MEET CHANCELLOR HOOKER:
INVITATION TO ALL FACULTY
RECEPTION, AT 2:15 P.M., PRECEDING MEETING
UPSTAIRS (THIRD FLOOR), RARE BOOK COLLECTION EXHIBIT AREA

MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, September 8, 1995, 3:00 p.m.

* * * * * Assembly Room, 2nd Floor, Wilson Library * * * * *

Chancellor Michael Hooker will preside. Attendance of elected Council members is required.

AGENDA

I. Chancellor Hooker's remarks: questions or comments on any subject will be invited.

II. Presentation of Hettleman Awards: Chancellor Hooker.

III. Chair of the Faculty Jane D. Brown.

IV. Report of the Faculty Assembly Delegation: Jane D. Brown, Chair.

V. Secretary of the Faculty George S. Lensing.

VI. Mr. J. Calvin Cunningham III, Student Body President.

VII. Charge and structure of the Educational Policy Committee: Special report of the Committee on University Government and second reading and vote on resolution amending The Faculty Code of University Government to revise the charge and structure of the Educational Policy Committee: Joseph S. Ferrell, Chair, Committee on University Government. (Report and resolution are attached to this Agenda.)

VIII. Resolution of Gratitude for Walter R. Davis.

IX. Old or New Business.

George S. Lensing
Secretary of the Faculty

ATTACHED IS THE LIST OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING DATES FOR THE 1995-96 ACADEMIC YEAR.

THE DUE DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE IS SEPTEMBER 15.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: PLEASE REMEMBER TO SIGN THE ROLL AND FIND YOUR NAME TAG ON ONE OF THE SEATS IN THE FIRST THREE ROWS.
NOTE: The dates for this year’s Faculty Council meetings are:

September 8  November 10  January 12  March 29
October 13   December 8   February 23  April 26

The September, October, November, December and January meetings fall on the second Friday of the month; the February and April meetings fall on the fourth Friday; and the March meeting falls on the fifth Friday. All meetings begin at 3:00 p.m. and will be held in the Assembly Room of Wilson Library.

The Agenda Committee meets approximately four weeks prior to each Faculty Council meeting. The due dates for the meetings of the Agenda Committee are approximately five weeks prior to the dates of Faculty Council meetings.
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE GENERAL FACULTY

September 8, 1995, Meeting

The Committee on University Government submits the attached resolution in response to the action of the General Faculty at its meeting on April 28, 1995. After a careful review of the transcript of the meeting, it is our conclusion that the General Faculty approved the following portions of the Faculty Code amendment submitted by the Educational Policy Committee: (1) enlarge the jurisdiction of the Educational Policy Committee to include acting as a council of advice for the University Registrar; (2) revise the method of obtaining undergraduate and graduate student participation in the Committee's work by adding two student members; and (3) update the title of the University Registrar throughout the Faculty Code.

Although the transcript of the proceedings is somewhat ambiguous on the point, we are of the opinion that the votes taken on the amendment as presented on April 28, 1995, constituted approval on first reading of the matters identified above. We have therefore advised the Secretary of the Faculty that approval of the attached resolution will constitute final approval of these matters.

The Committee on University Government will continue to study the question of expanding the jurisdiction of the Educational Policy Committee to include academic units in the Division of Health Affairs.

Joseph S. Ferrell, Chair
Laurel Files
Harry Gooder
George Lensing, ex officio
Janet Mason
Royce Murray
Jack Sasson
William Smith
A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FACULTY CODE OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT TO REVISE THE CHARGE AND STRUCTURE OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE.

