

**ACTION ITEMS PASSED BY THE FACULTY SENATE
With the Chancellor's Responses
2004-2005**

October 6, 2004

04-10-1 Election of members to serve on the Promotions and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate

Newly elected members of the Promotions and Tenure Committee are Senators Anna Marshall-Baker, Hazel Brown, and Kent Williams

Current members of the committee are Senators Allan Goldfarb, Marsha Paludan, Promod Pratap, and Eileen Kohlenberg (chair).

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

November 3, 2004

04-11-1 Recommendation of the proposed calendar for the academic year 2006-2007 to the Chancellor for approval

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

04-11-2 Recommendation to add a representative from the advising council to serve as an ex officio and nonvoting member to the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee.

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

December 1, 2004

04-12-1 Resolution on the Role of Deans Concerning the Unit Committees for Promotions and Tenure

WHEREAS, The *University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines* and the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* ensure that there will be a separate level of review by Deans; and

WHEREAS, The presence of a Dean during the deliberations or votes of a unit's committee on promotions and tenure is inconsistent with the principle of an independent level of faculty review.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That no Dean will be present during the final deliberations or votes of a unit committee on promotions and tenure. The work of such a committee will be divided into an evidence-gathering phase and a deliberative phase. Deans are entitled to participate in the evidence gathering phase of the meeting. When that phase of the meeting is determined to be over by a majority vote of the committee, the Dean will leave the meeting and final deliberations will proceed. A written ballot will be taken with the Chair counting the ballots and reporting the vote to the Dean.

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

04-12-2 Resolution on the Prohibition of Voting More Than Once for a Candidate for Promotion and Tenure

WHEREAS, The *University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines* specify that each unit will have a standing committee on promotions and tenure; and

WHEREAS, The *University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines* specifies that each unit will ensure at least two levels of faculty review with one being the unit's committee on promotions and tenure; and

WHEREAS, The *University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines* and the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* ensure that there will be separate levels of review by Deans and Department Heads; and

WHEREAS, Faculty may be eligible to review promotion and tenure portfolios at various levels within the department, unit and/or university through their membership in the structural unit and/or membership on a promotion and tenure committee;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That a faculty member eligible to vote for promotion and/or tenure will vote only once on a candidate's promotion and/or tenure. If serving on a higher structural or committee level, that faculty member will participate in the final deliberations, and vote, only at the lower level, though that faculty member may participate in the evidence-gathering phase at the higher level if invited to do so. Deans and Department Heads will not vote at meetings of senior and/or tenured faculty or at meetings of a unit's committee on promotions and tenure.

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

04-12-3 Resolution on the Independence of Departmental Committees for Promotions and Tenure

WHEREAS, The *University Promotions and Tenure Guidelines* and the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* ensure that there will be separate level of review by Deans and Department Heads; and

WHEREAS, The presence of a department head during the deliberations or votes of a department's committee on promotions and tenure is inconsistent with the principle of an independent level of faculty review.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That no Department Head will be present during the final deliberations or vote, on a faculty member's promotion and/or tenure, by the assembled senior and/or tenured faculty members of a department. Such a meeting will be divided into an evidence-gathering phase and a final deliberative phase. These phases will be presided over by a Chair elected by the assembled members of the department eligible to vote at the meeting. When the first phase of the meeting is determined to be over by a majority vote of the assembled faculty, the Department Head will leave the meeting and final deliberations will proceed. A written ballot will be taken with the Chair counting the ballots and reporting the vote to the Department Head. The Chair's responsibilities further include ensuring that all present sign on the appropriate page of the promotion and tenure form, and that the Department Head receives a detailed summary of the views of the assembled faculty, including any dissenting opinions.

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

February 2, 2005

05-02-1 Academic Policies and Regulations Committee's Resolution on Grade Replacement

WHEREAS, Current UNCG policy allows the grade of repeated courses to be averaged with the original grade of the course, and

WHEREAS, Students often experience academic difficulty when they begin their careers and fall into academic probation, and

WHEREAS, removing the lower grade from the student GPA may allow the student to redeem him/herself academically,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT UNCG's policy be changed to allow students to request grade replacement for a total of three (3) courses at the 300-level and below and that the lower grades be removed from the GPA.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the wording on page 41 of the *Undergraduate Bulletin* which reads:

