## Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

**Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House**

**Wednesday, Sep 5, 2012**

**3:00 – 5:00 PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>ENCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3:00  | Welcome: *John Lepri, Chair of the Faculty Senate*  
Approval of Minutes: April 18, 2012 Meeting  
Review of Agenda  
Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty Senate | Yes | A |
| 3:10  | Remarks: *Chancellor Linda P. Brady* | No | |
| 3:20  | Remarks: *Provost David Perrin* | No | |
| 3:30  | Faculty Senate Annual Report of Action Items Passed by Senate, 2011-2012  
*Josh Hoffman, Chair of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate*  
Summary of Annual Committee Reports, 2011-2012  
*Beth Bernhardt, Secretary of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate* | No | B |
| 3:40  | Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Report of 2011-2012 Actions  
*Karen ‘Pea’ Poole, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee* | No | D |
| 3:50  | Graduate Studies Committee: Report of 2011-2012 Actions  
*Ken Snowden, Committee Chair 2011-12* | No | E |
| 4:00  | Progress on SACS Reaffirmation  
*Jodi Pettazzoni, Director, Office of Assessment & Accreditation* | No | |
| 4:20  | Cultivating and Evaluating the Mosaic of Faculty Talents and Contributions in P&T  
*Emily Janke, Special Assistant, Institute for Community & Economic Engagement* | No | F |
| 4:30  | Discussion | | |

---

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Refreshments will be available from 2:30-3:00 pm. Please come early to socialize if your schedule permits. NOTE: Senators sit at the table according to their name cards; non-voting members and gallery sit in the chairs around the perimeter of the room.*

**Faculty Convocation & General Faculty Meeting**

**Wednesday, September 19, 2012, Virginia Dare Room**

**Next Senate Session will be on Wednesday, October 3, 2012**

*(Agenda Items Due: 5pm on Wednesday, September 19, 2012)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</th>
<th>Discussion/Motion</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome: Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</td>
<td>The Senate Chair opened the meeting at 3:08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/Approve Minutes of April 4, 2012: Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</td>
<td>Approval of the minutes from April 4, 2012</td>
<td>Minutes approved unanimously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks: Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</td>
<td>The Senate Chair made the following announcements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual year-end Committee reports are coming due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The election for Senate Leadership has to be postponed due to failure to nominate a chair-elect; there will be an electronic election as soon as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election: Senate Chair-Elect and Senate Secretary for 2012-13: Senate Elections Committee, Rich Ehrhardt, Chair</td>
<td>Did not occur due to failure to receive nominations for a Faculty-Senate Chair-Elect. An electronic election shall take place in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution #FS041812-01, To Clarify Section 3.E.iii.b Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor: Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</td>
<td>Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-01: To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to Clarify Section 3.E.iii.b Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor.</td>
<td>Resolution approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 3.E.iii.b was revised as follows (new language appears in bold print):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.E.iii.b. <strong>If review is requested by the candidate, the department may not delay the beginning of formal review for promotion beyond August 1 of the seventh year following conferral of tenure.</strong> The candidate shall write to the department head requesting review for promotion no later than the preceding March 1, and the department shall follow the procedures described in section 4. The department head shall acknowledge the candidate’s request in writing, with a copy to the dean and provost. This is not a mandatory review in that a candidate may choose not to request review. A decision not to request review does not preclude a candidate from choosing to be reviewed in any subsequent year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote: Unanimous in favor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assembling (or Assembled) refers to the actual physical presence of the tenured faculty. However, if there are extenuating circumstances that prevent a particular tenured faculty member from being physically present, then that faculty member may participate by real-time electronic means, such as speaker phone or video conference, with prior approval of the Dean. Such use of electronic means for participation during the deliberation process does not modify any other requirements for the vote.

| Resolution #FS041812-02, To Clarify the Conditions Under Which a Candidate for Promotion to Professor May Next Request Review After an Unsuccessful Bid: Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair | Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-02: To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to Clarify the Conditions Under Which a Candidate for Promotion to Professor May Next Request Review After an Unsuccessful Bid. Susan Schelmerdine asked for an amendment in wording to add “or withdraw” to the resolution at the end of sentence two. The requested amendment was unanimously approved. Section 3.E.iii.c. was revised and amended as follows (new language appears in bold print): 3.E.iii.c. If a review of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is unsuccessful, or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after an negative recommendation at the unit or university levels, the candidate may next request a review during the third year of service following notice of their unsuccessful bid, by writing to his or her department head as described in 3.E.iii.b. The review will begin no later than August 1st of the following year (the fourth year following notice of his or her unsuccessful bid or withdrawal). This is not a mandatory review in that a candidate may choose not to request review. A decision not to request review does not preclude a candidate from choosing to be reviewed in any subsequent year. The department may, of course, recommend the candidate for promotion earlier, as specified in 3.E.iii.a. Vote: Unanimous in favor |
| Resolution #FS041812-03, To Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined: Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair | Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-03: To Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined. An amendment was requested and approved to insert the word “assembled” and footnote it accordingly. Section 4.B.i.h, Right of faculty members to express dissenting opinions was revised and amended as follows (new language appears in bold print, language to be removed appears in strikeout): In cases where the majority vote recommended action of the department is not supported by a unanimous vote of the faculty senior to the candidate, the assembled faculty member(s) who did not vote in accordance with the majority recommended action may, at their individual discretion, include a single signed statement in the candidate’s portfolio explaining their vote, and the reasons why they feel that the recommended action should not be upheld. Resolution approved |

---

1 “Assembling (or Assembled)” refers to the actual physical presence of the tenured faculty. However, if there are extenuating circumstances that prevent a particular tenured faculty member from being physically present, then that faculty member may participate by real-time electronic means, such as speaker phone or video conference, with prior approval of the Dean. Such use of electronic means for participation during the deliberation process does not modify any other requirements for the vote.
| Resolution #FS041812-04, To Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees: Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair | Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-04: To Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees. The clarification consisted of a new footnote under Section 4.B.ii.a. as follows: 

**BE IT RESOLVED,** that a new footnote (footnote 12) whose text is reproduced below, be added to Section 4.B.ii.a, at the end of the phrase “counting the votes” and that all subsequent footnotes be renumbered in accordance with this change (see page 12 of The Regulations)

*New footnote 12*
If the unit committee consists of both Associate Professors and Professors, the units may (but need not), at their discretion, restrict the unit committee members who can vote on the promotion of Associate Professors to Professor, to the Professors who serve on the unit committee. Assistant Professors are not permitted to serve on unit promotion and tenure committees.

Vote: Unanimous in Favor |
| Resolution #FS041812-05, To Remove the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religions Perspectives (GPR) category designation from the General Education Program Learning Goal: General Education Council, Mark Hens, Chair | Mark Hens presented Resolution #FS041812-5: To Remove the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religions Perspectives (GPR) category designation from the General Education Program Learning Goal.

**BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religious Perspectives (GPR) category designation be removed from the list of general education program category designations linked to LG4.

Vote: Unanimous in Favor |
| Resolution #FS041812-06, To Create a Senate Committee on Online Learning: Faculty Senate, Josh Hoffman, Chair | Josh Hoffman presented the Resolution #FS041812-6: To Create a Senate Committee on Online Learning.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to amend the resolution to add the word “assessment” in the first sentence after “delivery.”

