Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, November 5, 2014   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: October 1, 2014 (Enc. A)

3:15 p.m.
Remarks: Linda Brady, Chancellor on Legislative Agenda/Major Issues and Dana Dunn, Provost

3:40 p.m.
Resolutions:
  Jonathan Zarecki, General Education Council Chair #FS 11052014:01 (Enc. B)
  To Revise the Student Learning Outcomes for the GNS General Education Category
  Rationale for resolution #FS 11052014:01 (Enc. C)
  Susan Shelmerdine, Academic Policies and Regulations Comm. Chair, #FS 11052014:02 (Enc. D)
  To Exempt Certain Withdrawn Courses from Academic Standing Calculations
  Rationale for resolution #FS 11052014:02 (Enc. E)
  Sue Dennison, Faculty Senator, #FS 11052014:03 (Enc. F)
  For a Comprehensive Review of the Campus Culture & Decision Making Processes
  Rationale for resolution #FS 11052014:03 (Enc. G)

4:10 p.m.
Committee Briefs
  Kathy Crowe, Faculty Assembly Delegate (Enc. H)
  Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of Faculty Government Committee
  Revisions to Post Tenure Review Process–rationale (Enc. I, J, K, L, M,)
  Stoel Burrowes, Chair Senate Elections Committee
  Deb Bell, Budget Committee, Recap of Howard Bunsis Presentation

4:30 p.m.
Presentations: David Nelson, QEP Update

4:40 p.m. Old/New Business

Adjourn

UPCOMING EVENTS:

Faculty Senate Forum: Wednesday, 11/19/2014, 3:00 p.m., Virginia Dare Room
Research Grants, On-Line Learning, New Tenure-Track Faculty Mentoring, Gen Ed Assessment and Budget
Dr. Richard DeMillo: What is College For? Tuesday, 11/4/14, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. Virginia Dare Room
Let’s Talk About it: Campus Culture, Climate, and Values Forum
November 11, 2014 from 4-6 p.m. in the EUC Cone Ballroom A &B

NEXT Faculty Senate Meeting: 12/3/14 (Agenda items due Thursday, 11/20/14 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 hrs.) By:
Communications Services for the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Contact: 336-275-8878 or Faculty Senate Office: 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks

Spoma Jovanovic, Chair of the Faculty Senate

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. with the chair’s following remarks:

Our university community has been shaken by the recent publicity surrounding the firing of three long-time employees in University Relations who were arrested on felony charges initiated by UNCG. This issue was first brought to our attention in a letter this week written by three other, former employees in the same department that was sent to the Chancellor’s Executive Staff, and then to other campus leaders, the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate. I know these letter writers, with 26 years of combined service to our university, to be courageous and ethical people who contributed much to UNCG.

Faculty and staff alike have expressed a range of views including outrage, concern, and fear. They have, as well, posed a number of questions. The Faculty Senate and Staff Senate leadership teams will take those questions into a specially called meeting about this issue with the Chancellor tomorrow morning. Those questions can generally be placed into these four, broad concerns:

1. What were the administrative and supervisory procedures used leading up to the termination and filing of criminal charges?
2. Was adequate mentoring provided to Paul Mason in how to manage personnel issues here at UNCG?
3. What role, if any, did prior employee complaints alleging a hostile work environment in the University Relations Department, play in the decision to use UNCG police resources to investigate and initiate felony charges?
4. Were there other internal measures that could have been followed to correct alleged errors or misdeeds that would have better expressed UNCG’s commitment to being an inclusive, equitable, fair, just, and safe community?

If you, as a member of the UNCG community, have questions you would like added to this list to be presented to the Chancellor, I invite you to share them with me before 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. There is paper on the tables and around the room for this purpose if you’d like to use it, or you can Email me.

The chair asked for any changes to the agenda and indicated that Rod Wyatt, who was on the agenda to speak on The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion requested earlier today to be scheduled for another meeting. Meanwhile, the order of the agenda as originally planned was changed to allow the action item to be considered first.
Resolution

Susan Shelmerdine, Chair of Academic Policies and Regulations Committee read
Resolution #FS10012014:01:

To Allow Undergraduates Who Began Enrollment Before Fall 2014 to Meet the Student Success Standards in the Catalog Under Which they Enrolled Student Success

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors’ Regulations 400.1.5[R] on “Fostering Student Success” required the creation of new Course Withdrawal, Withdrawal from the University, and Academic Good Standing policies effective Fall 2014; and,

WHEREAS, clarification from UNC General Administration confirms that campuses may permit continuing (pre-2014/2015) undergraduates to continue matriculating under the policies outlined in their catalog year instead of following the new policies; and,

WHEREAS, the faculty believes allowing students to complete their programs under the same university rules as when they started is both fair and less confusing than applying the new policies referenced above,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that, retroactive to the beginning of the fall 2014 semester, undergraduate students who enrolled at UNCG before fall 2014 will be allowed to meet the student success standards set forth in the catalog under which they enrolled.

Passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate asked if there were any changes to the previously distributed minutes for the meetings on April 2, 2014 and September 3, 2014. Hearing none, the chair affirmed that the minutes were approved.

