

**Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting, April 25, 2012**

**3:00-5:00 pm, Jarrell Hall**

**Josh Hoffman, Chair**

*Approved September 19, 2012*

<b>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</b>	<b>Discussion/Motion</b>	<b>Outcome of Vote</b>
<p>Call to Order and Opening Remarks: <i>Chancellor Linda Brady</i></p>	<p>Chancellor Brady called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm. She welcomed and thanked faculty for their attendance at the Spring General Faculty meeting. She next acknowledged those faculty members who are now deceased -- between September 2011 and April 2012 -- reading each name and then calling for a moment of silence.</p> <p><b>Remarks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked UNCG Faculty and Staff for all of their hard work and commitment</li> <li>• Offered a celebration of student successes, culminating in the coming Commencement for those have completed their programs, and stated that she looked forward to seeing many faculty in attendance at that event.</li> <li>• Shared the common questions/concerns expressed in her meetings with nearly 200 faculty, staff, and alumni over the preceding 12 months, which underscore the need for a clearly defined identity and sense of purpose, an understanding of who we are as an institution and what we want to become: a vision that surpasses our current strategic plan and builds on our academic strengths in addressing the needs of North Carolina's citizenry in the midst of an uncertain economic environment while remaining committed to academic quality and our core values. The future demands that we build from our academic and research strengths and capitalize on our historic commitment to community engagement and partnership. She cited the following principles that are central to UNCG's future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We are a community of Learners</li> <li>○ We promote discovery, creativity, and innovation</li> <li>○ We engage with our communities, locally and globally</li> <li>○ We recruit, develop, recognize, and support a diverse and inclusive community of faculty, staff, and students</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Spoke of Academic Program Review (APR) coming to closure maintaining its purpose to "position UNCG to be as strong academically as possible...(and) the impact of this university extends beyond the classroom, the studio, and the laboratory." Over the coming week, she will carefully consider her responses to the Provost's APR recommendations, along with other material she has reviewed, toward how they can support our aspirations.</li> <li>• Acknowledged the challenges experienced over the past several years including significant budget cuts, academic restructuring and program review – holding that UNCG's faculty and staff have remained committed to our mission.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p>Review Agenda, Approve Minutes: <i>Josh Hoffman, Senate Chair</i></p>	<p>Josh Hoffman, Chair of the Faculty Senate, opened the business portion of the General Faculty meeting. He called for review and approval of the minutes of the previous meeting, September 21, 2011.</p> <p align="center">Motion to approve the minutes: Jim Carmichael Second to the motion: Laurie Kennedy-Malone Vote: Unanimous to approve the minutes of September 21, 2011</p> <p>He then gave a brief overview of the agenda to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisions to the <i>Constitution of the Faculty</i></li> <li>• Revisions to the <i>UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom and Due Process Regulations</i></li> <li>• Presentation by the Provost: Recommendations on Academic Program Review</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to approve minutes passed by unanimous vote</p>
<p>Resolution to Revise the <i>Constitution of the Faculty of</i></p>	<p><b>Resolution #GF042512-01: To Revise <i>The Constitution of the Faculty of UNCG</i></b></p> <p>Bruce Kirchoff read the resolution calling for changes to the Constitution as follows:</p>	<p>Motion to approve Revisions to <i>The</i></p>

