculty in the appointing unit

10 in appointments and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure, except initial

11 appointment at the rank of professor for which consultation with the professors alone is sufficient.

12 III.2. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for

13 consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code establishing a

14 University-wide system for review of all appointments and promotions that have the effect of

15 conferring permanent tenure and all promotions to a higher rank of persons holding permanent

16 tenure at the rank of associate professor or assistant professor . The system should culminate

17 with the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. For the College of Arts and

18 Sciences, the School of Medicine, the School of Public Health, and any other professional school

19 that may hereafter be organized in departments that initiate faculty appointments and promotions,

20 the dean should seek the advice of an elected committee of the College or School faculty before

21 acting on a department chair's recommendation. For professional schools that are not organized

22 in departments, the dean should seek the advice of the entire assembled faculty who are qualified

23 to consult on the action in question or an elected committee of the unit's faculty, as may be

24 appropriate to the size and complexity of the school. The recommended system should eliminate

25 the level of review now being performed by the Subcommittee on Professional Schools of the

26 Committee on Instructional Personnel and the Health Affairs Advisory Committee.

27 III.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that a decision not to reappoint a

28 probationary-term faculty member should be forwarded by the dean or department chair to his or

29 her immediate administrative superior for review as to the adequacy, consistency, and coherence

30 of the evidence supporting the decision not to reappoint. In conducting that review, the reviewing

1 officer will seek the advice of the faculty advisory committee that would have reviewed the

2 decision had it been positive. [2]

---

[2] This resolve does not recommend changing the current provisions of the Tenure Regulations that require all faculty appointment, promotions, and tenure decision to originate at the departmental level. Hence, the review recommended by the resolve would be advisory only to the dean or department chair who made the original decision.

Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee
(Appointed Committee)

Charge

4-26. Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee. The chair of the faculty appoints the committee. It shall consist of (i) faculty members, who shall constitute a majority of the members; and (ii) one or more students, serving one-year renewable terms. The committee represents to the chancellor and the University community the concerns of faculty, and others with regard to information technology. The committee's functions include:

1. considering issues pertaining to the use of information technology in teaching and learning, research, and other professional activities in the University; and

2. advising University officers and offices of administration on faculty needs and interests relating to information technology.

Term Members

Name	Department	Term Ending
Angel, Bonnie	School of Nursing	
Assani, Idris	Mathematics	
Lee, James	Student Government	
Metzguer, Karen	School of Medicine	
Neal, Jocelyn	Music	Spring 2003
Anderson, Daniel	English	
Berger, Robert	Medical Informatics	
Bollenbacher, Skip	Biology	
Kowlowitz, Vicki	School of Nursing	
McLendon, Wallace	Health Sciences Library	
Moody, Aaron	Dept of Geography	
Noblitt, Jim (Chair)	Romance Languages	
Redman, Richard	School of Nursing	
Smith, John	Computer Science	
Strauss, Diane	Davis Library	Spring 2004
Janda, Laura	Slavic Languages	
Newby, Greg	SILS	
Stewart, John	Economics	
Turner, Craig	Dramatic Art	Spring 2005
Englebardt, Sheila	School of Nursing	
Estroff, Sue	Faculty Council	Ex Officio

Staff Members

Carl, Linda	Office of the Provost	carl@email.unc.edu
Casile, Lori	Information Technology Services	lori_casile@unc.edu
Evans, Libby	Admin. Information Service	uevans@email.unc.edu
Henshaw, Bob	Center for Instructional Technology	bhenshaw@unc.edu
Loewenthal, Norm	Continuing Education	norm_loewenthal@unc.edu
Peed-Neal, Iola	Center for Teaching & Learning	iola@email.unc.edu
Peterson, Rick	Office Arts & Sciences Info. Serv.	rick_peterson@unc.edu
Thomas, Kathy	Center for Instructional Technology	kdt@email.unc.edu

FITAC Annual Report
March 28, 2003

James Noblitt (Chair)

During its fourth year as a committee of the Faculty Council, FITAC activities were greatly influenced by 1) University-wide funding cuts and 2) the departure in 2002 of the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology. The Committee generally met twice a month during the fall and spring semesters to address a variety of issues and projects related to the educational uses of Information and Communication Technology (IT) on this campus.

I. Continuing Activities

1. *FITAC Resolution to the Faculty Council, Spring 2002*

a) The first part of the Resolution called for the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost to "revise, or create, University statement(s) regarding teaching such that the University promotes both excellence and innovation in teaching, which may include the use of information and communication technology." A committee was formed, comprised of the Chair of FITAC, Chair of the Faculty Council, and President of the Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars, with the charge of submitting a draft statement to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. *Status: The draft statement, guided by recommendations from the ADTS, Center for Teaching and Learning, and Center for Instructional Technology, is attached as Appendix A.*

b) The second part of the Resolution calls upon the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost to "establish an Information Technology Strategic Planning Council with substantial faculty representation which will, in collaboration with Faculty Council, develop a strategic plan for information and communication technology covering policy, infrastructure, application, adoption, and fund-raising priorities." *Status: Action on this plan has been delayed awaiting the appointment of a new Vice Chancellor for IT.*

c) The final portion of the Resolution calls upon the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, "in consultation with the Information Technology Strategic Planning Council and FITAC, to continue the successful faculty summer workshops and grants that promote excellence in teaching and learning through innovative applications of information technology."

Status: FITAC assumed responsibility for establishing the guidelines, criteria for evaluation, and announcement of proposals to support curricular innovation using new technology. Announcements of winners of the competition were made in late March 2002 under what was to have been the final year of grants under the initial support from IBM. The budget crisis of 2002 required the Provost to rescind these grants. FITAC wrote the Provost (Fall 2002) inquiring whether special funds could be located to continue the program, fearing momentum for the program would be lost, including mechanisms for proposal review and program maintenance. No funds were located, but the issue is mentioned as a concern in the current draft of the Academic Plan.