Another Amendment to the resolution was moved, seconded and approved to strike out the line “Faculty members shall either have taught
or be teaching an online learning course”

The resulting resolution is worded as follows (inserted language appears in **bold print**; eliminated language appears in strike out):

**Senate Online Learning Committee**

*Charge:* The Faculty Senate Online Learning Committee shall study issues pertaining to the development, delivery, **assessment** and enhancement of online learning courses and programs at UNCG. It shall also facilitate the development, delivery and taking of online learning courses and programs, and work to enhance the quality of distance learning courses.

*Membership:* One (1) faculty member elected by each academic unit, except for the JSNN, at their request, and one (1) Senator, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate. **Faculty members shall either have taught or be teaching a online learning course.** Ex officio, non-voting members: a representative from each of the following areas: the Division of Continual Learning, the Office of the Registrar, Admissions, Business Affairs, the Deans Council, the Staff Senate, the Student Government Association, the Faculty Teaching Learning Commons, and Information Technology Services.

Vote: Unanimous in Favor

John Lepri led a discussion on what the senate’s roll in Academic Program Review should be in the future. The Senate discussed the following points.

1. Academic Program Review (APR) should be focused on the intellectual value and quality of the academic experience and it should be directed by the Faculty.
2. The Faculty Senate, given its responsibility and obligation to guide and to assure the intellectual quality of the University experience, should be authorized to develop the leadership and structure needed for any future APR.
3. To increase the efficiency of the faculty and the administration, APR should be consolidated with existing evaluation mechanisms, including annual reviews and periodic departmental reviews. APR should be an ongoing process, with periodic all-inclusive reviews, occurring at an interval of every 7 to 10 years, or as needed, in the event of compelling changes in University direction or budgetary considerations.
4. APR should include the perspectives of external reviewers.
5. The results of APR, along with recommendations for changes, if needed, should be communicated to the Deans for further...
discussion with the Provost and Chancellor, these members of the administration will have primary responsibility to factor in any additional data needed to inform actions.

6. Ample opportunities for dialogue should precede any future APR and be carried forward throughout the process to invite all faculty and other university employees into the planning, review, and implementation phases.

| Adjournment: Senate Chair Josh Hoffman | Motion to adjourn the meeting: Ben Ramsey Second to the motion: Patty Sink Vote: Unanimous approval | Motion to Adjourn approved by Unanimous vote |

Respectfully submitted,

Beth R Bernhardt
Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2011-2012
This report consists of a list and short description of the main resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate during the academic year, 2011-2012.

The Senate Chair appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review to advise the Senate on its role in the Academic Program Review process. This committee consisted of a number of past Senate chairs, together with the current Chair-Elect.

Two important issues that the Senate dealt this academic year were (I) the ongoing Academic Program Review, and (II) the need for changes to the Constitution of the Faculty and the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate in order to (IIa) make those documents compatible with the recent restructuring, and (IIb) bring the JSNN into faculty government.

As required by the Constitution of the Faculty, the Senate carried out a census of the Academic Units following the recent restructuring, in order to allocate Senate seats to the Units. Later action by the Senate created a new seat for the JSNN, to be occupied for the first time in July of 2012. As the JSNN increases in numbers of UNCG faculty, the number of Senate seats it is allotted would eventually increase as well.

SEPTEMBER 2011 SENATE MEETING

The Senate made changes to the composition of the Student Learning Enhancement Committee and to the UNCG delegation to the UNC Faculty Assembly. It also slightly modified the UNCG Academic Probation Policy.

OCTOBER 2011 SENATE MEETING

The Senate revised the Post-Tenure Review Policy, and passed a resolution on Academic Program Review. The latter was not approved by the Chancellor, but later became moot.

These revisions to the Post-Tenure Review Policy were later approved by the General Faculty, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees.

NOVEMBER 2011 SENATE MEETING

The Senate approved the institution of a “NR” or “Not Reported” grade for instances when a faculty member does not submit a grade by the end of the grading period. The Senate passed a resolution calling for the modification of the Academic Program Review process, affecting the charge of the University Committee on Academic Program Review. The Chancellor did not approve this resolution, but the substance of the resolution later became moot, when the Senate and the Chancellor agreed to a change to the charge of the University Academic Program Review Committee.
DECEMBER 2011 SENATE MEETING

The Senate rejected a resolution to establish a “Maymester” between the end of the regular academic year and the beginning of the first summer session. The Senate concluded that the proposed Maymester was too brief a time during which to offer quality courses. The Senate considered a Resolution to Establish Parameters for Courses Carrying General Education Designations. This resolution was part of an overhaul of the General Education curriculum at UNCG. The Senate approved a Resolution to Modify the Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee. The Senate approved a Position Statement on Academic Program Review. The Chancellor did not approve this resolution, but the substance of it later became moot, when the Senate and the Chancellor agreed to a change to the charge of the University Academic Program Review Committee.

FEBRUARY 2012 SENATE MEETING

The Senate passed a Resolution to Revise the UNCG Vision and Mission Statement, a Resolution to Establish Parameters for General Education Courses, and a Resolution to Eliminate Reporting of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Class Performances (the function of which was replaced by the use of the new Starfish program). It also passed a Resolution to Modify Priority Registration Window Assignments (for UNCG-in-3 students), and tabled a Resolution to Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs (when elimination of those programs would result in the termination of tenured or tenure-track faculty).

MARCH 2012 SENATE MEETING

The Senate passed a version of the previously tabled Resolution to Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs. The Chancellor did not approve this resolution, but it later became moot when the Academic Program Review process did not result in the termination of any tenured or tenure-track faculty. The Senate also passed a Resolution to Revise the Constitution of the Faculty. This resolution incorporated the changes needed to accommodate the recent restructuring of the former HHP and HES into the new HHS, and those needed to bring the new unit, the JSNN, into faculty government. The Senate considered, but rejected, a Resolution to Exclude Departmental Dissenting Opinions as a Separate Section of a Candidate’s Promotion and/or Tenure Dossier. This resolution would have revised the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines at UNCG. The Senate passed a Resolution to Clarify Terminology for Second Baccalaureate Applications, and a Resolution to Close Grading at the End of the Term Based on the Academic Calendar.

APRIL 2012 SENATE MEETINGS (2)

The Senate held two April meetings. At these meetings, the Senate passed a Resolution to Revise the Committee Structure of the By-Laws of the Senate. This revision was necessary to make the By-Laws compatible with the newly revised Constitution of the Faculty. In other words, the recent restructuring and bringing the JSNN into faculty government required that the Committee Structure of the By-Laws be modified. The lists
of units had to be revised, and committee membership had to be revised. The Senate also passed a Resolution to Create a Senate Distance-Learning Committee. This committee is charged with considering issues related to the quality, delivery, accessibility, and assessment of distance learning courses and programs at UNCG. The Senate passed a Resolution to Modify the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Regarding Dissenting (Departmental) Opinions. The Senate also heard a summary of the final report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. The status of Non-Tenure-Track faculty at UNCG will be a major topic of discussion and action during the coming academic year. It is very likely that the Senate will consider resolutions to incorporate non-tenure-track faculty into faculty government, including the Senate, as well as other enhancements to the status of those faculty.

APRIL 2012 GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

The General Faculty approved the changes to the P&T Guidelines and to the Constitution of the Faculty that the Senate had passed since the last General Faculty meeting in December of 2011.

