

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**April 18, 2012**  
**3:00-5:00 pm**  
**Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House**  
**Josh Hoffman, Chair**

*Approved September 5, 2012*

<b>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</b>	<b>Discussion/Motion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Welcome: <i>Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i>	The Senate Chair opened the meeting at 3:08	
Review/Approve Minutes of April 4, 2012: <i>Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i>	Approval of the minutes from April 4, 2012 Motion to Accept: Ben Ramsey Second to the Motion: John Lepri Vote: Unanimous in favor	Minutes approved unanimously
Remarks: <i>Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i>	The Senate Chair made the following announcements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual year-end Committee reports are coming due</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	
Election: Senate Chair-Elect and Senate Secretary for 2012-13: <i>Senate Elections Committee, Rich Ehrhardt, Chair</i>	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.	
Resolution #FS041812-01, To Clarify Section 3.E.iii.b. Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor: <i>Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</i>	Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-01: To Revise the UNCG <i>Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations</i> to Clarify Section 3.E.iii.b Regarding Review for Promotion to Professor.  Section 3.E.iii.b was revised as follows (new language appears in bold print):  <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.  Discussion: None Vote: Unanimous in favor	Resolution approved

<p>Resolution #FS041812-02, To Clarify the Conditions Under Which a Candidate for Promotion to Professor May Next Request Review After an Unsuccessful Bid: <i>Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</i></p>	<p>Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-02: To Revise the <i>UNCG 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.</p> <p>Susan Schelmerdine asked for an amendment in wording to add “<b>or withdraw</b>” to the resolution at the end of sentence two. The requested amendment was unanimously approved.</p> <p>Section 3.E.iii.c. was revised and amended as follows (new language appears in bold print):</p> <p><b>3.E.iii.c.</b> If a review of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is unsuccessful, <b>or if the candidate withdraws his or her portfolio after a negative recommendation at the unit or university levels</b>, 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 <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.</p> <p>Vote: Unanimous in favor</p>	<p><b>Resolution approved</b></p>
<p>Resolution #FS041812-03, To Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined : <i>Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</i></p>	<p>Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-03: To Revise the Manner in Which Dissenting Opinions are Determined.</p> <p>An amendment was requested and approved to insert the word “assembled” and footnote it accordingly.</p> <p>Section 4.B.i.h, <i>Right of faculty members to express dissenting opinions</i> was revised and amended as follows (new language appears in bold print, language to be removed appears in strikeout):</p> <p>In cases where the <del>majority vote recommended action</del> of the department <del>is not supported by a unanimous vote of the faculty senior to the candidate</del> <b>is not unanimous</b>, the <b>assembled<sup>1</sup></b> faculty member(s) who did not vote in accordance with the <del>majority recommended action</del> <b>majority</b> <del>recommended action</del> may, at their <b>individual</b> discretion, include a <b>single</b> signed statement in the candidate’s portfolio explaining their vote. <del>and the reasons why they feel that the recommended action should not be upheld</del></p>	<p><b>Resolution approved</b></p>

<sup>1</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.

	Vote: Unanimous in favor	
Resolution #FS041812-04, To Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees: <i>Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</i>	<p>Bruce Kirchoff presented Resolution #FS041812-04: To Clarify the Role of Associate Professors on Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees.</p> <p>The clarification consisted of a new footnote under Section 4.B.ii.a. as follows:</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 (<i>see page 12 of The Regulations</i>)</p> <p><b><u>New footnote 12</u></b> 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.</p> <p>Vote: Unanimous in Favor</p>	<b>Resolution approved</b>
Resolution #FS041812-05, To Remove the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religions Perspectives (GPR) category designation from the General Education Program Learning Goal : <i>General Education Council, Mark Hens, Chair</i>	<p>Mark Hens presented Resolution #FS041812-5: To Remove the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religions Perspectives (GPR) category designation from the General Education Program Learning Goal.</p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, That the Philosophical, Ethical, and Religious Perspectives (GPR) category designation be removed from the list of general education program category designations linked to LG4.</p> <p>Vote : Unanimous in Favor</p>	<b>Resolution approved</b>
Resolution #FS041812-06, To Create a Senate Committee on Online Learning: <i>Faculty Senate, Josh Hoffman, Chair</i>	<p>Josh Hoffman presented the Resolution #FS041812-6: To Create a Senate Committee on Online Learning.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to amend the resolution to add the word “assessment” in the first sentence after “delivery.”</p> <p>Another Amendment to the resolution was moved, seconded and approved to strike out the line “Faculty members shall either have taught</p>	<b>Resolution approved</b>

	<p>or be teaching an online learning course”</p> <p>The resulting resolution is worded as follows (inserted language appears in <b>bold print</b>; eliminated language appears in strike out):</p> <p><b><u>Senate Online Learning Committee</u></b></p> <p><i>Charge:</i> The Faculty Senate Online Learning Committee shall study issues pertaining to the development, delivery, <b>assessment</b> 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.</p> <p><i>Membership:</i> 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. <del>Faculty members shall either have taught or be teaching a online learning course.</del> 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.</p> <p>Vote: Unanimous in Favor</p>	
<p>Discussion Regarding Findings/Position on Academic Program Review (APR) by the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Program Review at UNCG ; <i>Facilitated by John Lepri, Chair, Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. APR should include the perspectives of external reviewers.</li> <li>5. The results of APR, along with recommendations for changes, if needed, should be communicated to the Deans for further</li> </ol>	

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Adjournment: <i>Senate Chair</i> <i>Josh Hoffman</i></p>	<p>Motion to adjourn the meeting: Ben Ramsey Second to the motion: Patty Sink Vote: Unanimous approval</p>	<p>Motion to Adjourn approved by Unanimous vote</p>

Respectfully submitted,

Beth R Bernhardt  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2011-2012