

Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service
Toward a Third Century of Service

The Chancellor's Report on Planning
May 1992

I. To Command the Future

When I came to Chapel Hill in 1988, I found preparations well under way to celebrate 200 years of history and tradition in the nation's first state university. I also found our campus community united in the conviction that even as we celebrate the past, we must plan for the future in order to command it. There is widespread agreement that we must not wait passively for the future to unfold.

Thus, in the fall of 1989, I convened a committee of faculty members and administrators to advise me on the initiation and proper organization of a campus-wide, coordinated planning effort involving all units of the University. The committee recommended a process that would stimulate and enhance coherent planning in every academic and administrative unit and at the same time begin to address "all-University" issues that are beyond the scope of unit planning efforts. Pursuant to the recommendations of that committee, I issued in April of 1990 a "call to plan." In that call I asked our major academic and administrative units (listed in Exhibit I) to develop brief working plans that would assess unit strengths and weaknesses, identify goals for the next five years, and suggest actions to be taken in the next biennium to begin to achieve those goals.

EXHIBIT I Units Participating in University- Wide Planning Process

- Academic Affairs
- College of Arts and Sciences
- School of Business
- School of Education
- Institute of Government
- School of Journalism and Mass Communication
- School of Law
- School of Library and Information Science
- School of Social Work
- Health Affairs
- School of Dentistry
- School of Medicine
- School of Nursing
- School of Pharmacy
- School of Public Health
- Office of Provost
- Business and Finance
- Student Affairs
- Development and University Relations
- Athletics

During the 1990-91 academic year, these 20 units initiated or refined planning processes to produce working plans that were delivered to me in June. Later that month, I chaired a week-long series of meetings of the Planning Review Committee (members listed on Exhibit II) during which we reviewed those plans, heard presentations from the administrative leaders of the units, and discussed the implications of the working plans. Last fall I provided written responses to the administrative heads of the 20 presenting units, outlining in broad terms my reactions to the working plans presented to the Planning Review Committee.

With this report I should like to take several additional steps in the planning process. The first is to share with the campus community the "Synopsis of Academic and Administrative Working Plans" (Appendix I). Those 20 planning summaries should foster an awareness and appreciation across the campus of the multiple and outstanding ways in which the mission of the University is accomplished. They should also provide a useful overview of the challenges and opportunities our presenting units face in sustaining and advancing this outstanding institution.

Second, I want to review briefly the current study by the UNC System of the missions of the 16 constituent institutions. Third, I shall explore the current financial environment of the University. Fourth and finally, I shall discuss certain pan-University needs that have been identified in the course of our planning and point to some procedures and discussions that I shall sponsor in order to examine various approaches to meeting those needs.

II. The UNC System Review of UNC-CH's Mission

During 1990, after we had begun our planning, President C. D. Spangler, Jr., initiated a review of the institutional missions within the UNC System. The constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina are classified according to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, a nationally recognized taxonomy that groups institutions into categories on the basis of the level of degree offered — ranging from pre-baccalaureate to the doctorate — and the comprehensiveness of their missions. Currently there are eight different categories of institutions in the UNC System. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is classified as the most comprehensive institution in the System and in the Carnegie scheme — a Research University I.

The President's initiative invited the constituent institutions of the UNC System to make the case for

changes they might seek in their institutional classifications, to request authorization to plan new academic programs, to request organizational and other changes, and to submit ten-year enrollment projections.

As part of the mission review process, a group of consultants appointed by the President reviewed the proposals from each institution. Their general recommendations on The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill were as follows:

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is, by virtue of its early founding and distinguished record, the most renowned and highly respected institution in The University. It lives, as do all bellwether universities which are part of a system, in constant fear that its status will be eroded by a failure to recognize that the activities of a Research University I cannot be carried on at the cost level of a university component with a different mission. It is particularly vulnerable to budgetary policies which erode its flexibility in the handling of funds available in its budget. If UNC-CH is to remain one of the great public universities of the United States, which it clearly now is, its special needs must continue to be recognized.

