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1. **UNC School of Medicine Regional Educational Program in Wilmington**
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   G. Rumay Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Community & Diversity

*Some of the business to be conducted is authorized by the N.C. Open Meetings Law to be conducted in closed session.
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Charles (Chuck) G. Duckett, Chair
William (Bill) Keyes IV, Vice Chair
Donald Williams Curtis
Julia Sprunt Grumbles
Allie Ray McCullen
Houston L. Summers

Administrative Liaison:
Jim Dean, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
UNC School of Medicine Regional Educational Program in Wilmington

Situation: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine (UNC SOM) proposes designating our core teaching site at South East Area Health Education Center (SEAHEC) in Wilmington, in collaboration with New Hanover Regional Medical Center (NHRMC), a new geographic educational program.

Background: UNC medical students have been learning on clinical rotations in Wilmington for decades. Rotations occur at Southeast AHEC, New Hanover Regional Medical Center, and surrounding clinics. Required clerkships in Surgery, Internal Medicine, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Family Medicine are already delivered at this site, as are many fourth year electives. The experience for students has been superb.

The curriculum at the UNC School of Medicine has changed to better prepare students to effectively function in the modern health care environment. In the new curriculum, it is most effective for students to stay in one clinical setting for a full year. In their core clinical year, medical students will now experience three rotations of 16 weeks duration. They include Community Based Longitudinal Care, Care of Specific Populations, and Hospital, Interventional, and Surgical Care. Each of these can be completed in Wilmington. In addition, students take a year-long didactic course called Intensive Integration.

The accreditation body for medical schools, the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) requires that sites where students stay for a full year be designated as a geographically separate educational program. LCME leaders visited the Wilmington site in July and were pleased with its preparation and ability to support students for a full year of curriculum. The faculty in Wilmington are prepared to educate students for the entire year long curriculum and appropriate student supports have been identified.

If approval is obtained, the current plan for 2016-17 is to send 4-6 students to Wilmington for their clinical year. If successful, we envision that over time that number may increase up to 12 students per year.

Faculty who teach in Wilmington are adjunct faculty of the UNC School of Medicine already. The New Hanover Regional Medical Center (NHRMC) and the South East Area Health Education Center (SEAHEC) as part of the larger North Carolina Area Health Education Center (NC AHEC) have been actively engaged in medical education for over forty years. With a Graduate Medical Education Committee that oversees the four residency programs of (Internal Medicine, OB/Gyn, Surgery and Family Medicine) in addition to a Department of Student Services facilitating the entry of medical students from UNC into clinical sites and a very active Continuing Education Department, there is a significant infrastructure already in place.

The Wilmington Regional Educational Program model will support the education of medical students who will call Wilmington their home during their clinical years. This
expansion will build on a tradition of excellence in education. The UNC School of Medicine TEC curriculum will be implemented and complimented by the NHRMC physician community. Specific emphasis will be placed on population health and physician leadership utilizing foundational knowledge in quality improvement through LEAN methodology and training so as to prepare students to be successful in our rapidly transforming healthcare system. Educational strategies will be developed to address the specific needs of the area, particularly in primary care and underserved specialties. Students will be exposed to rural medicine through our partnerships and training opportunities in 4 rural counties and encouraged to explore that career option. Although students will have access to research opportunities, it is not the intention of this campus to be research focused.

The curriculum will be delivered by a combination of on-site faculty (e.g., lectures and small-group discussions) and main-campus faculty (e.g., videoconferencing and pre-recorded interactive modules). The experiences will be based in the clinical setting with clinically-focused teaching in Wilmington. Students will return to Chapel Hill for occasional day-back experiences.

As we work to both educate these students in the third and fourth year, we will also place emphasis on recruiting them to our residency programs. If a student does undergraduate training in rural centers and then an AHEC residency, the statistics report 70% will stay in rural NC.

Students will be evaluated in the same manner as those at the main campus. Initially, NBME shelf tests and OSCEs will be done at the main campus. Clinical evaluations and other assessments will be delivered remotely. Grading will be accomplished by the same methods with the final grade assigned by the main-campus clerkship director.

The curriculum of the regional educational program will provide comparable experiences, with each clerkship director of the branch campus working in partnership with the equivalent clerkship director of the main campus and participating in the Application Phase Committee that coordinates clerkships. The goals, competencies, patient types and settings, metrics, grading, and other assessments and evaluation pieces will be the same.

