Appalachian State University
Faculty Senate Minutes

April 14, 2014 (Approved)

The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Koch at 3:15 pm in the William Strickland Conference Room in I.G. Greer on Monday, April 14, 2014. Senators Daigle, Hageman, Murrell, Ortiz, Peterson-Sparks, Smith, Stanovsky and Stallworth were not in attendance.

I. Announcements

A. Chair Koch welcomed Senators and asked visitors to introduce themselves. Visitors were Dr. Lorin Baumhover (Chancellor’s Office), Dr. Mary Reichel (Academic Affairs), Gunther Doerr (Public Safety), Barbara Krause (Office of Gen. Counsel), Charna Howson (Sponsored Programs), Dr. Bobby Sharp (IRAP), Dr. Paulette Marty (THR), Amanda Sharp (student) and Anna Oakes (Watauga Democrat).

II. Minutes

A. Chair Koch asked for a motion to approve the March 17, 2014 Faculty Senate minutes. It was noted that the Budget Committee still has Senator Szeto listed on the minutes, though she has been replaced this semester with Mike Helms. Senator Aycock moved and Senator Erickson seconded to approve the minutes as amended. Motion passed. (Vote #1).

III. Visitors’ Reports

A. Chancellor Peacock addressed the Faculty Senate in his last meeting with this body as Chancellor. He was gifted with a Certificate of Appreciation and a gavel by Chair Koch. The Chancellor Peacock thanked the Senators for their service. He is happy with the new choice for Chancellor – Dr. Sheri Noren Everts - that the Board of Governors approved. After meeting with the Board of Governors, Chancellor Peacock described this period in the life of ASU as one with lots of change and challenges. The full impacts of tax cuts are still not known. Allotments have been cut and previous carry-over money no longer exists. At least ASU is still able to meet its payroll, while some other campuses are not. If there are no pay raises for professors, there may be a mass exodus from this state. One goal that Chancellor Peacock has encouraged in-coming Chancellor Everts to pursue is to re-visit the question of ASU’s Mission Statement.

B. Gunther Doerr reported about the Campus SaVE Act, related to criminal offenses. According to the Clery Act, ASU must incorporate an annual security report. Mandatory compliance must be completed by October, 2015. This report includes
sex offenses, domestic violence and dating violence. The elements of the program at ASU encompass collecting and reporting crime data, education and training of faculty and staff, and a Campus Security Authority (CSA). Doerr noted that federal and state definitions for various crimes are very different. The determinations for crimes are geographic-dependent: 1) on-campus property, 2) non-campus property and 3) public property, but apply to anyone: student, visitor, etc. As part of the program, there must be new and on-going training, and boards will be established to evaluate events as they arise. Those who sit on these boards must be specially trained. It was noted that staff should be trained as well as faculty.

B. Barbara Krause, the ASU Conflict of Interest coordinator, was present to inform the Senate of the Conflict of Interest policy. She presented a draft of a document of Frequently Asked Questions that is the product of the Conflict of Interest and Commitme

Council. She invited the Senators to read through the document and to provide feedback in order to maximize the utility of this document for faculty members. The updated form will be uploaded for online access in the near future.

Charna Howson elaborated upon the online component of this policy. There are three pieces to this online system: annual disclosure (completed by everyone), grant disclosure (external research) and the NIH training module. You only respond to the things which are pertinent to you. If a potential conflict is detected, it will go to the Office of General Counsel to be explored further. Ways in which this process is different from before are that: 1) it is all online (Department Chairs and Deans are not involved); 2) it is integrated with the modules from Chapel Hill, like the A-grant system and 3) there is a training module. The process will be faster and more secure in that only the people who need to see the information will see it. The information will be like personnel records. The information would only be known by the Office of General Counsel and possibly the Department Chair or Dean.

IV. Provost’s Report

A. Provost Gonzalez was unable to attend this meeting due to a meeting with the Chancellor. She requested that Dr. Reichel report in her place. Everyone is invited to participate in commencement from May 9-11, 2014 and to encourage colleagues to attend as well.

The Board of Trustees approved the Strategic Plan for the university entitled “The Appalachian Experience: Envisioning a Just and Sustainable Future”. It can be found on the ASU web site. At the same meeting, the Board approved Faculty Promotion and Tenure considerations. There are two searches underway: Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Compliance and a Graduate Dean. Interviews with candidates are upcoming.
Despite the budget news that there will not be full allocations given to the University, there are still allocations that are coming.

A question was raised by Senator Martin regarding the numbers of non-retirement losses of faculty. The College of Arts and Sciences seems to have lost as many faculty members this year as in the last six years combined. Is this true of other colleges? Chair Koch said that he will get the data regarding reduction of faculty to provide to the Senate as well as to President Ross along with the Senate’s expression of concern.

Senator Reck questioned whether ASU has requested any “Faculty Retention Funds” that can be used for faculty members who are considering leaving. Chair Koch asked how many times there have been requests for these funds. Dr. Reichel said she would find out that information and report back to the Senate.

V. Chair’s Report

A. Chair Koch reported that the Chancellor Advisory Committee discussed the information that Chancellor Peacock has already alluded to.

At the Faculty Assembly meeting, there was extensive discussion of the work of the Gen. Ed. Council. The Council has identified two skills as core competencies: critical thinking skills and writing skills. These skills must be documented and measured, using a UNC instrument. Paulette Marty elaborated on this process. The Strategic Plan states that there must be an instrument, and the Gen. Ed. Council decided that we must be involved in creating this instrument (a standardized test), and that it must be complemented with a qualitative assessment, such as e-portfolios. In order that an instrument is not imposed on the University, it is best to devise an instrument in conjunction with Educational Testing Services. This would be a written test, not multiple-choice, but it would not be discipline-specific, but rather more global. Some of the concerns that were raised were: how would it be scored (by ETS); how will the results of the assessment be used?; when would the test be given?; how do we get the students to take the test seriously?

The second resolution passed by the Faculty Assembly concerns program prioritization and its financial impact. This is included for information only. (see Appendix B)

The third resolution passed by the Faculty Assembly relates to post-tenure review. There will be more discussion about this as part of the Executive Committee report. (see Appendix C)
Dr. Sheri Everts, the new Chancellor, will be present for the April 28, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting. This appearance will be for a meet-and-greet only and not a time for substantive discussion. She has already reached out to establish good channels of communication with the Faculty Senate.

VI. **Committee Reports** (Committee Chair’s name is in bold print)

A. **Academic Policies (Campbell, Crepeau, Nash, Reed, Stanovsky)**

Senator Campbell reported that while previous years have been dominated by academic freedom issues, this year has been much quieter, and the committee has functioned more as a study commission working on issues that remain unresolved. The Ombuds office is seen to have a lot of potential to solve a lot of problems. The relationship between the Equity Office and the Ombuds office needs to be clarified. With a new Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Compliance coming on board, there are legal and practical issues that need to be defined. There are concerns about the current structure where one person serves as investigator, grand jury and judge. Perhaps issues related to course content and pedagogy would best be handled at the departmental level. Which concerns would best be directed to the Equity Office or to Academic Affairs? Lastly, whose job is it to defend academic freedom at ASU? Where does a faculty member go if they feel that their academic freedom is compromised? A Grievance Process exists, but that comes into play after disciplinary action. In an affirmative sense, whose responsibility is it to pursue and defend issues of academic freedom? The term “Ethics Points” has been raised, but ASU is not pursing this any differently than the other UNC campuses. It is simply a mechanism for “whistle blowers”.

Senator Campbell also expressed appreciation for the help and cooperation the committee has received from Academic Affairs and across the campus. Issues and recommendations will be brought next year.

B. **Agenda Committee (Koch, Aycock, Gates, Martin, Provost Gonzalez)**

No report.

C. **Budget Committee (Geary, Hageman, McGrady, Murrell, Rice, Stallworth, Strazicich, Helms)**

No report.

