Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, April 1, 2015  3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

3:00 p.m.
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks, Spoma Jovanovic, Chair of the Faculty Senate

3:10 p.m.
Approval of Minutes, Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: March 4, 2015 (Enc. A)

3:15 p.m.
Remarks, Dana Dunn, Acting Chancellor

3:25 p.m.
Resolutions
   Bruce Kirchoff, Faculty Government Committee Chair, FS#04012015:01 (Enc. B)
   To Revise the UNCG Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty

3:40
Committee Reports
   Deb Bell, George Michel & Wayne Journell, Budget Committee (Enc. C)
   with Charlie Maimone, VP Business Affairs
   Kathleen Williams, Student Learning Enhancement Committee (Enc. D)
   Chris Poulos, UNCG Values Committee

4:25 p.m.
Presentations
   Terry Ackerman, Jodi Pettazzoni & Roy Schwartzman, Update, General Education’s HEIghten Assessment
   Jim Carmichael, Ombuds Program
   Dan Winkler & Laura Pipe, Faculty Handbook Progress
   Kendra Hopkins, 1st G Student Organization

4:55
New Business/Old Business—Non Tenure Track Ad Hoc Committee Formation

Adjourn

UPCOMING EVENTS:
The Changing Tides of Scholarship and Strategies to Lift all Boats with Barbara Holland, Tuesday, April 7, 3:00-4:30 p.m., Maple Room, EUC (Enc. E)

What is College For? with Andrew Delbanco, Tuesday, April 14, 4:00 p.m. Virginia Dare Room

UNCG’s 3rd Annual Blue and Gold Kickball Game, Tuesday, April 14, 6:00 p.m. UNCG Baseball Stadium

NEXT Faculty Senate Meeting: 5/6/15 (Agenda items due Friday, April 17 at 5:00 p.m.)
Refreshments are available at 2:30 p.m. for Senators to meet and greet faculty colleagues. NOTE: We encourage Senators, non-voting faculty and visitors to speak upon being recognized by the Senate Chair.

Sign Language Services provided as needed and requested (please allow 72 hours) by:
  Communications Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
Contact: 336-275-8878 for Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Minutes Pending approval April 1, 2015

Minutes
Wednesday, March 4, 2015 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
Spoma Jovanovic, Chair of the Faculty Senate

As we approach spring break next week and then turn the corner to finish out the academic year, I’m beginning to understand how Fannie Lou Hamer felt when she proclaimed about her role in defending the rights of blacks to vote, “I’m sick and tired of being sick and tired.” This year has been fraught with one challenge after another on this campus, in the state, and in our community in ways that can beat down even an energetic, optimistic, passionate person.

The most recent disappointment I carry comes from Charlotte where with my dear colleague and Senator George Dimock, I attending the Board of Governors meeting last Friday. We went to witness and protest what eventually happened—the closing of 3 cherished university centers that sought to change for the better, the conversations surrounding poverty, voting rights, and climate conditions.

The students were the real heroes—out in force to speak and even risk arrest. One female student declared, “faculty can often not speak up, but students can and do.” Her statement should cause us all to ask ourselves, “Have I spoken up enough? What is my responsibility as a role model for students in what I do and importantly, say, in matters of public importance?”

To find hope when it feels all but extinguished, I turn to another of Fannie Lou Hamer’s quotes to remind me that the work we do as faculty—in the classroom, in governance matters at UNCG, and in the community—requires working with others. Fannie Lou said, “Whether you have a Ph.D., or no D, we’re in this bag together. And whether you’re from Morehouse or Nohouse, we’re still in this bag together.” I like that spirit—to seek collaboration and to be brave even when I alone don’t always feel like I have sufficient courage. Together with you and with our community, we are stronger—that is a fact.

We are in the midst of epic assaults on higher education that require the speaking of our conscience. I heard Anthony Romero speak this weekend. He is the executive director of the ACLU and the first such director to be Latino and openly gay. He reminded us that Martin Luther King, Jr. did not look at the separate water fountains for blacks and white and say, it would be more cost efficient to reduce the plumbing and remove one. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, “This is wrong!”

Let’s learn from that message, and use our disciplinary knowledge to speak out so that higher education may continue to contribute to the welfare of society. In addition to Fannie Lou, Anthony, and MLK, I have learned from ordinary people in the community with whom I have conducted research. They teach me, time and again that our work together will not “work” by simply writing a resolution or casting a vote now and again. Those are important acts, but only when they are part of a much stronger, well-organized deliberative process, often including vigorous critique, informed by our unique critical thinking, teaching and research skills. As faculty, we must work to create a culture here at UNCG where faculty voices are not just listened to, but sought out for the expertise we bring to bear in the world. It is work we cannot do alone, and it is work that we should not do separate from staff, students, administrators, and the community.

We face big issues, important decisions, and critical opportunities—even if you are a bit sick and tired at this point in the year, I urge you to persevere by recognizing we are all needed in the struggles before us. One way to engage and feel supported in the process is to attend the NC AAUP conference on 3/28/15 to be held on
our campus. State president and UNCG faculty Jim Carmichael along with UNCG’s chapter members have planned a day that includes national experts and local representatives from faculty, student, and community groups who will discuss how they are organizing others along different lines, but all with the goal of insuring justice and equality for our campus, our university system, and the residents of NC. Participating there is a way, among many, that we can all stretch, learn, and share our expertise with others.

Approval of Minutes
Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate
March 4, 2015 minutes presented.
Carmichael called for motion to approve. So moved and seconded. Minutes approved.