Be it resolved by the General Faculty:

Section 1. Section IV.B.(1)(b) of the Faculty Code of University Government is rewritten to read:

b) Educational Policy Committee

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

(aa) routinely taking on reference from the Faculty Council any matter lying within its range of concern which has been formally presented to the Council for study or for action, and on which the Council desires to have substantial committee study prior to undertaking formal consideration;

(bb) from time to time taking on reference from the Faculty Council any specific proposal which has come through the normal administrative channels for approval by the Council (such as adding or dropping academic programs) and on which the Council desires further review and advice prior to taking final action; and

(cc) acting as a council of advice for the University Registrar in administering faculty regulations concerning student records and transcripts, registration, class and examination schedules, grading systems, grade reports, academic deficiencies, probation, and readmission; and

(eedd) originating studies of particular matters lying within its range of concern by requesting authority from the Faculty Council to make such studies, conducting the studies if authorized, and reporting the results of the studies to the Council.

(ii) The Committee is composed of nine members elected by the Faculty for staggered three-year terms, one undergraduate student appointed by the Chair of the Faculty for a one-year term on recommendation of the President of the Student Body, and one graduate or professional student appointed by the Chair of the Faculty for a one-year term on recommendation of the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation. Eight members shall be elected by the Division of Academic Affairs voting at large. Of these, two members shall hold primary appointments in the Social Sciences Division of the College of Arts and Sciences, one in one of the professional schools or
other academic units in the Division of Academic Affairs other than the College of Arts and Sciences, (other than Journalism), two in the Humanities Division of the College of Arts and Sciences or the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, two in the Basic and Applied Natural Sciences Division of the College of Arts and Sciences or the Institute of Marine Sciences, and one in the Fine Arts Division of the College of Arts and Sciences. One member shall be elected by the Division of Health Affairs voting at large and shall hold a primary appointment in one of the professional schools or other academic units of that Division. Members shall serve three-year staggered terms. The Committee shall elect its own chair at the first meeting after July 1 of each year.

(iii) Except as expressly provided in this section, the Committee may function in accordance with such rules of procedure as it deems appropriate to the performance of its duties. In considering any matter referred to it and prior to its report to the Faculty Council the Committee shall provide reasonable opportunity for comment upon the matter by members of the faculty and of the student body.

(iv) Forthwith upon reference of any matter to it, the Committee shall in writing notify the President of the Student Body of the substance of the matter, of the terms of its reference from the Faculty Council, and of the anticipated time of submission of the Committee's report, and shall invite a conference with the President of the Study Body, or his or her delegates, to consider appropriate measures for securing representative student comment. The Committee shall similarly give reasonable notice to and invite comment from members of the faculty in residence.

(v) As soon as practicable after its report has been placed upon the agenda of the Faculty Council, the Committee shall transmit a copy to the President of the Study Body, with an invitation to submit written comment to the Secretary of the Faculty for consideration by the Faculty Council at the meeting for which the report is scheduled. The Committee shall include in its report to the Faculty council a summary of the steps taken to comply with the requirements of this section.

Sec. 2. Section VII Faculty Code of University Government is amended by striking out the words "Director of Records and Registration" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the words "University Registrar."

Sec. 3. This amendment to the Faculty Code of University Government shall take effect on the July 1 next following its final approval by the General Faculty. Notwithstanding this effective date, the Educational Policy Committee as now constituted may exercise any of the authority conferred on it by this amendment at any time after final approval.
RESOLUTION OF RECOGNITION AND GRATITUDE

for

WALTER ROYAL DAVIS

Over the past three decades, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has had many loyal friends and supporters, but few, if any, exceed the labors of Walter Royal Davis. His name is a familiar one because it is inscribed at the entrance to the main library on this campus, a magnificent structure that came about in a significant way as a result of his support. He remains a zealous guardian of the campus library system. More than helping to erect buildings, Walter Davis has been a steady, clear and outspoken voice in helping the University fulfill its mission of teaching, research, and public service. Most recently, his unflagging and tireless efforts to maintain support from the General Assembly for this campus were indispensable and highly effective. With this RESOLUTION OF RECOGNITION AND GRATITUDE, as approved by vote of the Faculty Council on this eighth day of September, 1995, we the faculty of the University of North Carolina single out this Texan whose heart seems to belong in a special way to Chapel Hill, Walter Royal Davis.