Note: Since there were no nominees willing and able to serve as Senate Chair-Elect and Secretary for the year 2012-13 at the April meetings of the Senate, the Chair of the Senate decided to schedule an online election of those officers when nominees had been recruited.
Summary of 2011-2012 Action Items Approved by the Faculty Senate and Forwarded to the Chancellor for Approval1

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: SEPTEMBER 7, 2011

Minutes of April 24, 2011 approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS090711-01: To Revise Membership of the Student Learning Enhancement Committee

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Action: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS090711-02: To Modify the Rules for Determining Delegates From UNCG to the UNC Faculty Assembly

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Action: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS090711-03: To Approve a Revised Academic Calendar for 2012-2013

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Action: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS090711-04: To Revise the Undergraduate Academic Probation Policy Regarding Maximum Hours Allowed During Probation

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Action: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

---

1 The numbering system that has been instituted for resolutions is formatted as follows: FS indicates Faculty Senate, GF indicates General Faculty; the numbers that precede the hyphen translate into the date of the meeting – in the format of mmdy – at which the resolution was approved, i.e. 090308 translates to September 3, 2008; the numbers that follow the hyphen indicate the ordinal of approval, i.e. 01 would be the first resolution that was approved on that meeting date, 02 would be the second resolution that was approved on that meeting date, etc.
FACULTY SENATE MEETING: OCTOBER 5, 2011

Minutes of September 7, 2011 approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS100511-01: To Revise the University Post-Tenure Review Policy

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved; forwarded to the UNCG Board of Trustees
Effective Date and Implementation: UNCG Board of Trustees Approval Required

Resolution #FS100711-02: Resolution on Academic Program Review

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Not Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: NOVEMBER 2, 2011

Minutes of October 5, 2011 approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS110211-01: Resolution to Institute an NR (Not Reported) Grade

Faculty Senate Action: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS110211-02: Resolution to Recommend Modification to the Academic Program Review Process

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Not Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: DECEMBER 7, 2011

Minutes of November 2, 2011 approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS120711-01: Charge to the University Program Review Committee

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately
Resolution #FS120711-02: To Add an Abbreviated Semester to the 2011-2012 Academic Calendar

Faculty Senate Response: Failed
Chancellor's Response: Received Only
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A

Resolution #FS120711-03: To Change the membership of the Graduate Studies Committee

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor's Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS120711-04: To Provide Parameters for Courses Carrying General Education Designations

Faculty Senate Response: Tabled
Chancellor's Response: Received Only
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: FEBRUARY 1, 2012

Minutes of December 7, 2011 – Approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS020112-01: To Revise the University’s Vision & Mission Statement

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS020212-02: To Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs

Faculty Senate Response: Table
Chancellor’s Response: Received Only
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A

Resolution #FS020112-03: To Establish Parameters for General Education Courses

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS020112-04: To Eliminate Reporting of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Class Performance

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS020112-05: To Change the Priority Registration Window Assignment
Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor's Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately  

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: MARCH 14, 2012  
Minutes of February 1, 2012 – Approved by the Faculty Senate  

Resolution #FS031412-01: To Include an External Program Review Process  
Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor's Response: Received and Not Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A  

Resolution #FS031412-02: To Revise the Constitution of the Faculty of UNCG  
Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor's Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: General Faculty Approval Required  

Resolution #FS031412-03: To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to Exclude the Inclusion of Dissenting Opinions as a Separate Section of the Candidate’s Dossier  
Faculty Senate Response: Declined by the Senate  
Chancellor's Response: Received Only  
Effective Date and Implementation: N/A  

Resolution #FS031412-04: To Clarify Terminology for Second Baccalaureate Applicants  
Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor's Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately  

Resolution #FS031412-05: To Reinstate the December 2012 Commencement Date  
Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor's Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately  

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: APRIL 4, 2012  
Minutes of March 14, 2012 – Approved by the Faculty Senate  

Page 4 of 6
Resolution #FS040412-01: To Revise and Rename Appendix A (Committee Structure) of the By-Laws of the Constitution of the Faculty

Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: APRIL 18, 2012

Minutes of April 4, 2012 – Approved by the Faculty Senate

Resolution #FS041812-01: To Clarify section 3.E.iii.b. Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor

Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Additional approvals required by the UNCG General Faculty and Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors. Effective immediately following all required approvals.

Resolution #FS041812-02: To Clarify the Conditions Under Which a Candidate for Promotion to Professor May Next Request Review After an Unsuccessful Bid

Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Additional approvals required by the UNCG General Faculty and Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors. Effective immediately following all required approvals.

Resolution #FS041812-03: To Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions Are Determined

Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Additional approvals required by the UNCG General Faculty and Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors. Effective immediately following all required approvals.

Resolution #FS041812-04: To Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees

Faculty Senate Response: Approved  
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved  
Effective Date and Implementation: Additional approvals required by the UNCG General Faculty and Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors. Effective immediately following all required approvals.
Resolution #FS041812-05: To Remove the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religious Perspectives (GPR) Category Designation from the General Education Program Learning Goal

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately

Resolution #FS041812-06 To Create a Faculty Senate Committee on Online Learning

Faculty Senate Response: Approved
Chancellor’s Response: Received and Approved
Effective Date and Implementation: Immediately
Academic Computing Committee 2011-2012 annual report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: This committee shall serve as a policy formulation body with respect to academic computing and related activities. The committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the Faculty Senate and to members of the University administration. The committee shall report to the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Planning and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology.

Eight meetings were held during 2011-2012. The main issues addressed include the student/faculty laptop program, secure keys for electronic signatures, problems with computer labs, and the virtual UNCG desktop. Bruce Kirchoff of the biology department presented/demonstrated to the committee the concept map software CMAP. We surveyed the departments for interest in the software. We also discussed the wireless peer connection using mobile devices, such as IPhone and IPad, on the university network. Because it involved the university’s security policy on its network, we did not reach solutions.

Academic Policies & Regulations Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall develop policies governing the academic calendar, summer session, class scheduling, academic advising, and undergraduate regulations and requirements.

The committee had a productive year, bringing a number of resolutions before the Faculty Senate. One resolution instituted a “NR” grade for unreported grades at the end of term (Previously, students were assigned an “F”, and some did not question it.). Another resolution asked that freshmen, sophomores, and juniors participating in UNCG in 3 be given priority registration. A third important resolution clarified the language for second baccalaureate applicants, removing the ambiguous use of “field” in the Undergraduate Bulletin and replacing it with “department or program” as well as asking for departmental feedback as to whether a distinct program of study was possible. The committee also revised the academic calendar several times, as the Registrar worked with the Greensboro Coliseum to schedule the December 2012 graduation date.