Remarks
Linda Brady, Chancellor
I want to focus my remarks today on the transition, assuming a new chancellor will be announced May 23, 2015 with projected start date of August 1. My commitment will be to support a smooth transition. First, budget issues: As for tuition and fees, the action by BOG last week to approve our requests for 2015-16 and 2016-17, enables UNCG to make significant investments in faculty retention/salaries, graduate student support, and undergraduate recruitment and retention initiatives. Enrollment is up 4.8% over last spring, thanks to Bryan Terry, faculty and staff who have supported recruitment and retention initiatives. Expect enrollment change dollars next year.

There will be a budget cut for 2015-2016. We are planning for 2% but given concerns about revenue could be as high as 4%, but we are unlikely to know for several months. I have asked Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs to work together to structure budget for next year, including plans for next round of budget cuts, in anticipation of the new chancellor making those final decisions.

Next, personnel matters. The search for a permanent General Counsel, under the chairmanship of Alan Boyette, will continue under the new chancellor. When the candidates are named, the new chancellor will interview finalists and make the appointment. Mile Tarrant, Director of Strategic Initiatives, has taken a position with Kenan-Flagler Executive Education LLC; Nikki Baker, who has worked with Mike for several years, has assumed his role on an interim basis with major emphasis on supporting our work in Raleigh during this legislative session as well as federal relations. This arrangement will allow the next chancellor to assess structure and reporting relationship for this office. Joe Gallehugh is serving in a contract role re media relations pending next chancellor’s review of reporting relationship and needs in this area. In addition, we recently hired Murphie Chappell as our first full time Title IX Coordinator. As you know, we are working hard to remain in compliance with federal mandates regarding Title IX. Murphie comes to us with a wealth of experience, including most recently having served as the staff attorney at the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault. Murphie received her law degree from North Carolina Central University. In all areas our goal is to support the work of the university while maintaining flexibility for the incoming chancellor regarding organizational structure and personnel matters.

With regard to facilities, Spartan Village Phase II was approved by the Board of Governors last week. It includes 330 beds and is projected to open in fall 2017. The Student recreation center construction is underway, and should open as scheduled in fall 2016. Union Square Campus, Inc. groundbreaking will be on April 7, and is on schedule to open July 2016 to accommodate the needs of the Doctorate in Nursing program.

The legislative session continues with meetings and visits to Raleigh in support of the UNCG and UNC General Assembly agenda. Salaries are in the forefront of business. The Raleigh Spartan Legislative Network trip last night was successful, with over 100 legislators or staffers and 75 faculty, staff, students, alumni/friends of UNCG present. Dr. Susan Letvak from the School of Nursing provided a compelling overview of our new program designed to bring veterans with prior medical experience into the health care workforce. The agenda of Greensboro Partnership Day in Raleigh on April 1 supports our efforts around Union Square Campus and the Doctorate in Nursing program. I will be in Washington, DC on March 17-18 for visits on the Hill with a number of new members.

As for Development news, we have events scheduled with alumni and donors in Atlanta and Washington. The Alumni Association Alumni Relations launched a 48-hour Giving Days Program in late February. While all the receipts are not yet in, we can report as of yesterday that more than 600 donors contributed—including more than 100 faculty and staff and 300 undergraduate alumni. More than $125,000 was raised during this 48 hour period. I
also want to report that as on this week, undergraduate alumni participation is 4%, up 55% from this time last year. This bodes well for UNCG as the campus moves toward the next campaign. Finally, I am moving through series of “thank you meetings” with approximately 30 major donors to UNCG. One recent meeting resulted in an unexpected new gift to support scholarships for students in four of our academic units.

Thanks for all you do to support our students and best wishes for a restful Spring Break.

**Dana Dunn, Provost**

The Provost announced that the impact of the recent Board of Governors Level 2 review on four campus Centers was triggered by a number of factors, including small operating budgets. UNCG had already reviewed three of these Centers either because they had no operating budget, no director, or were in some state of transition. Terri Shelton did an excellent job of sharing information on our center review process with the Board of Governors. We are exploring closing one center and merging its activities into another with similar functions related to research and evaluation. The Creative Writing Center will be closed as it was not functioning as a center and does not need center status to accomplish its objectives. The Center for New North Carolinians, a center very important to our university, passed its level 2 Board of Governors review and no further action is required. UNC Chancellor Folt has written of the chilling effect felt at the closing of UNC Law School’s Poverty Center. While I have no doubt this is the case, I am pleased to report that there was no direct negative impact on any of UNCG’s centers as a result of the review. It is important that we not engage in self-censorship and fail to bring forward important ideas for Centers. In that vein, I am pleased to share that the Board of Trustees recently voted to approve a new UNCG Center focused on Housing, Segregation, and Poverty.

A faculty-initiated discussion is occurring in several units on campus to explore the possible move of a number of Arts-related/design disciplines from the College of Arts and Sciences (Art, Media Arts, Interior Architecture, and creative writing) to Music, Theatre and Dance. This was previously explored in 2007-08 when external consultants visited campus and recommended such a move. I support exploration of this idea, and weighing the advantages and disadvantages. Potential advantages being discussed include synergy across the arts disciplines and the potential to market and brand a new College with a broad range of Arts disciplines. This move is not being explored as an efficiency, but it is also not possible at this time to invest significant new resources. The move, if recommended and approved, would be largely resource neutral. Recommendations will be forwarded to my office and then to a new chancellor upon their arrival.

**Resolutions**

**Susan Shelmerdine, Academic Policies & Regulations Committee Chair**

#FS03042015:01, To Clarify Eligibility Criteria for the Chancellor’s List and the Deans’ List
Shelmerdine read the resolution and called for questions. After discussion, the question was called.