Michael Hooker, Chancellor

Jane Brown, Chair of the Faculty
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, September 8, 1995
Assembly Room, Wilson Library

[A complete transcript of the proceedings is available on the University INFO line (Item 6: Faculty and Staff Information. Then, Item 4: Faculty Council Meeting Transcripts.)]

Faculty Council Attendance: Present 67; Excused Absences 8; Unexcused Absences 16.

I. Chancellor Hooker.

The Chancellor introduced himself as the "newest member of the Philosophy Department" and thanked the faculty for the "marvelously warm reception" he had received since arriving on campus. He recalled his years as an undergraduate on the campus and the flashback memories that now occasionally occur when walking across the familiar grounds. He added, "You can be sure that everything that I do here will be a labor of love, and the mistakes that I make will be mistakes of stupidity, not mistakes of inattention or lack of concern."

He introduced Elson Floyd and described him as his "chief of staff," a position he has created in order to free himself to perform the tasks required of the chancellor in representing the University externally and being the chancellor internally. Vice Chancellor Floyd will coordinate all the "cross-cutting issues" among the vice chancellors and deans -- not to usurp their authority but to keep things flowing efficiently.

Chancellor Hooker noted that in the recent rankings of colleges and universities within American higher education conducted by U.S. News and World Report this campus had slipped from 26th to 27th, a change he found "absolutely meaningless." But in looking at this campus in relation to other public universities, the survey ranks us fourth -- after Virginia, Michigan, and Berkeley and above UCLA. For this, he thought the campus could take justifiable pride. He noted that faculty salaries are "significantly below" those of these peer institutions: "We are on the order of $5,000 to $8,000 per full professor less in salary than the three public institutions that are ahead of us."

He referred to the presently contested issue of increasing tuition by $400 as a means given to us by the General Assembly to raise faculty salaries. Part of these monies would go to students now on financial aid and to those students who would become eligible as a result of the increase. Part would go to the libraries. But even with the Board of Trustees' approval of the increase, "we would only close half the gap between us, Berkeley, Michigan, and Virginia in faculty salaries." He saw the proposed increases as a "risk that we will be damned if we do and damned if we don't." If we do not impose the increases, the Legislature, in response to future petitions for salary increases, can reply that because the opportunity had been declined the need could hardly be so great. If we do impose the increases we may also place ourselves in the position of having the Legislature continue to fall back on tuition increases to solve problems of salary gaps.

Chancellor Hooker thanked the faculty who had acknowledged his handling of the Keith Edwards matter [a long-standing lawsuit involving a member of the campus Public Safety Department]. He expected to be a Chancellor who did a great deal of listening, especially because he thought it unreasonable to expect that "new programs or improvements in existing programs will be funded from the infusion of new external resources from the state." Realistically, we should plan only for budgetary increases for faculty and staff salaries and to cover inflationary increases in our operating budget. Consequently, we will have to make the decisions involved in establishing priorities" so that we can reallocate resources from areas of lower priority to areas of higher priority. That is a challenge that I will embrace over the next year." He expected to work closely with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council in this process.

He noted a growing tendency among legislators nationwide to look at public universities with greater scrutiny and to demand performance in ways never before demanded. One such issue
involves the question of whether faculty teach enough or the issue of faculty accountability. With
this climate in mind, he saw the value of issuing a report card on the University -- not to rate the
quality of the faculty or the quality of its teaching -- but to "measure the quality of our performance,
primarily as an administration, in expending our resources." There would be indices of comparison
with other institutions that could be used to establish new credibility with the Legislature and with
the people of North Carolina. We would also identify where we are doing exceptionally well and
where we aren't doing as well as we could.