2. *KnowledgeFoundary (formerly KnowledgeWorks)*

The publication of "e-books" to develop materials for undergraduate education received unanimous endorsement from FITAC in December of 2000.

Status: Initiative for the project has shifted from FITAC to the Vice Chancellor for IT, and Professor Bollenbacher (Department of Biology) has been appointed as Director.

3. *Support for a Laptop Option under The Carolina Computing Initiative (CCI)*

FITAC explored the desirability of including the option for faculty of selecting between a desktop and laptop as the replacement cycle for CCI machines proceeds. The option is designed to allow the use of laptops for in-class instruction.

Status: Provost Shelton responded supportively, but indicated that any decision on the issue would have to be addressed within the constraints of the University's overall fiscal situation.

4. *UNC Digital Library Services*

During the first year of the UNC/IBM Curricular Innovation Grants in 1999, FITAC funded a planning grant for a digital library project. This decision was based on the belief the University needed to begin shifting departmental media (images, audio, video, etc.) databases toward a common infrastructure that would facilitate resource sharing across disciplines and institutions. More than twenty courses in six departments are piloting first-generation digital library, and at least fifteen departmental collections will be placed in the new digital library system by the end of this summer.

Status: FITAC will continue to play an advisory role for this project until an alternative governance structure is created. Additional information on the project is available online at: http://www.unc.edu/projects/diglib/

5. *Technology in Context Consortium:*

FITAC continued to coordinate the "Technology in Context Consortium." This Consortium was created to include as many service organizations and providers for new technology across campus as possible. This resulted in a website (COMPASS; www.unc.edu/faculty/tic) that identifies providers, access, and services. This website is continually updated and is designed to provide "one-stop shopping" for the University community. The University of North Carolina Teaching and Learning with Technology Collaborative (TLTC) provides vision and shared resources in support of TLT programs and initiatives on the sixteen UNC campuses. The TLTC actively explores collaborative opportunities and assists in identifying and implementing best practices, common services and shared resources. The TLTC recently completed a Strategic Plan and an Operating Plan for 2002-2005. (See http://www.unctlt.org/tlt/news/news.cfm)

Status: FITAC will continue to review this effort and provide feedback and direction for a more comprehensive strategy to facilitate professional development.

II. New Initiatives

The committee has focused this year on a better understanding of the current educational uses of IT at UNC. Each meeting of the committee has featured an informational presentation by faculty or staff. These demonstrations led to a discussion of what innovations were needed to optimize the educational uses of IT on and off campus.

1. *Sampler of IT use by Departments*
   The following list of activities by various disciplines or programs and is intended to be illustrative of individual initiatives for the use of IT for teaching and learning. The list is a sample and is not intended to be exhaustive.

   a) **Music** (Jocelyn Neal): *History of Country Music Course*
      An online course site integrates music files, lyrics, images with homework assignments. Long-term future of collection is with Digital Library Services, which will facilitate sharing across departments.
      Student impact: This approach breaks down physical barriers to media. Student writing assignments improved when shared with classmates.

   b) **Romance Languages** (Jim Noblitt): *Foreign Language Resource Center Music & Oral Texts Database*
      An online database integrates music, lyrics, translations and images in an easy-to-use interface for classroom or individual use.
      Student impact: Language students have access to primary sources illustrating international cultural themes.

c) **English** (Daniel Anderson): *Business Writing*
Print literacy is repurposed for use in other media by giving students access to digital media production tools for use in online and face-to-face learning.
Student impact: Emphasis on the use of both text and video content in projects allows students to explore possibilities of the digital communication media.

d) **Academic Affairs Library** (Diane Strauss): *Library Resource Tutorials*
Tutorials were demonstrated on library resources for understanding plagiarism, copyright, information evaluation, library research, and citing information.
Student impact: The lessons can be used across different courses and curricula.

e) **Computer Science** (John Smith): *Introduction to Web Programming*
Topics are supported by online lessons, structured so that students can link to documentation and software relevant to the course.
Student impact: Students can run code snippets from within site and work at their own pace.

f) **Health Sciences Library** (Wallace McLendon): *Institutional Digital Repositories*
Current journal system is not sustainable, and is no longer an issue that just impacts libraries. Math, Physics, and Molecular Biology have been early adopters because research in science tends to be more sensitive to timely data. Alternative non-profit models for online publication are emerging, but tenure and promotion systems continue to reward publications in print.
Student impact: Primary journals are often an arm of the discipline's professional organization, which shapes faculty development and teaching strategies.

g) **Economics** (John Stewart): *Introductory Economics*
IT allows the use of computer-based graphics programs to present graphs, numbers, etc. Web pages are used primarily to make course materials and practice exams available to students outside of class.
Student impact: Class experience puts content in context as instructor clarifies key points and reviews practice exams.

h) **Biology** (Skip Bollenbacher): *Partnership for Minority Advancement in the Biomolecular Sciences (PMABS)*
IT is used to facilitate course management tasks like document dissemination and linking to current research articles, which are used as the basis for discussion of key concepts. The website also assists by managing writing assignments, special vocabulary lists, sample exams, and a topical link library.
Student impact: The technology links students and instructors among UNC-Chapel Hill and seven of the NC's historically minority universities, enabling them to share curricula across institutions and thus better prepare students to compete in advanced courses.

2. *Information Literacy*

FITAC was especially interested in gaining student input for the issue of information literacy and consequently sought representation from the Student Government Technology Council at the suggestion of ITS representative Lori Casile.

a) Tommy Mann, representing Student Government Technology Council, supports a required for-credit course on technology skills. Most students welcome the use of technology inside or outside the classroom. However, faculty use is inconsistent; as not all faculty have baseline technology skills. He notes that a large percentage of student research is conducted online.

b) Student representative James Lee and Greg Newby (I&LS) led a discussion on a proposal prepared by the Student Government Information and Technology Committee to include a technology competency course in the first-year undergraduate curriculum. The proposed course would consist of three major components: Building Blocks (technical concepts and application use), Information Retrieval and Resources, and Ethics.