Remarks and Q/A: Update on Salary Administration and 2015-2017 Budget Planning

Linda Brady, Chancellor

The Chancellor described the memo received from UNC General Administration on September 17, asking campuses to prepare for a 2% budget cut. UNCG’s total budget is approximately $143 million, so our portion to cut would be about $2.9 Million. We were given until September 29 to plan the cut, using the guidelines that had been in place since 2008. The administration made an effort not to compromise enrollment and retention goals, and to protect academic units, particularly the graduate assistanceships. The Provost allocated .85% to 1.35% of the cuts to the College and the Schools, less than the amount charged to non-instructional units, and less to those units where there was strong student demand for courses. Considerations are based on changes in revenue projections, but we don’t know yet that the budget cuts will occur or what they will be.

Dana Dunn, Provost

The Provost explained the small allocation of money for raises to UNCG: As I’m sure you are aware and we have reported at meetings, the state provided one thousand dollars across the board in raise funds for
SPA employees effective August, retroactive July 1. In addition they provided 40 hours bonus leave for all leave earning employees. Finally they also provided to the UNC system five-million dollars to be awarded to the category of EPA employees. That five million was distributed across all the UNC system institutions. Our share of that is $335,000. After benefits are subtracted that means there is $275,000 to allocate. In other words, funds are not sufficient for a meaningful across-the-board raise.

The Provost feels that we have pressing needs to address salary compression, inequity and merit. The time frame for deciding how to distribute these funds allocated was very short.

After discussion with the University’s Budget Sounding Board, academic deans, some unit heads and chairs, the decision was made to restrict the allocation pool to 9 or 10 month faculty and phased retirement faculty, since they were the only group of employees who received nothing from the state, no leave or across the board increase. Only Faculty employed for at least 3 years will be eligible for a raise effective November 1 retroactive to August 1. The awards will be capped at $3,000. Funds will not go far or address the many needs. The estimate is that only 10-15% of 9-10 month faculty will receive a raise from this small pool.

The Provost indicated we should prepare now to be in a state of readiness with data available to enable decisions about future raise fund distributions. To be better situated next year we need annual reviews of all employees that are up to date and thorough. One issue that emerged for faculty review is the umbrella evaluation only offering the ratings of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Some suggested expanding the option to include scaled ratings would enable more fine distinctions in determining how to distribute funds in the most effective and meaningful way.

The Provost said, UNCG is committed to addressing the issue of salary equity further when funds can be identified. There will be further discussion about annual review ratings for faculty as there is inconsistency in how they are rated in different units across campus.

**Presentations**

*Charlie Collicutt, Guilford County Board of Elections*

Collicutt detailed the ways that students can register to vote. Early voting begins October 23. There will be a student march to the courthouse downtown to vote *en masse* (Weatherspoon is not available this year), and regular voting in the EUC Maple Room November 4. October 10 is the deadline for voting registration, but voters can register same day in polling stations on early voting days. Voter ID will be required by 2016. There is a voter registration drive on campus staffed by volunteers and a voting registration desk in the lobby of Jackson Library and in the Ferguson Building lobby; moreover, voters can register anytime online at the Guilford County Board of Elections, at the public library and other locations where voter registration forms are distributed. Voting stations will be open from 6:30 AM to 7:30PM on November 4.

*Ben Ramsey & Bryan Terry* Undergraduate Studies-to University Teaching & Learning Commons & Enrollment Management

Ramsey explained the new organization chart that basically replaces what used to be Undergraduate Studies and the Registrar’s Office based in part on the model used at the Teachers’ College of Columbia University. The goal of this reorganization is to integrate research into teaching more easily; to provide resources for teaching for new faculty; retooling for mid-career faculty; and “final shot” interdisciplinary teaching for faculty members who are aging out. Faculty mentoring continues, under the direction of Susan Phillips.

*Roy Schwartzman* Report on UNC System General Education

Schwartzman reiterated the system wide survey results which showed critical thinking and written communication to be the two primary items most important to assess. The Board of Governors’
thinking is based on the K12 model of assessment. They are investigating three methods of assessment, one of which we will be bound to embrace: 1) CLA, or College Learning Assessment, already in use at five campuses, students pay $50 and are required to take test; 2) Pilot E-Portfolio, Qualitative Assessment, multidimensional, in use at four campuses including UNCG; 3) a test to be designed by ETS to be administered throughout state.

**Announcements**

*Ruth DeHoog, SECC.*

DeHoog outlined benefits and features of SECC campaign now underway with $200,000 goal. Contributions may be made using traditional paper packet, or online.

*Sean Farrell & Maggie Capone-Chrismon, Staff Senate*

Farrell spoke about shared concerns with Faculty Senate and points at which we intersect (representation on standing committees, service opportunities, and annual kickball event) and wants to work for closer relationship with faculty.

*Aaron Bryant, Student Campus Coordinator for NC Student Power*

Bryant talked about his experience with student debt and poor prospects for employment. He announced planned walkout at the end of October that is not intended to be confrontational to the administration or faculty members, whom he invited to join students in solidarity. The protest surrounds “high cost of education and fees, the overemphasis on capital, and the business model of education.”

**Committee Briefs**

*Beth Bernhardt, Scholarly Communications, 10/23/14, “Solving the Textbook Cost Crisis”*

Bernhardt announced a program to discuss the exorbitant rise of textbook costs led by national figure Nicole Allen in the Kirkland Room on October 23 from 3 until 5.

*Faculty Assembly, 2014-2015 Schedule and 9/5/14 Meeting Notes*

Jovanovic will continue to distribute news from Faculty Assembly meeting to the Senate this year.