We are keenly aware of the fact that UNC-CH has over many years established a superb national, and even international, reputation as an institution where outstanding research and graduate teaching in the humanities and social sciences are carried on. We believe emphasis ought to continue to be placed on the humanities and social sciences and that priority should be given to maintaining the historic strength in these disciplines. We believe also that emphasis should continue to be given to the further development of UNC-CH's nationally recognized academic medical center and programs in the health professions. For that reason we argue that the programmatic scope of the institution, particularly at the graduate level, not be expanded at the expense of its high quality work in the humanistic, social science and health-related disciplines.

UNC-CH has also for many years had an excellent national reputation as a place where undergraduate instruction is valued and nurtured. We urge that special attention be paid to that aspect of the institution's work so as to guarantee a continuation of this reputation in that part of higher education. Expansion of graduate offerings, particularly in the technical

disciplines, could, because of fiscal constraints, impede the splendid undergraduate work that goes on.

The consultants' programmatic recommendations for Chapel Hill explicitly acknowledged our "nationally distinguished" programs in the sciences. Furthermore, subsequent to the consultants' report, President Spangler recommended to the Board of Governors that Chapel Hill be authorized to plan a new Ph.D. degree in materials science. In addition, the President supported continuation of our strong program in the marine sciences.

Overall, the consultants' report and the subsequent recommendations of President Spangler, reflected the new economic environment confronting higher education in North Carolina. The UNC System clearly now takes a cautious approach to mounting new, expensive doctoral programs. Primary emphasis, for at least the next five years, is to be placed on protecting and strengthening the quality of existing programs, and maintaining undergraduate education as a top priority. These same themes emerged in our own planning process; therefore, it should be no surprise that I applaud with enthusiasm the principal thrusts of the

EXHIBIT II Members of The Planning Review Committee

- Professor Lawrence Avery
- Professor Steve Bachenheimer
- Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Donald Boulton
- Professor John Evans
- Professor Harry Gooder
- Chancellor Paul Hardin, Chair
- Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs
Garland Hershey
- Student Body President Matt Heyd
- Professor William Little
- Interim Vice Chancellor for Development/
University Relations Phil Nelson
- Provost Dennis O'Connor
- Professor Colin Palmer
- Professor James Peacock
- Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance
Ben Tuchi

consultants' report and President Spangler's leadership. We shall propose in the foreseeable future only programs that build upon and do not threaten to erode existing strengths, and we shall keep constantly before us in our planning the primacy of the teaching mission of the University.

III. The Current Economic Environment

It has become increasingly apparent that we have entered a new economic environment for public higher education in the United States. A recent publication of the Pew Higher Education Research Program observed:

...the 1990s are shaping up to be a period of unprecedented austerity in the post-World War II history of the nation's public sector. No matter what the source of concern — the economy, declining tax revenues, or institutional inefficiencies — the message is the same: institutions need to live more effectively within reduced means.

North Carolina has shared in that "unprecedented austerity," and our University and other state agencies have felt the impact severely. We are approaching the end of our third consecutive year of deepening constraint on state appropriations. Although we have had increasing success with contracts, grants, and private gifts, most of these resources are restricted to special purposes and cannot be applied to the basic expenses for which we have traditionally depended upon state appropriations. Careful studies, adjusted for inflation, show that since 1986 the University has experienced a decline in resources available per FTE student for its fundamental instructional mission.

Although the UNC System and all of us here will continue to make as strong a case as possible for the University, there is every reason to believe that this relative austerity will continue even when the economy turns. First, the belt tightening began in 1986, before the most recent economic recession. Second, there is ample evidence that the substantial economic deficits facing the federal government have been addressed in part during the 1980s by returning to the states such obligations as Medicaid, prisons, and highway construction. When we add to these general stresses our own state's determination to enhance funding of elementary and secondary education and community colleges, we must anticipate that state resources will continue to be tight for the University. All over the

country public universities are preparing for a difficult decade. The common concerns have become saving costs, improving quality, and achieving change by substitution, not by increment.