D. **Campus Planning Committee (Daigle, Everhart, Fenwick, Frye, Stokes)**

No report.
E. Committee on Committees (Gates, Hester, Morehouse, Oliver, Puckett, Villanova)

Vice Chair Gates indicated that there was a late development regarding a replacement Senator to finish out the at-large term of a Senator who resigned. The Committee on Committees unanimously recommends Hugh Hindman to fill this one-yr. vacancy. **Motion FS 14-15/04-01 passed to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Committees for Dr. Hugh Hindman to fill a one-year, at-large seat on the Faculty Senate. (Vote #2)**

Vice Chair Gates questioned how everyone was doing in their departments getting representation for upcoming elections. There is one three-yr. at-large Senate seat that also needs to be filled. He mentioned some other committee openings that also need to be filled. There has been good response for positions on non-elected committee openings. Still a little behind in relation to elections, but progress is being made to get that process started within the next week.

Vice Chair Gates reported again from the Workload Task Force, and Dr. Reichel provided a working draft of the Appalachian State University Policy on Faculty Workload. (see Appendix D) This report is to be a statement on how ASU determines faculty workload, how we account for variations and how we monitor and report what transpires in our professional lives. The Task Force has recently had meetings with the Council of Chairs and the Dean’s Council and has had good input which was incorporated into the report. The Task Force will meet again on April 23, 2014 to discuss the Faculty Senate input and will provide a final document to the General Administration by the end of September. A couple of issues were raised about the lack of inclusion of situations such as independent studies and supervising internships. Dr. Reichel and Vice Chair Gates emphasized that this was meant to be a broad, general overview of workload to the General Administration, and that departments would address more specific considerations.

F. Executive Committee (Koch, Gates, Martin, Aycock, Fenwick, Strazicich, Peterson-Sparks, Campbell)

Chair Koch called attention to the General Administration’s Post Tenure Review Working Group recommendations. (see Appendix E) The Executive Committee proposed a resolution in response to the changes to Post-Tenure Review. This response to those changes addresses the fact that the General Administration is making recommendations about things that could have serious ramifications for the campuses. It is hoped that enough pressure can be exerted to cause changes to be made to the report. **Motion FS 14-15/04-02 passed to approve the Resolution regarding Recommended Changes to Post-Tenure Review as presented in Appendix E. (Vote #3)**
Resolution on Recommended Changes to Post-Tenure Review

Whereas the UNC General Administration and the Faculty Assembly have requested feedback on the proposed changes to Post-Tenure Review generated by the General Administrations Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Working Group, and

Whereas the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate has reviewed the recommendations contained in the report,

Be it resolved That the Faculty Senate at Appalachian State University expresses its objections to the following recommendations contained in the proposal:

1. Requiring a substantive assessment of every faculty member undergoing PTR by college deans undermines the process of peer-review carried out by department faculty who are the most knowledgeable and best trained to assess the performance of an individual department faculty member. Further, such a review requirement will add to an already excessive workload experienced by many deans.

2. The expectation that faculty should map out their research agenda in a 5-year cycle reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of how scholarship works, the ways in which faculty may be drawn in new directions, or how faculty may avail themselves of new opportunities for research or funding. Further, by locking faculty into a process that takes on the character of a contractual obligation, such an artificially contrived plan would likely reduce the prospect of faculty generating new, innovative, and creative studies that respond to both the needs of North Carolina and the new trends and directions in research.

3. The use of three evaluative categories will confuse and weaken the system of performance review that is already part of an annual review process. This is particularly problematic as the PTR assessment is proposed as part of a reward structure on the campuses. Since the faculty member’s annual review is already the basis on which merit is recognized and rewarded within departments, and since no funding has been allocated for the reward of exceptional performance as part of PTR, this seems to be a plan without need, purpose, or funding. Further, since “recognizing and rewarding exemplary performance” is already stated as an objective in the Policy Manual on PTR, the reworking of the language on this topic is unnecessary.

4. If implemented, these changes will have a profoundly negative affect on faculty morale. Therefore, we agree with the sentiments expressed in the resolution of the Faculty Assembly on the PTR proposal. This policy may – and likely will – have the unintended consequence of undermining the faculty confidence that the
UNC administration and governing bodies support and respect faculty contributions to the goals of public higher education. The consequences of this policy may have very serious negative implications for our students’ educational experience, the reputation of our University system, as well as our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty.

G. Faculty Handbook Committee (Koch, Aycock, Gates, Vannoy, Provost Gonzalez)

*Faculty Handbook* changes regarding paid leave. Chair Koch presented a recommendation for a minor change in language to in Section 6.2.1.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*, changing “occasions” to “extraordinary circumstances”. (see Appendix G) **Motion FS 14-15/04-03 passed to approve the changes in Section 6.2 of the Faculty Handbook regarding Paid Leaves of Absence and Other Adjustments of Employment Obligations. (Vote #4)**

Senator Martin moved that the recommended changes to Section 3.13.4 of the *Faculty Handbook* (see Appendix H) regarding Lecturers be amended such that 3.13.4.3 (a) read: “A master’s degree from an accredited institution with 18 graduate credits in their field of teaching; and experience teaching a minimum of 40 courses (or the equivalent thereof) at Appalachian post matriculation for the master’s degree.” Senator Strazicich seconded the motion. **Motion FS 14-15/04-04 passed to approve the proposed change to Section 3.13.4.3 (a) of the Faculty Handbook. (Vote #5)**

**Motion FS 14-15/04-05 passed to approve the changes as amended to Section 3.13.4 and its subsections of the Faculty Handbook. (Vote #6)**

*Faculty Handbook* changes regarding Department Chairs. Chair Koch presented the recommended changes to Section 2.8 of the Faculty Handbook regarding Department Chairs. (see Appendix I) **Motion FS 14-15/04-06 passed to approve the proposed changes to Section 2.8 of the Faculty Handbook. (Vote #7)**

*Faculty Handbook* changes regarding Academic Tenure and Tenure-Eligible Academic Ranks. Chair Koch presented an updated revision of the proposed changes to the *Faculty Handbook* regarding opportunities for Early Promotion and Tenure, with language to accommodate the recoupling of promotion and tenure. There was one substantive change in Section 3.8.6.3. (See Appendix J) Again there was some concern regarding increased workload, but Chair Koch said that he felt that by recoupling promotion and tenure, these concerns would be addressed. **Motion FS 14-15/04-07 passed to approve the proposed changes to Sections 3.7-3.8 of the Faculty Handbook. (Vote #8)**
VI. Unfinished Business

None.

VII. New Business

None.

VIII. Adjournment

Senator Frank Aycock moved and Senator Helms seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn passed. (Vote #9). Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Faculty Senate Voting and Attendance Record for April 14, 2014
Y for Yes; N for No; A for Abstain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Alexander-Eitzman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Aycock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Campbell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crepeau</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Daigle</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Debelius</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Erickson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fenwick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Flanders</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Frye</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gates</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Geary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Gosky</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hageman</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Helms</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Hester</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Howard</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lane</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Martin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth McGrady</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Morehouse</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zack Murrell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Nash</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion to approve the Faculty Senate minutes for March 17, 2014 passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-01 to approve Hugh Hindman to fill a one-yr. At-large seat on the Faculty Senate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-02 to approve the Resolution regarding Recommended Changes to Post-Tenure Review as presented in Appendix E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-03 passed to approve the changes in Section 6.2 of the Faculty Handbook regarding Paid Leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-04 passed to approve the proposed change to Section 3.13.4.3 (a) of the Faculty Handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-05 passed to approve the changes as amended to Section 3.13.4 and its subsections of the Faculty Handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-06 passed to approve the proposed changes to Section 2.8 of the Faculty Handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/04-07 passed to approve the proposed changes to Sections 3.7-3.8 of the Faculty Handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motion to adjourn passed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A:

2014-04
Resolution in Support of the General Education Council’s Work on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly
April 04, 2014

Whereas, a major goal of the UNC 2013-2018 strategic plan “Our Time, Our Future: The UNC Compact with North Carolina” is to make the University of North Carolina a national leader in learning outcomes assessment by “supporting faculty in developing methods . . . to demonstrate student learning in ways that respect the depth and complexity of the knowledge we expect our students to master;” and