Discussion: Students currently get redundant IT instruction in various courses, thus it may be efficient to move content to a single course requirement. But a requirement raises issues:

Include all students (e.g., distance ed)?

Is student body ready to accept yet another course requirement?

How can students place out, and how would you evaluate students' information ethics?

Faculty currently have full accountability for the integration of skills into the curriculum. Does this relieve them of this responsibility?

Comment: UNC's leadership in infrastructure (CCI) needs to be matched with information literacy, but pointing students to self-paced modules would be more feasible during a time when resources are so stretched. (See II.1.d above.)

3. *IT Infrastructure and Administrative Issues*

a) **Search for new VC for Computing.** The committee responded to a request from Sue Estroff for FITAC input on desiderata for the University's CIO. Opinions from faculty and staff were summarized and forwarded to Estroff and Provost Shelton.

b) **The Academic Plan.** The Academic Planning Task Force draft proposal was studied by FITAC, and suggestions for improvement were summarized. The FITAC recommendations were forwarded to Deans Gless and Allred as well as the Provost. FITAC members Noblitt and Bollenbacher met with the Deans to discuss wording of the Academic Plan that affected educational uses of IT.

c) **New security policies for IT.** John Oberlin, Jeanne Smythe, and Jim Gogan (ITS) reported on IT new security policies required by new, state-mandated security audit. The auditor now has authority to take away campus budget flexibility (not just for IT). There will be two major policy changes: 1) regular update of ONYEN passwords and 2) new wireless network configuration requirements. Passwords will begin expiring January 20 on a staggered schedule, and will expire again every ninety days. ITS is implementing an online system that will allow users to reset password themselves in case they forget. New tools will allow departmental and other non-ONYEN systems to synchronize with the ONYEN account. Wireless cards and access points must be reconfigured to support the required encryption protocol (WEP). Will likely move toward a standards-based wireless security when it becomes available. WEP is short-term solution.

d) **New Course Retention Policy.** Jeanne Smythe (ITS) sought FITAC input in drafting a new policy for retaining course websites. She noted that some faculty members are not aware that course syllabi are public records. Records Office was eliminated in the budget cuts. In the past, department chair bore responsibility to retain records of course documents. Maximum statute of limitations on how long course documents should be kept is two years. Four years would be conservative guideline. Some instructors may need to delete portions of old course websites (e.g., exam keys) before the statute of limitations. Legal Counsel will have to consider on a case-by-case basis. In a follow-up meeting Jeanne Smythe and Libby Evans (ITS) pointed out that ITS would adopt a general policy, but there may be some instructional content that is difficult to track (e.g. discussion forums). Thus it is difficult for ITS to know when term of limitations begins. Some instructors may need to delete portions of old course websites (e.g., exam keys) before the statute of limitations. Legal Counsel will have to consider on a case-by-case basis. Response from Legal Counsel still pending. ITS needs clear direction on parameters, exceptions, etc. Comments should be sent to jeanne_smythe@unc.edu or cit@unc.edu.

e) **New Classroom Podium Design.** Rick Peterson (OASIS) sought input for the next generation of podia for classrooms outfitted with multimedia technologies. Committee members opted for as many rooms as could be economically accommodated, stressing the need for flexibility of design for a variety of conventional and multimedia presentation styles.

f) **Accessible Electronic Content.** Linda Carl (Continuing Education) and Bob Henshaw (CIT) briefed the committee on the University's Web Accessibility Policy and Initiatives. New policy announced last fall to strengthen University's readiness to accommodate students with disabilities. Anticipated increase in distance education enrollments is driving policy, since it is difficult for Department of Disability Services to act as intermediary for remote students. *Comment: FITAC will study implications and consider how new policy should be presented to Faculty Council.*

III. The FITAC Agenda: Priorities

The committee's focus for the rest of this academic year will be on direction, assessment, and support for the intelligent educational uses of IT. Our priorities are as follows:

1. **Advisory Committee for Vice Chancellor for IT**
The committee continues to support faculty representation for IT resource allocation. Our recommendation for an Advisory Committee for the new Vice Chancellor has been communicated to the Provost and to the search committee, now meeting. We feel that governance structures relating the Academic Plan to the IT infrastructure may be profitably reviewed at this time.

2. **Funding to Reinstate Innovation Grants Program.**
The committee continues to support a grant program for funding intelligent and innovative uses of IT for research, teaching, and learning. We are particularly concerned that the infrastructure created to generate, evaluate, fund, and support initiatives will fall into neglect. Thus the mention of this program in the Academic Plan is particularly welcome. We note that having to cancel the awards announced last year have created a negative impact on faculty morale. FITAC will investigate the possibilities of funding from the private sector as an interim measure.

3. **Academic Incentives for Scholarly Uses of IT**
The committee continues to support a policy of academic reward for scholarship and teaching that requires the digital medium for its proper realization. We recognize that quality assurance is a function best performed at the at departmental level, and that discipline specialists with an understanding of the new medium will be needed to oversee the meaningful use of IT on this campus.

4. **Assessment of IT Use on Campus**
The committee will continue to sample actual uses of IT for educational purposes on this campus. Our intent is to create an Internet resource that allows faculty and staff to understand how the design of content and IT infrastructure are may be optimized for meaningful access to educational material.

Teaching Statement

Final Draft - Spring 2002

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill exists to teach students at all levels in an environment of exploration, free inquiry, and personal responsibility. To accomplish this goal, we are committed to providing high-quality undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction to future generations of scholars, educators, professionals, and informed global citizens prepared to succeed in an increasingly complex and inter-connected world. Our instructional tools include service-teaching and learning, pioneering cross-discipline approaches, undergraduate research opportunities, advances in the use of technology, and other innovations that extend teaching and research to address the needs of the state of North Carolina and broader publics.