<p>UNCG – Bruce Kirchoff, Chair, Faculty Government Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust language references to HES and HHP which have been restructured into one unit, HHS;</li> <li>• Adjust language to include reference to the new Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology and its representation on the Faculty Senate;</li> <li>• Adjust language to show that specific aspects of distance learning fall under the purview of the Faculty Senate;</li> <li>• Adjust language to allow for a process for replacing elected officers of the Faculty Senate and/or its committees, as a result of unwillingness or inability to perform one’s duties</li> <li>• Adjust language to correct numerous small errors that have accumulated over time</li> </ul> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that <i>The Constitution of the Faculty of UNCG</i> be amended to read as indicated in the attached document. (<i>See Attachment A</i>)</p> <p>This action coming from a committee served as the motion needed to put forth the resolution for a vote. The changes to <i>The Constitution of the Faculty of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro</i> were accepted by unanimous vote.</p>	<p><i>Constitution of the Faculty, UNCG</i> passed by unanimous vote</p>
<p>Resolutions to Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations – Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee</p>	<p>Bruce Kirchoff read each of the resolutions brought forth to revise the UNCG <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> as follows:</p> <p><b>Resolution #GF042512-02: To Clarify Section 3.E.iii.b. Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor</b></p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that the first sentence of Section 3.E.iii.b of <i>The Regulations</i> be revised to read as follows:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The full text of the new Section 3.E.iii.b is reproduced below (<i>see page 8 of The Regulations</i>):</p> <p><b>3.E.iii.b. <u>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.</u></b> 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. (<i>See Attachment B</i>)</p> <p>This action coming from a committee served as the motion needed to put forth the resolution for a vote. The changes to the <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> were accepted by unanimous vote.</p> <p><b>Resolution #GF042512-03: To Revise the UNCG <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> to Clarify the Conditions Under Which a Candidate for Promotion to Professor May Next Request Review After an Unsuccessful Bid</b></p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that the phrase “or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after a negative recommendation at the unit or university levels” be added to Section 3.E.iii.c as follows (<i>see page 8 of The Regulations</i>):</p> <p><b>3.E.iii.c.</b> If a review of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is unsuccessful, <b><u>or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after an negative recommendation at the unit or university levels,</u></b> the candidate may next request a review during the third year of service</p>	<p>Resolution #GF042512-02 Approved by Unanimous Vote</p> <p>Resolution #GF042512-03 Approved by Unanimous Vote</p>

	<p>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 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year (the fourth year following notice of his or her unsuccessful bid <b>or withdrawal</b>). 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. (<i>See Attachment C</i>)</p> <p>This action coming from a committee served as the motion needed to put forth the resolution for a vote. The changes to the <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> were accepted by unanimous vote.</p> <p><b>Resolution #GF042512-04: To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined</b></p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that Section 4.B.i.h. of <i>The Regulations</i> be revised to read as follows (see page 12 of <i>The Regulations</i>):</p> <p>4.B.i.h Right of faculty members to express dissenting opinions</p> <p>In cases where the majority vote of the department faculty senior<sup>1</sup> to the candidate is not unanimous, the <b>assembled</b><sup>2</sup> faculty member(s) who did not vote in accordance with the majority may, at their individual discretion, include a single signed statement in the candidate's portfolio explaining their vote. (<i>See Attachment D</i>)</p> <p>This action coming from a committee served as the motion needed to put forth the resolution for a vote. The changes to the <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> were accepted by unanimous vote.</p> <p><b>Resolution #GF042512-05: To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations to Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees<sup>3</sup></b></p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that a new footnote (<i>footnote 12</i>) 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 <i>The Regulations</i>)</p> <p><u><b>New footnote 12</b></u> 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. (<i>See Attachment E</i>)</p> <p>This action coming from a committee served as the motion needed to put forth the resolution for a vote. The changes to the <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> were accepted by unanimous vote.</p>	<p>Resolution #GF042512-04 Approved by Unanimous Vote</p> <p>Resolution #GF042512-05 Approved by Unanimous Vote</p>
--	---	---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professors and Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors. Consequently, only Professors may evaluate, or vote on the promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Professor.

<sup>2</sup> **“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.**

<sup>3</sup> This Resolution prepared at the behest of the School of Nursing

Presentation of Recommendations on Academic Program Review –David Perrin, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor	Provost Perrin’s summary and recommendations resulting from the Academic Program Review Process were presented PowerPoint format and followed by much discussion. The Provost announced that the PowerPoint presentation would be made available on both the Academic Program Review and Provost websites. <i>(See Attachment F)</i>	
Adjournment: Josh Hoffman, Senate Chair	Upon the conclusion of the Provost’s presentation and with there being no further business, it was properly moved and seconded to end the meeting at 5:00 pm.	

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph Rasch  
Secretary to the General Faculty  
2011-13

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
General Faculty**

*Resolution #GF042512-01<sup>4</sup>*

**To Revise *The Constitution of the Faculty of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro***

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

**WHEREAS**, the recent restructuring of HES and HHP, and their replacement by the new HHS require changes in *The Constitution of the Faculty* to correct references to these units, and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering (JSNN) is not represented in the Senate under the current *Constitution of the Faculty*, and

**WHEREAS**, there is no explicit mention in *The Constitution* of distance learning as falling under the purview of the Faculty Senate, and

**WHEREAS**, there is no clear process in *The Constitution* for replacing elected officers of the Senate and/or its committees, including replacement of the Chair-Elect, when they are unwilling or unable to perform their duties, and

**WHEREAS**, there are other numerous small errors in *The Constitution* that have accumulated over time, such as:  
The College and professional schools are **now** referred to as “units,” and  
There are no longer Associate Members of the Graduate Faculty, and  
The name of the document “*Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro*” has not been updated, etc., and

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate gave its approval on March 14, 2012, therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** *The Constitution of the Faculty of UNCG* be amended to read as indicated in the attached document.