The curriculum of the program will be managed by an Assistant Dean who is a physician and faculty member at the Wilmington program. This administrator will participate in monthly meetings of the Education Committee and the Application Phase Committee (the committee coordinating the third-year curriculum) on the main campus and will coordinate clerkship directors and students on the branch campus. Currently the program director, Dr. Joe Pino, already serves in this role in managing the four clerkships and additional fourth year experiences that are already offered in Wilmington. When the program is designated a regional program, the program director will be designated an Assistant Dean for the School of Medicine.

UNC School of Medicine funds, in addition to AHEC funds, have been used to support preceptors and a campus director in Wilmington for years. With designation of the site as a Regional Educational Program we will transfer additional funds.
appropriate to educate the number of students there for the full year (§145,609) for the initial six students. Tuition funds will be transferred from the main campus to the program to assist in covering the costs of educating the medical students. SEAHEC and NHRMC will each offer in kind support as well.

**Assessment:**
It is in the medical students’ best interests and important to the medical school’s accreditation for Wilmington to be designated a Regional Educational Program of UNC School of Medicine. SEAHEC and New Hanover Regional Medical Center are prepared to be successful as a UNC School of Medicine Educational Program.

**Recommendation:**
Southeast AHEC in Wilmington, in collaboration with New Hanover Regional Medical Center (NHRMC), should be designated an official Regional Educational Program of UNC School of Medicine.
I. INTRODUCTION

This document establishes procedures to be followed where, pursuant to University policy, a party has the right to an appeal to the Board of Trustees (“the Board.”) These procedures are supplemental to substantive policies providing the right to appeal, and in the event of any discrepancy between such policies and these procedures, the provisions of the policies shall take precedence. Matters covered by these procedures include the following:

Student Matters

1. Appeals pursuant to section III. of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Admissions Policy (“Admissions Policy”) by applicants who have been denied admission to the University or to one of its schools or departments.

2. Appeals pursuant to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance (“Instrument”) by students who have been suspended or expelled from the University and who allege a violation of due process or a material deviation from Substantive and Procedural Standards adopted by the Board of Governors.¹

3. Appeals pursuant to section IV.K.2. of the Procedures for Reporting and Responding to Complaints of Discrimination, Harassment, and Related Misconduct Involving a Student as the Responding Party (“Discrimination, Harassment and Related Misconduct Procedures”).

EPA Non-Faculty Employee and Faculty Matters

1. Appeals pursuant to Step Four Review of the University’s EPA Non-Faculty Grievance Procedures.

2. Appeals pursuant to section X. of the Procedures for the Faculty Grievance Committee.

3. Appeals pursuant to section 8 of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (“Tenure Policy”).

Matters Involving Faculty, Staff or Students

¹ See Chapter 100.1, section 502D of the UNC System Policy Manual (“Section 502D”).
1. Appeals regarding ownership of copyrighted works pursuant to the University Copyright Policy

II. PROCESS FOR APPEALS TO THE BOARD

A. Submission of an Appeal

Appeals to the Board shall be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Board through the Office of the Chancellor and shall specify the grounds for the appeal and all supporting facts or documents upon which the Appellant bases the appeal. Except as otherwise provided for by the applicable policy, the appeal petition shall be submitted within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the letter communicating the result of the prior appellate review.

In consultation with the Office of University Counsel, the Chair shall review the appeal petition to determine if it states a valid ground for appeal under the policy or procedures creating the right to appeal. If the Chair determines that the appeal petition does not state a permitted ground, the Chair shall notify the Appellant in writing, the Board shall take no further action on the appeal, and the prior decision shall stand.

If the Chair determines that the appeal petition states a valid ground for appeal, the Chair, or designee, shall notify the Appellant in writing and specify whether any of the grounds alleged by the Appellant have been deemed invalid for appeal. The Chair shall notify the University official responsible for the decision at issue. For purposes of these procedures, the University official responsible for the decision at issue will be deemed an “Appellee” where the policy providing the right to appeal requires that official to respond to the appeal petition or where the Board deems it helpful for that official to do so. In appeals pursuant to the Discrimination, Harassment and Related Misconduct Procedures, the Chair shall notify the other party to the appeal of the decision to allow the appeal to be reviewed by the Board. That person shall also be considered an “Appellee” under these Procedures. The Appellee shall have five (5) calendar days from receipt of the Chair’s decision that the petition states a valid ground for appeal to submit a written response to the Chair. The Appellee’s written response shall address the grounds deemed valid for appeal by the Chair and shall specify all supporting facts or documents on which the Appellee bases the response.