*Deb Bell, Budget Committee, “UNCG’s Revenue and Spending”*

After a brief Budget 101 Session recap, Bell announced the upcoming talk by University of Michigan Professor Howard Bunsis on 10/24/14 in the Weatherspoon auditorium on UNCG’s Budget Analysis. His main concern will be how faculty lines are being used and how the budget should be analyzed from the faculty point of view.

**Senate Elections**

Stoel Burrowes distributed and counted ballots. All nominees elected. 1 abstention, 1 write-in candidate.

University Committee on Honorary Degrees: Omar Ali

University P&T Committee: David Ayers, Jing Deng, Joseph Starobin

Faculty Assembly Delegation Alternates: Rachel Briley, John Neufeld, Anita Tesh

**Old/New Business**

Faculty Senate leadership and Staff Senate Leadership will be meeting with the Chancellor tomorrow to discuss the personnel crisis being discussed by the News and Record. While not everything can be discussed because of confidentiality policy regarding personnel issues, the goal of the meeting is receive clarification on questions that faculty and staff have.

**Adjourn** The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS11052014:01

To Revise the Student Learning Outcomes for the GNS General Education Category.

Submitted by the General Education Council
Jonathan Zarecki, Chair

WHEREAS, the General Education Council is charged with ongoing review and maintenance of the General Education goals, assessment of student achievement of these goals, oversight of the General Education requirements, and the approval of requests for GEC markers and designations, and

WHEREAS, the review of UNCG’s General Education program and its courses is a continuous process that requires faculty guidance and participation, and

WHEREAS, regular recertification of General Education courses is necessary in order to ensure that GEC courses continue to meet the learning outcomes for which they were approved, and

WHEREAS, a committee of faculty who teach Natural Science (GNS) courses that was convened by the General Education Council has recommended a revision of the Natural Science (GNS) student learning outcomes in advance of the next scheduled recertification of Natural Science (GNS) courses, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the student learning outcomes for General Education courses carrying the Natural Science (GNS) category designation be amended to the following:

Natural Science (GNS)
1) Demonstrate an understanding of the process of scientific inquiry (i.e. the “scientific method”). (LG1, LG2)

2) Demonstrate knowledge of basic scientific principles. (LG2)

3) Analyze qualitative and quantitative empirical data. (LG1)

| Faculty Senate Action/Date: | Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals. 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. |
| Chancellor Action/Date: | |
| General Faculty Action/Date: | |
| Board of Trustees Action/Date: | |
| UNC GA or BOG Action/Date: | |
EXPLANATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION FS-11052014: 01
To Revise the Student Learning Outcomes for the GNS General Education Category.

Submitted by the General Education Council
Jonathan Zarecki, Chair

As part of the ongoing, faculty-driven review of General Education (GE) courses, each category and marker in the GE program undergoes a recertification process every four years. Recertification involves a number of steps which can be found on the General Education Council’s webpage (http://gened.uncg.edu/recertification/). The first step in the recertification process is the reevaluation of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the category or marker up for recertification. In 2014-15, the Mathematics (GMT) and Natural Sciences (GNS) categories will be recertified. Ad hoc subcommittees comprised of faculty teaching courses with these markers have been convened under the chairmanship of Richard Fabiano (MAT) for GMT and Mark Hens (BIO) for GNS. Each subcommittee has submitted revised SLOs for their respective categories, and these SLOs have been approved by the General Education Council. The Faculty Senate approved the revised SLOs for GMT at its meeting on Wednesday, September 3, 2014. The revised SLOs for GNS were approved by the General Education Council at its meeting on Wednesday, September 24, 2014, and the Council has forwarded the attached resolution for approval by the Senate.

The current SLOs for GNS were approved in Spring 2010. These SLOs are as follows:
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of scientific inquiry (i.e. the “scientific method”).
2. Demonstrate knowledge of basic principles as they apply to broad concepts (e.g. global warming).
3. Evaluate the credibility of sources of scientific information.
4. Analyze qualitative and quantitative empirical data.
5. Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of science on technology and society.

The GNS ad hoc subcommittee, which included representatives from the Departments of Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Geography, and Physics, met several times over the SP14 and FA14 semesters, and it has proposed the following set of SLOs for all GNS courses beginning with the Fall 2015 semester:
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the basic principles of scientific inquiry (i.e. the “scientific method”). (LG1, LG2)
2. Demonstrate knowledge of basic scientific principles. (LG2)
3. Analyze qualitative and quantitative empirical data. (LG 1)

The subcommittee decided, based on their experience in teaching GNS courses and in an effort to further ensure uniformity of student learning across all GNS courses, chose to eliminate the 3rd and 5th SLOs from the original list. These revised SLOs, if approved by the Senate, will be used in the recertification process of all GE courses carrying the GNS category designation. Any changes to the list of courses carrying the GNS category designation will go into effect with the 2015-16 Undergraduate Bulletin.
To Exempt Certain Withdrawn Courses from Academic Standing Calculations

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors’ Regulations 400.1.5[R] on “Fostering Student Success” required the creation of new Course Withdrawal, Withdrawal from the University and Academic Good Standing policies effective Fall 2014; and,

WHEREAS, UNC General Administration now allows the exemption of courses with a grade of WE (withdrawn with extenuating circumstances), W (withdrawn prior to Fall 2014) and WT (withdrawn Fall 2014 and after) to be exempted from hours calculated for Academic Standing,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, retroactive to the beginning of the fall 2014 semester, WE, W and WT courses are excluded from hours calculated for Academic Standing.