**Passed, with 3 no votes and 2 abstentions.**

#FS03042015:02, To Align the Academic Renewal Policy with Current Academic Standing Requirements
Shelmerdine read the question and opened the floor for discussion. After discussion, vote was called.

**Passed, with 11 votes for, 9 votes against, and 6 abstentions.**

**George Dimock, Faculty Senator**

#FS03042015:03, To Protest the Board of Governors Closing of Three UNC Centers.
Passed unanimously.

**Elizabeth Keathley, Faculty Senator**, report of final electronic vote.

#FS02182015:01, To Endorse the UNC Faculty Assembly “Resolution Regarding the Transition in Leadership and Direction of the UNC System” of January 25, 2015.

**Resolution passed electronically and ratified at this Senate meeting, hearing no objections.**

**Presentation**

**Ann Grimaldi, Curator of Education**, Weatherspoon Art Museum
Grimaldi gave a brief slide presentation about art resources that can be used in a variety of disciplines teaching or research endeavors, invited all faculty members to take advantage of new educational opportunities including a workshop series entitled, “The Art of Seeing” to enhance visual literacy, using the Weatherspoon’s collection.
Committee Briefs

**George Dimock, Faculty Senator**, Ad Hoc Committee on Aycock Auditorium Name

Dimock is one of 13 members of the committee, which includes, among others, co-chairs Chuck Bolton and Rob Wyatt. The committee has met twice thus far, and is in the process of creating a website that will give the history and documents surrounding Charles B. Aycock and the controversy surrounding his legacy, in order for the campus community to register opinions and comments.

**John Lepri, Faculty Assembly Delegate**, Faculty Assembly Update

Lepri referred Senators to his written summary of the many events that have preoccupied the Faculty Assembly, not least of which, has been the closing of three Centers has prompted publicity nationwide. Jovanovic and Dimock were present for the Board of Governors vote on Friday in Charlotte, which was heavily attended by protestors so that the BoG moved into a smaller room to finish their business and take the vote without being disrupted.

**Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect**, Chancellor Search Committee Update

Wallace announced with regret that the Search Committee members ultimately did not support last month’s Senate straw vote in favor of expanding the basically confidential search further. No doubt the Committee considers its response a compromise to the Senate’s proposal—by adding one additional member of several groups (alumni, faculty, students) to hear final candidate presentations. The faculty members of the committee had proposed 5 each representing these various groups and that they not be “cherry picked” by the Committee but selected at random. Yarborough noted that the number of stakeholders who will engage with candidates for the chancellor of the university will be far fewer than the number who typically engages with candidates for an assistant professorship in his own department. Surely the chancellorship is a more important position than an assistant professorship. The number of people involved in the search is slightly larger than typical, but we have seen the results of typical. The Senate has never formally endorsed the search process. Perhaps the Trustees will pay more attention if we explicitly do not endorse it.

Wallace cited a statement by Tom Ross at the Faculty Assembly meeting that nationwide—the trend in funding higher education has only increased 2% while enrollment has increased by 62%. She also noted Bill Funk’s statement that the BoG is considering a policy whereby all chancellors in the system would be reviewed before voting on compensation. She believes that Bill Funk’s Search effort is well-managed and organized.

Wade Maki reminded Senators to encourage faculty to nominate as many candidates as possible. By the end of the month the Committee will be “distilling” the number of candidates and we want as large a pool of qualified candidates as possible.

It was noted that a BoG representative announced that the BoG “would be very happy if you [the Chancellor Search Committee members] would please consider non-traditional candidates [i.e. non-academic/corporate—those lacking a Ph.D. or those not coming from the typical ranks with Dean and/or Provost experience.]”

**New Business/Old Business**

Jovanovic announced the establishment of two Ad Hoc Faculty Committees that she hopes the Senate will consider soon for permanent status, one on Enrollment Management, and the other on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Adams asked that we consider the number of committees under the Senate's purview and keep committee structure lean.

Jovanovic announced upcoming events: Harry Boyte, a showing of the film “The Ivory Tower,” and an appearance by Andrew DelBanco.

Our Senate on-line discussions for electronic voting in the future will be facilitated by Canvas once that system is up and running in the summer.

**Adjourn**

Karper moved to adjourn. Van Dorn seconded.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carmichael, Secretary, Faculty Senator
Resolution #04012015:01
To Revise the UNCG Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty

Submitted by the Faculty Government Committee
Bruce K. Kirchoff, Chair

WHEREAS, revisions to the UNC Policy Manual Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G] that deal with Post-Tenure Review have been revised, and

WHEREAS, these revision necessitate revisions to the UNCG Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty (the Policy),

BE IT RESOLVED, that the UNCG Annual and Post-Tenure Review for Faculty be revised to bring it into compliance with the Policy Manual, to add three categories of annual review, and to clarify existing provisions, as indicated with Track Changes on the attached version of the Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Action/Date:</th>
<th>Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Action/Date:</td>
<td>Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Faculty Action/Date:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees Action/Date:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC GA or BOG Action/Date:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY FOR FACULTY
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, September 2, 1998)
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 4, 1998)
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 11, 1998)

(Amended by the Faculty Senate, November 30, 2005)
(Amended by the Board of Trustees, April 5, 2006)

(Amended by the Faculty Senate, September 3, 2008)
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 18, 2008)
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 18, 2009)

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, October 5, 2011)
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, February 16, 2012)
(Approved by the General Administration, May 21, 2012)

(Approved by the Faculty Senate,***)
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, ***)
(Approved by the General Administration, ***)

I. DEFINITIONS, PURPOSE, AND APPLICABILITY

A. Annual review is a periodic (annual) evaluation of faculty performance intended to promote faculty vitality.

B. Post-tenure review is “a comprehensive, formal periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality.”1 (The UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G]).