We are committed, as a research university, to energetic engagement in research, scholarship and creative work. What faculty and students discover and produce contributes to the generation and dissemination of knowledge that improves human life, enhances cultural experiences, and expands opportunities in personal, professional, and civic spheres. As scholars, we pursue inquiry and scholarship to discover knowledge, and we pursue teaching to help others understand, generate and evaluate knowledge for themselves. Teaching and learning are intertwined with scholarship and service, each being informed by the other.

Effective teaching in the 21st century must cope with an increasingly diverse student body and our assessment of teaching should acknowledge the increasing diversity of effective teaching practices and locations. Teaching and learning occur in venues such as classrooms, offices and public meeting spaces, research laboratories, and distributed or virtual spaces; and teaching and learning occur through instructional practice, collaborative projects, clinical and fieldwork, internships, study abroad, and mentoring. Our instructional practices should encourage critical thinking, creative expression, and rigorous scholarship. Innovative methods and perspectives contribute significantly to the fulfillment of our instructional goals as they maintain the vitality of teaching, learning and the intellectual environment at the University.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE TO FACULTY COUNCIL
MARCH 28, 2003

Membership: Lucia Binotti (2005; on leave Spring 2003), Melissa M. Bullard (2003), Robert Daniels (alternate for Kramer), Peter C. Gordon (2005; on leave Fall 2002), John Halton (alternate for Gordon, Fall 2002, Binotti Spring 2003), George Harper (Graduate Student Representative), George W. Houston (2003; Chair), Lloyd S. Kramer (2004; on leave 2002-2003), Bobbi Owen (2003), Susan F. Pierce (2004), Kimberly Sexton (Undergraduate Student Representative), Joseph Templeton (2004), Barbara Wildemuth (2005), David Lanier (ex officio).

Meetings. In 2002-2003, the Educational Policy Committee met in alternate weeks during September and early October, weekly from late October through mid-December and in January, and in alternate weeks in February and March. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Wednesday, April 9.

Annual Report prepared by George W. Houston (Chair), with review of committee.

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

Activities, AY 2002-2003 (through March 26, 2003).

Proposed Change of Grades in Graduate Courses from HPLF to ABCDF. In April of 2002, Linda Dykstra, Dean of the Graduate School, wrote the Educational Policy Committee (henceforth EPC) asking for its reaction to a proposal to change grades in graduate courses from HPLF to ABCDF, with S retained for thesis/dissertation credit. She asked that we also consider the addition of plusses and minuses to graduate transcripts. The principal reason for proposing the change to an ABCDF scale is to allow the easy computation of grade point averages, so that graduate students may compete effectively for awards that are based in part upon GPA. A subcommittee consisting of John Halton (Chair), George Harper, and Barbara Wildemuth considered the matter. When polled by the Graduate and Professional Students' Federation, 83% of students (1,188 of 1,375, with another 63 undecided) were opposed to a change in the grading system. Faculty polled by the Graduate School would favor a change, 35 to 14. The EPC was not able to attain a clear majority in favor of or opposed to either proposal, and in our reply to the Graduate School we stated that there seemed to us to be no compelling reason to convert from HPLF to ABCF. (We did not seriously consider ABCDF. The problem is that students now are not eligible to continue if they receive three "L's." If one used ABCDF, which grade would determine eligibility, C or D?) The Business School had previously contacted the University Registrar about establishing their own grading scale. The EPC felt that this was not desirable, and we conveyed to the Graduate School our hope that there be a single grading system for all Master's and PhD programs, including both the Graduate School and the Business School.

Proposed XF grade and associated changes in the Student Judicial System. When the Chancellor's Task Force to Review the Student Judicial System made its report in May of 2002, the Committee on Student Conduct (COSC) was asked to review that report in general and to make recommendations concerning revisions to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance. One of the Task Force's recommendations was to establish a grade of XF to be assigned to students convicted of Honor Code violations; associated with that there was to be a required course in honor and integrity, and a wider range of options available as sanctions in cases of academic dishonesty. A Subcommittee consisting of Melissa Bullard (Chair), Lucia Binotti, Robert Daniels, and Kimberly Sexton met, considered the matter, and reported to the whole EPC. Following our discussion of the Subcommittee report, in which both divided opinions and serious reservations concerning the proposed XF grade emerged, the Subcommittee (through its Chair, Melissa Bullard) contacted the Chair of the COSC, Judith Wegner, and reported our concerns and misgivings. Those were taken into account by COSC as it continued work on the subject, and there were several exchanges of information and views from EPC to COSC and back. Ultimately, the COSC report and recommendations did not include the proposed XF grade but did allow for an increased range of sanctions, which the EPC too had thought was desirable.

Curriculum Review. Laurie McNeil, Chair of the Curriculum Review Steering Committee, presented the recommendations of the Steering Committee in a Faculty Forum on October 7, 2002. This was the last in a series of such fora, and following it the proposal was revised (becoming Version 1.3) and submitted to the EPC and to the Administrative Boards of the General College and the College of Arts and Sciences for their review and recommendations. The EPC met on a weekly basis in November and December to consider the proposal. We began by working through the proposal section by section, from goals to Foundations, then Approaches, Connections, and Supplemental General Education. At our meeting on December 11, we considered the proposal as a whole. Following that meeting, we prepared a memo, outlining the concerns we had about the proposed curriculum, and sent the memo to Professor McNeil and to Tom Tweed, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Curricula. In January, we met twice with Professor McNeil and Tweed to discuss their proposals, and then twice more to discuss the curriculum revision. At that point, we sent a revised memo in which we attempted to specify our concerns about the proposal. Meanwhile, the Administrative Boards had begun to consider Version 1.3, and on February 12 George Houston, Chair of the EPC, met briefly with the Adminstrative Boards, at the invitation of Tom Tweed, to outline the thoughts of the EPC. As of this writing (March 10), the Administrative Boards have made their recommendations, and the EPC awaits a revision of the Proposed Curriculum.