---

<sup>4</sup> Faculty Senate Action/Date: **Approved March 14, 2012**

Chancellor Action/Date: **Approved March 27, 2012, Approve April 26, 2012**

General Faculty Action/Date: **Approved April 25, 2012**

Other Approvals: No further approvals required

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.

Implementation of the Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons/offices and coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
General Faculty**

*Resolution #GF042512-02<sup>5</sup>*

**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**

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

**WHEREAS**, Section 3.E.iii.b. of the current UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations)* states:

If requested by the candidate, the department must conduct a formal review for promotion beginning no later than August 1 of the seventh year following conferral of tenure, and

**WHEREAS**, this text could be interpreted to state that the candidate's request for review for promotion to Professor at any time prior to August 1<sup>st</sup> of the seventh year following conferral of tenure must be honored, and

**WHEREAS**, the intent of Section 3.E.iii.b is to prohibit a department from endlessly postponing review of a faculty member for promotion to Professor, not to give the candidate the right to request review immediately after he or she has been granted tenure, and

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate gave its approval on April 18, 2012, therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the first sentence of Section 3.E.iii.b of *The Regulations* be revised to read as follows:

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.

The full text of the new Section 3.E.iii.b is reproduced below (*see page 8 of The Regulations*):

**3.E.iii.b. 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.** 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> Faculty Senate Action/Date: **Approved April 18, 2012**

Chancellor Action/Date: **Approved April 20, 2012, Approved April 26, 2012**

General Faculty: **Approved April 25, 2012**

Other Actions: No further approvals required.

Additional approvals required by the UNCG Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors.

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.

Implementation of the Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons/offices and coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro**  
**General Faculty**

*Resolution #GF042512-03<sup>6</sup>*

**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**

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

**WHEREAS**, Section 3.E.iii.c. of the current UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations)* allows Associate Professors who are unsuccessful in their bid to be promoted to Professor to next request a review during the third year of service following notice of their unsuccessful bid, and

**WHEREAS**, Section 4.A.iii. in combination with Footnote 6 currently defines an unsuccessful bid as a negative decision by the Chancellor, and

**WHEREAS**, Section 3.E.iii.b. of the current *Regulations* allows a candidate for Promotion to Professor to request review for Promotion no later than August 1 of their 7th year following the conferral of tenure, regardless of whether he or she may have withdrawn his or her portfolio from review in any previous year, provided that there has not been a negative decision by the Chancellor, and

**WHEREAS**, it is desirable that candidates who have withdrawn their portfolio after a negative recommendation at the unit or university levels face the same waiting period as those who have been denied promotion by the Chancellor, and

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate gave its approval on April 18, 2012, therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the phrase “**or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after a negative recommendation at the unit or university levels**” be added to Section 3.E.iii.c as follows (*see page 8 of The Regulations*):

**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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> Faculty Senate Action/Date: **Approved April 18, 2012**

Chancellor Action/Date: **Approved April 20, 2012, Approved April 26, 2012**

General Faculty Action/Date: **Approved April 25, 2012**

Other Approvals: Approval required by the UNCG Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors.

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.

Implementation of the Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons/offices and coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
General Faculty**

*Resolution #GF042512-04<sup>7</sup>*

**To Revise the UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations  
to Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined**

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

**WHEREAS**, Section 4.B.i.h. of the current UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations)* states:

In cases where the recommended action of the department is not supported by a unanimous vote of the faculty senior to the candidate, the faculty member(s) who did not vote in accordance with the recommended action may, at their discretion, include a signed statement in the candidate's portfolio explaining their vote and the reasons why they feel that the recommended action should not be upheld, and

**WHEREAS**, Section 4.B.i.a. (2) of *The Regulations* also mandates that the written summary of the faculty deliberations meeting include a fair presentation of both majority and minority opinions, and

**WHEREAS**, if a majority of the faculty vote against promotion and/or tenure for the candidate, then the nature of the recommended action referred to in section 4.B.i.h. cannot be known until after the Head has decided upon his or her recommendation, thereby delaying the preparation of dissenting opinion(s), if any, and

**WHEREAS**, the *attached table* explains the consequences of changing the policy for determining the minority from one based on the recommended action (RA) to one based solely on the majority vote of the faculty members senior to the candidate, and

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate gave its approval on April 18, 2012, therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that Section 4.B.i.h. of *The Regulations* be revised to read as follows (*see page 12 of The Regulations*):

4.B.i.h Right of faculty members to express dissenting opinions

In cases where the majority vote of the department faculty senior<sup>8</sup> to the candidate is not unanimous, the **assembled<sup>9</sup>** faculty member(s) who did not vote in accordance with the majority may, at their individual discretion, include a single signed statement in the candidate's portfolio explaining their vote.