C. The purposes of annual and post-tenure reviews are to (The UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3., and 400.3.3.1[G]):2

1. Sustain and facilitate excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance.

2. Foster faculty development by evaluating all aspects of professional performance, by acknowledging progress in specific areas, and by identifying specific activities that can be undertaken if improvement is needed.

D. Annual and post-tenure reviews shall evaluate all aspects of the professional performance of faculty, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty

---

1 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G]
2 UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3., and 400.3.3.1[G]
II. POLICIES GOVERNING BOTH ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. The primary locus of both annual and post-tenure reviews is the department, though the units may establish procedures that govern both types of reviews as long as these procedures do not violate university policies. The department head/Chair has the responsibility of carrying out the reviews, although the reviews of tenure-track and tenured faculty members must significantly involve peers in a form that is recorded in the department’s instrument of governance (see Section IV.F., below). If peer review involves a faculty committee, the department head/Chair shall not be a member of the committee. Disagreements between recommendations by the department head/Chair and the faculty member’s peers will be resolved by the dean, so that the faculty member receives a single rating.

B. Reviews of department heads will be conducted by their dean, and reviews of the deans by the provost. The provost will establish the procedures for these reviews, which must be in general agreement with the policies established here.

B. The responsibility for developing criteria for the evaluation of faculty performance rests with the departments, but the criteria for the review of tenure-track and tenured faculty should be based on those established in the University Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure (the Guidelines). The units may provide departments with direction on the establishment of evaluation criteria, as long as these directions are consistent with the Guidelines.

C. Feedback provided to faculty members during both annual and post-tenure reviews must be given on the appropriate review form (Annual Review Form or Post-Tenure Review Form) provided by the Provost’s Office. The evaluation categories used on these forms must be “excellent” (exceeds expectations), “good” (meets expectations) and “unsatisfactory” (does not meet expectations). Units, but not departments, may add to (but not remove from) the Forms and may create annual and post-tenure review procedures to fit their specific needs, provided such procedures do not violate the policies laid out in the UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G], or in this document. In adding to the Forms the units may, but need not, divide the “good” (meets expectations) category, into the evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, average, and

---

3 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 5 (for references to Post-Tenure Review)
5 For purposes of this Policy, the units are the administrative category above the department. The College of Arts and Sciences, the University Libraries and the professional Schools are all units.
6 UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, Section 2.D.ii.
superior. Neither the “excellent” (exceeds expectations) nor the “unsatisfactory” (does not meet expectations) category may be subdivided.

D. The faculty member being reviewed must receive written feedback as part of his or her review, and must be given an opportunity to respond formally to the review in writing. This response is attached to the review and becomes a formal part of the review.

E. The reviews, including the faculty member’s response (if any), must be completed by the end of the academic year in which they are scheduled.

F. All annual and post-tenure review policies must respect the basic principles of academic freedom including the full freedom, within the law, of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication, and may not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in accordance with Chapter VI of the Code of the University of North Carolina.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW POLICIES

A. Annual reviews apply to all faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, paid or unpaid (including lecturers, Clinical Faculty, Academic Professional Faculty, and other “Special Faculty Members” as defined in the Code of the University of North Carolina, Section 610).

B. Lecturers and other non-tenure-track faculty members are subject to annual review based on procedures that are established by each unit, and which must be recorded in each unit’s instrument of governance. These procedures must be established, and periodically reviewed, with the input of the affected faculty members, or elected representatives of these faculty members.

C. Reviews of department heads/chairs will be conducted by their dean, and reviews of the deans by the provost. The provost will establish the procedures for these reviews, which must be in general agreement with the policies established here, and must be recorded in the appropriate administrative document.

A. The UNCG Annual Review Report Form must be used for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members, but individual units (not departments) are free to add to the Form, and to create Annual Review procedures to fit their specific needs, provided such procedures do not violate those laid out in UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G], or in this document.

B. In adding to the Annual Review Report Form, the units may, but need not, divide the satisfactory category, into the evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. The unsatisfactory category of evaluation may not be subdivided.

C-D. In addition to the summary information provided on the Annual Review Report Form, it is incumbent on each department head/chairst to provide, to faculty members below the rank of tenured Professor, a clear indication of their progress towards promotion and/or tenure. This feedback must be informed by input from departmental faculty members senior to the person being reviewed, and must be consistent with the policies set down in Section 2 of the Regulations, the evaluation criteria in the University Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure, and the clear and specific criteria specified in unit and departmental promotion and tenure documents (The Regulations, Section 2.D.i).

7 UNC Policy Manual, Section 100.1
8 All further references to reviews of faculty members shall also refer to reviews of department heads and deans, though the locus of the reviews differs for these individuals.
9 For the purpose of this section, Associate Professors and Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors.
10 UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, Section 2.D.i.
D.E. Prior to departmental review and completion of the Annual Review Report Form, faculty members must supply a record of their annual accomplishments in a format specified by their unit. The reporting method must be consistent within a unit, but may differ between non-tenure track and tenure-track (or tenured) faculty. These reports may, but need not, include a written self-evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments during the year.

E.F. Annual feedback from the department head/chair to tenured or tenure track faculty members will include a completed UNCG Annual Review Report Form (as modified11 by their unit), written feedback on the year’s achievements, and a summary of the peer review. It may also include recommendations for rewards or improvement, as appropriate.