Any time period requirements imposed under this Section II.A. may be extended upon good cause shown through written application to the Chair.

B. Review of an Appeal

Upon determination that an appeal states valid grounds for review by the Board, the Chair will appoint a three (3) person panel of the Board (“the BOT Panel”) to consider the appeal on behalf of the Board. The BOT Panel shall consider the appeal at the BOT Panel’s earliest convenience.

The BOT Panel’s review shall be based upon the record provided to the BOT Panel by the relevant University committee or office, in addition to the appeal petition submitted by the Appellant and any response submitted by the Appellee.

The BOT Panel may determine that in order to decide the specific issue on appeal, it is desirable that the BOT Panel receive personal testimony in addition to the existing record. In such instances, and
if allowed by policy, the BOT may request the presence of the party or parties, or of any other person who can provide testimony relevant to the issues on appeal. Such testimony will be limited to matters relevant to the issue on appeal.

In either circumstance, an individual may appear before the BOT in person, by videoconference, or by phone. A party may be accompanied by legal counsel, who may make a brief opening statement to the BOT Panel in support of the party’s position on appeal. Attorneys will not be allowed to question witnesses or the other party. The BOT Panel Chair shall have discretion to control the conduct of the appeal proceedings, including the imposition such deadlines as are necessary and appropriate, and may limit or exclude testimony when deemed redundant or irrelevant.

C. Decision of the Board

The BOT Panel shall conclude its review as described below:

1. Appeals Based Upon the Admissions Policy – The BOT Panel shall have full authority to act on behalf of the Board, and the decision of the BOT Panel shall be deemed the decision of the Board.

2. All Others – The BOT Panel shall issue a recommended decision to the Board, which may be in the form of a written memorandum to the Board or may be communicated orally to the Board by the BOT Panel Chair. The Board shall be provided access to the full record in the matter. If a majority of the Board members present vote to accept the BOT Panel’s recommendation, the BOT Panel’s recommended decision will be deemed the decision of the Board. If a majority of the Board members present vote against the BOT Panel’s recommendation, the Board shall issue an alternate decision.

The Board may reverse the prior decision only if the Appellant can meet the burden of showing that the prior decision is affected by clear and material error. If the Appellant is unable to satisfy this burden, the Board shall affirm the prior decision. In the event the Appellant meets the burden of proof, the Board shall proceed as described below.

1. Appeals Based Upon the Admissions Policy – The BOT Panel shall remand the case to the appropriate admissions office for reconsideration in light of any guidance the BOT Panel chooses to provide.

2. Appeals Based Upon the Instrument – The Board shall decide whether to remand the case for a new Honor System hearing or dismiss the charge if the alleged violation cannot be corrected through remand. In the event the Board decides to remand the case, the Board may provide, as appropriate, guidance regarding the recommended scope of the remand.

---

2 Or in the case of Admissions Appeals, the BOT Panel.

3 Absent a determination to the contrary by the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Student Body President shall be expected to recuse herself or himself from consideration and determination of any appeal before the Board arising under the Instrument or any appeal under the Discrimination, Harassment, and Related Misconduct Procedures that involves a student.
3. **Appeals Based Upon the Discrimination, Harassment, and Related Misconduct Procedures** – The Board shall decide whether to remand the case to the Hearing Panel or dismiss the charge if the alleged violation cannot be corrected through remand. In the event the Board decides to remand the case, the Board may provide, as appropriate, guidance regarding the recommended scope of the remand.

4. **Appeals Based Upon the EPA Non-Faculty Grievance Procedures** – The Board shall decide whether to remand the case to the Grievance Committee or recommend other corrective action if the alleged violation cannot be corrected through remand. In the event the Board decides to remand the case, the Board may provide, as appropriate, guidance regarding the recommended scope of the remand.

5. **Appeals Based Upon the Procedures for the Faculty Grievance Committee** – The Board shall decide whether to remand the case to the Grievance Committee or recommend other corrective action if the alleged violation cannot be corrected through remand. In the event the Board decides to remand the case, the Board may provide, as appropriate, guidance regarding the recommended scope of the remand.

6. **Appeals Based Upon the Tenure Policy** – The Board shall decide whether to remand the case to the Hearings Committee or recommend other corrective action if the alleged violation cannot be corrected through remand. In the event the Board decides to remand the case, the Board may provide, as appropriate, guidance regarding the recommended scope of the remand.