Since the process is ongoing, this is not the place for a detailed account of our concerns, but a few summary remarks may be helpful. The Committee is appreciative of the work done on the Curriculum Revision by Laurie McNeil, Tom Tweed, the members of the Steering Committee, and many other members of the student body and the faculty. We are especially grateful to Professors McNeil and Tweed for their willingness to meet with us, and for their attempt to respond to our concerns and those of the Administrative Boards. The EPC is particularly concerned with the complexity of the proposed new curriculum, with the number of requirements it involves, with multiple counting as a way of dealing with the requirements, and with some of the definitions and names of requirements. We think it likely that it will be difficult for students to understand the curriculum as an intellectual and educational process, and that there will be problems in implementation and administration. Despite this, we note that the proposed curriculum has many good points, and it is our hope and expectation that further revision (leading to Version 1.4) will resolve some or all of these concerns.

Grade Compression and Inflation. Faculty Council has requested that the EPC annually review grade point averages as a result of the concerns outlined in the EPC report on grading standards of Spring 2000. In response to Faculty Council Resolution 2001-5, all units reviewed their grading practices in the course of the year 2002 and reported on their reviews to the Provost's office. Those reports were forwarded from the Provost's office to the EPC and reviewed by Joseph Templeton and George Houston of the EPC. They vary from very brief to very detailed, but collectively they indicate that the various educational units in the University are aware of the need for attention to grading practices and in particular to the need for consistency. The Registrar's office now makes available a report on GPA's by subject, semester by semester (with a six-month lag to allow time for the resolution of IN and AB grades). It is available at <http://regweb.unc.edu/official/stats/datamart>. Since the Faculty Council action on this matter took place only three semesters ago, it is still too early to tell if there are any long-term trends in grade point averages, although we note that, if one compares the Fall of 1999 to the Fall of 2001, about as many units had lower GPA's as had higher. The EPC will continue to monitor these reports and bring them to the attention of the Faculty Council.

Remarks on Student Transcripts. Sue Estroff, Chair of the Faculty, acting on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council (ECFC), asked the Educational Policy Committee to gather information concerning remarks that are added to the transcripts of undergraduate students at the request of individual units within the University, and then to design a procedure for the approval of any such remarks proposed in future. At present, there are close to three hundred such remarks, most of them awards ("Carmichael Cobb Award," for example). In response, the EPC proposes a procedure that will require initiating units to submit a short form that will be routed through the Provost's office (as representative of the Administration), then to the EPC (representing the Faculty), and thence to the Registrar's office. Most such proposals are likely to be straightforward, so this should not be a burdensome task for either the Provost's office or the EPC. The proposed policy, procedure, and form is attached (Attachment A).

Professional School Certificates for Undergraduate and Non-Degree Students. In response to a request from Sue Estroff on behalf of the ECFC, the EPC considered a draft proposal, prepared by the Provost's office, of a policy regarding the establishment of new certificate programs for undergraduate students in professional programs. A subcommittee consisting of David Lanier (Chair), Kimberly Sexton, and Barbara Wildemuth, reviewed the draft that we were sent and proposed changes, which we have forwarded to Sue Estroff. Our proposed revised version is attached as Attachment B.

Noise, the Educational Process, and Related Issues. Peter Gordon brought up the matter of noise, and in particular construction noise, on campus, and its effect on the educational process. He wondered also about the process of classroom renovation, in particular the criteria used in establishing which classrooms will be renovated first, or in what order. Members of the EPC agreed that these are matters that affect our ability to teach, especially in light of the proposed construction to take place over the next several years. At our meeting on March 3 we began considering both specific problems and possible resolutions of them. We plan to meet with members of the Administration, especially Facilities Planning, to find out what plans for noise abatement are already in place, then consider what might be an appropriate course of action.

Educational Policy Committee. *Attachment A.* DRAFT of Policy statement regarding remarks to be added to transcripts and DRAFT of a form to be used when proposing a new Remark on Student's Transcript.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Office of the Registrar
Remarks on Transcripts

1. Policy. The transcripts of students who attend the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill provide space for remarks that recognize special achievement in academic and University-related activities. Individual units may propose new transcript remarks subject to the following conditions:

- The remark must recognize academic achievement or achievement in activities directly related to the University. Negative remarks are not permitted.
- The remark may not exceed 54 characters in length.
- The word "distinction" may be used only to recognize academic achievement. For other activities, words such as "recognition" or "excellence in ..." should be used.

Some examples of acceptable remarks: "Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award," "Pfeiffer Scholar," "Year-at-Lyon," "Certificate in Women's Studies." All remarks in use by February 2003 are hereby approved. A master list of all approved remarks is maintained by the University Registrar.

2. Proposal for a New Transcript Remark. *Instructions.* For approval of a new remark, please complete this form, then send a copy to the Provost's office for approval. The Provost's office will forward it to the Educational Policy Committee for their approval. Upon final approval, the EPC will forward the form to the University Registrar, who will confirm the effective date and inform all parties listed below when the remark is available.

Initiating Unit (Department, Curriculum, etc.):

Proposed Remark (54 characters maximum):

Justification. Please be brief. If more documentation is needed, it can be attached.

Proposed Effective Date:

Contact information and signature of Unit Head; date.

Approval by Provost; date.

Approval by Educational Policy Committee; date.

Received by the University Registrar; confirmed effective date:

Educational Policy Committee. *Attachment B.* DRAFT of policy statement regarding certificate programs in professional schools.