F.G. Annual reviews should provide a means of recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance by means of merit pay increases, when funds are available for this purpose.

G.H. The Annual Review Report Form, as modified11 by the units, must be included in all promotion and tenure portfolios, for all years under consideration. The written feedback (Section III.E.) need not be included as part of the promotion and tenure portfolio, but must be retained in the departmental offices so that they can be reviewed, upon request, by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

IV. POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. The cumulative post-tenure review is informed by summaries of the annual reports of a tenured faculty member’s work, and includes an additional summary evaluation of all aspects of his or a faculty member’s professional performance relative to the mission of the department, unit and institution.

B.C. When performance is judged to be excellent, written feedback to the faculty member must include recognition of this performance.12

B.C. Post-tenure review shall take place no less frequently than every five years following the conferral of tenure.13 If however, in a given academic year, a tenured faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review is recommended for promotion through the departmental and unit levels of review, then that faculty member will be deemed to have had a post-tenure review. There is no need to do a separate cumulative review in addition to the promotion-review. Otherwise, the faculty member in question will undergo a [separate] post-tenure review.14

D. At the beginning of a post-tenure review cycle, each tenured faculty member shall set five-year goals in consultation with his or her department head/chair. Disagreements between the faculty member and his/her department head/chair on appropriate five-year goals will be resolved by the dean.

E. A faculty member’s five-year goals may be modified annually, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. These goals are used to prepare the faculty member’s annual work plans15 that form the basis for the annual performance evaluations.16

---

11 Units may add to the Form, but may not remove or change aspects of the existing Form provided by the Provost’s Office.
12 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 11.
13 A faculty member’s date of the conferral of tenure (or promotion, for those already tenured) begins his or her post-tenure review clock. The first post-tenure review must be concluded no later than June 30 of the fifth calendar year following that date. July 1 of the year in which this review is completed begins his or her next post-tenure review cycle, and so on for future post-tenure review cycles.
14 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 2.
15 Work plans are prepared annually, and cover one year’s work.
16 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 6.
D.F. Peers must be involved in the post-tenure review process. Peer review must be in the form of a peer review committee whose members are selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured members of the department. The faculty member being reviewed may not select members of the peer review committee.

E-G. Because post-tenure review is a cumulative summary of informed by the performance reported in his or her annual reviews, the faculty member under review shall not be required to provide additional documentation of his or her accomplishments, other than an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae.

H. The UNCG Post Tenure Review Report Form must be used in all Post Tenure reviews, but individual units (not departments) are free to add to the Form, and to create Post Tenure Review procedures to fit their specific needs, provided such procedures do not violate those laid out in the UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1(G), or in this document. In modifying the Post-Tenure Review Report Form, units may, but need not, divide the satisfactory category of evaluation into additional evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. The unsatisfactory category of evaluation may not be subdivided.

F-I. UNCG shall, through the provost’s office, provide training for all peer-evaluators, including, but not limited to, members of the peer-review committees, department heads/chairs, and deans. This training shall include access to digital training modules prepared and distributed by UNC General Administration, as well as training in campus-specific policies and procedures. The provost will certify that required training has been conducted in his or her annual report to the General Administration.

G. Because Post-Tenure Review must reward excellence, the Post-Tenure Review procedures designed by the units must provide a mechanism for recognizing excellent performance.

H-J. Post-tenure reviews may reward performance by means of special, non-monetary, recognition such as:

1. Recommendations for salary increases
2. Nomination for awards
3. Research leaves
4. Revisions of work load

I-K. Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review. An Unsatisfactory cumulative review may only occur, but is not required, if there have been at least two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the current post-tenure review cycle. In cases of an unsatisfactory cumulative post-tenure review, the following procedures must be followed:

1. The department head/chair shall prepare and sign a statement declaring that the faculty member has received an unsatisfactory post-tenure review. This statement must include a recital of the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and a specific description of his or her shortcomings as they relate to these duties, and to the directional goals established as part of the post-tenure review cycle. The statement must document the reasons why the faculty member has been given an unsatisfactory post-tenure review, with reference to specific failings noted in the faculty member’s annual reviews. Each of the relevant areas of performance must be addressed. A copy of this statement, along with copies of the faculty records, must be provided to the faculty member under review and their department chair.

---

17 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8.
18 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8
19 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8
20 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 9
21 UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3.1[G], item 11
member’s last five annual reviews, and the materials submitted as part of their post-tenure review, and the faculty member’s response to the post-tenure review shall be delivered to the faculty member, and the dean, with a copy to the faculty member.

2. The department head/chair must, in consultation with the dean and the individual faculty member, develop a plan for the improvement of the faculty member’s performance, and a timeline and benchmarks for improvement. The total time allowed for demonstrated improvement (as specified in the improvement plan) may not be less than two years. The resources necessary for the successful implementation of the improvement plan must be clearly stated in the plan, and must be made available to the faculty member during the improvement period. If the faculty member’s duties are modified as part of the improvement plan, then the plan should indicate this and take into account the new allocation. The plan must include a written statement of the consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time. If agreement between all parties is reached, the plan will be signed by all three parties. If, following the consultation specified above, the dean determines that agreement cannot be reached, the dean, with the approval of the provost, will sign the improvement plan. A copy of the improvement plan will be delivered to the faculty member and his or her department head/chair, and will become a permanent part of his or her personnel file.

3. Progress meetings with the department head/chair must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the improvement period.