Reflecting this shaky environment, tentative enrollment projections for the undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of the schools (Exhibit III) are not, at first glance, aggressive. Overall enrollment for UNC-Chapel Hill is projected to remain largely stable at approximately 24,000 students (headcount) for the next ten years, but changes are projected in the composition of our enrollment, most notably a decline in the enrollments in traditional master's programs in Arts and Sciences and a continuing increase in the number of doctoral students. These projections are still subject to further discussion and negotiation. For example, some of the projections for increased doctoral enrollment may be unrealistic when we take into account the level of financial support realistically available for students, the possible shortage of active research mentors in some departments and schools, and student completion rates in the various Ph.D. programs.

Two actions of the General Assembly in 1991 deserve very positive comment. First, the Assembly attempted to "stop the bleeding" from budget cuts by raising taxes. New revenues from tax increases are not yet sufficient to restore lost spending power, but they may forestall deeper cuts.

Second, the General Assembly approved the UNC Fiscal Accountability/Flexibility Bill. Under this legislation The University of North Carolina Board of Governors has designated twelve institutions in the UNC System, including UNC-Chapel Hill, as "special responsibility" institutions. This designation carries a number of benefits, including two of particular relevance to our planning: 1) receiving state appropriations for each budget code (i.e., Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, and AHEC) in a lump sum and being permitted to determine the allocation of these funds; and 2) being permitted to carry forward to the next fiscal year and expend on one-time expenditures up to 2.5 percent of the amount of General Fund (state) appropriations after returning to the state as reversions an amount equal to the average sum reverted to the state treasury over the preceding five fiscal years. This is a large step toward the managerial accountability we have been seeking for a number of years. However, it will take several years for the new flexibility to have a significant impact on our budget unless some of the cuts in state appropriations are restored. Thus, neither of these positive actions of the Assembly offers early relief from austerity.

In sum, the present and reasonably foreseeable financial context in which we shall pursue our mission

Projected Head Count Enrollments : University and Academic Units ***

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: University Totals													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	14,912	15,661	15,440	15,818	15,602	15,552	15,582	15,577	15,493	15,363	15,249	15,179	15,226	15,295
Professional	1,648	1,636	1,645	1,649	1,651	1,631	1,641	1,641	1,731	1,851	1,971	2,091	2,091	2,091
Masters	2,523	2,738	2,714	2,598	2,644	2,652	2,699	2,670	2,713	2,685	2,742	2,734	2,766	2,733
Doctorate	1,653	2,277	2,599	2,831	2,889	2,909	2,921	2,945	2,966	2,984	2,997	3,015	3,027	3,042
Other *	469	1,224	1,179	1,128	1,180	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230
Business **	0	0	0	0	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
EC Mixed	260	43	15	28										
TOTAL	21,485	23,579	23,592	23,852	23,966	23,974	24,073	24,063	24,133	24,113	24,189	24,249	24,340	24,391

* Includes Non-Degree Enrollments
 ** Executive MBAs

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: Arts & Sciences Totals													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	10,892	12,123	12,111	12,279	12,250	12,250	12,250	12,250	12,250	12,250	12,250	12,300	12,350	12,400
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	918	868	747	676	665	655	645	635	625	615	605	595	585	575
Doctorate	982	1,352	1,582	1,746	1,785	1,795	1,805	1,815	1,825	1,835	1,845	1,855	1,865	1,875
TOTAL	12,792	14,343	14,440	14,701	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,750	14,800	14,850

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: Graduate School of Business Administration													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	1,354	808	714	636	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	292	503	559	515	520	520	520	520	520	520	520	520	520	520
Doctorate	56	64	64	62	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
Other *	0	0	58	113	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Other **	0	0	0	0	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Total	1,702	1,375	1,395	1,326	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455	1,455

