I. Announcements

A. Chair Koch welcomed Senators and asked visitors to introduce themselves. Visitors were Dr. Mary Reichel (Academic Affairs), Dr. Tim Burwell (Academic Affairs), LTC David Cox (ROTC), Dr. Lynn Gregory (COM), Dr. David Wiley (RCOE), Beth Poudre (ITS), Rob Robertson (ITS), Susan Roggenkamp (HS) and Anna Oakes (Watauga Democrat).

II. Minutes

A. Chair Koch asked for a motion to approve the minutes for November 10, 2014. Senator Aycock moved and Senator Dunston seconded to approve the minutes. Senator Strazicich requested that the report from the Budget Committee at the November meeting be included in the minutes as an appendix. Motion to approve the minutes as amended passed. (Vote #1).

III. Visitors’ Reports

A. Lynn Gregory, representing the Military Affairs Committee, discussed the role of this committee and the idea of raising awareness of faculty of the committee and its work. The committee was appointed by the Provost in 2011 as part of the UNC Serves Report to the General Administration. It seeks to develop best practices in serving military students and military-affiliated students to get more of this population into school. One of the things they are doing now is to have veteran honor cords at graduation for veterans, both students and faculty, and others who might not have veteran status. Work is also being done with enrollment management policies that will help military students. Other initiatives are also being explored for veterans, for those on active duty and for military spouses and children.

Chair Koch raised the question of whether this Committee has been part of the discussion about members of the military getting credit for courses related to training that they have received. Lynn stated that they have been part of this discussion and noted that Senate Bill 761 offers transfer credit for military experience. For example, one who has served as a medic might receive science
credit. Jane Rex is leading this initiative at ASU and also serves on the GA committee addressing military affairs. ACE, the accrediting body that has been around for a long time, might request credit (e.g. Someone who had completed a leadership development course and then served as an officer might receive leadership or organizational credit.) and then the Department would decide whether or not that credit would be appropriate. This initiative is being taken to help military students get through college sooner, for their benefit and for the government’s benefit, since that is who is funding the education.

B. David Wiley began the discussion about Digital Measures. He has been involved in this project that came about because of dissatisfaction from many of the colleges when the program was first implemented. The level of support varied from college to college, so some colleges had good implementation of Digital Measures, while others required a lot of supplemental work to get any meaningful information. The charge now is to create a more generalized program across the campus (useful for things such as SACS) and then to create some customization per college, according to the needs of each. Work began in Spring 2014, with the emphasis on simplifying what computer screens are asking for so that information can better be harvested from what is put in. Efforts are to digitize many fields in the program.

Rob Robertson, who was with the College of Business at the inception of the Digital Measures program, became the support person for that college. He was assigned as the University Administrator in October of last year. Prior to this time, there was no support at the University level for this product. Therefore, the application was not being used. They are now trying to set up a support network, so that if there are issues, there is someone to contact. A web site will be created with tutorials and support information, which will be available sometime during the Spring 2015 semester. They are also trying to find ways to improve the product now. For example, there is a publications screen which is now active where faculty can search the data base for publications they might have out there. They will also be adding the Library of Congress and other data bases to be searched. Google Scholar will be available to download files, and there is work being done on a work-flow application for annual reporting so that much paper work can be eliminated in this process. There are many accreditation bodies on campus, so the goal is to streamline those processes so that Digital Measures can produce those reports. Faculty feedback is needed, and there will be focus groups in departments to gather input.

Susan Roggenkamp stated that the document of the proposed changes to the Digital Measures would be sent out to Senators via email, and she would like for Senators to look over the document and make suggestions, give feedback, etc. In
January, members of the Committee will be meeting with departments to get input. If your department would like to have an in-depth conversation, they would be happy to do that. When new screens are created, no data will be lost that has previously been entered. That data will be imported. Custom reports will be developed and support information and tutorials will be prepared. A soft launch of the revision of current screens will take place in Spring 2015. The company Digital Measures will be re-vamping the appearance and other aspects over the summer, so the big launch at ASU will take place in Fall 2015, incorporating those changes at the company level as well as the revisions for ASU.