Unfinished business/issues to be addressed in 2011-2012: The committee was asked to take on the issue of Special Topics/variable unit courses. Several programs on campus (i.e. Women’s and Gender Studies or African American Studies) allow for 12-18 credit hours toward graduation in Special Topics Courses. A concern was raised (not clear from whom) in 2010-2011 regarding this issue, and Josh Hoffman asked our committee in 2011-2012 to formulate a policy regarding such courses. The committee did discuss this issue at length, and I (Maura Heyn) met with Jodi Pettazzoni regarding SACS oversight (It should be noted that SACS has not made any mention of special topics courses.) The difficulty with creating a policy regarding such courses is that it must be applied across the board once it is written (SACS will notice if we don’t do this). A number of other programs on campus: LIHC, Freshman Seminars, and various residential colleges use Special Topics/Shell courses to accommodate the variable expertise of their faculty. The overriding conclusion of the committee members was the need for some type of regulation of these courses when they are used for special programs. In meeting with Jerry Pubantz and others, it is clear that there are practices in place to oversee the content of such courses in LIHC (and Freshman Seminars) to ensure that they meet the stated learning outcomes. Also, students who take courses in LIHC or Freshman Seminars are not fulfilling requirements for the major. So, the question is whether we want to formulate a policy that may well be overly restrictive to all (or overly broad, in which case it won’t help either)? The over-riding issue for these special topics courses in particular programs would seem to be learning outcomes: when the UCC passes a course, it also approves the learning outcomes. This means that all courses offered under the same course number need to have the same learning outcomes. There is no SACS standard dictating how many sections of a ‘Special Topics’ course students can take, though it follows that the curriculum must be designed to require multiple courses with the same learning outcomes if students are allowed to take more than one section of the same course. Do we need a policy regarding the enforcement of this practice? Do all departments have explicitly stated “learning outcomes”? Much needs to be clarified before a good policy can be formulated. There is also much confusion about what qualifies as a “special topics” course, and how these are different from “shell” courses and variable unit courses. The committee would appreciate the Senate’s guidance as to whether we should pursue the formulation of a policy regarding special topics courses, as explained above.
Budget Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall review the budgetary needs of the University and make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, the Provost, and other appropriate administrators and to the Faculty Senate regarding the needs of the faculty. The committee shall educate its members and the General Faculty on how the budget is allocated at UNCG and through the UNC system, and provide forums as needed for issues related to this process, be consulted by and shall advise in a timely fashion the Chancellor and other administrative officers during the process of the budgetary cycle, its revision, and allocation of University resources.

The committee had no issues come up to address, so we met once to share stories of how the budget cuts affected our units differently. The staff senate budget committee was active in scheduling some information sessions. It may be well for the chair of the faculty budget committee to be in contact with the staff budget committee since there are sometimes concerns shared by both parties.

Bylaws Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall recommend to the Senate for its approval, procedures for conducting its business. The committee shall maintain an accurate record of the Senate Bylaws.

The Committee received no business, held no meetings, and recommended no actions to the Senate. The Senate Chair should appoint a chair for this committee.

Committee on Committees 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall preside over elections for the Secretary of the General Faculty and for elected at-large members of faculty committees. The committee shall conduct the nomination and elections processes and determine the eligibility of the nominees in conformity with The Constitution and membership regulations of the committees; it shall also collate results from Unit elections and appointments and General Faculty elections and report all results to the Faculty Senate in accordance with the Bylaws of The Constitution of the Faculty.

For committees with student representation, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs shall submit the names of students recommended by the President of the Student Government to the Committee for inclusion on the committees that have undergraduate representation. The Dean of the Graduate School shall submit names of students recommended by the Graduate Student Association to the Committee for inclusion on the committees that have graduate representation. The committee shall recommend to the Chancellor, as requested, names of faculty members to serve on specially appointed committees. In addition to the above responsibilities, the committee, upon approval by the Faculty Senate, shall recommend to the Chancellor the names of three tenured faculty members from which the Chancellor may select the Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Senate Bylaws for this representative.

At the time of the report, Senate Faculty Committees should have full representation from all units except those that become open in the event of faculty resignations. Those will be filled at the beginning of the 2012-13 academic year.

Due Process Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Committee on Due Process shall exercise the following duties and responsibilities:
Receive evidence, conduct hearings, and report its findings and recommendations to the department head and the department head’s immediate supervisor or to the Chancellor and, as appropriate, to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, on appeals from administration decisions involving discharge or the imposition of serious sanctions, termination of faculty employment, and non-reappointment. In exercising its responsibility, the committee shall use the definition of terms and the procedures for such hearings which are established by The Code of The University of North Carolina and the Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom and Due Process Regulations of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. All appeals arising under Section 603 of The Code of The University of North Carolina shall be heard by the full committee. In all other appeals arising under the committee’s jurisdiction, the committee may establish and ad hoc panel of at least three committee members appointed by the chair to conduct hearings, receive evidence, and report to
the full committee for the committee’s deliberation and recommendation. The panel report shall include records, transcripts, all other written material, and the panel’s recommendation. However, no committee member may participate in the discussion or decision on his or her own appeal or in any other case in which that committee member has participated in the recommendations from departments, the units, or other University committees.

This committee met once, to elect a chair.

Elections Committee of the Senate 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Senate Elections Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate with composition and duties as listed below.
• The Committee shall receive nominations and conduct elections to fill all elected offices and elected committee positions of the Senate.
• The Committee shall make recommendations regarding the replacement of elected officers and committee members when vacancies occur.
• The Committee shall periodically adjust the apportionment factor for conducting Senate elections, as described in Article III, Section 2.
• The Committee shall review the election procedures of the electoral divisions and recommend to the Senate changes where appropriate. If the Senate supports the changes, they shall be forwarded to the electoral divisions for their action.

Our only activities were to count votes at elections during Senate meetings. In hindsight, we should have met early in the year to discuss the last 2 bullets. We may have generated ideas for action. It would have been helpful to receive a written charge to the committee from the Senate Chair.

Enrollment Management Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall review, recommend, and advise on policy decisions related to undergraduate enrollment, recruitment, admissions, financial aid, and retention.

There were two meetings of the Committee in AY 2011-2012. First, it was agreed that the Committee should offer its recommendations to the Provost, rather than directly to the Faculty Senate. Second, it was agreed that the Committee have one “foundational” meeting in the Fall Semester to review admission/retention/graduation data. At the foundational meeting the membership would provide guidance to the Chair for a report on this information to go to the Provost, to be shared with the Faculty Senate as a part of the Provost’s report. Other meetings could be scheduled on an ad hoc basis for specific items requiring Committee input. Any Committee recommendations made on the topics of the ad hoc meetings could be sent forward to the Provost for possible action.

UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: This committee shall serve as a policy formulation body with respect to academic computing and related activities. The committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the Faculty Senate and to members of the University administration. The committee shall report to the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Planning and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology.

The Faculty Assembly delegation kept the UNCG Faculty Senate informed through written reports and meeting presentations about several UNC system and General Administration developments, including the evolving state budget situation, new performance measures and funding, legislative initiatives, campus safety, and faculty workload reporting. The Faculty Assembly met 5 times in 2011-2012. Dr. Jones served on the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee. The major accomplishment within the Faculty Assembly was its “Academics First” initiative to streamline and coordinate academic policies across the system campuses. The Academics First workgroup within the Faculty Assembly is focusing on policies regarding student retention and graduation rates, minimum admissions requirements, satisfactory progress policies, definitions of attempted hours, and drop/add and withdrawal policies. In addition, the Faculty Assembly is examining cross-campus policies associated with distributed education. The Academics First, distributed education, and faculty workload reporting work groups will continue their business into the next academic year.
The responsibilities for the alternate delegates should be more carefully specified. In the last two years only one alternate (Professor Lowe) has agreed to attend a Faculty Assembly meeting when needed. The other alternates have never responded positively to requests to attend meetings in place of absent members.

Faculty Compensation Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall review, recommend, and advise on all policies regarding faculty salaries and employee benefits for the regular academic year, summer session, and UNCG extension courses. The committee shall make periodic and timely reports to the Faculty Senate regarding the salary situation at UNCG such as comparison of salaries among the units, gender differences in salaries and salary inequities between new appointments and continuing appointments in similar disciplines. The committee shall also review the salaries and employee benefits in the UNC system, national trends in faculty salaries and employee benefits and the effect of inflation upon salaries and benefits. The committee shall make an annual recommendation to the Faculty Senate regarding salary increases and the employee benefits package. These recommendations shall address merit pay increases, cost of living adjustments, and enhanced employee benefits, and shall be forwarded to the Chancellor, the Provost, and to the President of the UNC system through the UNCG Delegation to the Faculty Assembly.