4. If a faculty member fails to meet the designated levels of improvement by the conclusion of the improvement period specified in the plan, then the department head/chair may recommend that the faculty member be subjected to disciplinary action or discharged, as established in The UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G], and Section 603 of The Code of the UNC System.

5. If the department head/chair recommends that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action as established in Section 603 of The Code, then the following process of review shall be followed.

   a. The head’s/chair’s recommendation shall be reviewed by a committee consisting of the tenured faculty in his or her department who are senior to the candidate under review, and a recommendation to accept or reject the head’s/chair’s suggested course of action prepared.

      i. A minimum of three faculty members senior to the candidate are normally necessary to assure adequate review. In cases where the dean believes there are too few faculty of the appropriate rank in the candidate’s department, the dean will consult with the department head/chair and the candidate on the constitution of the committee. If agreement between these parties is reached, a memorandum of agreement signed by all parties will specify the composition of the review committee. If, following the consultation specified above, the dean determines that agreement cannot be reached, the dean, with the approval of the provost, will specify the composition of the committee. It is the dean’s responsibility to ensure that the committee is constituted so as to ensure a fair and independent peer assessment of the candidate’s record.

22Associate Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors. In the case of disciplinary action or dismissal of a Professor, his or her peers shall be other Professors. Untenured faculty members of whatever rank may not be members of the committee.
ii. Both the faculty member and department head/chair may provide additional documentary evidence to this committee. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.

b. Both the head’s/chair’s and the committee’s reports will be forward to the unit Committee on Promotions and Tenure, who will recommend for or against the recommended course of action to the dean. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.

c. The dean will review the recommended course(s) of action suggested by the head/chair, the departmental committee and the unit Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and prepare a recommendation to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The dean may recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.

d. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will review the dean’s suggested action and recommend for or against this action to the provost. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the dean.

e. The provost will review the lower-level reviews and make a final recommendation to the chancellor. The provost may suggest modifications to the disciplinary action.

f. Except for the grievance procedures established under Sections 603 of The Code of the University of North Carolina, the decision of the Chancellor is final.

g. The University has the burden of proof in justifying the recommendation in question. The standard of proof to be used throughout the stages of this review is that of clear and convincing evidence (which is the same as the greater preponderance of the evidence).

h. The recommendations at each level of review shall be forwarded, together with all of the documentary evidence and all of the prior recommendations, to the next level of review.

V. APPEALS

A. Faculty members who receive an unfavorable annual or post-tenure review may appeal that review and/or the improvement plan to the Faculty Grievance Committee, according to the procedures of that committee.

B. Faculty members who are the subject of serious sanctions/disciplinary action, or dismissal, by the Chancellor may appeal this decision to the Due Process Committee according to the policies laid out in Section 603 of The Code of the University of North Carolina, as reflected in the Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and in the operating policies of that committee.
Template for Constructing the Faculty Senate Budget Committee
Annual Report
draft
January, Year: 2015 (For June 30, 2013-June 30, 2014)

Note: May 2015—tentative deadline for the first completed annual report

Campus Internet Sites for Information

There are several key internet sites mentioned in this report that the Budget Committee should closely examine on an annual basis:

A. For the UNCG Campus Revenue and Spending Data:

Financial Services Link (type in Financial Services at UNCG home page then proceed to relevant links. The Finance link takes you to three useful links if you scroll far enough down: Fiscal Profile, Financial Reports, and UNCG State Budgets. Some of the data for the most recent fiscal year (June 30, 2013-June 30, 2014) should be available as early as July 1, 2014 but much of it will be available after August 31—or as late as January, 2015. The State Auditor must confirm final data (as late as mid-December). This report is published on-line at the Financial Services link and ultimately available at ncauditor.net.

The most critical link below is “Financial Reports.” This link allows access to final state-audited reports that give us the most accurate data regarding UNCG’s revenue and spending for the year. It provides most of the information we need for the Senate Budget Report.

- **Fiscal Profile:** This link takes you to “Fiscal Profile by Years”, by “Schedules,” and by “Printable Full Versions.” You can find “Financial Statement and Summaries,” and then go to “Statement of Revenue, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets” among other links by using the “Fiscal Profile by Years” link. The “Schedules” link is divided into several categories.

  Note that the B schedules are estimations of the budget whereas the A schedules are exact data. Consequently, sometimes the A schedule data aligns with the B schedule data—but not necessarily.

- **Financial Reports:** The audited financial statements are based on the fiscal year ending June 30, and report on the revenues, expenditures, and key financial benchmarks that are tracked consistently every year.

- **UNCG State Budgets:** State operating budget reports may provide useful historical information by department, as background to the development of the budget, including potential expansions and reductions. Some key pages to check:
Section I which summarizes the State Operating Budget by Division (gives an overall view of expenditures for the entire university, Section IV which summarizes budgeting for key areas in Academic Affairs, and Section V, which summarizes EPA, SPA, and Faculty FTE support across the university’s divisions.

B. For the FT Faculty and Staff Employment Trends Data, and the FT Student Enrollment Data:

- **IPEDS Data Center:** This gives employment data for faculty and staff that UNCG has reported to the Federal Government.
  

  Select “Look up an institution,” type “University of North Carolina at Greensboro.”
  
  Click on the “Reported Data” link.
  
  Click on the “Human Resources” link.

- **The Office of Institutional Research (IRE.edu)**

  This site has information on 5 year trends in faculty, EPA/SPA staff, and undergraduate, graduate student headcounts. The tables are found by going to the Fact Book and Reports link. The Fact Book link features a “most recent fact book” link as well as a Fact Book Archive that displays various tables designating different years and can show increases and decreases in employment trends and student enrollment. They can also compare employment trends in comparison between increases and decreases in student enrollment.