The Chancellor returned briefly to the expectation that the state will provide resources only
for inflationary increases in the operating budget. He thought that this was the case because, during
the Reagan and Bush years, there was a transfer of responsibility for social expenditures from the
federal government to the state governments without a transfer of revenues. As a result, public
universities now receive a shrinking portion of the state budget relative to social expenditures. This
state of affairs is likely to continue until there is a significant increase in taxes.

He expected that curriculum reform made up another project that will occupy his time in the
coming year, along with other recommendations from the recently completed SACS self-study report.
One of those recommendations calls for increased attention to the quality of teaching. He recalled
his own instructors when he had been an undergraduate here as "absolutely superb... I mean I did
not have a bad teacher when I was here. I think I can say that truly." But we must pay more overt
attention to the quality of teaching now. He wanted also to undertake the process of bringing
teaching and research together as complementary ("There absolutely is not a tradeoff!!") and to
represent that view to the people beyond the campus. In addition, he wanted to work on the
intellectual climate on campus, particularly among undergraduates. The problem of alcohol by students is related to this issue. The Chancellor then called for questions.

Professor E. Willis Brooks (History) reminded the faculty of Project Literacy, a student-run
and campuswide-based organization that sought the involvement of the faculty as teachers. About
10,000 adults in Orange County, or one in ten of the local population, cannot read or write well
even to fill out a job application. He urged colleagues who could volunteer time to teach literacy
to contact him or Mr. Kenneth Manwaring, Director of Training and Development in Human
Resources, at telephone-number 962-2550. The Chancellor responded that he had been studying the
issue of the housekeepers and their grievances, their pay, and their job promotion prospects, etc.
Deficient literacy skills are part of that problem and he was struggling with the issue of carving out
part of their work schedule in order to permit them to enroll in literacy courses.

Professor Harry Goeder (Microbiology and Immunology) raised the issue of support for
graduate education, noting that over the past 25 years there had been little such support from the
Legislature. Chancellor Hooker replied that the Board of Trustees was aware of the problem, but
that graduate education was difficult to sell to the Legislature. We will have to reallocate resources
internally to make needed corrections. Professor Joy Kasson (American Studies) welcomed the
improvement of teaching as one of the Chancellor's priorities, but she noted that logistical support
for teaching was often inadequate: malfunctioning photocopying machines, lack of adequate supplies
and equipment, insufficient funds for long-distance calls, lack of computers for all faculty, overloaded
E-mail, etc. Chancellor Hooker noted that in electronic support for teaching and research we are
significantly behind the average of our 20 flagship public peers. All these issues will have to be
addressed through internal reallocation of resources.

Professor Miles Fletcher (History) identified himself as the co-author of a recent letter to the
Chancellor on the condition of classrooms on campus, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences.
Many are inadequately equipped, many are in disrepair, and there are not quantitatively enough
classrooms. The Chancellor was aware of the problem, and he thought that Professor Fletcher's
letter was useful because classrooms tend to be neglected. There had been an appropriation from
the Legislature this year for repair of facilities. But he looked forward to continued work on the
problem. Professor Carl Bose (Pediatrics, Medicine) addressed the necessity of public relations in
the University because much goes on here of which the public is unaware. The Chancellor had
discovered that about 20 persons on campus are charged, directly or indirectly, with public relations
and he had recently brought them all together twice. This group will generate a strategic plan for
communication with the public -- the citizens of North Carolina and their elected representatives. Professor Steve Bayne (Dentistry) expressed on behalf of the faculty a willingness to assist the Chancellor in these and other problems. The Chancellor has found "a wonderful can-do attitude of spirit and enthusiasm and optimism here, which is refreshing." The state, too, is prosperous and has a significant budget surplus, "and I have to believe that eventually some of that is going to flow to us as legislative largesse."