Chair of committee presented 2008-2011 faculty salary comparison data to the UNCG Deans Council on November 2, 2011. Reviewed salaries across campus by department and rank, and compared UNCG faculty salaries to peer institutions and doctoral programs nationally. Based on the UNCG institutional goal of compensating faculty at the 80th percentile, a report documenting UNCG salary comparisons were made using the 80th percentile target. Inequities in faculty salaries across UNCG were noted as a concern. Report shared with Provost and Chancellor. A Blackboard organization space was created for the Faculty Compensation Committee to facilitate continuity of committee documents from year to year and communication across committee members. Committee Chair served as a member of the Chancellor’s Budget Sounding Board Committee meetings to represent faculty interests.

A different senator will chair the committee during the next academic year. In order to facilitate this transition a meeting of the outgoing and incoming chairs will be scheduled for the beginning of the 2012 academic year. Also, there were some changes to how the data could be pulled down from CUPA. According to Sarah Carrigan: “There is a new wrinkle this year. CUPA used to provide a comparison group of all public doctoral campuses. Now we can compare on public or on doctoral, but not both together.” This will need to be revisited this coming year so that year-to-year comparisons can be made with accuracy. The Committee should continue to advocate for “Salary Packages” from the state in order to retain and/or recruit quality faculty.

Faculty Government Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The primary function of the committee is to recommend to the Faculty Senate all changes to The Constitution of the Faculty. Recommendations related to the policies and regulations subject to adoption by the General Faculty shall be forwarded to the Faculty Government Committee for consideration and review before presentation to the Faculty Senate. The committee shall also review the governance structures adopted by the units to determine that they are consistent with The Code of The University of North Carolina, the Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, and The Constitution of the Faculty.

The Committee presented resolutions on a number of housekeeping tasks, but also finalized work the new Annual and Post-Tenure Review Policy for Faculty, which has been approved by GA and will go to the Board of Governors at their May 2012 meeting. Among the housekeeping tasks were:

1) Modifying the membership of the Faculty Assembly Delegation
2) Modifying the membership of the Student Learning Enhancement Committee
3) Revising the Constitution of the Faculty to include the Joint School of Nanosciences and Nanoengineering in the Senate; to change the number of Units represented by the Senate to accord with the number that report to the Provost after the merger of two schools to form the School of Health and Human Sciences, and to correct a number of problems in working.
4) Revising and renaming the document that used to be called the FACULTY SENATE & COMMITTEE STRUCTURES to correct outdated language, and to bring it into line with the revised Constitution of the Faculty.
5) Revising UNCG’s Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to address a number of issues that had been brought to our attention by the Senate leadership, or by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

None, but the Committee will undertake a review of the Constitution of the Faculty, the Bylaws, and the Appendices if time permits.

Faculty Grievance Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Faculty Grievance Committee shall hear, mediate, and advise with respect to the adjustment of faculty grievances concerned with matters directly related to a faculty member’s employment status and institutional relationships on this campus in accordance with the provisions of The Code of The University of North Carolina. No grievance that grows out of or involves matters related to a formal proceeding for the suspension, discharge, or termination of a faculty member, or that is within the jurisdiction of another faculty committee, may be considered by the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Committee dealt with one petition for a Grievance Committee hearing. The petition was dismissed by the Committee and no hearing was held.

Faculty Promotion & Tenure Guidelines Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall review the units’ documents and exchange information about the general guidelines and expectations that the units have developed for the evaluation of teaching, research and creative activity, service, and directed professional activity for promotions and tenure.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee surveyed the members of the committee on two different occasions this academic year. The first survey addressed the composition of faculty members on the unit committees. Units vary on how members are elected to the committee, rank of committee members and if an elected committee, what the role the elected committee is for the unit. (candidate review and/or procedural changes to documents). The second survey addressed the new on-line format for promotion and tenure. The chair reported the results of the survey at the meetings held by Senate Leadership in the Spring on the on-line process. Suggestions made by unit chairs were taken in to consideration by Senate Leadership; changes made will be reflected in the directions for the on-line format which can be found on the Provost Web-site.

It remains important for Senate Leadership to oversee that the mandatory changes to the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Recommendations are implemented at the department level, given the changes to academic departments due to academic restructuring. It is also recommended that Senate Leadership continue to evaluate the on-line format for promotion and tenure review.

Faculty Professional Development & Welfare Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The purpose of the Faculty Professional Development and Welfare Committee shall be to support the role of faculty members as learned professional. The committee shall review and make recommendations on matters concerning professional status and effectiveness in the areas of teaching, research, and service. All matters other than salary and benefits are relevant, including but not limited to standards of professional performance; professional rights and privileges; working conditions; standards for teaching loads and reduction in load for research and service assignments; research and other leaves of absence; and programs for the enhancement of faculty professional abilities and effectiveness, including participation in seminars, workshops, colloquia and other professional development programs, professional travel and similar activities.

No meetings during 2011-2012 (only met once during 2010-2011).

The committee has no charge other than what is brought to it by the Senate. Dr. Nemati (chair 2010) and I used the committee as an avenue to create and deliver the faculty satisfaction surveys of 2007 and 2010. But other than that work, which was self-initiated, we haven’t had other responsibilities since 2007. The Senate should review the purpose of the committee and see if it can be discharged to other committees or arenas (areas?)
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall be responsible for monitoring and reporting on intercollegiate athletics to the Faculty Senate. Of primary concern to the committee shall be the academic welfare of the student athletes and the overall integrity of the intercollegiate athletics program. The committee shall be available to hear and act on complaints and suggestions about intercollegiate athletics from the faculty, students, and other members of the University community.

Major Activities for FCIA (2011/12) included:
1. Touring athletic facilities (baseball club house and all new locker rooms)
3. Completing an NCAA-required review of Academic Support Services for Student-Athletes. The review team included FCIA members as well as other faculty and staff. The report was submitted and accepted by the NCAA.
4. FCIA completed a review of the Athletic Department’s Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Policy as well as specific team policies. FCIA directed the review but much of the work was completed by an undergraduate student from Public Health Education (Janie Burley) as part of her Internship requirement. Highlights from the AOD policy review include:
   - Every student-athlete is drug tested at the start of the year.
   - Then we randomly test student-athletes during the course of the year.
   - The first positive is treated as an educational opportunity.
   - An administrator meets with the student-athlete.
   - The student-athlete then has to call their parent or guardian to let them know the situation.
   - The student-athlete needs to meet with the Athletic Director.
   - The student-athlete is put into a substance abuse educational program.
   - The educational program results in a risk rating for the student and it may recommend some additional steps.
   - First violation requires 10 hours of community service.
   - The second positive is the same as the first but adds a suspension from the team.
   - The third positive and you are done.
   - We have seen fewer violations this year than last year.
   - Student-athletes to keep their trainers informed on any legitimate medications they maybe be taking – both over the counter and prescription.