Whereas, the strategic plan defines mastery of critical thinking and communication skills, as well as faculty scholarship and teaching that meets the highest intellectual standards, as central to the University’s compact with the people of North Carolina; and

Whereas, the strategic plan, the UNC Faculty Advisory Council’s “Our University, Our Future,” and the research of nationally acknowledged experts all recognize that there is no national consensus about assessment methodology, sample design, or any single assessment instrument and that effective assessment of learning is best conducted by faculty and requires both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary (programmatic) expertise, as well as multiple approaches that cannot “be limited by any one measure that attempts to capture all of the complexity of the desired outcomes;” and

Whereas, there is no evidence of the educational effectiveness and validity of global assessment of student learning; and

Whereas, the UNC General Education Council (GEC) has by its thoughtful, comprehensive, and innovative work determined that the goal of making North Carolina a national leader in learning outcomes assessment can only be met if the University develops its own instruments for system-wide assessment of student learning outcomes; and

Whereas, the GEC has enumerated Principles of Good Assessment to guide the development of the assessment instruments; and

Whereas, the GEC has defined the primary functions of these instruments to be the demonstration of student achievement of core competencies at the institutional level and the use of assessment results to improve the curriculum with respect to the core competencies; and

Whereas, the conceptualization, design, and implementation of student learning outcomes assessments, and the interpretation and formative use of the results of student learning assessments, are curricular concerns requiring faculty expertise and responsibility; and

Whereas, the GEC will have primary responsibility for the development of these instruments, with the goal of University of North Carolina becoming a national leader in assessment;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That, the Faculty Assembly expresses its appreciation for the work of the GEC; and

Be It Further Resolved That, to obtain the benefits of effective assessments, the Faculty Assembly endorses the GEC’s recommendation that the University of North Carolina develop its own assessment instruments, following the Principles of Good Assessment, for the purposes of demonstrating student achievement and producing results to be used for formative improvements in the curriculum; and

Be It Further Resolved That, because the development, implementation and interpretation of assessment instruments, as well as their formative use in revising both curriculum and assessment tools, are central to the curricular responsibilities of faculty, the faculties of the University are responsible for all such matters.
Appendix B:

2014-03
Resolution on Transparency of Financial Impacts in Academic Program Prioritization Processes
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly
April 04, 2014

Whereas, many of the UNC constituent institutions are responding to budgetary reductions by undertaking an academic program prioritization process; and

Whereas, these processes have been undertaken using widely different approaches with varied levels of faculty involvement; and

Whereas, it has been unclear how many of the recommendations made during these processes will increase efficiency or reduce costs without undue negative impact on the students, staff, and faculty of the affected programs;

Therefore, Be It Resolved That, any constituent institution that proposes structural reorganization, consolidation, or reduction of colleges, schools and academic programs maintain transparency by first communicating to the faculty via the campus shared governance organization the realistic costs and anticipated savings associated the proposed changes, including those costs related to faculty and administrative staff changes, changes in operating budget, teach out plans, and facility utilization; and

Be It Further Resolved That, immediately following and at least annually after implementation of any structural reorganization, consolidation or reduction of colleges, schools and/or academic programs, a detailed report on all realized savings and/or costs of the implemented changes be provided to the faculty and all other university constituencies.
Appendix C: Workload Background

Portion of Memorandum from Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs to UNC Chief Academic Officers on June 24, 2013:

All campuses and constituent institutions will develop and implement policies and procedures to monitor faculty teaching loads and to approve significant or sustained variations from expected minimums. Policies must include the criteria and approval process for reductions in institutional load attendant to increased administrative responsibilities, externally funded research, including course buy-outs, and additional institutional and departmental service obligations. Given the complexity of faculty work activities, individual faculty teaching loads are best managed at the department and school level, and not at the system or state level. However, to ensure meaningful comparisons of faculty teaching load over time and across peers, all campuses shall adopt a standard methodology for collecting data on teaching load.

In order to appropriately monitor and reward faculty teaching, evaluations must be placed in the context of total faculty workload. Therefore, all campuses and constituent institutions shall implement annual faculty performance evaluations policies that measure and reward all aspects of faculty workload, separately and in combination, consistent with the instructional mission.

Members of Faculty Workload Task Force:
Paul Gates, Chair
Arts and Sciences  Tony Calamai, Dean; Kim Gunter, Assistant Chair, English
Business  David Marlett, Chair of Finance, Banking and Insurance
Fine and Applied Arts  Jean Klein, Art; Joel Williams; Theatre and Dance; Paul Gates, Communication, Faculty Senate and Chair of Task Force
Graduate School/Council  Marie Hoepfl, TED, Director of the Graduate Program and Assistant Chair
Health Sciences  Travis Triplett, Interim Chair HLES
ITS  Beth Pouder
Institutional Research  Bobby Sharp
Library  Kelly McCallister
Music  Doug James
Reich College of Education  Susan Colby, Chair of Curriculum and Instruction
Academic Affairs  Mary Reichel

Overall Steering Committee for the Faculty Workload Task Force, the Digital Measures Task Force and the Banner Faculty Task Force. Digital Measures TF is co-chaired by David Wiley and Susan Roggenkamp; Banner Faculty TF is co-chaired by Bobby Sharp and Josh Belliteau. Steering Committee chaired by Tony Calamai and includes chairs of the task forces, Cathy Bates, CIO, and Mary Reichel.

Review Groups: Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, Deans Council, General Counsel, Provost

Timeline: Task Force Appointed Fall 2013; first met 11-19-13; Working draft 4-3-14; Share with review groups and make changes; Task Force finalize policy early Fall Semester 2014; Provost approval; Submit to General Administration no later than September 30, 2014.
Appendix D:  WORKING DRAFT – 4-3-14

Appalachian State University Policy on Faculty Workload

1. Introduction
In accordance with UNC Policy 400.3.4 the purpose of this document is to ensure that Appalachian State University (ASU) has an established process to monitor faculty workloads and to approve significant or sustained variations from expected teaching loads. This document includes the criteria and the approval process for assigning instructional loads in relation to increased administrative responsibilities, externally funded research, including course buy-outs, and additional institutional and departmental scholarly/creative and service obligations. The policy was formally developed in response to General Administration Charge on Faculty Workload Policy 400.3, but it codifies practices and procedures that have been in place for a decade or more.

2. Scope
2.1 This policy covers tenured and tenure track faculty members.
2.2 The UNC Policy Manual 400.3.4 includes the statement that “given the complexity of faculty work activities, individual faculty teaching loads are best managed at the department and school level, and not the system or state level. However, to ensure meaningful comparisons of faculty teaching load over time and across peers, all campuses shall adopt a standard methodology for collecting data on teaching load.” Section 4.6 addresses the requirement for a standard methodology for collecting teaching load data.
2.3 The authority for this policy comes from the University of North Carolina Policy Manual (UNC POL), specifically Chapter 400. It is also based on the Appalachian State University Faculty Handbook (ASU FH.)

3. Definitions
3.1 Professional Workload for Faculty
Faculty workload includes the entirety of a faculty member’s responsibilities, and is defined in the ASU Faculty Handbook in this way: “The professional workload for full-time faculty members includes teaching; scholarship and/or creative activities; and professional, university, and community service relevant to faculty expertise.” (ASU FH 6.1.1)
3.2 Teaching Workload. UNC POL 400.3.4 defines the “standard faculty teaching load measured by number of organized class courses a faculty member is assigned in a given academic year” as six courses for a Masters (Comprehensive) I institution, such as ASU. White the ASU Faculty Handbook 6.1.2 states “the maximum teaching load for faculty is twelve credit hours per semester, or equivalently twelve instructional contact/load hours in formally scheduled lab, clinical or studio courses, in addition to office hours…..” the standard practice across ASU colleges and academic departments is to assign faculty 18 credit hours or the equivalent per academic year as faculty members are expected to be active in scholarly or creative activities. This practice is consistent with UNC POL 400.3.4.
3.3 Instructional Expectations. ASU Faculty Handbook Chapter VI “Faculty Workload and the Instruction of Students” in section 6.1.2 defines instructional expectations broadly including direct classroom, lab, and studio teaching as well as class preparation, student evaluation, scheduled and unscheduled office hours, and meetings related to curriculum development, syllabus preparation, and program evaluation. Section 6.1.2 states that “for each formal instructional credit/contact/load hour, faculty members typically spend two to three hours in preparation for teaching.”
3.4 Differential Instructional Responsibilities. Although the language in UNC POL 400.3 and ASU’s Faculty Handbook 6.1.2.1 varies slightly in terminology, the intent of both is to develop criteria that include differential instructional responsibilities resulting from administrative duties; scholarship and/or creative activity; externally funded research, including course buy-outs; and special assignments including additional institutional and
departmental administrative and service obligations.