* Includes Non-Degree Enrollments
 ** Executive MBAs

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: Education													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	418	485	453	431	430	410	410	400	400	390	380	380	380	380
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	264	175	149	117	120	155	175	180	200	210	240	265	275	280
Doctorate	187	259	235	218	220	215	215	220	225	230	230	235	235	240
Other *	0	0	58	1	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Total	869	919	895	797	795	805	825	825	850	855	875	905	915	925

* Includes Non-Degree Enrollments

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: Evening College													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	823	764	694	797	750	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other *	469	1,129	989	952	1,000	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050
Total	1,292	1,893	1,683	1,749	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750

* Graduate Students in Evening College

Fall Enrollment Projections

Class/Fall	School or Unit: Journalism and Mass Communication													
	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	308	521	505	502	517	517	532	532	548	548	564	564	581	600
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	30	41	49	44	45	46	47	48	51	53	55	57	59	61
Doctorate	7	15	18	19	20	21	22	24	26	28	30	30	32	32
Total	345	577	572	565	582	584	601	604	625	629	649	651	672	693

*** These projections were made for planning purposes in fall, 1990. They do not represent official budgeted enrollments, and are subject to revision.

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Law												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional	677	678	694	692	681	651	661	661	661	661	661	661	661	661
Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	677	678	694	692	681	651	661	661	661	661	661	661	661	661

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Information and Library Science												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	142	145	139	136	135	140	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145
Doctorate	14	22	38	43	35	30	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Other *	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total	156	167	177	179	175	175	175	175	175	175	175	175	175	175

* Certificant of Advanced Study

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Social Work												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	170	151	185	181	220	190	220	190	220	190	220	190	220	190
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	19	20	19	20	20	20	20
Other *	0	54	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	170	205	206	211	220	198	234	209	240	209	240	210	240	210

* Part-Time Enrollment

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Dental												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	115	48	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
Professional	330	293	280	279	290	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300
Masters	51	54	51	45	45	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	496	395	386	379	390	397	397	397	397	397	397	397	397	397

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Medicine												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	101	102	103	103	105	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Professional	641	638	648	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650
Masters	133	166	172	190	195	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Doctorate	217	300	312	318	325	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	330
Total	1,092	1,206	1,235	1,261	1,275	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Nursing												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	307	175	197	239	270	290	310	320	320	320	320	320	320	320
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	59	93	106	103	105	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Doctorate	0	2	11	16	24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Other *	0	15	21	0	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Total	366	285	335	358	419	450	470	480	480	480	480	480	480	480

* Includes Non-Degree Enrollments

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Pharmacy												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	486	530	519	495	495	490	485	480	380	260	140	20	0	0
Professional	0	27	23	28	30	30	30	30	120	240	360	480	480	480
Masters	33	31	33	34	34	34	35	40	40	40	45	50	50	50
Doctorate	14	26	30	34	35	35	35	37	40	42	42	45	45	45
Total	533	614	605	591	594	589	585	587	580	582	587	595	575	575

Fall Enrollment Projections		School or Unit: Public Health												
Class/Fall	1980	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Undergrads	108	105	89	81	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	431	511	524	557	560	560	560	560	560	560	560	560	560	560
Doctorate	176	237	309	375	380	380	380	380	380	380	380	380	380	380
Other *	0	26	32	32	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Total	715	879	954	1,045	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050

* Includes Non-Degree Enrollments

of excellence in teaching, research, and public service is not favorable. We must support political efforts to restore lost appropriations and reduce the portion of overhead receipts captured by the state, we must maximize alternative sources of revenue, and we must manage scarcity without diminishing quality. These are not small tasks, and to accomplish each one will require energy, ingenuity, and cooperation among all elements of our University — beyond the norm even for this energetic and collegial campus.