II. Presentation of the Hettleman Awards: Chancellor Hooker.

The Hettleman Awards, established in 1986, are presented annually for outstanding scholarly or artistic achievement by young faculty. A cash award is presented. This year's recipients are:

Timothy Bralower, Associate Professor, Department of Geology
James Leloudis, Associate Professor, Department of History
Kenneth Lohmann, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology

III. Chair of the Faculty Jane D. Brown.

Professor Brown identified herself as beginning the second year of her term as Chair of the Faculty. She thanked the Chancellor for his candidness in discussing problems and issues. She reminded the members of the Council that each represents about 25 colleagues within a designated division, and she had arranged the seating of the Council members so that they could be near and become better acquainted with others in their division. She urged new and old members to bring any questions or confusions about their roles in the Council to her or to the Secretary of the Faculty.

A subcommittee had worked over the summer on ways to make the Council more relevant to current issues. In a recent orientation for new Council members, chairs of the standing committees had given reports about their respective missions, and not all committees are congruent with issues that come before the Council. Some committees may no longer need to exist. Professor Joe Ferrell, Chair of the Faculty Committee on University Government, had agreed to have his Committee examine the standing committees and to make recommendations for improvement of their structure. She has also identified important issues to be undertaken at each Council meeting and these issues are then lined up with forthcoming reports from relevant standing committees. For example, faculty salary distribution will be discussed in October, along with a new set of guidelines for determining salary raises. Other issues that will be addressed over the year: support for graduate education and research, intellectual climate on campus, reports from task forces on minorities and women, issues of affirmative action, teaching and the General Education curriculum, and public service.

Professor Brown introduced members of the Executive Committee: Craig Calhoun, Sue Estroff, Joseph Flora, Lolly Gasaway, Pete Andrews, Harry Goeder, Carol Jenkins, Jim Peacock, Pamela Conover, Paul Fare, Carl Bose, Lilie Searles, George Lensing, and herself. She urged the faculty to march on University Day, October 12, when Chancellor Hooker will be formally installed as Chancellor. Professor Bayne wished to have regular reports to the Council on the work of the Executive Committee, and Professor Brown assured him that this would be done.

IV. Secretary of the Faculty George S. Lensing.

Professor Lensing reviewed some of the procedures of participation in the Faculty Council meetings. He introduced members of the Agenda Committee: Pete Andrews, Pamela Conover, Hillel Gitelman, Laurie McNeil, Maria Salgado, Jane Brown, Chancellor Hooker, and himself and urged members of the Council to bring to the Agenda Committee any matters that they wanted to discuss at Council. He reported that the offices of faculty governance had moved over the summer from Bynum Hall to Carr Building. He introduced Rosemary Munsat and David Thompson who work in the offices.
V. Mr. J. Calvin Cunningham III, Student Body President.

Mr. Cunningham identified three issues of concern for faculty-student cooperation. One is the proposal for a review of the General Education curriculum that was called for in the SACS reaccreditation study. A second is the Honor Court system. Many people seem to have little faith in that system and its effectiveness has been reduced. We need to study why that is so and seek to repair it. The third issue has to do with student access to information technologies. "Putting that information technology into the students' hands through the residence halls and through other computer labs and the faculty's employment of that information technology are, I think, the discussion that I'd like to open."

Mr. Cunningham was also interested in creating a new alcohol-use policy for students, and he saw that issue related to the general one of intellectual climate on campus. He wanted to see student-fee monies used, not for the purchase of alcohol, but to bring outside speakers to campus and other intellectual programming. The local Center for Alcohol Studies is a resource that must be brought more effectively to student attention. He said he has supported publicly the proposed tuition increase because the needs are critical. He thought the proposal itself was "just a shoddy piece of legislation" but should not be rejected. He noted that parts of the student body could be exempt from the increase, and he was proposing that graduate and professional students be exempt. He hoped that the portion of the increase for financial aid to students could be increased from 35% to 40%. He noted that 4,400 periodicals in the library had been cancelled in the last ten years because of subscription costs, and he wanted to support the 10% of the increase for libraries. He hoped that the increase could be phased in gradually - not this semester or next semester.