3.5 Course Overload. A course overload is a teaching workload assignment that exceeds the expected teaching load for the department. A faculty member may receive additional pay or alternative compensation, such as a subsequent course reduction, for overload assignments.

4. Policy and Procedure Statements

4.1 College-Level Faculty Workload Criteria. ASU’s Faculty Handbook 2.6 states that “the dean has general administrative oversight of all matters affecting the strength of the college/school….” The development of college-level criteria for faculty workload shall reside with the dean in consultation with department chairs or equivalent. The purpose of the college-level workload criteria is to provide general guidance and equity within the college for departments and programs. The Provost will approve college-level workload criteria.

4.2 Departmental Faculty Workload Guidelines. Based on this policy and consistent with the college-level workload criteria, departments will develop and maintain written guidelines which “outline any differential instructional responsibilities resulting from administrative duties, scholarship and/or creative activity, and other special assignments” (ASU FH 6.1.2.1) including externally funded research, funded course buy-outs, and additional institutional and departmental administrative, scholarly, and service obligations. Departments will also “outline relevant course load equivalencies for lab, clinical or studio courses, and for oversized courses.” (ASU FH 6.1.2.1). “Department workload guidelines will be developed by the department’s tenure-line faculty in consultation with the unit administrator and dean and be voted on by the tenure-line members of the department” (ASU FH 6.1.2.1). Departmental guidelines that vary significantly from expected minimums will require approval by the dean.

4.3 Assignment of Individual Faculty Workload. In accordance with Faculty Handbook 4.3.2, the department chair is responsible for planning the workload of each faculty member on an annual basis, arranging the various faculty responsibilities equitably and effectively within the department. When assigning individual workloads, department chairs consider a variety of factors such as faculty expertise, preferences, and goals; student, program and departmental needs; and departmental productivity. Duties “may vary by academic discipline, college, program, school and departmental missions, and over time in an individual faculty member’s career.” (ASU FH 6.1.2.1) Instructional assignments that vary significantly from expected departmental and college minimums will require approval by the dean. The dean shall approve instructional assignments that vary significantly from expected department and college minimum loads. The dean shall consult with the Provost as needed.

4.4 Joint Appointments. In accordance with Faculty Handbook 3.10, faculty may hold joint appointments in more than one department. For faculty holding joint appointment, the administrator of the faculty member’s “base” or primary department, in consultation with the administrator of the unit to which the faculty member is jointly appointed, will plan the workload of the faculty member.

4.5 Annual Review of Faculty. Faculty members will include their instructional responsibilities, scholarship and/or creative activity, service, administrative, and other special assignments in their annual reports. They will also assess progress on the goals set in the previous annual review. The department chair’s annual review of faculty will be based on the year’s assigned duties and goals. For more information, see Faculty Handbook 4.3.2.

4.6 Reporting on Faculty Workload. As specified in UNC Policy Manual 400.3.4[R] “the University of North Carolina campuses will use the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (Delaware Study) Data Collection Form for reporting.”

4.6.a UNC Policy Manual 400.3.4[R] continues that “To further ensure consistency, the following University of North Carolina defined Instructional Formats will be reported to the Delaware Study as an ‘Organized Class’:

- Lab
  A course requiring scientific- or research-focused experiential work where students test, observe, experiment, or practice a field or discipline in a hands-on environment, typically held in 210 designated spaces.

- Studio
A course requiring visual- or aesthetic-focused experiential work where students test, observe, experiment, or practice a field or discipline in a hands-on environment.

- **Lecture**
  A course requiring the extended expression of thought supported by generally-accepted principals or theorems of a field or discipline led by an expert or qualified representative of the field or discipline.

- **Seminar**
  A course requiring students to participate in structured conversation or debate focused on assigned readings, current or historical events, or shared experiences led by an expert or qualified representative of the field or discipline.

- **Lecture and Lab**
  A course that requires the combined attributes of a Lecture course and a Lab course.

- **Recitation**
  A course requiring the extended expression of thought supported by generally-accepted principals or theorems of a field or discipline led by a teaching assistant or instructor under the guidance of a permanent faculty member, which often supplements or expands upon the content of a related or co-requisite course.

4.6.b [This section still needs to be reviewed by the Task Force. There are concerns about the ramifications of this section across colleges.] For reporting teaching loads within the Delaware Study, two measures are calculated: (a) the number of organized classes a faculty member is assigned in a given semester, and (b) the number of student credit hours a faculty member generates. Courses that are not conducted in regularly scheduled class meetings, such as “readings,” “special topics,” “problems” or “research” courses, including dissertation/thesis research, and “individual lesson” courses (typically in music and fine arts) are not defined as “organized” and thus are excluded from calculations of the number of organized courses for a faculty member. However, the student credit hours generated by a faculty member include all course types.

4.6.c The University will participate in the Delaware Study which collects information on teaching workload annually at department, college, and university levels and will monitor implementation of the University’s workload expectations.

5 Additional References
Appalachian State University Faculty Handbook ([http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/files/Faculty-Handbook-110613.pdf](http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/files/Faculty-Handbook-110613.pdf)), especially sections 6.1 Faculty Workload; 2.6 The Dean of a College/School; 3.10 Joint Appointments, and 4.3 Evaluation of Faculty and the “Pilot Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation 2013-14”.

6 Authority
UNC Policy Manual 400.3.4 Monitoring Faculty Teaching Workloads
UNC Policy Manual 400.3.4 [R] Regulations Related to Monitoring Faculty Teaching Workloads

7 Contact Information

8 Effective Date
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Post-Tenure Review Working Group Recommendations

The University of North Carolina General Administration

April 2014
This report summarizes the work and recommendations of the post-tenure review working group. Membership of the working group consisted of the following, Mr. GA Sywassink, Chair of the working group and Vice Chair of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Mr. Thurence Pickett, member of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Chancellor David Belcher of Western Carolina University; Chancellor Harold Martin of North Carolina A&T State University; Dr. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at East Carolina University; Dr. David Barlow, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Fayetteville State University; and Dr. Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs acted as staff to the committee.

The Committee was charged with examining current system and campus post-tenure review policies and practices to identify ways in which they can be strengthened with an emphasis on consistency, rigor and accountability. The working group was tasked with submitting recommendations to the President on the inclusion of practices to strengthen the guidelines governing post-tenure review and recommend any changes to UNC Policy.

The Committee conducted a series of in-person and teleconference meetings between January 24, 2014 and March 11, 2014. During these meetings and subsequent discussion the working group reviewed 400.3.3.1[G] and identified several changes or clarifications which would strengthen the post-tenure review process while also increasing the effectiveness of performance evaluations. These include, greater alignment between annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, clarification of the process of a second level of review beyond the department chair or unit head, providing training opportunities for those involved in the post-tenure review evaluation process, auditing of compliance with training and process regulations, and the creation of three assessment categories.

Appendix A is a red-line version of the policy showing the suggested edits.

Greater Alignment Between Annual Performance Reviews and Post-Tenure Review

The current guidelines direct campuses to ensure their policies show a relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review and specifies that annual performance reviews are not substitutes for the “comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review.” To better align annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, the working group recommends that the post-tenure review be based on a set of directional goals proposed by the faculty member at the beginning of the review cycle. These directional goals should act as a guide for the professional growth of the faculty member over the coming five-year period. Milestones created in these goals will act as the basis for annual reviews. Directional goals should be approved by the department chair. The working group felt it was important to recognize that changes in circumstances could necessitate changes in these directional goals and therefore included language in the proposed guideline edits which allows for annual modifications as deemed appropriate.

