

BOARD EDITORIALS

# SEEING THE DANGER

University officials deserve credit for quickly cancelling classes and closing offices due to inclement weather and bad driving conditions.

University officials did well to cancel classes Monday to ensure the safety of students, staff and faculty.

Sunday's winter storm created a dangerous situation on the roads across North Carolina with a combination of snow, sleet and freezing rain.

UNC officials announced Monday evening that the University would operate under weather Condition III, meaning offices as well as classes were closed while critical employees were asked to come to work.

Administrators have been criticized in the past for making questionable calls regarding the operation of the University in severe weather.

For example, during Hurricane Isabel last semester administrators decided to hold classes until 2 p.m. Sept. 18th, when the danger to drivers — and individuals walking about campus — became painfully obvious.

Another case was last January's winter storm, when roughly 3 inches of snow accumulated on the ground. The University operated under Condition I, which advised caution for students and faculty but did not affect classes or office openings.

Officials, however, took the right step in this case by taking the storm seriously.

At least 80 traffic accidents were reported across Orange County on Sunday and The (Raleigh) News & Observer reported four weather-related traffic deaths. The slick conditions represent a real threat to commuter safety.

The timing of the announcement also was well-conceived. In recent years administrators waited to make the decision until the early morning of the next school day. By announcing the cancellation early in the evening, administrators saved commuters from the confusion caused by having to check repeatedly for updated information.

Many students depend on Chapel Hill Transit, which operated on a limited schedule Monday. Last year's storm forced many students to miss classes simply because they couldn't make it to campus.

Yesterday's decision-making is a welcome change of pace. Forcing commuters to drive in the snow and put their own lives at risk is simply irresponsible.

University officials should continue to make safety a higher priority than studies.

# THE RIGHT CHOICE

By declining to accept a one-time bonus, Chancellor Moeser showed solidarity with the many employees who still are waiting for pay raises.

Many of the University's faculty members and employees deserve to be paid more and are in need of salary increases.

One hopes that they can take some comfort in the fact that the man at the top of the UNC-Chapel Hill totem pole is considering their pain.

In a noble gesture, Chancellor James Moeser declined a one-time bonus given to many UNC-system chancellors by system President Molly Broad. The bonus would have been 8 percent to 12 percent of Moeser's annual salary, which is \$255,625.

It would have been a sizeable chunk of change, and he had every right to pocket the extra money. UNC-system chancellors themselves haven't seen a pay raise in quite a while.

The one-time bonuses for chancellors serving for at least two years as of the beginning of the 2003-04 fiscal year had met with the approval of the UNC-system Board of Governors.

But Moeser was the only one of the 12 eligible head administrators in the UNC system to decline the offer. Taking the bonus money would have constituted a slap in the face for the UNC-CH faculty.

Seeing the chancellor accept a raise certainly would not have done wonders for employee morale, and Moeser knew it.

"I just needed to decline this one," he told The (Raleigh) News & Observer on Friday. "I think there are times when it's important to stand with the troops."

In hindsight, it might have been laudable if Moeser followed the lead of Marye Anne Fox, chancellor of N.C. State University, who accepted her bonus and is set to add it to N.C. State's capital campaign. Perhaps Moeser could have donated his bonus to the Carolina First campaign or distributed it among UNC-CH departments or faculty members.

Granted, such actions could have led to accusations of favoritism, but at this point in time, any amount of extra money is better than nothing.

Regardless, this ignores the fact that the chancellor did the right thing.

At a time when faculty retention is arguably University administrators' highest priority, Moeser has sent out a strong message: We're all in this together.

# WELCOME SPENDING

The omnibus spending bill that recently passed through Congress will serve numerous interests in the world of higher education.

Amid the tons of pork contained in the omnibus spending bill passed in the U.S. Senate last week is good news for those in the world of higher education.

The legislation, which according to The Chronicle of Higher Education had been held up by Senate Democrats, is notable for the victories it holds for higher education institutions across the country.

First and foremost, the bill calls for a 3.7 percent increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health. Almost \$28 billion will be appropriated to the NIH, which is responsible for issuing federal grants for research.

UNC received almost \$357 million in federal research grants last year, and about 66 percent of those funds — \$237 million — came from the NIH.

The \$28 billion appropriation, albeit a relatively small one, should enable the NIH to issue more research grants, a boon to major research universities.

The legislation also provides for increased funding for historically black colleges and universities, as well as schools that educate primarily Hispanic students.