  **Note:** Headcount and FTE are different ways to measure. Headcount refers to both full and part-time students. The Full-Time Equivalent figure standardizes these categories by integrating the credit hours generated by both categories. The FTE measure also standardizes the combined number of full-time and part-time faculty.) The current Senate Budget Report relies on the **FTE student enrollment measures for undergraduate, graduate, and extension (long distance learning enrollments).**

  Note: the extension student enrollment number can be found in the Fact Book at the IRE site within the one-page summary/profile for each academic year.

  **JWGEA recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding IPEDS data, February 2014**

  **JWGEA recommendations:**
  A regular assessment of UNCG’s resource needs, budget flexibility, and personnel by a university wide body composed of faculty, staff, and administrators, is necessary to develop and implement strategic plans and priorities. A fortified partnership between the
faculty, the executive staff, professional and other staff is critical for the success of the effort.

The financial balance between instructional effort, administrative services, and physical plant should be a primary consideration. In addition, a closer analysis of instructional hiring should take place, differentiating tenure-track, non-tenure-track faculty, and instructional support, and how those hires support or impair strategic institutional priorities. We recommend an annual planning session to include input from the chancellor’s budget sounding board which includes members of the Faculty Senate and the staff Senate. The planning session should include members of the Faculty Senate and the staff Senate, perhaps the co-chairs.

Caveats from the JWGEA:
The data upon which this report is based comes from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS), a system in which universities self-report university data. The IPEDS dataset lacks rigorous definitions and precise characteristics, so caution in interpreting the data is required. The comparative data were assembled on our request by the Education Advisory Board. The development of consistent and rigorous definitions and standards of occupational categories and position types, especially for personnel serving in an administrative capacity, is an unmet need for this type of analysis. This would facilitate the assessment of each category’s contribution to the University’s mission as well as providing an accurate determination of each category’s relative yearly growth or decline.

Additional detailed notes on gathering the data for the Senate Budget Report:

Note: due to the new SOC job title categories, the IPEDS data has become more detailed and specific since the JWGEA caveats above were generated. Also, the IPEDS data lists all newly created positions in all faculty and staff categories for each year.

The IPEDS data over the past several years has become increasingly helpful in alerting the reader to dramatic differences in employment numbers from one year to the next. Look for the “!” near data that seems significantly different from the previous year.

Starting with the 2012-13 Academic Year:
Note source of Fall 2013 figures at SOC Job Title and Gender at Office of Institutional Research site for more specific EPA and SPA positions. **Note: Starting in 2013-14, the administrative category “Other Professional” was eliminated.

On the other hand, IPEDS lists executive administration positions under “Management Positions” as well as clerical support under “Office Support.” IPEDS is also currently providing more detailed data related to EPA/SPA Educational Positions using key titles such as:

Librarians, Curators, Archivists,
Librarians,
Library Technicians,
Student Academic Affairs and Other Educational Services

The current Senate Budget Report combines the Few Full Time Research positions with the teaching positions because that is how IPEDS reports it (as a separate category next to the final total of instructional positions. It combines EPA/SPA staff (non-teaching) positions under the following subheadings:

Executive Admin
Education Service and Librarian Positions (described above)
Office and Administrative Support

Other EPA/SPA professional and technical positions which fall into a range of new categories related to the current “SOC Job Titles” such as:

Business and Financial Operations
Computer, Engineering, and Science
Community Service, Legal Arts, Media
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical
Service Operations
Sales and Related Occupations
Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance
Production, Transportation, and Material Moving

See Appendix A for a more complete range and explanation for additional position categories. All of these positions clearly show up in the detailed campus-wide annual “Personnel Data File—Sum of FT Equivalent Employees” that the Office of Institutional Research will share. The value of this data is that it reports actual FTE to GA—although if there is a vacant position it is not included.

The Position Data that the Office of Institutional Research also now generates annually shows all of the positions regardless of whether they are filled or not. That is—they show faculty positions approved at the date of the report but this data does not count people.

The IPEDS report requires headcounts of full-time and part-time employees and then converts part-time employees to FTE with the .3 value for each Part Time employee.

Reviewing these data could be helpful in future years as a way of tracking overall trends in job creation and elimination in specific areas of campus—but we can get an excellent “bird’s eye view” of these patterns by using the IPEDS data—which compares notable differences from year to year and alerts the reader to these notable differences.

The Senate Budget should eventually be able to identify positions and titles currently used for other personnel and OTP expenditures rather than as state-funded tenured/tenure-track teaching positions. But as of yet, we do not have an easy way to do this.
C. Faculty Salary Comparisons According to Rank with Peer Institutions

Regularly compare AAUP regional and national average salaries with the average salaries for Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors. The Office of Institutional Research at UNCG can—and has—generated data as an excel spreadsheet using the AAUP report.

While this data is rather easy to obtain from our Office of Institutional Research for the purposes of the Senate Budget Report, keep in mind that it is a “bird’s eye view” because even though it ranks the salaries between peer institutions, in some cases, there might be very little difference in the salary among large differences in rank. The reader should note the range of the lowest salary to the highest salary—in order to get a more precise idea of how dramatic the salary ranges between peer institutions actually are. Also, it is more important to rank UNCG’s salaries with peer institutions, rather than by region or degree offering or by national rankings. The following data, while interesting, does not give us a true picture of how UNCG’s salaries compare. We need institutions to UNCG for comparisons (our peer institutions) rather than data such as below.