Clarification of the Process of a Second Level Review

The current guidelines currently require that post-tenure review outcomes be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. To increase consistency throughout the system, the working group proposes that the Deans must provide an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the peer review committee and the department chair. The Provost will be required to certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policy and guidelines. Department chairs/unit heads are often in difficult positions when it comes to evaluating faculty within their departments. They are organizationally situated immediately beside faculty colleagues and often return to faculty ranks to later be evaluated by someone whom they once had the responsibility to evaluate. The recommended change not only provides greater consistency across the system regarding who is involved in the post-tenure review process but also provides an opportunity to the review process to be more meaningful for the faculty member undergoing the review and builds in additional support for department chairs and unit heads. Under the proposed revision, faculty will be receiving feedback from a peer review committee but also department chairs/unit heads and the Dean.
Providing Training Opportunities

As the working group discussed the goals of the post-tenure review process as noted in the policy, to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions. The working group feels strongly that post-tenure review should be a positive and useful process that both recognizes strong performance and provides constructive criticism to strengthen the performance and provide professional growth of the faculty. The current guidelines neglect to include a mechanism by which evaluators are prepared to provide such feedback. The working group recommends that institutions be provided ongoing support and training for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer committee members, department chairs/unit heads, and deans. UNC General Administration will be responsible for preparing digital training modules for campus use. The modules will focus on the essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review: how to prepare, conduct and manage a meaningful review process and how to provide constructive criticism in a positive manner. The Provost will be charged with certifying that training is being conducted.

Auditing Compliance

One of the pieces of the charge to the working group was to identify ways in which the post-tenure review process could be strengthened by identifying areas where greater consistency could be achieved across the system. One such area is compliance reporting. The current guidelines offer an unstructured form of compliance reporting and therefore is conducted differently across the system. The working group recommends implementing a compliance audit to ensure that training and processes are being conducted according to policy. UNC General Administration will be responsible for conducting training and process audits of all campuses during the 2015-2016 fiscal year. In subsequent years, process audits will be conducted of all campuses on a three-year rotating cycle unless irregularities are identified.

Assessment Categories

The current policy notes recognition and reward of exemplary faculty performance as one of the three purpose of post-tenure review. The working group therefore recommends that each campus utilize three levels of assessment for their faculty, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and does not meet expectations. These three categories will not only provide consistency across the system in terms of evaluation metrics, but also satisfies one of the main goals of the post-tenure review policy, to recognize exemplary faculty performance. Without the three assessment categories, faculty with exemplary performance are not identified and therefore cannot be recognized. The working group recognizes that absent funding, recognition of exemplary performance can be challenging but felt there were other avenues of recognition outside of salary increases. Examples of these alternatives include, course-release time, professional development funding, and public recognition.

Conclusion

In summary, the post-tenure review working group sought to identify areas in which the post-tenure review policy and guidelines could be strengthened. Specifically, the working group wished to identify areas where greater consistency could be achieved in implementing policy across the system. These recommendations seek to achieve this outcome by creating three assessment categories and including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer within the post-tenure review process. An additional outcome of this review was to increase the rigor and accountability of the process. Recommendations for the inclusion of an auditing process, including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer, and providing training opportunities all contribute to strengthening the rigor of the post-tenure review process. Additionally, the post-tenure review working group felt strongly that the post-tenure review process should be positive in nature and allow for recognition of exemplary performance as well as a constructive evaluation process by which faculty could continue to grow professionally. Providing training for all individuals involved in the post-tenure review process assists reviewers in strengthening their evaluation skills. Training also increases the
probability that faculty will receive the types of feedback that is most helpful and valuable to their individual growth and contribution to the institution.

These recommendations have been shared with faculty assembly and are currently being reviewed by Chancellors and their executive leadership. Following receipt of their feedback, a final version of these recommendations will be provided to President Ross for approval.
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Resolution on Recommended Changes to Post-Tenure Review

Whereas the UNC General Administration and the Faculty Assembly have requested feedback on the proposed changes to Post-Tenure Review generated by the General Administrations Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Working Group, and

Whereas the Appalachian State University Faculty Senate has reviewed the recommendations contained in the report,

Be it resolved That the Faculty Senate at Appalachian State University expresses its objections to the following recommendations contained in the proposal:

1. Requiring a substantive assessment of every faculty member undergoing PTR by college deans undermines the process of peer-review carried out by department faculty who are the most knowledgeable and best trained to assess the performance of an individual department faculty member. Further, such a review requirement will add to an already excessive workload experienced by many deans.

2. The expectation that faculty should map out their research agenda in a 5-year cycle reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of how scholarship works, the ways in which faculty may be drawn in new directions, or how faculty may avail themselves of new opportunities for research or funding. Further, by locking faculty into a process that takes on the character of a contractual obligation, such an artificially contrived plan would likely reduce the prospect of faculty generating new, innovative, and creative studies that respond to both the needs of North Carolina and the new trends and directions in research.

3. The use of three evaluative categories will confuse and weaken the system of performance review that is already part of an annual review process. This is particularly problematic as the PTR assessment is proposed as part of a reward structure on the campuses. Since the faculty member’s annual review is already the basis on which merit is recognized and rewarded within departments, and since no funding has been allocated for the reward of exceptional performance as part of PTR, this seems to be a plan without need, purpose, or funding. Further, since “recognizing and rewarding exemplary performance” is already stated as an objective in the Policy Manual on PTR, the reworking of the language on this topic is unnecessary.

4. If implemented, these changes will have a profoundly negative affect on faculty morale. Therefore, we agree with the sentiments expressed in the resolution of the Faculty Assembly on the PTR proposal. This policy may – and likely will – have the unintended consequence of undermining the faculty confidence that the UNC administration and governing bodies support and respect faculty contributions to the goals of public higher education. The consequences of this policy may have very serious negative implications for our students’ educational experience, the reputation of our University system, as well as our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty.
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6.2 Paid Leaves of Absence and Other Adjustments of Employment Obligations

6.2.1 Paid Leaves of Absence for Medical or Family Reasons

6.2.1.1 There are times when a faculty member, for one of the reasons listed in section 6.2.1.3 below, may find it necessary to be absent in total or in part for an extended period of time. In such cases, leave with pay will be considered subject to the following procedures and conditions, including the completion of the Leave Request and Certification forms:


(a) Eligibility for consideration is limited to those faculty who (1) are eligible to participate in the N.C. Teachers’ and State Employees’ Retirement System or the UNC Optional Retirement Program and (2) have been employed a minimum of half-time at Appalachian State University for at least one year;

(b) When a faculty member finds it necessary to take such leave, a request in writing will be submitted to the departmental chair stating the reason for the request and the expected length of time (not to exceed one semester) the absence or reduced workload will last. The request for leave should be submitted at least sixty (60) days in advance of the leave or as soon as practicable after the need for the leave is foreseeable;

(c) The departmental chair will discuss the request with the dean who will in turn notify the provost and executive vice chancellor what is requested and what is recommended;

(d) The provost and executive vice chancellor will make the final decision and will so notify the faculty member in writing;

(e) When leave is taken for medical reasons for oneself, the University may require that the faculty member have a health care provider certify that the faculty member is fit to resume duties. The University makes the ultimate decision as to the faculty member’s fitness to resume duties;

(f) The departmental chair is responsible for arranging coverage of the faculty member’s duties. Whenever feasible, replacement instructors should be hired to assume the duties of a faculty member on extended leave. Responsibility for covering the cost of replacement instructors will be determined through consultations among the departmental chair, dean, and provost and executive vice chancellor;

(g) Any academic year during which, under this policy, a probationary faculty member is on leave for more than twenty-five (25) class days of the academic calendar or receives a total teaching-load reduction of more than six credit hours will not count as probationary service with respect to permanent tenure unless the faculty member requests in writing to the departmental chair that it be so counted. Such request must be made within one calendar year following the end of the leave or course-load reduction;

(h) Paid leave provided for under this policy has no effect on the faculty member’s other employment benefits. All periods of paid leave under this policy will be construed as family and medical leave under the Family Medical Leave Act, and the FMLA entitlement of twelve (12) weeks without pay will run concurrently with any period of paid time off. The North Carolina Family Illness Act allows for an extension of up to fifty-two (52) weeks of leave without pay during a five-year period in cases of serious illness of a child, spouse, or parent. Faculty with a balance of accrued leave from a previous twelve(12)-month appointment will be requested to exhaust that leave before receiving paid sick leave under this policy;

(i) Unused leave under this policy will not be accumulated or carried over to another academic year; allowable as terminal leave payment when the faculty member leaves the University; or used to extend years of creditable service for retirement benefit purposes;

(j) Responsibility for maintaining faculty leave records rests with the Office of Academic Affairs. Copies of all such records should also be maintained in the offices of the appropriate departmental chair and dean.