Faculty Senate Action/Date:  
Chancellor Action/Date:  
General Faculty Action/Date:  
Board of Trustees Action/Date:  
UNC GA or BOG Action/Date:  

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.  
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.
Fellow Senators,

Our November 5, meeting will include more issues from the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee (APR):

I Resolution on Course Withdrawals related to Academic Standing. Here is some background for the resolution. Also see the Course Withdrawal _ University Withdrawal document with full text for the Bulletin; all new language in red and policy changes highlighted in yellow.

A. Last year’s BOG policy changes required us to modify our course withdrawal system and to create designations that Banner could track for the different types of course withdrawals. That’s why we now have a variety of course grades such as WX (for courses counting towards the 16 s.h. limit), WE, W, WT, and WF.

B. This fall General Administration sent a memo to campuses in the system backtracking on what courses had to count towards the number of attempted hours that are calculated for determining Academic Standing. This memo allows us to exempt certain withdrawn courses from that calculation and thus benefits students.

C. The resolution offered by APR does two things:
   1) updates the current withdrawal policies to reflect the resolution we passed at the last Senate meeting (the first highlighted sentence) and to use current language (e.g. Students First replaces Undergraduate Studies)
   2) exempts the allowed courses from the calculation of hours for Academic Standing (highlighted sentences after the first one)

II Faculty Initiated Course Withdrawals. *For Discussion*

We have had a long-standing Class Attendance policy that has allowed faculty to withdraw from his or her course a student who has missed too many classes. With the BOG policy change that restricts students entering the university starting in Fall 2014 to 16 s.h. of withdrawals, the question arose whether we should keep this policy, and I have received a number of emails from Senators on this. The majority of opinion has been in favor of keeping the policy since this step by the instructor is sometimes the only thing that gets the student’s attention, and since a grade of F in the course is, ultimately, more damaging than a grade of W/WT.

APR discussed the pros and cons of all this and is in favor of continuing the current policy, but also of specifying procedural steps 1) to encourage more communication between the faculty member and student about the student’s situation, and 2) to clarify exactly what office will coordinate such requests. Remember that the policy allows, but does not require, a faculty member to withdraw a student. Over the last year or so, there have been about 25 such requests each semester at most.

The APR proposes the following procedures for the existing policy:
   • a faculty member must email the student before initiating a course withdrawal
   • the form for initiating the withdrawal must be emailed to the Students First Office, along with a copy of the prior email to the student
   • the Students First Office will notify the student of the withdrawal, with a copy to the faculty member
III Academic Calendar Language. *For Information*

The University Registrar’s Office publishes an Academic Calendar which used to use language now made inaccurate by the 16 s.h. limit for course withdrawals. That language has been edited in two places to be more accurate:

1) August 22, Friday

old language: Last day to drop course for tuition and fees refund

new language: Last day to withdraw from a course for tuition and fees refund; course withdrawal policy in effect.

2) October 10, Friday

old language: Last day to drop course without academic penalty.

new language: Last day to withdraw from a course without incurring a WF grade (withdraw failing)

Please let me know if you have any questions in advance of the Senate meeting.

Many thanks,
Susan Shelmerdine
shelmerd@uncg.edu

******************************************************************************

Withdrawal Policy

The following requirements and procedures for maintaining Academic Good Standing became effective April 29, 2013 for newly-admitted degree-seeking undergraduate (freshman and transfer students) in the Fall 2014 term and after in compliance with UNC Policy 400.1.1[R].

Withdrawing from Current Term Courses

16-semester-hour limit for course withdrawals

Beginning Fall 2014, all degree-seeking undergraduate students entering the University during or after the 2014-2015 academic year will be limited to withdrawing from a maximum of 16 semester credit hours during their undergraduate career. This limitation does not include course withdrawals completed within the course adjustment period (as identified on the Academic Calendar) that do not count as attempted hours and are not limited to 16 semester credit hours. Students who have not exceeded their 16-semester-hour limit may withdraw from a course or courses after the course adjustment period and within the first eight weeks of the term without incurring a WF grade (Withdrawn Failing). Withdrawal from courses within the 16-semester-hour limit will be indicated on a transcript with a grade of WX.

Course withdrawals after eight weeks or in excess of 16 semester credit hours will incur a WF grade (Withdrawn Failing).

Courses of less than one semester’s duration, including Summer School courses, shall have shorter withdrawal deadlines (proportional to the course adjustment and eight-week deadline for the regular semester). All withdrawal deadlines are published on the University Registrar’s Office Web site.
All courses with WX grades count as Academic Standing attempted hours and in tuition surcharge calculations, and are subject to financial aid and Satisfactory Academic Progress rules and calculations.

**Withdrawing from a course with extenuating circumstances**

Undergraduate students with appropriate cause, as determined by medical, psychological, or unanticipated personal life events, or administrative reasons, may petition for an exemption from the 16-semester-hour limit and the eight-week deadline by initiating a Course Withdrawal Request through the Students First Office. The Students First Office shall be responsible for authorizing Course Withdrawal Requests in consultation with the instructor of every course, and with other departments or agencies as needed. If a Course Withdrawal Request is authorized, all requested courses will be indicated on a transcript with a grade of WE (Withdrawn with Exception).

If a student withdraws from all courses, the student is considered officially withdrawn from the university. See section on Withdrawal from the University.