IV. Meeting Pan-University Needs

Our task of commanding the future would be sufficiently daunting if we had only the preservation of existing strengths to achieve in this unfavorable financial environment. Unfortunately, there are other challenges that did not appear in all unit plans but have pressed spontaneously for attention in the planning review process, in urgent budget and priority discussions among faculty, students, and administrators, and in several committee and task force reports to Faculty Council and to me.

One set of needs can be characterized as relating to academic infrastructure. Foremost here is the restoration to fiscal health of the campus libraries. Because of recent state budget cuts both library collections and library services have deteriorated at an alarming rate. The campus libraries are the foundations for the entire academic enterprise; arresting this decline is a most urgent priority. Other priorities related to academic infrastructure include completion of the Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN); enhancement of information technology and networking; increased financial support for graduate and post-doctoral students; improved support for and coordination of international education programs and interdisciplinary programs, including women's studies, African-American studies, and other multicultural studies; and the development of the Center for World Environment and Sustainable Development in cooperation with the other Triangle universities.

A second set of pan-University needs may be characterized as relating to faculty and staff compensation and working conditions: implementation of at least the initial phase of the Hewitt Study on Employee Benefits; the funding of approved but currently unfunded SPA pay improvements; pay improvements and/or subsidized health care insurance for our lowest paid employees and for TAs and GAs; enhanced supervisory and management training programs; and enhanced accessibility to quality child care.

A third set of needs relate to the physical plant — only some of the most urgent being mentioned here and only those not specifically targeted in the Bicentennial Campaign or in the proposed bond issue being presented to the General Assembly: correction of problems related to the new boiler plant; compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and construction of the South Chiller Plant.

A final set of needs, not very glamorous, but not optional either, include: payment of workmen's compensation expenses; completion of payment for already installed computers; permanent funding for the Health and Safety Office; maintenance and operation of the Broadband Network; and elimination of the deficit in the budget for the Bicentennial Campaign and Observance.

The last-mentioned item presents an irony. The campaign is going very well. Despite the recession, our alumni and friends are responding generously. But the costs of conducting the Campaign are very much front-loaded, while the formula we have relied upon in funding the effort has not yet produced enough revenue to enable us to "pay as we go."

The next phase of our cooperative planning must emphasize the wisest possible allocation of scarce resources to meet the most urgent pan-University needs and the most urgent needs of the planning units. It is obvious that general belt-tightening is a permanent, not temporary, necessity. In addition, it is obvious that we must join together to identify specific programs and expense categories that are less vital than some newly emerging, legally imposed, or alarmingly underfunded needs that go to the heart of our mission and our institutional health.

The vice chancellors who have responsibility for the funding of these pan-University needs have been meeting regularly to array priorities, identify available funds, and propose potential sources for future funding of the needs whose fulfillment must be postponed. Available resources are terribly inadequate to meet these needs — as is the case in many of our schools and other planning units.

The next phase of our cooperative planning must emphasize the wisest possible allocation of scarce resources to meet the most urgent pan-University needs and the most urgent needs of the planning units. It is obvious that general belt-tightening is a

permanent, not temporary, necessity. In addition, it is obvious that we must join together to identify specific programs and expense categories that are less vital than some newly emerging, legally imposed, or alarmingly underfunded needs that go to the heart of our mission and our institutional health.

Following the arrival of our new Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (so that he can participate fully in this process), we shall broaden administrative discussions on University planning and priority setting and formalize further our consultation with Faculty Council — following the guidelines recently recommended by the Committee on Government. We may also appoint ad hoc task forces from appropriate constituencies to address particular problems, such as program review.

In all of this, we must protect the quality of all we do, even if the quantity must be reduced. We must also balance coherent, coordinated planning with that essential level of autonomy in the schools and other units that rewards creativity and excellence. Finally, we must work with efficiency and reasonable dispatch. Broad consultation must be “in”; stalling must be “out.” Time is of the essence.

We shall propose in the foreseeable future only programs that build upon and do not threaten to erode existing strengths, and we shall keep constantly before us in our planning the primacy of the teaching mission of the University.