6.2.1.2 There may be extraordinary circumstances when a one-semester leave is not sufficient. When this is the
case, a request for an extension of the leave may be made subject to the procedures and conditions stated above. Should time in excess of two consecutive semesters be required, it will be necessary to consider a leave of absence without pay or a medical disability leave.

6.2.1.3 Leave with pay will be considered for any of the following reasons:

(a) for the birth of a child and/or to exercise primary responsibility for the care of an infant following the birth;

(b) to exercise primary responsibility for care of a child under age five placed with the faculty member for adoption or foster care, provided the leave is taken immediately following the placement;

(c) to exercise primary responsibility for the care of the faculty member’s child, spouse, domestic partner, or parent when that child, spouse, domestic partner, or parent has a serious health condition;

(d) because the faculty member has a serious health condition and is unable to perform the essential functions of the position.
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3.13.4 Lecturers

3.13.4.1 Lecturers must possess at least a master’s degree from an accredited institution with 18 graduate credits in their field of teaching. The lecturer rank will be used for non-tenure-track faculty with a workload of at least nine hours or the equivalent per semester and a contract for an academic year or longer. Such appointments are eligible for benefits as allowed by the State of North Carolina. Lecturers may receive consideration to advance in rank based on a combination of length of service and meritorious service. However, advancement in rank is not required for reappointment. Appointments of special faculty members shall be recommended by search committees or DPCs as determined by the departmental faculty. Recommendations for promotions for special faculty members shall be the responsibility of DPCs. The rank of lecturer carries with it the requirement of teaching and institutional service.

3.13.4.2 The rank of lecturer is appropriate for an initial appointment. There is no limit on the number of times that a lecturer may be appointed. Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment to the rank of lecturer are:

(a) A master’s degree from an accredited institution with 18 graduate credits in their field of teaching;

(b) Evidence of potential in teaching; and

(c) Evidence of potential in institutional service.

3.13.4.3 Upon promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, faculty members retain their status as faculty members under Article I of the Faculty Constitution. Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment to the rank of senior lecturer are:

(a) A master’s degree from an accredited institution with 18 graduate credits in their field of teaching; and experience teaching a minimum of 40 courses (or the equivalent thereof) at the rank of lecturer at Appalachian;

(b) Demonstrated ability in teaching; and

(c) Demonstrated ability in institutional service to the university.
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2.8 The Departmental Chair

Departments are integrally related to their colleges and to the total University and at the same time are separate units with viable and justifiable functions all their own. A given department must, therefore, be well organized to function properly within the full life of the academic community and within its own special commitment.

Each department must provide the setting in which competent persons are able to realize their professional capabilities and make their most creative contributions to their students, colleagues, and society. Members of the department should experience freedom, have the power to articulate goals, and accept accountability to themselves, to others, and to the scholarly discipline in which they work.

The department has an appointed chair with the general responsibility for guiding the department toward selected goals. It is the specific responsibility of the chair to:

(a) participate in the development of University policies and be responsible for their communication and implementation at the departmental level;

(b) communicate the needs of the department (personnel, space, fiscal) to the appropriate administrative units;

(c) serve as an advocate for the department and represent the department in the University, the community, to appropriate external agencies, and at meetings of learned and professional societies;

(d) prepare an annual report to the dean in consultation with the faculty of the department;

(e) provide leadership in the recruitment and appointment of faculty members;

(f) arrange effective and equitable distribution of faculty responsibilities, including:
   (i) teaching duties and committee assignments within the department;
   (ii) evaluate and counsel with all departmental faculty members concerning the performance of their duties;

(g) encourage and support good teaching, scholarly activity, and professional development within the department;

(h) initiate, in consultation with the appropriate faculty committee, recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal in accordance with the University and college policy;

(k) endeavor to maintain faculty morale by reducing, resolving, or preventing conflicts;

(l) make salary recommendations in accordance with University and college guidelines;

(m) organize and coordinate the departmental faculty and staff in developing, implementing and evaluating short and long-range departmental goals, objectives, standards, and programs;

(n) work with the faculty to develop standards, curricula, and procedures, which provide adequate preparation of graduates for professional or further academic endeavor;

(o) provide for appropriate advisement of students majoring in the department;

(p) provide leadership in supporting equality of opportunity and the protections available to members of the University community under all applicable laws;

(q) manage the departmental resources, including the budget, in accordance with college and University guidelines;

(r) participate in planning capital improvements and maintenance of physical facilities;
(s) endeavor to secure and maintain adequate supplies, materials, and equipment for the department; and

(t) supervise the departmental support staff.

2.9 The Departmental Assistant Chair

If a department has an assistant chair, that person will receive an initial term of up to three years in accordance with the departmental assistant chair policy. Subsequent terms may be approved in accordance with the departmental assistant chair policy. Review of the assistant chair will follow the departmental assistant chair policy.

Every department with an assistant chair must develop a departmental assistant chair policy, approved by the department, specifying how this position will be filled, evaluated for effectiveness, reviewed, renewed, and dismissed (see Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Constitution).

It is the general responsibility of the assistant chair to work with the department chair to guide the department toward its goals.

It is the specific responsibility of the assistant chair to:

(a) represent the departmental chair in the chair’s absence;

(b) serve as the departmental representative on University Committees as needed. Provide faculty with another level of administrative communication;

(c) communicate with the departmental chair concerning departmental business and the assistant chair’s responsibilities;

(d) The departmental chair, as determined by the departmental assistant chair policy, may assign other duties.

2.10 The Departmental Graduate Program Director.

If a department has a graduate program director, that person will receive an initial term of two or more years in accordance with the departmental graduate program director policy. Subsequent terms may be approved in accordance with the departmental graduate program director policy. Review of the graduate program director will follow the departmental graduate program director policy.

Every department with a graduate program director must develop a departmental graduate program director policy, approved by the department, specifying how this position will be filled, evaluated for effectiveness, reviewed, renewed, and dismissed (see Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Constitution).

It is the general responsibility of the graduate program director to work with the departmental chair, graduate faculty, and the graduate school to guide the department toward its goals.

The graduate program director is the main liaison with the graduate school and is responsible for ensuring that key tasks are completed in a timely manner. It is the general responsibility of the graduate program director to work with the departmental chair and graduate faculty to guide the department toward its goals.

2.11 The Departmental Undergraduate Program Director.

If a department has an undergraduate program director, that person will receive an initial term of two or more years in accordance with the departmental undergraduate program director policy. Subsequent terms may be approved in accordance with the departmental undergraduate program director policy. Review of the undergraduate program director will follow the departmental undergraduate program director policy.

Every department with an undergraduate program director must develop a departmental undergraduate program director policy, approved by the department, specifying how this position will be filled, evaluated for effectiveness,
reviewed, renewed, and dismissed (see Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Constitution).