**Withdrawing from courses retroactively**

Undergraduate students shall be given one year following the term in which a course or courses were taken to submit a Course Withdrawal Request with the Students First Office. Students who seek to withdraw from a course or courses retroactively must meet the conditions under Withdrawing from Current Term Courses and the Students First Office must authorize the request. Students are strongly encouraged to contact the Students First Office for assistance before officially submitting a Course Withdrawal Request. If a Course Withdrawal Request is authorized, all requested courses will be indicated on a transcript with a grade of W (Withdrawn) for classes taken prior to Fall 2014, and a grade of WE (Withdrawn Exception) for courses taken in Fall 2014 and thereafter. Students who have graduated may not withdraw from courses retroactively.

Neither the course withdrawal (WX) nor the course withdrawal with an exception (WE) can be replaced under the university’s Grade Replacement Policy or forgiven as part of the Academic Renewal Policy.

**Withdrawal from the University**

Undergraduate students who find that they must withdraw from the university can do so by withdrawing from all courses through UNCGenie. Undergraduates who withdraw from all courses are considered to be withdrawn from the university and must seek reactivation or readmission through Undergraduate Admissions to return to school in subsequent terms.

Students withdrawing from the university within the first eight weeks of the term will be indicated on the transcript with a grade of W (prior to Fall 2014) or WT (Fall 2014 and after). All courses with W or WT grades are excluded from Academic Standing attempted hours, but are subject to financial aid and Satisfactory Academic Progress rules and calculations; they do not count in GPA calculation or tuition surcharge calculations.

If a student withdraws from the university after the eight-week deadline, WF grades will be recorded. WF grades are calculated in the student’s GPA as F (failing) grades.
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
Faculty Senate  

Resolution #FS 11052014:03  

For a Comprehensive Review of the Campus Culture & Decision Making Processes  
Submitted by Susan Dennison, Faculty Senator  

WHEREAS, the faculty of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro acknowledges the principle of shared-governance, and recognizes the responsibility of the faculty in advising the Chancellor with respect to questions of academic policy, institutional governance, and any other matters pertaining to the institution that are of interest and concern to the faculty (The Code of the Board of Governors of University of North Carolina, Section 502 D (2)), and  

WHEREAS, the recent role of UNCG administration as complainant in felony charges against former employees has illuminated the erosion of said shared governance, of trust in those offices who are expected to facilitate ethical faculty work conditions, and of clarity in governance and policy documents intended to facilitate the work of faculty, and  

WHEREAS, a series of projects lead by Chancellor Brady and her administrative team were carried out in ways that circumvented and/or limited faculty involvement, thus, working against the historical and collegial agreements reflecting shared governance at UNCG, and  

WHEREAS, a 2014 survey of faculty morale indicated broad-scale perceptions of serious morale issues at UNCG, and  

WHEREAS, UNCG faculty workloads have increased while pay has remained stagnant and the academic mission has been severely challenged by broader budget issues, and by UNCG budget response of cut and manage, rather than strategize and reorganize, and  

WHEREAS, UNCG faculty continue to be committed to providing socially relevant, cutting-edge, creative educational experiences for the citizens of North Carolina and beyond, therefore  

BE IT RESOLVED, that the current administration will join the faculty in recalibrating the ethical tenor of this UNCG through the following actions:  

Repair Faculty Support Systems on Campus  
1) Conduct an audit of Human Resources and remediate staff and practices as needed;  
2) Create an office for confidential, faculty support when experiencing inadequate working conditions.  

Require Shared Governance in all Academic Actions  
3) Publish an administrative procedure for advancing academic initiatives that requires faculty involvement at every stage;  
4) Regularly conduct policy review forums for faculty;  
5) Add ethics/campus culture section to the Strategic Plan, with measurable outcomes that feature desired faculty involvement in shared governance.  

Require Faculty involvement in the Chancellor Search  
6) Conduct the search of UNCG’s next chancellor as an open search;  
7) Assign a faculty member as co-chair of the Chancellor search committee;  
8) Assign two or more faculty as members of the Chancellor search committee.  

| Faculty Senate Action/Date: | Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals. 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. |
WHEREAS, the faculty of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro acknowledges the principle of shared-governance, and recognizes the responsibility of the faculty in advising the Chancellor with respect to questions of academic policy, institutional governance, and any other matters pertaining to the institution that are of interest and concern to the faculty (The Code of the Board of Governors of University of North Carolina, Section 502 D(2)), and

WHEREAS, the recent role of UNCG administration as complainant in felony charges against former employees has illuminated the erosion of said shared governance, of trust in those offices who are expected to facilitate ethical faculty work conditions, and of clarity in governance and policy documents intended to facilitate the work of faculty, and

WHEREAS, a series of projects lead by Chancellor Brady and her administrative team were carried out in ways that circumvented and/or limited faculty involvement, thus, working against the historical and collegial agreements reflecting shared governance at UNCG, and

WHEREAS, a 2014 survey of faculty morale indicated broad-scale perceptions of serious morale issues at UNCG, and

WHEREAS, UNCG faculty workloads have increased while pay has remained stagnant and the academic mission has been severely challenged by broader budget issues, and by UNCG budget response of cut and manage, rather than strategize and reorganize, and

WHEREAS, UNCG faculty continue to be committed to providing socially relevant, cutting-edge, creative educational experiences for the citizens of North Carolina and beyond, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the current administration will join the faculty in recalibrating the ethical tenor of this UNCG through the following actions:

Repair Faculty Support Systems on Campus
   1) Conduct an audit of Human Resources and remediate staff and practices as needed;
   2) Create an office for confidential, faculty support when experiencing inadequate working conditions.