I extend my profound appreciation and hearty thanks to each of you in the 20 planning units who had a role in developing working plans. The appended summaries serve as one means of recognizing your efforts. I express also special thanks to the “presenters” of unit plans. You informed the planning review committee well; you even inspired us by giving us new insight into the important work being done in your schools and other units. Finally, I express warm thanks to the Planning Review Committee for many hours of conscientious and valuable labors.

We have made substantial progress in assessing our current situation, reviewing the achievements and goals of individual units, and identifying pan-University issues and needs that must be resolved if we are to command the future. It is a privilege to be your colleague in this challenging but exciting Bicentennial era. I look forward to continuing our work together so that the future of our University, like its past, can be bold, ennobling, and bright.

Paul Hardin

Appendix I SYNOPSIS OF ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE WORKING PLANS

Division of Academic Affairs

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs identified the principal goals of the Division's academic and administrative units in the planning document. This overview expressed the concerns shared by a large portion of the University and establishes divisional priorities for the coming five years. These goals and concerns are: support for the Library, graduate and professional student support, undergraduate financial aid, and availability of research funds, equipment and facilities. The Division is also committed to eliminating barriers to the development of interdisciplinary teaching and research efforts within and across division lines.

The bulk of the Academic Affairs planning document is the five-year plan for the University Library, which includes Davis, Wilson, and the House Undergraduate Library as well as nine department branch libraries. This plan speaks specifically about issues of infrastructure affecting the Academic Affairs Library which are not expressed in the pan-Library planning document submitted to the Provost. The role of the Library as an information provider needs to be redefined in light of advanced information technologies, complex international information networks, and other advances in the gathering, storage, and retrieval of data.

Given the reduced purchasing power of the past decade, the library must develop a consistent process for evaluating priorities to determine how they fit the broad mission it has accepted. Internal program review will ensure that programs which have outlived their usefulness can be eliminated and new programs can be designed to accommodate changes in information technology. These new programs should be implemented in the most cost efficient manner possible. Collection development processes and priorities also require review and efficiency evaluation.

A new automated acquisition/serials control system is planned that will increase the library's control over its financial obligations for materials. It will also enable much more thorough gathering of data concerning collection development, finance, and operations for the Library.

Plans also call for increasing the level of resources available to subject libraries from the Academic Affairs Library, the University and departments. A systematic

School of Pharmacy

The School of Pharmacy is the only state-supported school in North Carolina responsible for the education and preparation of pharmacists and their continuing education. The School is dedicated to the discovery, analysis, and application of knowledge about pharmaceuticals and pharmaceutical care through basic and applied research. The School's largest enrollments are in its B.S. in pharmacy degree program. It also offers a doctor of pharmacy (Pharm.D.) degree, M.S. degrees in pharmacy administration and pharmacy practice, M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in medicinal chemistry, natural products, and pharmaceuticals, and a joint Ph.D. degree between Pharmacy Administration and Health Policy and Administration in the School of Public Health. Post-doctoral fellowships are offered in each of the pharmaceutical disciplines.

Extramural research funding awarded to Pharmacy faculty has approximately tripled in the last decade. Outstanding research programs in the School include the Clinical Drug Development Laboratory, the Natural Products Laboratory, the Radiosynthesis Laboratory, and the Laboratory for Molecular Modeling. New areas of research are emerging through the Drug Targeting Program, which represents a critical investment by the School in biotechnology as well as in future drug design and delivery. Critical to the research endeavor are the on- and off-campus collaborative linkages which have been established.

The School is a major provider of continuing education for North Carolina pharmacists both as a primary provider and through alliances with the AHEC Program and professional societies. Pharmacy is unique among major health disciplines in the state in that it mandates continuing educational participation for the annual relicensure of its practitioners. The School, through its Pharmacy Policy Research Laboratory and in conjunction with the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists, offers a highly successful executive management program for directors of hospital pharmacies. Through its Laboratory for Molecular Modeling, the School and the American Chemical Society have offered workshops for scientific professionals who wish to develop their capacity to work with highly specialized hardware and software.

