

	<p style="text-align: center;">Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting February 1, 2012 3:00-5:00 pm, Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House Josh Hoffman, Chair</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Approved at the March 14, 2012 Meeting</i></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Agenda Item & Presenter</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion/Motion</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Outcome</p>
<p>Welcome: <i>Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i></p>	<p>The Senate Chair opened the meeting at 3:04 pm</p>	
<p>Review/Approve Minutes of December 7 2011: <i>Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i></p>	<p>The minutes of Dec 7, 2011 were revised to show that Susan Shelmerdine put forward the motion for <i>Resolution FS120711-04, Parameters for Courses Carrying Genmenral Education Designations</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion to accept: Jacalyn Claes Second to the Motion: Beth Barba Vote: Unanimous in favor</p>	<p>Minutes approved by Unanimous Vote</p>
<p>Review Agenda: <i>Senate Chair, Josh Hoffman</i></p>	<p>Senate Chair, Josh Hoffman, presented the agenda for review. There we no changes made.</p>	
<p>Remarks: <i>Senate Chair, Josh Hoffman</i></p>	<p>Following is a summary of remarks made by the Senate Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated business forthcoming in the March Senate meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A resolution from the Faculty Government Committee to revise the Constitution as a result of the recent creation of HHS (from former HES/HHP units) including reapportionment of Senators and other changes for clarification, accuracy, and to bring the constitution up-to-date. ○ A resolution from the Faculty Government Committee to establish a standing Senate committee on distance learning to bring oversight and centralized control over this growing area. Its charge will not include areas that are already covered by the Undergraduate Curriculum or the Graduate Studies committees. ○ A possible resolution that would create a follow-up ad hoc Senate committee on Academic Program Review positioning the Senate to live up to its constitutional responsibility and advise the administration with respect to the findings of the University Academic Program Review Committee, which are due on March 1. Between then and the time that the administration takes action, the Senate needs to give its advice. The proposed ad hoc committee would consist of current Senators as well as others and would make recommendations on what the advice to the administration ought to be. 	
<p>Remarks: <i>Chancellor Linda Brady</i></p>	<p>Chancellor Brady's remarks centered on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative update remarks will be deferred to the March Senate meeting, at which time, more information may be available • Comments regarding the Academic Program Review resolution to be presented later in the meeting regarding a provision for an external program review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our goal is to position UNCG to be as "strong academically as 	

possible,” consistent with our mission, Strategic Plan, and responsibility to the people of North Carolina. Academic Program Review is about institutional enhancement, academic excellence and strengthening the foundation enabling us to build collectively a future of which we can all be proud.

- Faculty have been integral to the progress made thus far and the commitment remains to ensure sustained faculty involvement as we bring the process to a close
- The Chancellor and Provost Perrin recently met with the Senate leadership and the Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Program Review on the proposal to engage an external review as part of the Academic Program Review process. After further consideration, including consultation with University Counsel and UNC General Administration and, most importantly, reflection on the impact of extending the process on those academic units and faculty likely to be affected, the Chancellor decided that inserting yet another step into what has been a long, difficult, and stressful process is not in the best interests of our university.
- The *Board of Governors Code* authorizes the Chancellor to make decisions concerning program curtailment or discontinuation, and requires consultation with appropriate faculties and academic administrative officers. UNCG’s process does just that. UNCG’s Academic Program Review process has been led by faculty at the department, unit and university levels beginning with the submission of department and program surveys to unit-level review committees. Next month, the results of the work of the University Program Review Committee will be presented to the Faculty Senate as well as other constituencies for written advice and recommendations.
- Faculties of departments, academic programs, academic units and schools that may be affected by decisions made in response to the recommendations of the University Program Review Committee will have the opportunity to provide their written advice and recommendations as well.
- The Provost has indicated his intent to seek advice as needed from deans and program directors, as well as from faculty of affected programs, before forwarding his recommendations to the Chancellor. While the Process Document does not require the Chancellor to consult beyond her Executive Staff before acting on the Provost’s recommendations, her intention to consult with affected units and faculties, the Faculty Senate et al., as appropriate, before making any decisions.
- The Chancellor stated that if programs are curtailed or even eliminated, it does not necessarily follow that the associated faculty members will lose their jobs. If the decision to curtail or discontinue an academic program impacts the status of tenured or tenure-track faculty, UNCG will adhere strictly to

the *Code of the Board of Governors*, which provides for due process.

- The Chancellor shared her strong belief that the faculty and academic administrative officers of UNCG are best positioned to assess the quality, functions, demand, and efficiency of our academic programs, in the context of UNCG’s history and mission, and that these are the reasons she does not support the addition of another step in the Academic Program Review process that will further extend what has already been an inclusive and time-consuming process.
- Academic Program Review will enable UNCG to identify its strengths and inform decisions concerning the allocation and reallocation of resources. Such decisions are at the core of our collective responsibility -- faculty and administration -- as partners in shared governance.
- Some universities have already concluded similar reviews (*e.g., North Carolina Central University and East Carolina University -- you may examine reports on their respective websites to get a sense of the nature of their processes and the recommendations that have come forward in the context of reviews that have occurred within a six-month or shorter period of time.*), and others are just beginning. UNCG remains focused on bringing the Academic Program Review process to a successful close this semester to be well positioned to take advantage of opportunities for focused investment in the future. Significant progress has been made, but we must continue to work together to ensure we reach our goal.