Jane Burley: A great deal of the discussion on whether or not there should be difference in violations with alcohol vs. other drugs.
5. FCIA completed a review of the UNCG Concussion Policy. Highlights include:
   - Terry Ackerman (Faculty Athletic Representative) emailed a copy of the UNCG Concussion Management Policy to FCIA members.
   - Kim Record (Athletic Director) provided an overview of how UNCG got to the point of the Concussion Management Plan and Statement.
   - Kim Record mentioned that while this policy started in athletics, that ACIA and FCIA had approached the Dean’s Council to look at a school wide policy to deal with all students who have to deal with concussions during the school year.
   - Terry Ackerman brought up that he had had a discussion with John Imarino with the Southern Conference making sure that game officials were trained in concussion management. The SoCon football officials are but the other sports (for example men’s and women’s basketball) have not discussed the issue.
6. FCIA reviewed the Leave/Missed Class Policy for student-athletes. Highlights include:
   - Terry Ackerman emailed FCIA members the UNCG missed class policy.
   - Terry Ackerman also provided sample leave policies from other SoCon schools and other schools in the UNC system.
   - Terry Ackerman as the other faculty members present at the meeting what had been their experience with student-athletes missing classes do to completions. The faculty present said that the way the department notifies professors of student-athletes needing to miss class due to competition was very positive.
   - Terry Ackerman asked the student-athletes present what had been their experience with dealing with professors about having to miss class time due to athletic competition. It was brought but that it varies from teacher to
Some teachers were very positive and accommodating. But other professors had set policies about dropping students a letter grade based on the number of missed classes.

- There was a discussion about whether such policies were really fair to student-athletes and other students in general.
- Kim Record mentioned that Athletics attempts to look at competition schedules and how that would affect class attendance.
- David Wyrick brought up that the way a student-athlete approaches a faculty member about having to miss classes, could affect how willing the professor will be in working with a student-athlete’s schedule.
- Brian Battle brought up that we ask coaches to collect course syllabuses from their student athletes and the AEP staff making a list of classes that have issues with missed classes.
- There was also discussion of online vs. in-person classes as a way of being able to work around missed class issues.
- Terry Ackerman explained that we are in an information gathering stage when it comes to altering this policy and asked the members to talk with their fellow faculty members about their thoughts on this issue.

7. FCIA reviewed the required AOD class (HEA 331) required of all new (Freshman and Transfer) UNCG student-athletes.

- Instructor Chris Seitz gave a brief overview of the class.
- This year the course has gone from three sections of 30 student-athletes to one section of 75 student-athletes.
- The class has recently taken on a component dealing with communication with media and professors.
- There has been a lot of positive feedback from student-athletes taking the course.
- Last spring there was discussion on how the program could be improved.
- Ed Wahesh (Doctoral student from Educational Counseling) has been brought into to add a component dealing with Group Motivational Interviewing.
- Group Motivational Interviewing holds a lot of promise as being the most effective way of reaching college students a limited amount of time.
- Ed gave an overview of the motivation interviewing component of the program and his experiences with the success of motivational interviewing at Fordham University.
- Motivational interviewing is a directed counseling approach to exploring substance abuse and ambivalence to making changes to behavior.

Unfinished business/issues to be addressed in 2011-2012:
1. Continued work on the Leave/Missed Class Policy for UNCG student-athletes.
2. Continued work on HEA 331
3. Education with coaches regarding team AOD policies
4. Continued revision of Athletic Department AOD policy

FCIA and ACIA held joint meetings for the 2011/12 academic year. This worked very well and the possibility of combining the two committees should be seriously considered.

Promotion & Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

**Charge:** The major purpose of the committee is to provide faculty counsel to the Chancellor in accord with the University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines, Section II, Part B. The committee will review promotion and tenure policies and procedures yearly and will recommend modifications and changes in committee function and guidelines to the Faculty Senate.

As has become standard practice, the Provost referred to the Committee for its advice all of those cases where there was not unanimity at the lower levels of review, and those cases that were applications for early promotion and/or tenure. The Committee was informed of the cases it would be evaluating at its first meeting, and laid out its procedure for evaluating the assigned cases. At a second meeting, after Committee members had studied the dossiers of the candidates, the Committee deliberated over the assigned cases, and voted on what advice to give the Chancellor. The Committee reported its advice on these cases to the Provost and Chancellor in a third meeting scheduled for that purpose, and, subsequently, at a fourth meeting, with the Chancellor and Provost, learned of the Chancellor’s final decisions on the cases in question.

The Committee this past year was the first to enjoy access to candidates’ dossiers online. For the most part, this new access went very smoothly, and made the Committee’s job much easier. In meetings which I attended after the
Committee’s business had concluded, further improvements to the format and instructions for the online dossiers were discussed, and changes have been made for next year. No doubt, this will be an ongoing process.

The Committee Chair provided the members with a template for the Committee’s individually assigned preliminary reports on the candidates, so as to ensure uniformity of format among those reports. This seems to have worked well. The final drafts were prepared by the Chair, based on these individual reports, once they had been approved by the Committee at its second, conference meeting.

Research Grants Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The primary functions of the committee are to: (a) receive, evaluate, and act on applications for funding of faculty research grants, subsidies for book publication, referred publication page charges, submission fees, journal article reprints, and exhibition/performance charge; and (b) set policies and procedures deemed necessary.

Membership: Seven (7) faculty (one [1] from each School and the College), plus one (1) Senator. (Up to six [6] additional members may be appointed by the chair, after consultation with the Associate Provost for Research, in order to achieve programmatic balance, to serve one-year terms.

Reviewed and selected the awards for the Regular Faculty Grants, Regular Faculty Summer Excellence Research Awards, New Faculty Grants and New Faculty Summer Excellence Research Awards. (the Regular Faculty Summer Excellence Research Awards program was new this year). Held 2 training sessions for faculty on submitting the grants. Reviewed and updated the instructions and guidelines for submission for AY 2011-2012, including incorporating instructions and guidelines for the new Regular Faculty Summer Excellence Research Awards program. Reviewed and selected awardees for the publication subsidy funding. Discussed options and opportunities to expand funding for subsidies.

Unfinished business: Continue discussing options and opportunities to expand the amount of funding available for subsidies and discussing ideas for further expanding the funding for Regular Faculty proposal programs since there are so many more excellent proposals submitted for the Regular Faculty grant proposal programs (Regular Faculty Grant and Summer Excellence Research Award) than could be funded (please note that $80,000 was added to the funding amounts provided by Terri Shelton’s office this year, to support the newly added Regular Faculty Summer Excellence Research Awards program; the response to this new program was huge).

Research Policies Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall make advisory recommendations to the Faculty senate and/or to the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development, acting for the Provost, about new policies or changes in existing policies that affect research conducted by faculty at the University. The overall goal for the committee is to enhance the research climate of the University.

During seven meetings, the RPC dealt with the formulation of two policies in collaboration with the Office of Research and Economic Development. In both cases, RPC members were particularly focused on specific scenarios and uncertainties that might arise from the implementation of the policies based on their wording, and offered language to alleviate these potential issues. For the Minors in the Lab Policy which culminated in the completion of a policy statement, RPC members indicated that the wording of consent forms was not suitable for minors and their guardians/parents, and also raised concerns about the distinction between research subjects who are minors. The RPC provided feedback, suggested revisions, and addressed a variety of issues in order to sharpen and clarify a Data Access and Management Policy that ultimately was approved by the Chancellor in April, 2012. These included concerns about data access for faculty who leave UNCG for other institutions and for those who subcontract from other institutions. Concerns were also raised about the level of security necessary for human subjects research, and its distinction from HIPAA information. For both policies, RPC had suggested that an annual review of the policy be included as part of its implementation, which was adopted.