Those institutions would see a funding increase of almost \$10 million more than last year. Historically black institutions alone would receive 3 percent more — roughly \$8.3 million.

While the increase is so small that it is almost negligible, it is a gesture of good faith from the federal government amid a financial landscape that sees many institutions of higher education experiencing slashed government appropriations.

Perhaps the most important part of the legislation was a move that will prevent U.S. Department of Education officials from changing the formula by which a student's eligibility for Pell Grants is decided. Had the changes been allowed, an estimated 84,000 students nationwide — almost 2,000 in North Carolina alone — would have lost Pell Grant eligibility in the 2004-05 academic year.

Unfortunately, Pell Grant funding was not increased, but given the nation's current financial landscape, this should come as no surprise. As soon as it is fiscally feasible, federal officials should bolster the grants to match quickly rising college costs.

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** The above editorials are the opinions of solely The Daily Tar Heel Editorial Board, and were reached after open debate. The board consists of seven board members, the editorial page associate editor, the editorial page editor and the DTH editor. The 2003-04 DTH editor decided not to vote on the board and not to write board editorials.

# UNC enrollment growth won't get out of hand

What's the right number of students for Carolina? I understand that's a question students wonder about as they navigate classes and the University.

We won't become a "mega-campus" the size of the universities of Texas, Michigan-Ann Arbor or Ohio State.

That's not consistent with our culture of close-knit collegiality in Chapel Hill. We're committed to a Carolina experience that focuses special attention on our undergraduates.

That's uncommon at major research universities, and we aim to preserve that characteristic as a hallmark of a Carolina liberal arts education.

Our enrollment is on track for modest, controlled growth, but not at the expense of the quality of the education we provide to students.

We've staked out a position in the academic plan adopted last year to guide decisions about future investments and priorities during the next five years.

Providing the strongest possible academic experience for students tops the list of our six overriding academic priorities in that plan.

In considering enrollment growth, we must balance the needs of North Carolina with our



**JAMES MOESER**  
CHANCELLOR

own.

Carolina and the 16-campus UNC system made a promise to the state in 1998. Expecting a big boom in the numbers of college students statewide, the Office of the President began working with the campuses on plans to accommodate that growth. Chapel Hill agreed to do its fair share.

State taxpayers voted to provide the facilities required for such growth by approving the Higher Education Bond Referendum in 2000.

That vote means about \$510 million for Carolina for renovations and new construction that already is providing modern facilities for students and faculty. Murphey Hall, a newly renovated classroom building, is one example.

Currently, we project total growth of about 2,000 students to roughly 28,870 by 2012. Serving the changing needs of students and the state must remain a prior-

ity, but we only intend to expand into any new areas if adequate funding and resources, including faculty, are available.

We've absorbed some painful reductions in state appropriations as North Carolina dealt with the economic downturn.

At the same time, the state has provided funding to help cover the costs of enrollment increases. Such funds allowed Carolina to offer more class sections in some high-demand undergraduate areas such as English last year.

That support helped boost our number of class sections with at least one undergraduate enrolled to 2,770 last fall, compared with 2,413 in fall 1999. The average class size was 28 students, compared with 31 in 1999.

Finally, a commitment by the College of Arts and Sciences and the University to increase the percentage of courses with an enrollment of fewer than 20 students has been successful. That number has grown from 40 percent in fall 2002 to 51 percent last fall. This jump exceeds the average of our public campus peers — including Michigan — over several years.

Our Enrollment Policy Advisory Committee, which includes the student body president, guides our growth to preserve the quality of the educational experience.

ON THE DAY'S NEWS

"Better a thousand times careful than once dead."

PROVERB

EDITORIAL CARTOON

By Andrew Johnson, johnso40@email.unc.edu



COMMENTARY

# Patriotism is about moving forward, not standing still

Recently, my uncle lectured me over his steak about the state of politics in our fine country. "Liberals are against this country," he said to me, his deep voice rumbling like the voice of authority. "They're trying to tear the United States apart."

I think his argument is a fascinating one, and it certainly wasn't the first time I've heard it. A liberal is guilty of treason. Questioning your country's motivations during wartime is sedition. All interesting arguments, and all of them have been argued before.

During World War II, a variety of black newspapers took up the "Double V" campaign, which means victory over foes abroad and victory over racism at home. They had the difficult task of questioning their country during wartime. Their question was simple: How could the United States fight for equality overseas when it was still dealing with major equality issues within its own borders?