It is the general responsibility of the undergraduate program director to work with the departmental chair and faculty to guide the department toward its goals.
Appendix J:

3.7 Academic Tenure

Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member’s employment. More specifically, it refers to the protection of a faculty member against discharge from employment except for reasons of (i) incompetence, (ii) neglect of duty, or (iii) misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, as specified in Code Section 603 and in accordance with the procedures provided in section 4.10, or against termination of employment except as provided for in section 4.9. (The overall policy for academic tenure in the UNC system is found in the UNC Code 602.)

3.7.1 The purposes intended to be served by providing the protection of academic tenure to faculty members are to secure their academic freedom and to help the institution attract and retain faculty members of high quality. While academic tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible in section 3.7.6, its conferral requires the assessment that the candidate has met the criteria for the rank of associate professor as specified in 3.8.6.2. Promotion or appointment to the rank of professor confers permanent tenure (3.8.6.6 and 3.8.7.3) and requires the assessment that the candidate has met the criteria for the rank of professor (3.8.7.2.).

3.7.2 The Faculty Handbook criteria for the conferral of tenure shall be the basis for each academic department’s criteria for conferment of tenure, and both Faculty Handbook and departmental criteria shall be considered in all tenure decisions. Departmental criteria may be more rigorous than Faculty Handbook criteria. (3.7.3 addresses the required length of service for tenure.)

The conferral of tenure requires:

(a) an assessment of the faculty member’s demonstrated professional competence;
(b) potential for future contributions;
(c) commitment to effective teaching, research, and public service; and
(d) the needs and resources of the institution.

3.7.3 An Assistant Professor must be considered for tenure during his or her sixth year if he or she has not been granted tenure earlier (3.8.5.6) Under no circumstances should the length of the probationary period exceed seven years of full-time service except when the probationary period has been extended according the provisions of 3.8.5.5, 3.8.5.6, and/or 6.2. Associate Professors, not appointed with tenure, shall be reviewed for tenure no later than the fourth year of appointment (3.8.6.4) except when the probationary period has been extended according the provisions of 3.8.6.5.1 and/or 6.2.

3.7.4 If a faculty member begins employment between January 1 and May 15, the partial academic or calendar year shall not count as part of the probationary period.

3.7.5 A decision not to grant tenure may not be based upon (1) the faculty member’s exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution, (2) unlawful discrimination based upon the faculty member’s race, color, national origin, religion, creed, sex, gender identity and expression, political affiliation, age, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation; or (3) personal malice. For purposes of this section, the term “personal malice” means dislike, animosity, ill will, or hatred based on personal characteristics, traits or circumstances of an individual that are not relevant to valid University decision making. See UNC Policy 101.3.1 II.B. (4.6.1)

3.7.6 Academic tenure, as herein described, pertains exclusively to the employment of faculty members by appointment to specified faculty ranks. Appalachian State University requires the doctorate or other appropriate earned terminal degree for consideration of the conferral of permanent tenure on any faculty member, unless there are exceptional circumstances.
3.8 Tenure-Eligible Academic Ranks

3.8.1 The University shall require the doctorate or other appropriate earned terminal degree for all full-time faculty appointments above the rank of instructor, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Appointments may be for fixed terms of employment, automatically terminable when they expire (“fixed-term appointment”); or they may be for probationary terms (“probationary-term appointment”); or they may be continuous (“appointment with permanent tenure”) until retirement, death, resignation, or dismissal pursuant to The Code of The University of North Carolina.

3.8.2 No reviewing person or committee substitutes its judgment for the judgment of the departmental chair, a search committee, and/or the departmental personnel committee or the departmental promotion and tenure committee on matters relating to the professional qualifications of the individual involved [i.e., the individual’s ability to fulfill adequately the professional requirements of the position. However, in accordance with The Code of The University of North Carolina, section 602(4), those charged with making decisions on initial appointment, reappointment, promotion and permanent tenure shall examine and evaluate “demonstrated professional competence” i.e., the faculty member’s actual performance, the faculty member’s potential for future contribution, and institutional needs and resources.

3.8.3 The faculty ranks to which appointments may be made, the minimal criteria that a candidate must meet in order to be eligible for consideration for the various ranks, and the incidents of academic tenure applicable to each rank are set forth in sections 3.8.4 through 3.8.7. The Faculty Handbook criteria for ranks shall be the basis for each academic department’s criteria, and both Faculty Handbook and departmental criteria shall be considered in all appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Departmental criteria may be more rigorous than Faculty Handbook criteria.

3.8.4 Instructor

3.8.4.1 See The University of North Carolina Policy Manual, section 400.3.1.1 concerning required discussions relating to the primacy of teaching.

3.8.4.2 Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment to the rank of instructor are:
   (a) a master’s degree from an accredited institution in an appropriate field or special competencies in lieu of the master’s degree; and
   (b) evidence of potential in teaching; and
   (c) evidence of potential in at least one of the following:
      (i) research or other germane creative activity; or
      (ii) professional service to the University and/or to the public.

3.8.4.3 The rank of instructor is appropriate for one who is appointed to the faculty but lacks, when appointed, one or more qualifications expected by the department or college/school for appointment to professorial rank. When all of those qualifications are met, the instructor may be promoted to assistant professor, offered a terminal appointment of one academic year, or be offered a special faculty appointment (see section 3.13).

3.8.4.4 An initial appointment to the rank of instructor is for a probationary term of one academic year. The instructor may be reappointed successively for six terms of one academic year, a total of seven such terms. At least ninety (90) calendar days before the first term of appointment ends, the instructor shall receive written notice whether, when the current term expires, the instructor will be reappointed at rank for another term, promoted to the rank of assistant professor, appointed to a special faculty appointment as provided in section 3.13, or not be reappointed. An instructor appointed to a second one-year term shall receive a similar notice not less than 180 calendar days before that term ends. During the last 180 calendar days of the second consecutive year of employment, the institution may notify the instructor that employment will be terminated at the end of the third year of employment. Before the end of the third consecutive term, an instructor who has not been notified that employment will be ended in that year as provided in the preceding sentence shall receive a written notice whether, when the current term expires, the instructor will be reappointed at rank, promoted to the rank of assistant professor for a four-year term, appointed to a special faculty appointment as provided in section 3.13, of at least a one-year duration, or offered a terminal appointment of one academic year at the end of the current term. Decisions shall be made with respect to these same options before the end of the fourth, fifth, and sixth consecutive term. No
reappointment to the rank of instructor may be made after seven consecutive years of employment at that rank. (But see section 3.13, “Special Faculty Appointments.”) The failure to give the required notice of a decision not to reappoint at any point herein required has the same effect as a decision at that time to offer a terminal appointment of one academic year at the same rank. The decisions herein required shall be made as provided in section 4.4.

3.8.5 Assistant Professor

3.8.5.1 See The University of North Carolina Policy Manual, section 400.3.1.1, concerning required discussions relating to the primacy of teaching.

3.8.5.2 Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment/promotion to the rank of assistant professor are:

(a) the appropriate earned terminal degree from an accredited institution, unless there are exceptional circumstances;

(b) demonstrated ability in teaching;

(c) evidence of ability for research or other germane creative activity;

(d) willingness to participate in institutional affairs and professional service to the University and/or to the public.

3.8.5.3 An initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is normally for a probationary term of four academic years. Before the end of the third year of the four-year probationary term, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether, when the current term expires, she or he will be reappointed at that rank for a second probationary term of three years or not be reappointed.

3.8.5.4 Before the end of the second year of the three-year term as assistant professor, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether she or he will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the higher rank or not be reappointed.

3.8.5.5 An Assistant Professor may request review for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure one year earlier than the mandatory year (see 3.8.5.6.) An Assistant Professor must request review for promotion and tenure at the same time. If the Assistant Professor is granted promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, the action shall become effective at the beginning of the next fiscal year. If the Assistant Professor is unsuccessful in his/her review, he/she may request review in the following, mandatory year.

3.8.5.6 An Assistant Professor must be considered for tenure during his or her sixth year if he or she has not been granted tenure earlier. Under no circumstances should the length of the probationary period exceed seven years of full-time service except when the probationary period has been extended according to the provisions below and/or 6.2.