The RPC undertook two major areas for discussion with Associate Chancellor Terri Shelton, and these discussions will continue next year: Conflicts of Interest and Faculty Workload issues, particularly as these pertain to areas of research and scholarship.
Scholarly Communications Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Scholarly Communications Committee will support the University’s research and teaching missions by consulting with and advising the University faculty in matters relating to the dissemination, use, and archiving of information and knowledge. The Committee will work collaboratively with campus administrators and faculty members to develop and implement a program offering leadership and direction toward altering the current course of scholarly communications, so that it is economically sustainable and ensures the widest possible access to the scholarly record. The Committee will: Analyze issues of scholarly publishing and communication as they apply to academic research institutions like UNCG; Propose short-term and long-term strategies to inform UNCG faculty about these issues; Propose short-term and long-term strategies to inform UNCG faculty about these issues; Provide faculty with guidance on fair use, intellectual property rights, and management of their creative works; Suggest and endorse avenues for individual and collective action, including actions that faculty members can take to contribute to an open and sustainable system of scholarly communication; Promote initiatives and practices that encourage faculty to explore the challenges and opportunities associated with disseminating research, creative works, and teaching materials through new methods and electronic means.

In October 2011, the Committee sponsored a Faculty Forum concerning article processing fees for open access journal publishing, and after the forum, committee members worked with the Libraries and the Office of Research and Economic Development on the creation of the Open Access Publishing Support Fund, a pilot project providing grants of up-to $1,000 for faculty, EPAs, and graduate students who publish in open access journals. The fund was established in January 2012, and two members of the Committee are on the three-person panel that reviews applications and makes recommendations. The Committee also continued to support NC DOCKS and the OJS journal publishing software.

The Committee will sponsor a Faculty Forum in October 2012, and the tentative plan is to have a panel of local faculty members who would discuss the many issues related to open access publishing and how publishing in open-access journals fits within the promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review processes on campus. The Committee is also considering sponsorship for two other faculty forums during the 2012-13 academic year—one forum would be similar to the forum mentioned above, but it would concern technology transfer, and the other forum would also be similar but would focus on community engaged scholarship.

Student Learning Enhancement Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Student Learning Enhancement Committee is established: a) to review the assessment plans for all undergraduate and graduate programs to assure that they are designed to improve student learning based on evidence and to meet accreditation requirements, b) to report annually to the Faculty Senate on the current status of academic program assessment at UNCG, c) to advise the deans of academic units or their designees on how departments might enhance their academic program assessment plans to improve opportunities for student learning, and, d) to make recommendations to the Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment for actions to be taken to improve UNCG’s efforts to enhance student learning. This committee is also charged to celebrate successful examples of student learning enhancement resulting from assessment activities and to sponsor presentations and workshops to familiarize faculty with assessment practices and benefits.

In 7 meetings plus subcommittee meetings:
A. Completed reviews of departmental assessment plans and reports based on 2010-2011 Compliance Assist reports.
B. Established monthly committee meeting schedule and additional conference/workshop opportunities for further faculty development activities.
C. Arranged with Associate Deans to replace three departing committee members.
D. Held eight committee meetings in 2011-12.
E. Revised, provided committee development, and applied Enhancement Progress Rubric which is used to review all academic programs’ learning enhancement processes. Presently being used to review and communicate with Associate Deans and then departmental faculty.
F. Refined guidelines, and made one award, for the Student Learning Enhancement Excellence Award. We also provided detailed feedback to the other two submitters for improvement purposes.
G. Worked with Liane Davenport of Office of Academic Assessment (OAA) to produce a BB site for committee with a series of Best Practices, readings, committee reports, etc. for faculty development.
H. Maintained excellent working relationship with Dr. Jodi Pettazzoni, Director of OAA.

SLEC is quite pleased with the improvements UNCG’s academic programs have made in one year. We have seen approximately an 40% increase in the number of academic programs that have Met Expectations from the committee's perspective, and we are aware of an even larger number of departments that are making serious changes/adjustments in the student learning enhancement processes for the 2011-12 CA reporting time frame.

Unfinished business:
A. Amy Lixl-Purcell and Jerry Walsh are returning for another term. We are soliciting nominations for a Graduate Student to join the committee, as Korinne Chiu has accepted an assessment position in Virginia.
B. Departmental reports based on 2009-2010 Compliance Assist reports have been completed and submitted to appropriate Associate Dean or Department Head.
C. Guidelines for the Student Learning Enhancement Excellence Award are ready for next year.
D. Repeat cycle for 2011-12 CA reports in the upcoming year.
E. Report the status of academic assessment to the Faculty Senate and Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment.

University Teaching & Learning Center Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The committee shall serve as a policy formulation body with respect to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons. The Committee shall review and make recommendations to the Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons. The committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the Faculty Senate and to members of the University administration.

During three meetings, the FTLC focused on conducting the Executive Director search. The Oak Grant Foundation faculty development was started, where the Universal Design for Learning workshops were implemented.
Charge: The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall be the agency of the Faculty Senate responsible for reviewing the undergraduate curriculum, making policy recommendations to the Faculty Senate on curricular matters, and performing such other duties as approved by the Faculty Senate, including the following: a) To review and approve all proposals for new courses; existing courses in which substantial changes have been made; new majors, programs, concentrations, and degrees which have been approved by the College Council or the curriculum committees of the various units; the discontinuation of courses and programs; routine changes as previously approved by the Provost’s Office. When the Provost gives preliminary consideration to a plan to establish or discontinue one or more undergraduate degree programs, for example, during the early stages of the University’s strategic planning process, the Provost will consult with the committee; the committee will make recommendations to the Provost regarding the general advisability of pursuing such a plan; b) To serve as the oversight committee for administration of all aspects of the General Education Core (GEC), to include oversight of the ten GEC category committees and the GEC Assessment Committee and final designation of courses for GEC credit; c) To review and approve student proposals under Plan II (Specially Designed Programs of Study); d) To oversee the adherence to the General Education Program (GEP) by the units, and to provide for the required annual and five-year reviews of the GEP and the GEC committees; e) To take up for study or action matters referred by the Faculty Senate and General Faculty or any other matters deemed important to the work of the committee.

Nine meetings were held. As a result of the Program Review process, there were numerous requests to discontinue programs and concentrations over the course of the academic year. The committee approved the program requests noting that discontinuation would only be final after approval from General Administration and SACS. Approval of discontinuation of concentrations did not need GA and SACS approval as long as the degree program continued to exist. Changes to the University Curriculum Guide were requested including inclusion of a statement on the forms indicating that in the normal course of discussion of course approval and program revisions that consideration of the University mission statement occurred. This statement will be included to clarify adherence to SACS policy with regard to the approval process and the University’s mission statement. Approved 65 new and amended course proposals (see attached), 55 program revisions, and numerous routine changes.

Unfinished business/issues to be addressed in 2011-2012: At the April 13th meeting the committee was asked to approve courses at the Undergraduate level in Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution. The committee tabled any action on these because they were uneasy with approval of courses where no major or program existed at the undergraduate level. A motion was approved to allow Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution to proceed with intent to plan a new baccalaureate degree.