The Chancellor ended her remarks by thanking all who have helped in the Academic Program Review process and stated that this is our chance to distinguish UNCG as a leader in meeting the needs of our students and the people of this state – today and in the future. She stated her appreciation for continued support for this process.

Remarks by the Provost: *David Perrin Provost*

The Provost’s remarks consisted of an update on the tuition increase proposal due to it having the most impact on faculty and the resources that will be available to work with in the coming year.

- Process followed
 - Tuition Committee co-chaired by SGA President and Vice Provost; Fee Committee co-chaired by SGA Vice President and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (student representation has been consistent; SGA leadership serving as co-chairs is new)
- Guidelines -- General Administration provided three scenarios
 - Keep request to 6.5% or less
 - Requests of more than 6.5% must demonstrate unmet need
 - Requests may be submitted within the guidelines of the “catch

	<p>up plan,” i.e., add certain percentage to the base request over 4-5 yrs to bring campus more in line with new set of peer institutions and rise higher in the lowest quartile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNCG Tuition Committee request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10% increase in tuition for AY 2012-2013 ○ Up to a 10% increase over the next 4-5 years, to be evaluated annually to determine actual need • Proposal approved by BOT and forwarded to GA • Pres Ross submitted his system-wide request to BOG with the following parameters: (20 previous members of the board of governors wrote a letter asking them not to approve increases of the magnitude that had been submitted to the President and GA. Lots of controversy over the level of these increases in spite of the fact that the institutions would still remain in the lowest quartile in comparison to peer institutions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “keep the combined increases for tuition and fees below 10% on every campus for in-state undergrads on every campus in the system ○ Every campus set aside at least 25% for need-based financial aid ○ Increases to be in effect for only two years • The result is that UNCG’s increase was capped at 7.5% with the following comparative figures -- 10%, 7.4 mil vs. 7.5%, 7.2 mil <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need-Based Financial Aid (25%): 1.85 mil vs. 1.80 mil ○ Faculty Salaries—retention/equity (20%): 1.48 mil vs.1.44 mil ○ Grad Awards/Waivers (5%): 370,000 vs. 360,000 ○ Offset Budget Reductions in Faculty (50%): 3.7 mil vs. 3.6 mil <p>The original 10% tuition/fees increase was approved by the UNCG Tuition/Fees Committee. President Ross’ proposal was endorsed by the University of North Carolina Assn of SGA’s; the Board of Governors has yet to hand down its decision and it remains to be seen if the General Assembly approves our enrollment projection and whether funding will be based on enrollment growth or performance.</p> <p>The Provost responded to questions.</p>	
<p><i>Resolution FS020112-01: To Revise the University’s Vision and Mission Statement – Sue Stinson, Chair, University Vision and Mission Statement Revision Committee</i></p>	<p>Sue Stinson brought forth and read <i>Resolution FS020112-01 -- To Revise the University’s Vision and Mission Statement.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Motion to accept the resolution: CP Cause Second to the Motion: Jim Carmichael Discussion: None Vote to approve the Resolution: Unanimous</p>	<p>Resolution Unanimously Approved</p>
<p><i>Resolution FS020112-02: To Incorporate an External Review of</i></p>	<p>Gary Rosenkrantz presented <i>Resolution FS020112-02 -- To Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs.</i> The Senate was asked and agreed to accept a revised version of the Resolution that was sent in the agenda packet (<i>the revised version is included as an attachment to these</i></p>	<p>Resolution Tabled by Majority Vote</p>