For their questions, they were accused of treason, threatened with prosecution by government officials. Their very right to question was called into question.

During the Vietnam War, youth all over America burned their draft cards. They were met with disgust by a good portion of America for questioning their country's motives to fight during the fight itself.

Then just recently, the Dixie Chicks say they are ashamed that President Bush is from Texas. Met with anger by fans. Banned by radio stations all over the country.

Very interesting. Another story. Ronald Reagan looks to Bruce Springsteen for a song to match his back to roots campaign for president. A real patriotic anthem. He picks



**BILLY BALL**  
FOR KIDS WHO CAN'T READ GOOD

Springsteen's "Born In The USA." One problem: The song is about a veteran who returns from Vietnam to find he has no work. It's a song about how this man's country turned its back on him. Not the patriotic fodder Reagan was looking for. Springsteen declined to give him the song.

Let's stick with Springsteen for just a moment, and not just because he's my hero. His fame probably crested in the 1980s with him waving a flag and singing his seemingly patriotic anthem.

Automatically, one could assume that Springsteen is a conservative because he's waving the flag. Yet Springsteen is a self-professed liberal who once said in a concert, "Because in 1985, blind faith in your leaders, or in anything, can get you killed."

Does that mean Springsteen doesn't love his country and can't wave the flag at his concerts? Does it mean that because I question my country that I don't love my country? I hope that someday we can all answer that question with one great, resounding, "No!"

I can't think of anything that I love more than the American dream and America itself. My heart fills with pride every time I remember I am an American. I am proud of my roots, and I can't live or grow without them. But I'm not content with that.

An aging Frederick Douglass once asked in one of his most

memorable speeches whether this country would ever have the courage to finally live up to the Constitution that it drew up.

I know that I can't think of anything more patriotic than defending the Constitution that sparked one of the greatest experiments in human history. A constitution that calls for free speech and equality for all in these states. A glorious dream, and one that I hope we'll never forget.

But every time that I see the name of patriotism defiled by a wave of intolerance, I get sick to my stomach. Every time that I see America forgetting its entire reason for being. And when I see a voice of discontent banned from the airwaves for their discontent. And when I see our country trying to pass an Amendment telling people whom they can love.

Many generations are judged for their greatest failures, regardless of their greatest successes. There's a picture at home of which my family is ashamed. A picture of two black youths hanging from a tree while the people underneath beam for the camera. Some of them might be my relatives.

I wonder if we took a picture of our generation what it would look like today. No one really can tell until time passes. Would our greatest failures be captured in that still moment in time? What would our greatest failures be?

All I know is that I don't want to be caught in that picture, standing underneath our greatest injustices and beaming for the camera for my children to see.

Does that mean I love my country any less? Let me answer that with a great, resounding, "No!"

Contact Billy Ball at [wkball@email.unc.edu](mailto:wkball@email.unc.edu).

Established 1893  
110 years of editorial freedom  
**The Daily Tar Heel**  
[www.dailytarheel.com](http://www.dailytarheel.com)

- ELYSE ASHBURN**  
EDITOR, 962-4086  
OFFICE HOURS 2:15-3:15 PM MON., WED.
- DANIEL THIGPEN**  
MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750
- JENNIFER SAMUELS**  
PROJECTS MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750
- NATHAN DENNY**  
EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR, 962-0750
- BROOK R. CORWIN**  
UNIVERSITY EDITOR, 962-0372
- EMMA BURGIN**  
CITY EDITOR, 962-4209
- CLEVE R. WOOTSON JR.**  
STATE & NATIONAL EDITOR, 962-4103
- BRIAN MACPHERSON**  
SPORTS EDITOR, 962-4710
- MICHELLE JARBOE**  
FEATURES EDITOR, 962-4214
- NICK PARKER**  
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR, 962-4214
- ALEX OBREGON**  
COPY EDITOR, 962-4103
- BRIAN CASSELLA**  
PHOTO EDITOR, 962-0750
- MICHELLE KUTTNER**  
DESIGN EDITOR, 962-0750
- KRISTEN OLIVER**  
ONLINE EDITOR, 962-0750
- JOHN FRANK**  
PROJECTS TEAM LEADER, 962-0246
- ERIC GAUTSCHI**  
OMBUSMAN

If you have any concerns or comments about our coverage, please contact Ombudsman Eric Gautschi at [gautschi@email.unc.edu](mailto:gautschi@email.unc.edu) or 918-1311.