Recommendations for Senate to consider: The Senate needs to address the charge to the UCC with regard to its relationship to the General Education Council. Early in the year the committee discussed the fact that there is no University policy with regard to programs going on moratorium. The UCC defers to the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee to discuss this issue. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approved a motion on April 13th to encourage the Faculty Senate to review the Charge to the UCC with the purpose of changing the Charge. Specifically the language in the Charge that states:

"To serve as the oversight committee for administration of all aspects of the General Education Core (GEC), to include oversight of the ten GEC category committees and GEC Assessment Committee and final designation of courses for GEC credit;"

and

"To oversee the adherence to the General Education Program (GEP) by the College and the Schools, and to provide for the required annual and five-year reviews of the GEP and the GEC committees;"

Since these activities have for some time now been the direct responsibility of the General Education Council, the language in the Charge appears to present a conflict of responsibilities.
Graduate Studies Committee 2011-2012 Annual Report to UNCG Faculty Senate

Charge: The Graduate Studies Committee shall be an agency of the Senate devoted to studying aspects of graduate education. Its basic duties and responsibilities are as follows:

a) Establish criteria for the selection and review of members of the Graduate Faculty;
b) Review all new courses, revised courses, and modifications to current courses taking one of the following actions: approve, disapprove, approve with modification. Review and act on all proposals for new graduate programs or major modifications to existing programs including the discontinuation of graduate programs. When the Provost gives preliminary consideration to a plan to establish or discontinue one or more graduate degree programs, for example, during the early stages of the University’s strategic planning process, the Provost will consult with the committee; the committee will make recommendations to the Provost regarding the general advisability of pursuing such a plan;
c) Review and formulate policies and regulations related to graduate education admission, retention, and graduate requirements;
d) Hear student appeals related to Graduate School policies and regulations;
e) Call to the attention of the Graduate Faculty and the administration issues of concern relating to graduate education;
f) Act on matters referred by the Faculty Senate, Dean of the Graduate School, Graduate Faculty, and the Graduate Student Association on graduate education;
g) Report to the Faculty Senate on actions taken regarding graduate education policies and programs;
h) Advise the Faculty Senate on matters relating to graduate education.

Charge:

In eight meetings, the GS Continued to review and approve graduate curriculum including proposals for new programs and modifications to existing programs. Developed process for dealing with program discontinuation requests per the Academic Program Review process (which continues into 2012-13, see below) that is SACS compliant per OPA (including a teach-out plan, etc.). Included mission statement guiding academic programs on curricular signature sheet (per SACS requirement). Revised committee membership to reflect academic restructuring and to include representatives from JSNN (voting) and the library (non-voting) per Faculty Senate resolution. Reviewed and revised several graduate school policies, including clarifying time limits for appeals process as well as articulating appeals procedures, clarifying leaves of absence requests, and specifying a time limit on graduate certificates.

Unfinished business: Continue discussion of policy regarding annual review of doctoral and specialist students as well as creation of centralized Accelerated Bachelor’s to Master’s Degree Program. Continue reviewing graduate program discontinuation requests resulting from final results of Academic Program Review.
August 13, 2012

Dear Academic Deans, Department Chairs, and Faculty Members,

Over the past several years, UNCG has emerged as a leader in its commitment to activating and supporting our mission to “redefine the public research university for the 21st century as an inclusive, collaborative, and responsive institution making a difference in the lives of students and the communities it serves.” Our reputation as a community-engaged university is nationally recognized, not only by the Carnegie Foundation, but also by and in national, state, and local associations, publications, and conversations. In addition to our excellent engaged scholarly work, we are also looked to as a leader because of our active and intentional steps toward integrating community-engaged faculty work into promotion and tenure guidelines at university and department levels. In his very first visit to campus, President Tom Ross congratulated UNCG faculty on this accomplishment and urged us to continue to lead the way in North Carolina in this effort.

As you are well aware, revising guidelines to recognize community-engaged scholarship poses a challenge as it necessarily raises some other fundamental questions about the promotion and tenure policy that also must be addressed. For example, some questions raised about community-engaged scholarship connect to, but extend beyond, the persistent challenge we face in evaluating work that is interdisciplinary or collaborative. The danger of not addressing these questions about how best to evaluate diverse forms of scholarly work directly and separately from the actual review of candidates’ dossiers is that we fail to appropriately recognize, reward, and account for the full scope of faculty work, productivity and impact. Even worse, we may fail to encourage and support – as well as recruit and retain - innovative faculty who contribute significantly to the public teaching and research mission and values of UNCG. Many of these newer modes of scholarly work are increasingly important to our research funding competitiveness both now and in the future.

To support our exploration of these challenges in the context of changing forms of scholarship, I have asked Drs. Emily Janke and Barbara Holland to act as conveners and facilitators of campus-wide dialogues on this important topic: Cultivating and Rewarding the Mosaic of Faculty Scholarly Talents and Contributions. In the facilitated dialogues, faculty will discuss a common and rigorous approach to assessing the quality and impact all forms of scholarly activities and products, including community-engaged scholarship and the scholarship of teaching and learning. To ensure that each dialogue addresses relevant and immediate questions and concerns of the department and units, Emily will be requesting the assistance of faculty members from each School/College to customize each presentation to common and persistent issues raised in P&T reviews as they relate to documenting and evaluating nontraditional forms of faculty scholarship in their disciplines and units.

I ask that all faculty who serve as department heads/chairs or reviewers of faculty candidates at the department- and unit-levels make room in their schedules to attend one of the sessions during the week of September 17-21. As you will note in the schedule below, sessions are customized for particular disciplinary areas. However, to accommodate busy faculty schedules, each is open to any faculty member from any discipline. Please share this schedule with the faculty in your areas and urge those to which this is relevant to register for and attend the appropriate sessions.

Thank you for your support,

Dave Perrin

- schedule and registration on next page –
UNCG is committed to supporting innovative and high impact faculty work. In support of the faculty's decision to recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship, alongside of other forms of traditional and innovative forms of scholarship, in promotion and tenure policies, UNCG is offering a series of facilitated dialogues. This is an opportunity for faculty to discuss a common and rigorous approach to assessing the quality and impact of all forms of scholarly activities and products, including community-engaged scholarship.

All dialogues will be facilitated by Drs. Barbara Holland (Senior Scholar) and Emily Janke (Special Assistant for Community Engagement). Professor Holland is an expert in community engagement, performance measurement, and organizational change in higher education. She has held executive administrative positions at University of Sydney, University of Western Sydney, Northern Kentucky University, Portland State University, and has advised more than 100 universities in five countries. Dr. Janke directs the UNCG Institute for Community and Economic Engagement.

### PART I. EVALUATING the Mosaic of Faculty Scholarly Talents and Contributions*

Open to all faculty
(reviewers of P&T candidate dossiers and department heads/chiefs are especially encouraged to attend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Sept 17</td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>HHS (Dogwood Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Sept 18</td>
<td>10-12pm</td>
<td>SOE and Libraries (Claxton Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>CAS natural &amp; social sciences and JSNN (Dogwood Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Sept 19</td>
<td>1:30-3:30</td>
<td>Bryan (Dogwood Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, Sept 20</td>
<td>10-12pm</td>
<td>SON (Dogwood Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5pm</td>
<td>CAS humanities &amp; design (Dogwood Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Sept 21</td>
<td>10-12pm</td>
<td>MTD (Maple Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sessions are customized for particular disciplinary areas, but to accommodate busy faculty schedules, each is open to any faculty member from any discipline.

Register Online

### PART II. DOCUMENTING the Mosaic of Faculty Scholarly Talents and Contributions

Open to all faculty*
(upcoming/future candidates for P&T and mentors are especially encouraged to attend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Sept 21</td>
<td>1-3pm</td>
<td>Open to faculty in ANY discipline (Maple Rm, EUC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* additional sessions will be offered in Spring 2013

Register Online

**Series Sponsors and Supporters:**
This series and other professional development opportunities and resources to support innovative and engaged pedagogies, scholarly agendas, and public service are offered by the Office of the Provost, the Institute for Community and Economic Engagement (ICEE), the Office of Leadership and Service-Learning (OLSL), and the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons (FTLC).