A major element of the School's strategic planning is consideration of a sequenced expansion of enrollment in the existing doctor of pharmacy curriculum (amended to include an interim B.S. in pharmaceutical science), and eventual deletion of the B.S. in pharmacy curriculum. This shift is seen as consistent with national trends and responsive to an increased

emphasis on pharmaceutical care in the profession of pharmacy. Pharmaceutical care involves the pharmacist working with the patient and other professionals in designing, implementing, and monitoring a therapeutic plan that produces specific outcomes for the patient. Such a role will require the pharmacist to have greater knowledge and expertise in a number of basic science areas, computing and robotics, research and analysis skills, and patient consultation and education skills.

Other goals for the School of Pharmacy include increasing the diversity of students and faculty, initiating support for faculty development in teaching and research, and expanding the School's international outreach. The expansion and renovation of teaching and research facilities in Beard Hall has been identified as a particular need. The building accommodates more than twice the number of people than when it was built in 1960, and both additional and renovated space are required to support the School's teaching and research programs.

School of Public Health

A unique aspect of the School of Public Health's overall mission to prevent disease and promote health is its special emphasis on the health status and health needs of communities or populations as distinguished from individuals.

The UNC School of Public Health is one of the largest and top-ranked schools of public health in the nation, and it is the only such school in North Carolina. The School has seven academic departments and one degree-granting curriculum, offering studies in biostatistics, environmental sciences and engineering, epidemiology, health behavior and health education, health policy and administration, maternal and child health, nutrition, and public health nursing. Four interdisciplinary programs — international health, health promotion and disease prevention, aging, and occupational health — offer opportunities for faculty and student research as well as study across departments.

More than 1,000 students enroll in the School each year, 90 percent in graduate programs. The School's 155 full-time faculty are supplemented by more than 300 adjunct faculty, from professional settings throughout the state and nation, who provide specialized expertise. Faculty members actively pursue sponsored-research funding opportunities, and two-thirds of the School's budget is generated from grants and contracts. The School engages in many collaborative activities with other schools and centers on campus, as well as with a multitude of county, state,

national, and international agencies and organizations.

The School also has a strong commitment to its public service responsibilities. It has a vigorous continuing education program, which last year presented or cosponsored (often with AHEC more than 170 courses attended by 7,000 professionals). During that same period, faculty contributed almost 24,000 hours of technical assistance to 864 community service projects.

During the School's strategic planning process, the following six areas of challenge were identified and related strategic goals were developed to address these:

1. Complex public health problems of today, such as AIDS and global climate change, cannot be solved in isolation. One area of emphasis, therefore, will be on the development of opportunities for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research.

2. The United States invests a higher percentage of its GNP in health services than any other country in the world, but the health status of its people is below other industrialized nations on many significant indicators. Drawing from its strong foundation in the quantitative sciences, the School will emphasize the development of research tools for surveillance, data collection, and assessment of health and environmental status — tools that are essential to determining whether allocation of resources will result in corresponding benefits.

3. Many minority and ethnic groups and other special populations, such as children, the elderly, and the poor, bear an unfair burden of death, disease, and disability. The School will emphasize development of programs to improve the health of populations at greatest risk.

4. National reports have documented that some schools of public health are isolated from the fundamental problems of public health practice. While the UNC School of Public Health has a long tradition of working with public health practice, it will rededicate its efforts to strengthen links to practice through partnerships with public agencies, private industry, community organizations, and governmental units.

5. To strengthen the profession of public health, the School will renew its emphasis on the education of public health leaders, practitioners, and scholars. One initiative underway is a unique new doctoral concentration developed specifically to teach leadership skills for public health practice.