Professional School Certificate for Undergraduates and Non-Degree Students

A Professional School Certificate enables a student to explore a specific area of professional study at the undergraduate level. The Certificate is offered under the direction of a professional school and is designed for undergraduates and for non-degree students. A non-degree student must have a minimum of an associate-level degree. The admission to on-campus certificate programs will be performed through the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. The admission to off-campus certificate programs will be performed according to distance education admission policy. A Professional School Certificate must be comprised of a minimum of nine credit hours. To establish a Professional School Certificate, the originating department head, program director and dean should submit the following information to the Office of the Provost:

- Statement of rationale and any existing established need for the program. If the program is offered by a community college, explain why there is also a need to offer this certificate at UNC-Chapel Hill.

- Describe the demographics of the target student population for this program (degree-seeking UNC Chapel Hill students, non-degree students, college-age, adult).

- Detailed description of the proposed program including its impact on campus resources such as classrooms and instructional personnel.

- If directed toward UNC Chapel Hill degree students, specify if courses can be double-counted toward the student's major as well as the certificate, and describe why certificate is necessary beyond offering major options, concentrations, or minors.

- Admissions criteria.

- Three-year semester-by-semester projection of enrollments, course offerings, financial plan, and evaluation plan. Course and program evaluation should be a standard component of all certificate programs. Certificate programs should be reviewed at least every five years by the administrative board of the school.

- Identification of proposed Certificate Program Director, teaching faculty and membership of Advisory Board.

- Text for the undergraduate bulletin.

Students enrolled in the program must earn at least a "C" grade in each course to be awarded the certificate. Students who earn a "C" or lower grade in any certificate course will not be awarded the certificate. Students may not transfer courses into the certificate program.

Programs must be approved at least six months prior to enrolling students. Once the Office of the Provost approves the certificate, it will advise the Office of the University Registrar. Recipients of a Professional School Certificate may have this award noted on their Carolina transcript.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
March 28, 2003, 3:00 p.m.

Attendance

Present (55): Adimora, Allison, Ammerman, Bane, Bouldin, Cotton, Daye, Elter, Elvers, Fishell, Foley, Gollop, Henry, Kagarise, Kelley, Kjervik, Langbauer, Lohr, Malizia, McGraw, Metzguer, Miller, Molina, Morris-Natschke, Nonini, Orthner, Owen, Panter, Parikh, Pittman, Poole, Porto, Reinert, Reisner, Retsch-Bogart, Rippe, Rock, Xue, Rowan, Salmon, Schauer, Shea, Simpson, Smith, Straughan, Strauss, Sueta, Tauchen, Toews, Tresolini, Tulloch, Wallace, Weiss, Willis, Wilson.

Excused absences (27): Bachenheimer, Barbour, Bollen, Bowen, Cairns, Carelli, Chenault, Colindres, D'Cruz, Files, Fowler, Gerber, Gilliand, Granger, Janda, Kessler, Leigh, Meece, Moran, Nelson, Pfaff, Pisano, Sigurdsson, Vandermeer, Vick, Watson, Yopp.

Unexcused absences (5): Carter, Crawford-Brown, McQueen, Nicholas, Sams.

Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time

Chancellor Moeser reported that the Tar Heel Bus Tour will be held this year. It is being financed, as always, from private funds, not State appropriations.

The chancellor reported that six of our undergraduate students have won prestigious national scholarships this spring.

Chancellor Moeser concluded his remarks with congratulations to the University's first 50-year employee, Mr. Hubbard of the Grounds Department.

Remarks by the Provost

Provost Robert Shelton reported that the Board of Trustees recently approved the appointment of Robert Blouin as ninth dean of the School of Pharmacy. Blouin is currently associate dean at the University of Kentucky's College of Pharmacy.

The provost said that all of the deans are making progress in reviewing cases identified by the recent salary equity study. He said that Assoc. Provost Bernadette Gray-Little will be making a full report on this at the April Council meeting.

After yet more discouraging news about the State's fiscal problems, Provost Shelton said he wanted to turn to some positive news. He said that in times of fiscal constraint, we can become more creating in developing partnerships with other institutions. He mentioned five examples:

- The new Institute for Advanced Materials, Nano-Science, and Technology—a joint program in materials science with NC State.
- The Robertson Scholars Program, now in its third year, a joint program with Duke that enrolls 15 students each year from each institution.
- The Library Consortium, an inter-library agreement among Duke, Carolina, N.C. State, and N.C. Central through which collections on each campus are available to students and faculty at all four institutions.
- Joint hiring efforts, especially in the area of spousal hires and retention.
- Collaboration between our University Center for International Studies and Duke's Center for International Development.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Prof. Estroff spoke of her concern about the onset of the war with Iraq: "as we sit here in safety and in comfort, others a world away are enduring another night of explosions, fear and destruction. Toddlers like mine have to cope

with the noise and fear and chaos, while, mine, in comparison, have no worries at all. Young people the age of our students, both Iraqi and American, are now playing the ironic card of the harm in each other's way. We may be lulled into feeling safe here in this room, but perhaps might analogize our steadily eroding grip on truly democratic government and authentically implemented basic rights to the steady occupation and loss of territory that Iraqis experience as we meet." She invited the Council to take a few moments in silent reflection to recognize a tragic circumstance for us all.

Report on the Five-Year Transportation Plan

Chief Derek Poarch briefed the Council on plans being developed by the Advisory Committee on Transportation.

Prof. James Porto (Health Policy & Administration) commented on hazardous conditions in crossing streets in the vicinity of the School of Public Health. He urged that consideration be given to traffic bumps.

Resolution Endorsing Certain Recommendations of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The Council returned to consideration of Resolution 2003-7. Prof. Joseph Ferrell, Secretary of the Faculty, Presided.