Require Shared Governance in all Academic Actions
   3) Publish an administrative procedure for advancing academic initiatives that requires faculty involvement at every stage;
   4) Regularly conduct policy review forums for faculty;
   5) Add ethics/campus culture section to the Strategic Plan, with measurable outcomes that feature desired faculty involvement in shared governance.

Require Faculty involvement in the Chancellor Search
   6) Conduct the search of UNCG’s next chancellor as an open search;
   7) Assign a faculty member as co-chair of the Chancellor search committee;
   8) Assign two or more faculty as members of the Chancellor search committee.

| Faculty Senate Action/Date: | Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals. 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. |
EXPLANATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION FS - 11052014:03

For a Comprehensive Review of the Campus Culture & Decision Making Processes
Submitted by Susan Dennison, Faculty Senator

Reflecting stated formal support for shared governance, and recognizing a recent legacy of threats and actual disregard for this agreed upon form of governance, this resolution calls for specific actions to restore the ethical culture and collaborative decision-making that have been central to UNCG’s execution of its educational mission.

Among the moments of disregard for shared governance and faculty consultation were the following initiatives:

1) Branding of UNCG through men’s basketball at the coliseum;
2) Removal of the wrestling program from the Athletic Department offerings;
3) Renovation of the dorms and quad;
4) Realignment of academic units;
5) Academic program review;
6) Expansion into the Glenwood neighborhood; and
7) The New Campus Recreation facility

It is well within governance structures to expect UNCG administration to join faculty in reasserting a commitment to shared governance as a means to restore an ethical, transparent, and humane university culture. It is also well within governance structures to require a more formal facilitation of this shared governance in all campus decision-making that affects our academic mission.
UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting
October 3, 2014

Attending from UNCG:
Anita Tesh (School of Nursing)
Rachel Briley (School of Music, Theatre and Dance)
Kathy Crowe (University Libraries)

President Ross update

- UNC is in compliance w/ ACA
- He is NOT retiring!
- Ross is not in favor of giving public money to Western Governors University. UNC has strong online programs.
- UNC asked to submit budget that reflects net 2% cut.
- He wants BOG to submit a proposal for 2% expansion
- BOG is reviewing Centers and Institutes. They bring in over 5 million in funds.
- There is a UNC task force on campus security. I produced a report to Bog with recommendations w price tag. UNC needs to be compliant w federal law which requires staff and funds.
- Pilot projects on some campuses on minimum admission requirements
- Current practices may not predict success
- Some research indicates little correlation between SAT and success. GPA is better predictor. Will propose pilot project on 3 campuses with sliding scale
- Discussing some tuition break offering to border states in close geographic range.
- Financial aid is below what we need by millions
- We will need tuition increases. BOG is resistant but Ross making a case. Need it for faculty salaries.
- Question: Faculty salaries next year. He won’t seek certain % but rather will provide info on past raises and cost of living increases.

Academic Affairs update

Warwick Arden Interim VP Academic Affairs

- Higher Education budget issues in NC
- NC supports HE pretty well but there have changes recently as we know.
• National trend toward public support for has been going down for last 30 years. What’s happening in NC emblematic of national trends?
• How do we continue to direct resources to core academic mission? Are we spending resources on most important activities?
• Don't long for good old days; they probably won't happen.
• Hope NC doesn't follow other states but we will have more challenges.
• How we budget between tuition and appropriation in NC is an issue.
• Most states have base of state funds and tuition is added on to it rather than a supplement.
• Don't want high tuition but need more flexibility with how to use tuition dollars.
• Other states don't have caps on out of state students which yields more revenue.
• Need to be more aggressive on grants and development.
• As economies recover concerned about questioning value of higher education. Need to be actively involved.
• As states decrease funding they increase micro management. How can we get out from under the thumb? Those that have more flexibility can be more independent. Tuition retained at institutions in other states.

Executive Session

Stephen Leonard, Chair of FA

• Searching for new Senior VP for academic affairs. Hope to fill by January 2015
• Post tenure review: BOG is requiring plan for next 5 years
• Freeze and cap in place for need-based financial aid. Interest in other funding sources.
• BOG teaching awards: how to make them more significant? Issue on discussion board
• BOG concerned about minimum admissions requirements
• Athletics reporting coming up in October
• Faculty workload reports due in December. If there are workload changes must be documented. Annual reviews are crucial. There will be a report on how campuses will proceed from the campus Provosts Office. Faculty should be part of this.
• Concern about student advising in BOG
• BOG makes many requests to campuses creating much work. Provost's concerned about this.
• Leslie Boney (Vice President for International, Community, and Economic Engagement at GA) will make presentation to BOG re: international experiences & international students and their importance (not sure when)
Choosing Institutional Leaders panel

- Characteristics: character, ethics, honesty, energy, interpersonal skills, political savvy, transparency,
- academic or professional experience
- Institutional mission and culture important
- No one ideal. Must have faculty trust and believe in faculty governance
- Learner centered rather than student centered
- Does candidate value what we do?
- How do we find good administrators? Are search firms the best way? When to use search firms?
- When should faculty be involved? Open search vs. closed. GA says searches should be closed but most faculty think they should be open. Process influences candidate; if it hasn't been an open search they can come in with a strike against them.
- Personal vetting is crucial

Panel on Faculty Administrators

- Distrust between faculty and administrators.
- Why did we get into higher education?
- Why should faculty become administrators?
- Why is there turnover in administrators? Make decision to be administrator and few opportunities at own campus
- Mindset that someone from outside will be better but they need to learn culture.
- Model of former faculty not happening any more.
- Many don't want to give up teaching and research
- Some junior faculty don't want these roles

Other Announcements

ETS Gen Ed assessment will be piloted 15-15. Spearheaded by GA. Roy Schwartzman has kept Senate apprised.