6. Public health and the natural environment are interconnected and interdependent, transcending political and international boundaries. Another special focus for the School will involve increased attention to research, education, and service directed toward global and international health problems.

Office of Provost

Several units with a diversity of functions report directly to the Office of Provost. The plans reviewed and included in the comprehensive plan supplied to Chancellor Hardin and the Planning Review Committee included: the Graduate School, Office of the Associate Provost for Research (and Research Services), Office of Information Technology, and Educational and Support Services (i.e., the Ackland Art Museum, Continuing Education, Morehead Planetarium, North Carolina Botanical Garden, Summer School, and Center for Teaching and Learning).

Each unit developed a list of program objectives and strategies to accomplish their goals. Some of these objectives such as making up personnel losses resulting from past budget cuts, increasing staff to meet the needs of additional or expanded programs, and maintaining/renovating facilities were concerns of most if not all the units. The plans of the Ackland Museum, Morehead Planetarium, and North Carolina Botanical Garden were also concerned with developing initiatives to strengthen relationships with related academic departments as well as with external constituencies such as the North Carolina public schools.

Continuing Education plans to strengthen its programs by developing additional venues to certify practicing professionals, as well as to develop programs to help post-baccalaureate students fulfill prerequisites for graduate programs, professional schools, career changes, and upward mobility. The unit plans to begin a program of assessment and evaluation of educational needs to expedite program changes to meet these challenges. Efforts to attract program contracts and grants will be made to support innovative program development and physical enhancement of the Friday Center.

The **Summer School** would like to see course offerings, especially at the graduate level, expanded during the summer sessions. Additional Summer School opportunities in the School of Education for K-12 public school teachers will be sought. The Summer School also plans to encourage wider acceptance of its budget as receipts-based and develop incentive programs for departments to plan effectively summer course offerings and to staff these with highly rated teachers. The Summer School hopes to use the savings generated by maintaining low administrative costs for support of developmental and graduate courses.

The **Center for Teaching and Learning** serves as an extremely valuable resource for faculty and students on the UNC-Chapel Hill campus and as a model for similar centers in the state university system. The



Old East, cornerstone of the University, will regain its mid-19th century soundness.

Relations have developed specific goals and strategies to help overcome their inadequate work spaces and, in many cases, their inadequate logistical support as University Relations seeks to strengthen its internal and external communications programs.

Department of Athletics

The Department of Athletics plays an important role in enriching university life. Sporting events become shared experiences among students, faculty, administration, alumni and fans of the teams. The Department has been very successful in maintaining a balance between sports and academics. Its athletic programs have won national tournaments and recognition of the University while its academic support programs, which have contributed to high graduation rates for its student athletes, are models for other universities across the nation.

The Department is responsible for generating the necessary revenues to support all of its 26 athletics programs as well as its academic support programs. The main sources of these funds are ticket sales, television and radio contracts, concession revenues, royalty revenue, and grants from the Educational Foundation. (The latter may only be used for scholarship purposes).

The Department of Athletics developed its strategic plan by evaluating factors in its external environment

which impact on its operations and programs' success and analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of its internal environment. Possible decreased consumer demand for event tickets, decreased fund-raising during a "down" economic period, and increased competition from other sports activities and facilities across the state pose a substantial risk of decreased revenues for the Department. Internal improvements in automation and communications in a large and complex department will be implemented. Internal strengths are the quality of the Department's sports programs and facilities, staff, and student athletes.

This analytical approach led to the development of a comprehensive set of goals to address any deficiencies that exist in the Department's operations and programs. These recommendations focus on helping the Department develop suitable operating strategies and relate to communications issues, business operations, fund-raising, academic student support programs, and general management issues. The Department will continue to provide strong support for the Athletic Academic Support Program currently run by the College of Arts and Sciences and develop more effective budget processes, general management practices, and cost reduction measures. Finally, the Department would like to increase revenues by marketing the Smith Center more effectively, improving corporate support, and increasing the level of donations and memberships in the Educational Foundation.