Professor Craig Calhoun (Sociology and Interim Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Graduate School) commended Mr. Cunningham for his leadership. He asked why he grouped graduate and professional school students in his recommendation for exemptions from the tuition increase. Graduate students (Ph.D. and M.A. students) were in different situations from graduate students in the professional schools. "There isn't the same compelling reason to exempt those students in the professional degree programs." Mr. Cunningham replied that he had intended only to include teaching assistants, RAs, and GAs, and Professor Calhoun pointed out that these tended to be graduate students and not professional students.

Professor Paul Farel (Physiology) noted that some Ph.D. students in Health Affairs have their stipends paid from research grants from the federal government and training grants, and these are quite different from costs for graduate students in English. "So I wouldn't want even to lump all Ph.D. students together." He had just learned that monies from the tuition increase would favor salary increases in Academic Affairs at a ratio of 3:1 over those of faculty in Health Affairs. Some highly rated basic science departments in the School of Medicine have salaries in the third quintile on a national comparison. The tuition increase will be of little help to these departments. Mr. Cunningham replied that the ratio was based upon the number of students taught and there are more of them in Academic Affairs.

Professor Bayne thought that tuition increases were of limited use in solving the problems of salaries. He thought some incentive options for faculty should be pursued in terms of "rewarding people for grants and contracts and special participation and work outside the normal university system." Such a package of options would have to be sold to the Legislature.

VII. Change and structure of the Educational Policy Committee: Special report of the Faculty Committee on University Government and second reading and vote on resolution amending The Faculty Code of University Government to revise the charge and structure of the Educational Policy Committee: Joseph S. Ferrell, Chair, Faculty Committee on University Government.

Professor Ferrell explained that we are now presenting to the Council for a second hearing the resolutions adopted last April for changes in the Educational Policy Committee. All General Faculty are eligible to vote on these amendments.
The resolution amends Section IV.B.(1)(b) of the Faculty Code identifying the Educational Policy Committee with this responsibility:

"(cc) acting as council of advice for the University Registrar in administering faculty regulations concerning student records and transcripts, registration, class and examination schedules, grading systems, grade reports, academic deficiencies, probation, and readmission."

The constitution of the Committee is also amended:

"(ii) The Committee is composed of nine members elected by the Faculty for staggered three-year terms, one undergraduate student appointed by the Chair of the Faculty for a one-year term on recommendation of the President of the Student Body, and one graduate or professional student appointed by the Chair of the Faculty for a one-year term on recommendation of the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation."

Professor Ferrell added a brief history of the Educational Policy Committee since it was first proposed in 1974. "The original proposal emanated from a belief at that time that the University's basic educational policies should be developed on an institution-wide basis, and should enjoy broad-based support across the University's many and disparate academic units." The original proposal envisioned three committees: one for the Division of Academic Affairs, one for the Division of Health Affairs, and one for the Graduate School. When the Faculty Committee on University Government received the original proposal, there was thinking that little if any business would come from Health Affairs, and there was an "uneasiness among the professional school deans about a committee whose jurisdiction in that regard had not been spelled out with particularity." Then and now, Health Affairs remains exempt from the jurisdiction of the Educational Policy Committee.

The revised amendments were moved, seconded, and adopted unanimously.

VIII. Resolution of Gratitude for Walter R. Davis.

Professor Lensing introduced the resolution as a suggestion that had come from faculty who had worked in the General Assembly on behalf of the University budget and faculty salaries. They had noted the labors of Walter Davis on behalf of the University.

The following resolution was then presented to the Council:

Over the past three decades, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has had many loyal friends and supporters, but few, if any, exceed the labors of Walter Royal Davis. His name is a familiar one because it is inscribed at the entrance to the main library on this campus, a magnificent structure that came about in a significant way as a result of his support. He remains a zealous guardian of the campus library system. More than helping to erect buildings, Walter Davis has been a steady, clear and outspoken voice in helping the University fulfill its mission of teaching, research, and public service. More recently, his unflagging and tireless efforts to maintain support from the General Assembly for this campus were indispensable and highly effective. With this RESOLUTION OF RECOGNITION AND GRATITUDE, as approved by vote of the Faculty Council on this eighth day of September, 1995, we the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill single out this Texan whose heart seems to belong in a special way to Chapel Hill, Walter Royal Davis.