7. **Appeals Based Upon the Copyright Policy** – The Board shall remand the matter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Research to implement such clarification of copyright ownership as is appropriate to the circumstances.

**D. Notification of Decision**

The decision of the Board shall be communicated simultaneously to all parties in writing and shall state the Board’s findings, its determination, and its rationale. The decision shall also state whether further appeals, if any, are available pursuant to section III., below, or whether the decision is final. The Board shall transmit the decision to all parties by electronic, campus, or first-class mail.

**III. FURTHER APPEALS**

A. **Appeals Based Upon the Admissions Policy** – The Board’s decision is final, and no further appeals are available.

B. **Appeals Based Upon the Instrument** – In cases where the sanction imposed was suspension, the Board’s decision is final, and no further appeals are available. In cases where the sanction imposed was expulsion, the Appellant may appeal to the Board of Governors consistent with Chapter 100.1, section 502D of the UNC System Policy Manual.

C. **Appeals Based Upon the Discrimination, Harassment, and Related Misconduct Procedures** – In cases where the sanction imposed was suspension, the BOT Panel’s
decision is final, and no further appeals are available. In cases where the sanction imposed was expulsion, both the Appellant and the Appellee may appeal to the Board of Governors consistent with Chapter 100.1, section 502D of the UNC System Policy Manual.

D. Appeals Based Upon the EPA Non-Faculty Grievance Procedures – The Board’s decision is final, and no further appeals are available.

E. Appeals Based Upon the Procedures for the Faculty Grievance Committee – The Board’s decision is final, and no further appeals are available.

F. Appeals Based Upon the Tenure Policy – The Board’s decision is final and no further appeals are available except where section 8 of the Tenure Policy specifies that appeals may be made to the Board of Governors.

G. Appeals Based Upon the Copyright Policy – The Board’s decision is final, and no further appeals are available.

IV. REFERENCES

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Admissions Policy – http://www.unc.edu/ugradbulletin/admissions.html


EPA Non-Faculty Grievance Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill – http://hr.unc.edu/files/2012/11/ccm1_018368.pdf

Procedures for the Faculty Grievance Committee – http://faccoun.unc.edu/faculty-code-and-policies/procedures-for-the-faculty-grievance-committee/


The Copyright Policy of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill – http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/05/Copyright.pdf
Task Force on UNC-Chapel Hill’s History

University Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees
November 18, 2015
## Assignments from Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Plaque installed on or inside Carolina Hall</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Hall historical marker/exhibit recommendations</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCorkle Place markers/Curation recommendations</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of buildings, monuments, memorials and landscapes &amp; recommendations for improvements</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic options for creating an on-line orientation program or course for all new community members (students, faculty, and staff) to learn about UNC’s history, values, and contributions to society</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility study for a public space to house a permanent collection of UNC’s history</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trustees’ Plaque on Carolina Hall

Carolina Hall

We honor and remember all those who have suffered injustices at the hands of those who denied them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Lux Libertas
UNC Board of Trustees 2015

Installation scheduled for November 23, 2015
Carolina Hall Curation

- Exhibit to cover Saunders’ contributions, building naming in 1920 and historical context, and renaming in 2015
- Initial “expert” working group
- Timeline: 7 months (includes fabrication and installation by an outside firm)
- Exhibit budget: $10,000 – 15,000
- Next steps: add student, faculty, and staff representatives to the Carolina Hall working group to further develop exhibit content and design
McCorkle Place Curation

- Mix of physical and virtual interpretation
- Consideration of temporary art exhibits
- Informed by Carolina Hall exhibit process
- Next step: appoint a McCorkle Place working group
Examples of Possible Elements

Building plaques

Mobile Interpretation: Histories of the National Mall (mallhistory.org)

Sidewalk markers
Engagement

• Published series on North Carolina and UNC history; laying the foundation for informed conversation

• Web site under development

• Email address: historytaskforce.unc.edu

• Public schedule of task force and working group meetings

• Presentations for key stakeholders (Faculty Council, Employee Forum, Student Government, etc.)

• Focus groups
### Additional BOT Mandated Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit of historical information about campus buildings, monuments, memorials, and landscapes</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility study for a museum of history that tells the University’s story from its origins in the late 18th Century to its present as a great, global public research university</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic options for orienting all new community members to UNC’s full history</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>