3.8.5.6.1 If a faculty member begins employment between January 1 and May 15, the partial academic or calendar year shall not count as part of the probationary period.

3.8.5.6.2 Credit toward tenure and promotion for service elsewhere. The department chair and an assistant professor candidate must negotiate any credit for service elsewhere to be granted toward tenure and promotion at the time of the offer. The assistant professor candidate may submit to her or his departmental chair a written request (with appropriate supporting documentation) that up to, but no more than, three years served elsewhere in a tenured or tenurable position (or in an equivalent position) may be counted toward tenure and promotion at Appalachian State University. Following review of materials and consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, the chair will make a recommendation to the dean, and the dean will make a recommendation to the provost and executive vice chancellor. The final decision, which shall rest with the provost and executive vice chancellor, shall be made on the basis of the verified documentation provided and shall be irrevocable. Any service credited toward tenure and promotion must be specified in the letter of offer at the time of hire and included in the provisions of the initial contract. Motion FS 13-14/12-02 approved as amended.

3.8.5.6.3 If one year of service elsewhere is counted, the initial contract will be for a probationary term of three years. Before the end of the second year of the first three-year term, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether, when the current term expires, she or he will be reappointed at the same rank for a second probationary term of three years or not be reappointed. Before the end of the second year of the second three-year term as assistant professor, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether she or he will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the higher rank or not be reappointed.

3.8.5.6.4 If two years of service elsewhere are counted, the initial contract will be for a probationary term of three
years. Before the end of the second year of the three-year term, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether, when the current term expires, she or he will be reappointed at the same rank for a second probationary term of two years or not be reappointed. Before the end of the first year of the two-year term as assistant professor, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether she or he will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the higher rank or not be reappointed.

3.8.5.6.5 If three years of service elsewhere are counted, the initial contract will be for a probationary term of four years. Before the end of the third year of the four-year term, the assistant professor shall receive written notice whether she or he will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the higher rank or not be reappointed.

3.8.5.6.5.1 Temporary suspension of probationary period with respect to permanent tenure

3.8.5.6.5.2 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an assistant professor who has been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 6.2.1.1 (g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section. The calculation of probationary service in such circumstances shall be automatic, and no request for such calculation need be made by the faculty member.

3.8.5.6.5.3 A faculty member may submit to her or his departmental chair a written request for a determination that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of the faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. Any such request should be submitted as soon as practicable, but in no event later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred. The departmental chair shall submit the request to the departmental promotion and tenure committee for review and recommendation; and, upon receipt of the departmental promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation, the departmental chair shall forward that recommendation along with the departmental chair’s recommendation to the dean. The dean shall in turn forward her or his recommendation to the provost and executive vice chancellor, who shall make a determination whether extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting the specified academic year as part of the faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure.

3.8.5.6.5.4 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under section 3.8.5.4.2.2 above and section 6.2 may not exceed two academic years.

3.8.5.7 The failure to give the required notice of a decision not to reappoint at any point herein required has the same effect as a decision at that time to offer a terminal appointment for one academic year at the same rank. The decisions herein required shall be made as provided in section 4.4.

3.8.6 Associate Professor

3.8.6.1 See The University of North Carolina Policy Manual, section 400.3.1.1, concerning required discussions relating to the primacy of teaching.

3.8.6.2 Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment/promotion to the rank of associate professor are:
(a) the appropriate earned terminal degree from an accredited institution and at least five (5) completed years of appropriate experience, unless there are exceptional circumstances;
(b) recognized skill in teaching;
(c) recognized accomplishment in research or other germane creative activity;
(d) recognized accomplishment in professional service to the University and/or to the public; and
(e) demonstrated willingness to participate in institutional affairs.

3.8.6.3 An initial appointment to the rank of associate professor may be made with tenure or for a probationary term of up to five academic years. The length of this initial appointment takes into account credit toward tenure and promotion for service elsewhere. If the associate professor is not appointed with tenure, the department chair and the associate professor candidate must negotiate any credit for service elsewhere to be granted toward tenure at the time of the offer. The associate professor candidate may submit to her or his departmental chair a written request (with appropriate supporting documentation) that up to, but no more than, three years served elsewhere in a tenured or tenurable position (or in an equivalent position) may be counted toward tenure at Appalachian State University. Following review of materials and consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, the chair will make a recommendation to the dean, and the dean will make a recommendation to the provost and executive vice
chancellor. The final decision, which shall rest with the provost and executive vice chancellor, shall be made on the basis of the verified documentation provided and shall be irrevocable. Any service credited toward tenure must be specified in the letter of offer at the time of hire and included in the provisions of the initial contract. Motion FS 13-14/12-03 passed (Vote #5) Motion FS 13-14/12-03 as approved.

3.8.6.4 Associate Professors, not appointed with tenure, shall be reviewed for tenure no later than the fourth year of appointment except when the probationary period has been extended according the provisions of 3.8.6.3, 3.8.6.5.1 and/or 6.2.

3.8.6.5 Before the end of the probationary term, the associate professor shall receive written notice whether she or he will be recommended for permanent tenure at the same or higher rank when the current term expires or not be reappointed, consistent with the schedule of “Notification of Reappointment or Non-reappointment” specified in section 604A (1) of The Code of The University of North Carolina:

(a) During the first year of service at the institution, the faculty member shall be given not less than ninety (90) calendar days’ notice before the employment contract expires;

(b) During the second year of continuous service at the institution, the faculty member shall be given not less than 180 calendar days’ notice before the employment contract expires; and

(c) After two or more years of continuous service at the institution, the faculty member shall be given not less than twelve (12) months’ notice before the employment contract expires.

3.8.6.5.1 Temporary suspension of probationary period with respect to permanent tenure

3.8.6.5.1.1 The probationary service with respect to permanent tenure of an associate professor who has been granted a leave or course-load reduction under the terms of section 6.2.1.1 (g) shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of that section. The calculation of probationary service in such circumstances shall be automatic, and no request for such calculation need be made by the faculty member.

3.8.6.5.1.2 A faculty member may submit to her or his departmental chair a written request for a determination that extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting a specific academic year as part of the faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure. Any such request should be submitted as soon as practicable, but in no event later than ninety (90) calendar days following the close of the academic year in which the circumstances occurred. The departmental chair shall submit the request to the departmental promotion and tenure committee for review and recommendation; and, upon receipt of the departmental promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation, the departmental chair shall forward that recommendation along with the departmental chair’s recommendation to the dean. The dean shall in turn forward her or his recommendation to the provost and executive vice chancellor, who shall make a determination whether extraordinary circumstances warrant not counting the specified academic year as part of the faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure.

3.8.6.5.1.3 The total time not counted toward a faculty member’s probationary period with respect to permanent tenure, both under section 3.8.6.4.1.2 above and section 6.2 may not exceed two academic years.

3.8.6.6 The failure to give the required notice of a decision not to reappoint at any point herein required has the same effect as a decision at that time to offer a terminal appointment for one academic year at the same rank. The decisions herein required shall be made as provided in section 4.4.

3.8.6.7 A promotion at any time from the rank of associate professor to the rank of professor confers permanent tenure from the effective date of the promotion. Since this promotion confers permanent tenure, it must be approved by the chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

3.8.7 Professor

3.8.7.1 See The University of North Carolina Policy Manual, section 400.3.1.1, concerning required discussions relating to the primacy of teaching.

3.8.7.2 Minimal criteria for consideration of appointment/promotion to the rank of professor are:

(a) the appropriate earned terminal degree from an accredited institution, and at least ten (10) completed years of appropriate experience unless there is exceptional performance;

(b) recognized skill in teaching;

(c) evidence of at least one of the following:
(i) outstanding accomplishment in research or other germane creative activity with ongoing, recognized accomplishment in professional service to the University and/or public; or
(ii) outstanding accomplishment in professional service to the University and/or to the public with ongoing, recognized accomplishment in research or other germane creative activity; and
(d) demonstrated ability and participation in institutional affairs.

3.8.7.3 An initial appointment to the rank of professor shall be made with permanent tenure.