A motion to suspend the rules requiring that resolutions be circulated twenty four hours in advance was made, seconded and passed unanimously. The resolution was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.

IX. Old or New Business.

Professor Jim Stasheff (Mathematics) announced that he had been soliciting the responses of his colleagues in the Math Department to the proposed tuition increase. Those responses varied, and he thought it important for the public to realize that the faculty were not speaking with one voice
on this issue. Some of his colleagues were worried about the burdens placed on the students and about the fact that the Legislature was "essentially passing the buck to us." He noted that the Constitution of North Carolina mandates that costs for admission be as near free as possible. While the monies brought in by the increase would remain on campus, the fact remains that normal tuition does not go to the campus but to the general fund in Raleigh. He thought it important to convey our concerns about the hardships on students imposed by the increase.

Professor Brown referred to her own comments on the tuition increase that she had presented on the previous day to members of the Board of Trustees, as well as the statement made by Professor Richard Soloway. She thought that Professor Soloway had made an excellent case for the need to increase tuition. The Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council had endorsed the proposal. Although the increase is designated as $400, it could be greater in the Professional Schools (up to $2600 beyond the $400) in Business, Law, Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy, but not other professional schools such as Social Work, Public Health, or Journalism and Mass Communication. Apparently, because the students for the "primarily professional degrees" have greater earning potential, they can be asked to pay more.

Professor Farel wished for more discussion of the allocation of the salary increase by units within the University "because it's certainly not anything that seems to redound to the long-term amity of the University faculty." The role of grant funding has not been considered in this formula. Professor Sue Estroff (Social Medicine) thought it unwise to single out students who have greater potential "earning power" for greater tuition increases. Many of these students have greater debt incurred in paying current costs. Professor Peter Gilligan (Microbiology and Immunology) added that medical and dental school students already pay $10,000 more in tuition than other students. He also wondered what percentage of total cost of education is currently covered by tuition. He thought that students must have some responsibility for these costs. Students who could not pay the costs could qualify for scholarships, but for families with larger personal incomes "quibbling over $400 is pretty silly." Mr. Cunningham said that costs of education per student were somewhere between $16,000 and $20,000, so that the state is subsidizing on the order of 90% of costs.

Professor Goeder cautioned that we should be wary of simplistic solutions: one recent proposal called for asking only for salary increases and nothing else for next year's allocation. Professor Farel agreed that needs for salary increases are greater in Academic Affairs than in Health Affairs, but "it's just the way this is implemented that really, I think, bothers us." Professor Stasheff also worried about the greater debt incurred by students at all levels. He asked if the amount allotted for financial aid were grants or loans. Professor Brown answered that it was scholarship money and not loans.

Professor Dirk Frankenberg (Marine Sciences) was concerned about the consequences if the increase were rejected. To do so would leave us in a poor position to join our colleagues asking for further salary increases in Raleigh. Professor Brown offered to send names and addresses of the Trustees to the Council members so that they could communicate directly with them.

Professor Bayne returned to another issue that had been discussed last year. About 50% of faculty in Health Affairs are non-tenured and not represented in the Faculty Council representation. Professor Brown replied that the issue was being studied by the University Government Committee and a new proposal would be forthcoming.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

George S. Lensing
Secretary of the Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 1995</td>
<td>Resolution of Recognition and Gratitude for Walter Royal Davis</td>
<td>To Walter Royal Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second reading on amendment to Faculty Code of University Government: Section IV.B. (1)(b) (Educational Policy Committee). To act as council of advice to University Registrar and to add two students to membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>