There will be a survey of FA membership to determine current practices of shared governance on UNC campuses.

Based on results there will be a FA resolution on shared governance with recommendations on best practices.
THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Revisions to the Post Tenure Review Process-Rationale (Enc. J)
A & PTR Policy GA approved 5-21-12-draft revision.doc (Enc. K)
Post-Tenure Review Report Form 2011-23-09-draft revision (Enc. L)
Annual Review Report Form 2011-23-09-draft revision (Enc. M)

Presented by Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee at the November 5, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting
Date: October 21, 2014
To: Faculty Senate
From: Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair
RE: Required changes to UNCG’s Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty

This past June, GA revised its policy on Post-Tenure Review (The Policy Manual 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G]), and now requires us to revise our PTR policies. The appended UNCG Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty shows the changes that the Faculty Government Committee thinks are needed to meet the new requirements. The remainder of this document explains the changes, and explains what resources are available on the Faculty Senate Blackboard site to support out recommendations.

The Post-Tenure Review Working Group Recommendations (GA PTR Working Group Report.doc) summarizes the recommendations of the working group and provides a helpful context in which to understand the changes to The Policy Manual. It is important to remember that we are not bound by the recommendations in this report. We can, however, use this report to clarify the meaning of some of the mandated changes. In this regard, I would like to draw your attention to the text on page two of the report that reads: “To better align annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, the working group recommends that the post-tenure review be based on a set of directional goals proposed by the faculty member at the beginning of the review cycle. These directional goals should act as a guide for the professional growth of the faculty member over the coming five-year period.” This text is important, because it gives a context for the mandated changes expressed in Item 6, on page 2 of The Policy Manual, section 400.3.3.1[G]. This section reads: “At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member shall develop with his/her department chair a five-year goal or plan. This plan can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. This plan should indicate milestones aligned with annual performance evaluations.”

The Faculty Government Committee recommends that this text be interpreted in the following way based on the recommendations in the working group report: At the beginning of each five-year cycle a faculty member will prepare a set of goals that will guide his or her work for the next five years. These goals are just that, goals that the faculty member will aim to accomplish. They are not a work plan, but goals that will guide the development of a faculty member’s annual work plans. As clearly stated in 400.3.3.1[G], these goals may be revised annually. Using these five-year goals as a guide, at the beginning of each year each faculty member will prepare an annual work plan that is aligned with the goals. The annual plan forms the basis for the faculty member’s work during that year, and for the annual performance evaluation that takes place at the end of the year. The FGC does not find any basis in these documents for requiring faculty to prepare a detailed work plan that covers a full five years. This is the most substantial change required by the new changes, and the one we wanted to draw your attention to most clearly.

An annotated list of other required changes can be found in the memo from Warwick Arden (GA July PTR Policy Update Memo.pdf), which is posted on the Blackboard site. Also posted on Blackboard are the updated versions of 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G] with highlighting to indicate the sections that are most relevant to the proposed revisions.

A final change to the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty should be mentioned. Both 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G] use the word Chair to designate the administrative leader of a department. We therefore propose the use of the word Chair in the revised Policy. Footnote two makes it clear that this term also refers to Department Heads at UNCG.

In addition to the new draft policy, you will also find attached suggested changes to the Annual Review Report Form, and the Post-Tenure Review Report Form. These forms are maintained in the Provost office and are the means by which the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty is implemented. They are included here for your information.
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” (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]):
   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. The Annual Review components of this policy 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).

E. Annual reviews are related to promotion and tenure reviews because reviews for promotion and tenure must reflect the feedback that the candidate has received in his or her annual reviews (UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations), Sections 2.D.ii. and 4.B.i.d., see also Section III.G, below).

F. Post-Tenure Reviews are required of all tenured faculty members.
G. Post-Tenure Reviews are separate from reviews for faculty promotion and/or tenure (except as specified in Section IV.B. of this policy).

II. POLICIES GOVERNING BOTH ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. The primary locus of both 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 headchair 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 The Regulations Section 2.D.ii., and Section IV C, below). If peer review involves a faculty committee, the department headchair shall not be a member of the committee. Disagreements between recommendations by the department headchair 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, and will be recorded in Administrative Guidelines for Appointment and Review of Department Chairs.

C. 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.

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, and is shared with the next higher administrative level.

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 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. 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/meets expectations category, into the evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. The unsatisfactory/does not meet expectations category of evaluation may not be subdivided.

---

1 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.

2 For the purposes of this Policy, department chairs/heads and academic program directors are considered equivalent to department headchairs.

3 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.

4 Units may add to the Form, but may not remove or change aspects of the existing Form provided by the Provost’s Office.

5 Ibid
C. In addition to the summary information provided on the Annual Review Report Form, it is incumbent on each department head chair 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.).

D. 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 include a written self-evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments during the year.