Prof. Ferrell called for consideration of Sec. III.1. He explained that this section requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for discussion a Faculty Code amendment expressing the faculty's "expectation" that all tenured faculty members in each department or school be consulted on appointments and promotions that confer permanent tenure, except initial appointment to the rank of professor for which consultation with the full professors alone would be sufficient. He said that the effect of such an amendment would be to encourage would be to include tenured associate professors in consultations on promotions from assistant professor to associate professor and initial appointments at the rank of associate professor with permanent tenure. He further explained that although the Code now requires only consultation with the full professors, many appointing units already include associate professors.

There being no discussion or debate, Sec. III.1 was adopted without dissent.

Prof. Ferrell called for consideration of Sec. III.2. He explained that this section calls for the Committee on University Government to prepare and present for consideration a Faculty Code amendment to establish a uniform, University-wide procedure for review of tenure-track faculty appointments and promotions. The procedure would culminate with the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. There would be only one level of intermediate review above the department level, which would be carried out either by the assembled tenured faculty of the unit or by an elected committee chosen by the unit's voting faculty. The existing Health Sciences Advisory Committee and the Subcommittee on Professional Schools of the Committee on Instructional Personnel (SCOPS) would no longer be involved in reviewing faculty personnel actions.

Prof. Diane Kjervik (Nursing) spoke against Sec. III.2. She said she had discussed the proposal with both the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the School of Nursing and the Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC), of which she is a member. Both groups oppose eliminating HSAC which is composed not of deans but of faculty members who are selected by the deans in Health Affairs to represent their respective schools.

Prof. Kjervik moved to amend Sec. III.2 by striking out language that would eliminate HSAC review of faculty personnel decisions originating in the Division of Health Affairs.

Prof. Paul Farel, co-chair of the Task Force on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, said that the task force had spent more time discussing this provision than any of its other recommendations. The fundamental principle being advocated by the task force is that all reviews above the departmental level must be conducted by committees composed of elected members of the faculty, not administrators or faculty appointees. Neither SCOPS nor HSAC are composed of elected bodies. A second principle articulated by the task force is that faculty personnel decisions rightly belong primarily at the level of appointing unit. With the elected APT Committee performing the overall quality-control function, there is no real need for an intermediate level of review if the decision has already been reviewed and approved either by the entire assembled faculty of the school (in the case of professional schools not organized into departments) or by an elected committee of the faculty (in the case of the College and schools organized into departments). Prof. Farel opposed the amendment.

Prof. Estroff remarked that another issue is lack of comparability of the tenure process across the institution. She favored Sec. III.2 as originally proposed.

Prof. Kjervik said that she had discussed the election issue with both the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the Nursing School and HSAC. Both groups were very open to being elected rather than appointed.

There being no further discussion of Prof. Kjervik's amendment, Prof. Ferrell called for a vote. The amendment was defeated.

Prof. William Smith (Mathematics) said that he favors the concept of intermediate review between the departmental level and the APT Committee, and also the ideal of having a university-wide system of review. He would prefer to drop the explicit direction to eliminate SCOPS and HSAC in the process and substitute language that would allow development of a proposal to have the mid-level review committees elected. He said that the ultimate decision might be to eliminate the mid-level review, but he preferred to leave the Committee on University Government free to consider several alternatives.

Prof. Dulcie Straughn (Journalism & Mass Communication) said that there is concern within the School of Journalism and Mass Communication that elimination of SCOPS would effectively eliminate and entire level of tenure review for all professional schools, except Medicine and Public Health. She said this would make the tenure review process less rigorous. She moved to strike the entire sentence calling for elimination of SCOPS and HSAC in the review process.

Prof. Ronald Strauss (Dentistry) said that he thought it telling that opposition to the proposal to eliminate SCOPS and HSAC is coming from the smaller professional schools. He felt that the mid-level review now in place at least allows a presence from faculty members familiar with the characteristics of all of the schools. He said he favored the idea that these committees should be elected, but for the moment he felt that keeping the current system would be protective of some of the smaller professional schools.

Prof. Estroff said that some of the discussion appears to be based on the assumption that upper-level review is somehow disadvantaged if someone from the candidate's own school or department is not involved. She disagreed with that assumption.

Discussion having concluded, Prof. Straughn's amendment was put to a vote. The amendment was adopted by a divided vote.

Chancellor Moeser asked whether the discussion and the vote on Prof. Straughn's amendment indicates a consensus that there should be a mid-level review by an elected faculty committee? If so, he thought the record should so indicate.

Prof. Ferrell replied that the normal practice is that the proposal as adopted would go to the Committee on University Government without instruction on points not specifically addressed.

Prof. Estroff asked whether someone shouldn't propose an amendment called for an elected mid-level review committee.

After several extemporaneous attempts to devise an appropriate amendment, Prof. Ferrell proposed that a full transcript of the discussion by prepared and transmitted to the Committee on University Government.

Discussion having concluded, Sec. III.2, as amended, was adopted.

Prof. Ferrell called for discussion of Sec. III.3. There being none, Sec. III.3 was adopted as presented.

Annual Reports

Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee. Prof. James Noblitt, chair of the Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee, summarized the committee's annual report.

Educational Policy Committee. Prof. George Houston, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), commented on portions of the committee's annual report. He said that the committee had carefully followed the development of the proposed revision of the general education curriculum and had opened a dialogue with Prof. Laurie McNeil, chair of the task force, and Assoc. Dean Tom Tweed. Prof. Houston said that the task force has revised its proposals in response to concerns and suggestions from both EPC and the Administrative Board of the College of Arts and Sciences. EPC received the latest revision just this week and will now begin to discuss it.

Referring to the proposal to change the grading system for graduate courses (HPLF) to correspond to the letter grade system used for undergraduate courses, Prof. Frank Wilson (Orthopaedics) asked what weight had been given to student preferences. He thought perhaps student opinion and faculty opinion might be at odds here. He said he had been involved in many discussions over the years as to how to report grades and had generally found that students do not favor making the system more specific. He pointed out that any four-point system is not only less discriminating than a five-point system, it also cannot be used to generate an average grade. He acknowledged that the Medical School uses a three-point system (HPF) which is even less discriminating, but at least it can produce an

average grade. He wondered whether the message might be that any odd-numbered system is preferable to an even-numbered system. He hoped that EPC would look favorably on the proposal to move to a five-point system for graduate courses.