---

<sup>7</sup> Faculty Senate Action/Date: **Approved April 18, 2012**

Chancellor Action/Date: **Approved April 20, 2012, Approved April 26, 2012**

General Faculty Action/Date: **Approved April 25, 2012**

Additional approvals: Required by the UNCG Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors.

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.

Implementation of the Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons/offices and coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.

<sup>8</sup> Associate Professors and Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors. Consequently, only Professors may evaluate, or vote on the promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Professor.

<sup>9</sup> **"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.**

The table on this page makes several assumptions.

1. The chair of the committee votes with the majority - this may not be true

2. The chair does not adequately summarize the minority opinion, as is required by The Regulations

Note: Failure to summarize the minority opinion would be a procedural violation, and would allow the candidate to grieve the process.

Red text shows the proposed reference for defining the minority.

Some Comments: The current policy defines minority in terms of the recommended action (RA). This is a meaningful definition from a policy perspective as it allows faculty who disagree with the action of the department to express their opinions. However it raises some problems, most notable of which is the condition in which the majority of the faculty oppose promotion but the department head supports it. In this case, the RA is to support the candidate, and the summary written by faculty will be mostly negative, as the majority of faculty opposed the candidate. In addition to this largely negative summary, the current regulations allow a dissenting opinion by the same majority faculty (because they disagree with the RA). - The proposed change fixes this problem by defining minority with reference to how the faculty votes, not with reference to the RA. This removes the problem, but creates one case in which the minority letter will be supportive of the RA (pink box). - The proposed policy also removes problems with the timing of the submission of the dossier to the unit. These problems can occur when the faculty votes against the candidate, while the head supports him/her. In these cases the RA is not know until after the head reaches his/her decision, and the faculty who voted against the candidate will not know that they are in the minority until that time, thus delaying the preparation of their dissenting letter (if any).

**Proposed Change = minority view defined relative to vote of faculty (not RA)**

	Head Supports Promotion				Head Opposes Promotion			
Majority Faculty Vote	Faculty supports promotion		Faculty against promotion		Faculty supports promotion		Faculty against promotion	
Departmental Recommended Action (RA)	to promote		to promote		to promote		oppose promotion	
Faculty vote unanimous?	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
Chair's one-sided summary emphasizes	to promote	to promote	oppose promotion	oppose promotion	to promote	to promote	oppose promotion	oppose promotion
Minority letter possible	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Nature of minority letter	no minority	oppose promotion	no minority	to promote	no minority	oppose promotion	no minority	to promote

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
General Faculty**

*Resolution #GF042512-05<sup>10</sup>*

**To Revise the UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations* to Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees<sup>11</sup>**

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

**WHEREAS**, Section 4.B.ii.a. of the current UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations)* allows Associate Professors who serve on unit promotion and tenure committees to vote on the promotion of Professors, and

**WHEREAS**, the promotion and tenure committee in some units is constituted to be a committee of the whole, consisting of all tenured faculty members in the unit, and

**WHEREAS**, it is *inadvisable to prohibit* Associate Professors from voting on the promotion of a candidate to Professor at the department level (see *The Regulations*, Section 4.B.i.a) while allowing the same Associate Professors to vote at the unit level, and

**WHEREAS**, in other units the unit committee is constituted or administered so as to prevent this occurrence (meaning that *The Regulations* as they now stand serve these units well), and

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate gave its approval on April 18, 2012, therefore

**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.

---

<sup>10</sup> Faculty Senate Action/Date: **Approved on April 18, 2012**

Chancellor Action/Date: **Approved April 20, 2012, Approved April 26, 2012**

General Faculty Action/Date: **Approved April 25, 2012**

Other Approvals: UNCG Board of Trustees and the UNC President/Board of Governors

Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.

Implementation of the Resolution: The Faculty Senate Office shall collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons/offices and coordinate the update of printed and electronic forms and publications.

<sup>11</sup> This Resolution prepared at the behest of the School of Nursing