E. Annual feedback from the department head chair to tenured or tenure track faculty members will include a completed UNCG Annual Review Report Form (as modified 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. 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. The Annual Review Report Form, as modified 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 summarizes the annual reports reviews of a tenured faculty member’s work, and includes an summary additional, summative evaluation of all aspects of his or her professional performance relative to the mission of the department, unit and institution.

B. Written feedback to the faculty member should include recognition of performance that exceeds expectations.10

C. Post-Tenure Review shall take place no less frequently than every five years following the conferral of tenure. 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.11

B.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 chair. These goals may be modified annually, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal

---

6 For the purpose of this section, Associate Professors and Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors.
7 Units may add to the Form, but may not remove or change aspects of the existing Form provided by the Provost’s Office.
8 Departments that conduct separate merit raise evaluations may wish to consider additional information, such as criteria for ranking candidates, when awarding merit pay increases.
9 See footnote #7 above.
10 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.1[f][G], item 11.
11 UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.1[f][G], item 2.
circumstances. These goals are used to prepare the work plans\textsuperscript{12} that form the basis for the annual performance evaluations.\textsuperscript{13}

E-E. Peers must be involved in the Post-Tenure Review process.\textsuperscript{14} 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,\textsuperscript{15} and recorded in its instrument of governance. The faculty member being reviewed may not select members of the peer review committee.\textsuperscript{16}

D-E. 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.

E-G. 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\textsuperscript{17}, 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 400.3.1[G], or in this document.

H. In modifying the Post-Tenure Review Report Form, units may, but need not, divide the satisfactory “meets expectations” category of evaluation into additional evaluative subcategories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. The unsatisfactory. Neither the category “exceeds expectations,” nor the category “does not meet expectations” of evaluation may not be subdivided.

F-I. UNCG shall provide training for all peer-evaluators, including department 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 Post-Tenure Review report to the General Administration.\textsuperscript{18}

G-J. 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.K. Post-Tenure Reviews may reward performance by means of special, non-monetary, recognition such as:

1. Nomination for awards
2. Research leaves
3. Revisions of work load

H-L. 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\textsuperscript{4} shall prepare and sign a statement declaring that the faculty member has received an unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review that does not meet expectations. 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. The statement must document the reasons why the faculty member has been given an

\textsuperscript{12} Work plans are prepared annually, and cover one year’s work.
\textsuperscript{13} UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.1(G), item 6.
\textsuperscript{14} UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.1(G), item 56.
\textsuperscript{15} ibid
\textsuperscript{16} ibid
\textsuperscript{17} See footnote #7 above.
\textsuperscript{18} UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.1(G), item 9.
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 member’s last five annual reviews, and the materials submitted as part of their post-tenure review, and the faculty members’ response to the Post-Tenure review shall be delivered to the faculty member, and the dean.

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 time line 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 headchair, 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 faculty member 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.

---

19Associate 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 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.
POST-TENURE REPORT FORM

See the text of the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty for information on how this form may be modified by the units.

I. INFORMATION ON THE FACULTY MEMBER UNDER REVIEW

Name ___________________________________ Date __________________

Department ______________________ Review Period ____________

Faculty Member's Status _________ (Choose response from below)

T= Tenured  F= Other Full Time
N= Non Tenured, Tenure-Track  P= Part Time

II. TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

A. Head’s Chair’s Summary Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Exceeds Expectations --- Meets Expectations --- Does not Meet Expectations

Satisfactory ———— Unsatisfactory

B. Head’s Chair’s Written Evaluation

III. TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY MEMBERS CHARGED WITH POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Summary Peer Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Peers’ Overall Rating

Exceeds Expectations --- Meets Expectations --- Does not Meet Expectations

Satisfactory ———— Unsatisfactory

B. Peers’ Written Evaluation

* For the purposes of this form, department chairs and academic program directors are considered equivalent to department heads.
IV. TO BE COMPLETED BY DEAN

A. Dean’s Summary Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Dean’s Overall Rating

Exceeds Expectations --- Meets Expectations --- Does not Meet Expectations

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

B. Dean’s Written Evaluation

V. NAMES and SIGNATURES OF EVALUATORS

Department Head-Chair

Faculty Members Charged with Peer Review

Dean
ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT FORM*  
See the text of the Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty for information on how this  
form may be modified by the units.

I. INFORMATION ON THE FACULTY MEMBER UNDER REVIEW

Name ____________________________ Date ________________

Department _______________________ Review Period ____________

Faculty Member's Status ____________ (Choose response from below)

T= Tenured           F= Other Full Time  
N= Non Tenured, Tenure-Track     P= Part Time

II. TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DEPARTMENT HEAD†

A. Head’s Summary Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Head’s Overall Ranking

| Meets Expectations | Satisfactory | Does not Meet Expectations | Unsatisfactory |

III. TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY MEMBERS CHARGED WITH PEER REVIEW

B. Peer’s Summary Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Peers’ Overall Rating

| Meets Expectations | Satisfactory | Does not Meet Expectations | Unsatisfactory |

IV. TO BE COMPLETED BY DEAN

C. Dean’s Summary Evaluation (please circle one response below)

Dean’s Overall Rating

| Meets Expectations | Satisfactory | Does not Meet Expectations | Unsatisfactory |

* Completed versions of this form must be included in all promotion and tenure dossiers, for all years under consideration.  
† For the purposes of this form, department chairs and academic program directors are considered equivalent to department heads.
V. NAMES and SIGNATURES OF EVALUATORS

Department Head

Faculty Members Charged with Peer Review

Dean