Prof. Houston replied that the Graduate School had only asked EPC for preliminary comments. The committee took many things into consideration in its discussions but in the end was unable to reach consensus. The outcome was to communicate the committee's thoughts and concerns to the Graduate School and to invite another specific proposal in the future.

Prof. James Porto (Health Policy & Administration) pointed out that any system of discrete grades builds in large ranges of difference. He asked whether any thought had been given to a continuous grading scale from 0 to 4.

Prof. Houston said that the short answer was no. Some faculty have concerns about assigning grade point averages to graduate students. EPC is not sure that we should focus closely on graduate grades. Some member thought doing so would encourage grade inflation. Others thought a graduate GPA might be used inappropriately by those outside the academy.

There ensued a lively but inconclusive discussion of grading practices in graduate courses.

Report on the Revision of the General Education Curriculum

Prof. Laurie McNeil, chair of the Task Force on Revision of the General Education Curriculum, briefed the Council on the process that had been employed to generate the task force's proposals. She then demonstrated a web site developed by a talented team of students enrolled in Computer Science 145, taught by Prof. Kye Hedlund. The site allows students to navigate easily the complex requirements of the curriculum. Prof. McNeil urged Council members to familiarize themselves with the task force's proposals, using materials that had been distributed and by visiting the task force web site. She said that the proposal would be placed before the Council for a formal vote at the April meeting.

Adjournment

The business of the day having been concluded, the Council adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Resolution Adopted March 28, 2003

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. [Amended 2/7/03. Adopted as amended 2/7/03.]

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. [Adopted 2/7/03]

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. [Adopted 2/7/03]

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 regulations[1] to increase from one year to two years the maximum extension of the probationary period that may be granted. [Adopted 2/7/03]

I.5. [Concerning mutual agreement between chairs and probationary-term faculty to delaying tenure decision until the final year of appointment. Defeated 2/7/03.]

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

II.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code of University Government establishing an elected standing committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.2. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit develop a plan that defines the respective roles and contributions of tenure-track and fixed-term faculty appointments in that unit. [Amended 2/28/03. Adopted as amended 2/28/03.]

---

[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) [pertaining to less than full-time employment for up to 12 months for similar reasons], 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.

II.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that all appointments to fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, contain provisions relevant to the possibility that funding to cover the full duration of the contract may not be available due to funding rescissions. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.4. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that, to the maximum feasible extent, no person should be appointed to more than three consecutive one-year terms in a fixed-term rank before appointment to a longer term is made available. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.5. The Faculty Council urges the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to rescind the administrative rule now in effect that links the term of fixed-term faculty appointments to the term of appointment of the department chair. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.6. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code stating the expectation that all appointments and reappointments to fixed-term faculty positions, whether full-time or part-time, will be made with the same consultations within the appointing unit as is the case for appointments to tenure-track positions. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.7. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the Council a proposed amendment to the tenure regulations creating the rank of senior lecturer. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.8. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each appointing unit that makes appointments to graduated ranks using the prefix qualifiers "research," "clinical," or "adjunct" develop descriptions of the criteria for initial appointment to and progression through those ranks." [Amended and Adopted as amended 2/28/03.]

II.9. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that promotions within fixed-term ranks that differentiate appointment by ranks analogous to those employed in tenure-track appointments follow the same time line for review as is prescribed for tenure-track appointments. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.10. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that each academic unit include fixed-term faculty in appropriate school and departmental decision-making and advisory venues, except those relating to evaluation and promotion of tenure-track faculty. [Amended 2/28/03. Adopted as amended 2/28/03.]

II.11. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that deans and department heads make every effort to include fixed-term faculty in professional development activities. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

II.12. The Faculty Council requests the Provost to examine the criteria for awards, particularly those related to service, to ensure that fixed-term faculty are eligible for consideration unless disqualified by the terms establishing the award. [Adopted 2/28/03.]

III. Review of Tenure-Track Appointments and Promotions

III.1. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code establishing a University-wide system for review of all appointments and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure and all promotions to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure at the rank of associate professor or assistant professor . The system should culminate with the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. For the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Medicine, the School of Public Health, and any other professional school that may hereafter be organized in departments that initiate faculty appointments and promotions, the dean should seek the advice of an elected committee of the College or School faculty before acting on a department chair's recommendation. For professional schools that are not organized in departments, the dean should seek the advice of the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action in question or an elected committee of the unit's faculty, as may be appropriate to the size and complexity of the school. [Amended 3/28/03; Adopted as amended 3/28/03.]

III.2. The Faculty Council requests the Committee on University Government to prepare for consideration by the General Faculty an amendment to the Faculty Code expressing the expectation that deans and department chairs will consult all tenured faculty in the appointing unit in appointments and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure, except initial appointment at the rank of professor for which consultation with the professors alone is sufficient. [Adopted 3/28/03.]

III.3. The Faculty Council endorses the recommendation that a decision not to reappoint a probationary-term faculty member should be forwarded by the dean or department chair to his or her immediate administrative superior for review as to the adequacy, consistency, and coherence of the evidence supporting the decision not to reappoint.

In conducting that review, the reviewing officer will seek the advice of the faculty advisory committee that would have reviewed the decision had it been positive.[2] [Adopted 3/28/03.]

---

[2] This resolve does not recommend changing the current provisions of the Tenure Regulations that require all faculty appointment, promotions, and tenure decision to originate at the departmental level. Hence, the review recommended by the resolve would be advisory only to the dean or department chair who made the original decision.