For example—in the March-April 2014 AAUP Academe issue:
Page 26: Average Salary for faculty at doctoral universities nationally:
Professor--$141,883
Associate--$93,062
Assistant--$82,381
Instructor--$53,722
Lecturer--$62,669

Page 27: Average Salary for faculty at doctoral universities in the South Atlantic region:
Professor--$133,039
Associate--$88,717
Assistant--$77,960
Instructor--$52,920
Lecturer--$54,624

Page 64: UNCG average salary compared to the national average for Research I Doctoral Institution:
Professor--$108, 4th percentile (below average 3rd percentile)
Associate--$76.1, 5th percentile (lowest percentile)
Assistant--$69.8, 4th percentile (below average 3rd percentile)
Instructor-data not provided
Lecturer-data not provided

Page 64: Chapel Hill average salary compared to the national average for Research I Doctoral Institution:
Professor--$146.7, 1st percentile (ranked highest above average 3rd percentile)
Associate--$98.1, 2nd percentile (ranked next to highest above average 3rd percentile)
Assistant--$81.1, 2nd percentile (ranked next to highest above average 3rd percentile)
Instructor--$66.9, 1st percentile (ranked highest above average 3rd percentile)
Timeline for Developing the Report

July 2014 to January 2015: Gather data as it is generated by Office of Institutional Research and IPEDS for the 2013-14 fiscal year. Note: much of it can be gathered before mid-December—although the Audited Financial Report for 2013-14 is generally not available until late December or early January.

Note: If the Faculty Senate can afford it, it would be money well-spent to acquire the services of an off-campus financial expert from AAUP (like Howard Bunsis who visited UNCG in Fall 2014) who represents the faculty’s perspective in interpreting the revenue and spending trends at UNCG. This “informed” faculty perspective would generate more informed dialogue with the administration to annually explore optimum ways of ensuring adequate support for UNCG’s educational mission.

January 2015: Assemble all data (including relevant increased and decreased percentages of data over the past five year period) for analysis.

February 2015: Meet with UNCG administration (especially Financial Services and Office of Institutional Research) to confirm/explain/update preliminary questions about the report’s analyses of the data.

March 2015: Present Data Analyses as a Preliminary Report at the March Senate Meeting for review.

April 2015: Meet with UNCG administration (especially the Provost, Chancellor, Financial Services and Office of Institutional Research) regarding questions/thoughts by Senators in response to the data analyses.

May 2015: FINAL REPORT to the Senate: Brief three-page summary of data analyses, Senate review of the data with administration, and conclusions based on this review. Distribute campus-wide.

Archive documentation for comparative study in future years.
2014-15 Student Learning Enhancement Committee (SLEC)

• Committee membership:
  – College of Arts & Sciences:
    • Kimberlianne Pollas
    • David Remington
    • Jerry Walsh
    • Fabrice Lehoucq
    • Jon Zarecki (Gen Ed Liaison)
  – Bryan School:
    • Vasilis Tzimas
  – HHS:
    • Kathy Williams (SLEC Chair)
  – MTD:
    • Ashley Barret
  – NUR:
    • Kay Cowen
  – University Libraries
    • Jenny Dale
  – Office of Assessment (ex officio)
    • Jodi Pettazzoni
    • Terry Brumfield

Outcomes of analysis of 2013-14 reports

• Meets expectations: 97 (54%)
• Approaching Expectations: 44 (24%)
• Does not meet Expectations: 39 (22%)

  – Reports that do not meet expectations typically are missing 1) findings for 2013-14 and/or 2) action plans for 2014-15.

SLEC Awards for 2013-14

• 2 awardees announced on 3/27 at Faculty-Staff Excellence Awards event:
  – BA in Religious Studies
  – BA in International and Global Studies
BARTER HOLLAND, PH.D.
The Changing Tides of Scholarship and Strategies to Lift All Boats
Tuesday, April 7, 2015
3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Maple Room, Elliott University Center

Higher education is in the early stages of a time of extensive and fundamental change on a scale greater than has been experienced since the mid-20th Century. The search is on for a new business model, and all aspects of academic work and culture are shifting and adapting to the growing need to build more efficient and collaborative models of knowledge discovery and dissemination. Increasingly, it is unproductive to organize teaching, learning, research and engagement as separate activities. The long-standing focus on organizing academic work as an individual enterprise is being replaced by a growing emphasis on collective action. Through her extensive work with a wide variety of higher education institutions in the USA and other nations, Dr. Holland will articulate how these major trends play out in the more immediate reality of daily life on campus. Universities and colleges that develop greater capacity for adaptation, innovation and intentionality will be more successful going forward.

This keynote address is open to anyone who is interested (within or outside of UNCG), so please share this announcement with your colleagues! No registration necessary! We hope you can join us!

Questions? Contact Kristin Medlin, ICEE Communications and Partnerships Manager, at kdmedlin@uncg.edu or 336-334-4661.

Professor Barbara A. Holland was most recently the Director of Academic Initiatives in Social Inclusion for the University of Sydney in Australia. In this role she led the University in the development of community partnerships and teaching/research strategies to enhance social inclusion in the context of Australia’s oldest research university. Previously, she served three years as Pro Vice-Chancellor Engagement at University of Western Sydney where she created and implemented the University’s first strategic plan for engaged learning and research activities. Central to the plan is the UWS Schools Engagement agenda which in 2009 involved nearly 11,000 school students in academic enrichment, tutoring, and mentoring activities. The engagement plan also focused on small business economic development, cultural understanding, and environmental sustainability. Read Dr. Holland’s full biography online!