<p>Academic Programs - Gary Rosenkrantz, co-chair Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review</p>	<p>minutes). All agreed. Dr. Rosenkrantz read the Resolution.</p> <p>Motion to accept the Resolution: CP Cause Second to the motion: Jacalyn Claes Discussion: the result of the discussion was a motion to table the Resolution, rework it and bring it back to the next Faculty Senate meeting in March</p> <p>Motion to table the Resolution: Ben Ramsey Second to the Motion: Robert Strack Vote: Table the Resolution – 17 (yes); 13 (no)</p>	
<p>Resolution FS020112-03: To Establish Parameters for General Education Courses – Mark Hens, Chair General Education Council</p>	<p>Mark Hens brought forth and read <i>Resolution FS020112-03: To Establish Parameters for General Education Courses.</i></p> <p>Motion to accept the Resolution: Stephen Yarbrough Second to the Motion: Patti Sink Discussion: None Vote: Motion approved by unanimous vote</p>	<p>Resolution Unanimously Approved</p>
<p>Resolution FS020112-04: To Eliminate Reporting of S/U Class Performance – Maura Heyn, Chair Academic Policies and Regulations Committee</p>	<p>Maura Heyn brought forth and read <i>Resolution FS020112-04: To Eliminate Reporting of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Class Performance.</i> Only discussion and a vote were required.</p> <p>Discussion: None Vote: Motion approved by majority vote with one vote of opposition.</p>	<p>Resolution Approved by Majority Vote with One (1) Vote of Opposition</p>
<p>Resolution FS020112-05: Change to Priority Registration Window Assignment - Maura Heyn, Chair Academic Policies and Regulations Committee</p>	<p>Maura Heyn brought forth <i>Resolution FS020112-05: Change to Priority Registration Window Assignment.</i> Only discussion and a vote were required.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion centered around the effect of the change in the priority registration window assignment on students enrolled in the UNCG-in-3 Program. The population is small, but if it increases measurably, the priority registration window assignment may have to be revisited. Vote: Motion approved by unanimous vote</p>	<p>Resolution Approved by Unanimous Vote</p>
<p>Report: Activity of the UNCG Trustees’ Task Force on Revenue Generation – Nicholas H. Oberlies, Task Force Member</p>	<p>Nicholas Oberlies informed the Senate about a Task Force for Revenue Generation established by the UNCG Board of Trustees in response to cuts to the UNCG budget. The Taskforce is chaired by Board of Trustees member, David Sprinkle, who was also in attendance at the Senate meeting. The Taskforce welcomes any and all ideas on how to recoup the \$30 million lost in budget cuts. In addition, the Taskforce is charged with finding other ways to generate revenue for the University.</p>	
<p>Report: Activity of the UNC Faculty</p>	<p>David Ribar referred the Senate to the written report distributed as part of the agenda packet for the current meeting.</p>	

<i>Assembly – David Ribar, Lead Delegate, UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation</i>		
<i>Adjournment: Senate Chair Josh Hoffman</i>	Motion to adjourn the meeting (4:47 p.m.): CP Cause Seconded to the motion: Patti Sink Vote: Unanimous approval.	Motion to Adjourn Approved by Unanimous Vote

Respectfully submitted,

Beth R Bernhardt
 Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2011-2012

Attachment

Revised version of *Resolution FS020112-02: To Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs*

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

Resolution #FS020112-02 (Revised)¹

To Incorporate an External Review of Academic Programs

*Submitted by the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Program Review
Presented by Gary Rosenkrantz, ad hoc Committee Co-Chair*

WHEREAS, the Chancellor may recommend the discontinuation of programs, and discontinued programs could result in a recommendation to terminate positions held by tenured faculty, and

WHEREAS, the revocation of tenured or tenure-track positions for programmatic reasons should only be considered ~~under extraordinary circumstances, and only~~ after a thorough review of the affected program by external faculty knowledgeable in the field of study who are able to review the program impartially, and

WHEREAS, the current Academic Program Review Process does not include a provision for an external program review, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that programs considered by the Chancellor for discontinuation along with tenured or tenure-track faculty positions go through an impartial external program review before a final discontinuation decision by the Chancellor. ~~External reviewers will not make a recommendation about whether to continue or discontinue a program, but – at a minimum – will address program quality, function and demand. Upon the recommendation~~Based upon the report of the external program reviewers and considering any other information as a result of the Academic Program Review, the Faculty Senate will provide its ~~advice~~recommendation to the Chancellor about whether to discontinue a program, pursuant to *The Constitution of the Faculty* [Article III, Section 1.1 (~~gh~~)] before a final program ~~disposition recommendation~~discontinuation decision by the Chancellor. In compliance with Article III, Section 1.1 (~~gh~~), the Faculty Senate will also provide its ~~advice~~recommendations about whether to discontinue any other program that the Chancellor is considering discontinuing, before a final program ~~disposition recommendation~~discontinuation decision by the Chancellor; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that for each program to be reviewed, a total of ~~three~~two external reviewers will be chosen, selected as follows. Tenured or tenure-track faculty in the affected program will propose names of ~~three~~at least two potential external reviewers to be considered along with names proposed by the Office of the Provost and an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate. A member of the *ad hoc* committee will recuse himself or herself from the selection process in any particular case in which he or she is part of the faculty of the program to be reviewed. ~~The three~~One of the external reviewers will be chosen by the Office of the Provost and the ~~other by the~~ *ad hoc* Committee of the Faculty Senate, ~~by mutual agreement~~. The ~~selected~~ external program reviewers ~~chosen~~ should be tenured faculty at other institutions comparable to UNCG who are impartial, knowledgeable in the field of the program to be reviewed, and experienced in conducting program reviews. The time-line for the aforementioned processes will be managed by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate, ~~and~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the foregoing provisions will not apply in the event of a demonstrable, bona fide institutional financial exigency.

¹ Faculty Senate Action/Date: Tabled, 02/01/2012