Repeated Course Grade Averaging

Except for courses with specific provision in the course description for repeated credit, a UNCG undergraduate student may repeat a UNCG course in an attempt to earn a better grade. Attempted hours and grade points from both attempts will be counted fully in the Grade Point Average (GPA). Credit hours earned for the course will count only once in the total hours for the degree.

be changed to read:

Grade Replacement Policy

Except for courses with specific provision in the course description for repeated credit, a UNCG undergraduate student may repeat a UNCG course in an attempt to earn a better grade. Students may request that an original grade in a course be removed from the Grade Point Average (GPA) and replaced by the grade earned in the repeated course. Only 300-level and below courses may be repeated. During their undergraduate careers students may request to replace the grades for a total of three courses, regardless of credit hour value. Students must initiate the request by filing a form with the University Registrar's Office to replace a grade. All grade replacements are final. The academic transcript will reflect all attempts and grades. Students who have taken advantage of the Academic Renewal Policy are not eligible to benefit from the Grade Replacement Policy. Grades earned as a result of Academic Integrity violations recorded by the Office of Student Affairs may not be replaced by another grade.

In the case of all other repeated courses, attempted hours and grade points from all attempts will be counted fully in the GPA. Credit hours earned for the course will count only once in the total hours for the degree. Departmental policies supercede this policy. This policy is effective Fall 2005.

Chancellor's Action – Received and Approved

April 6, 2005

05-04-1 RESOLUTION TO REVISE SECTION 4 B.1 OF THE *REGULATIONS ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM, TENURE, AND DUE PROCESS*

WHEREAS, SECTION 4 B. 1. of the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* states that a faculty member denied reappointment or tenure has "five [university working] days after receiving a written notice of nonreappointment from the faculty member's department head" to submit a written request for a private conference with the department head "to discuss the reasons" for the non-reappointment; and

WHEREAS, ten days is generally perceived to be more reasonable than five for a faculty member denied reappointment or tenure, or otherwise the object of a serious sanction, to reflect clearly about his or her options and the appropriateness of pursuing an appeal;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the first paragraph of SECTION 4 B.1 should henceforth be amended as follows:

"Within ten [university working] days after receiving a written notice of nonreappointment from the faculty member's department head, the faculty member may in writing request a private conference ..." [the remainder of the paragraph may remain as currently printed].

Chancellor's Action – Received and sent to the General Faculty for action.

05-04-2 RESOLUTION ON REMINDING INDIVIDUALS OF THEIR RIGHTS TO APPEAL DECISIONS THAT MAY BE PERCEIVED TO INVOLVE A FAILURE OF DUE PROCESS

WHEREAS, on six separate occasions the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* state that notification of a decision not to reappoint (or to impose sanctions) should be made in an "unelaborated written statement" (Sec. 3 H.8; Sec. 4 B.1 ¶ 2; Sec. 4 B.2 ¶ 2; Sec. 4 G.1; Sec. 4 G.2 ¶ 4; Sec. 6 B.9 ¶ 1); and

WHEREAS, faculty members notified of such a decision should be reminded of their rights to appeal should they perceive the decision to involve a failure of due process;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the "unelaborated written statement" clauses should be modified to read:

"unelaborated written statement of the decision with a reference to the appropriate processes of appeal laid out in the relevant unit and University regulations."

Chancellor's Action – Received and sent to the General Faculty for action.

05-04-3 RESOLUTION ON COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING NON-REAPPOINTMENT, IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS, AND FOLLOW-UP APPEALS

WHEREAS, the majority of injunctions in the *Regulations* bearing on the notification of non-reappointment, imposition of "serious sanctions," and follow-up steps for appeal indicate only that such communications be conducted "in writing" or in "a written notice" (e.g., *Regulations* Sec. 3 H.8; Sec. 4 B.1 and B.2, etc.); and

WHEREAS, it is essential that all parties engaged in such communications keep an accurate and complete record of the dates of conveyance and receipt of such documents to insure that deadlines and time-windows set out in the *Regulations* be properly observed;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That a new footnote (no. 5) should be added to the *Regulations*, at the phrase "written statement" in Sec. 3 H.8, expressing the following clarification (in accordance with existing wording found in Section 6 B.3, "Type of Notice to Be Given"):

*5. In all cases of communications regarding non-reappointment, the imposition of serious sanctions, and follow-up processes of appeal, the terms "in writing" and "written statement" (or "notice") shall be understood to mean **in a hard copy letter conveyed by a method of delivery that requires a signature for delivery.***

Chancellor's Action – Received and sent to the General Faculty for action.