Senator West expressed gratitude that this work is being done and stated that the report for accreditation for her department was over 500 pages long. Susan said that report writing is a big issue that needs to be addressed. Senator West also inquired whether departments would have input about what they want in a report as the re-design of Digital Measures takes place. Susan said that departments would be consulted, and that they will be informed when that process is ready.

Senator Reed asked that, as an average faculty member, “What does it (DM) do for me?” Susan stated that the members of the committee had attended a user conference and were impressed by ways in which campuses were making Digital Measures useful. They would like to get to the place where DM becomes the hub for faculty information and used for creating CVs, grants, promotion portfolios, annual reports, etc.

Senator Flanders asked if it is true that departmental categories would not be changed. Her department has very specific categories that have been carefully created to take differences into account. Rob indicated that there would be some fields that would be the same across campus, and then there would be fields created at the departmental level. Those departmental categories would be kept. The committee is seeking to make this helpful for faculty as well as for administration.

IV. Provost’s Report

A. Interim Provost Aeschleman provided four handouts to address faculty retention and salary issues. He first addressed the two resolutions that were passed in the Senate at the last meeting, the first dealing with reporting on faculty retention efforts from last year and the second related to recruitment and retention funds in the General Administration. Since he was not serving as Provost at ASU last year, he asked Tim Burwell to address the faculty retention efforts last year. A summary document of the last two years reveals a total of 42 departures among colleges, with eleven counter offers and 31 instances where there were no counter offers. There were also nine preemptive offers. Departures accelerated in 2013-14.
Preemptive offers were sometimes made for certain faculty to prevent them from looking elsewhere. Most preemptive offers were made to non-tenure track faculty.

Senator Reck asked for how many successful counter offers were retention funds used. Dr. Burwell responded that none were used because they were not needed in order to be successful. If the salary structure at ASU is such that we can’t compete with an offer from another campus, no counter-offer is made. Funding was not an issue in making counter offers. He said that he was not aware of any situation where available funding – in terms of our willingness to provide it – was a deciding factor in a faculty member leaving.

Senator West questioned whether there was data of why faculty were leaving. Dr. Burwell responded that Deans report reasons as best they can, but that information is not always provided by the faculty member.

Senator Dunston stated that he was under the impression that a faculty member had to have an offer in hand in order for a counter-offer to be considered, so he does not understand a preemptive offer being an option. Dr. Burwell said that is not true. Interim Provost Aeschleman interjected that preemptive requests are permissible if the faculty member can provide credible evidence that (s)he is being recruited or likely to seek employment elsewhere.

The Interim Provost then drew attention to a document that outlines guidelines for using the University Faculty Recruiting and Retention Fund. This came from the General Administration. Universities are admonished to use this fund as the last resource to be tapped into. In general, these funds would not be requested for a few thousand dollars. He has requested data to provide more detail about the use of this fund by other campuses. Chair Koch stated that this information is available on the General Administration web site.

Senator Strazicich questioned whether there was any pattern of departures. Dr. Burwell stated that most were in the colleges of Arts & Sciences and the College of Education.

The focus of the second resolution that the Interim Provost addressed was related to the comparison of ASU faculty salaries with eighteen peer institutions, and of the years 2008-2009 and 2013-2014 at ASU. Associate Professor and Full Professor salaries were lower in 2013-2014 than in 2008-2009. This is consistent with the compression issues that we have had on campus. In terms of reaching bench marks in comparison to our peer institutions, our status has declined since 2008-2009. Efforts have been made to create accurate bench marks for comparison, which can be difficult with institutions that don’t have the same
course offerings. Other factors, such as size of the student bodies, were taken into account, and we were compared with 125 institutions. He said that the State has abdicated its responsibility to provide salary increases for faculty.

The Interim Provost then directed everyone’s attention to the document addressing the tuition increase which will be proposed to the Board of Trustees this Friday. The recommendation that went to the Chancellor from the Tuition Committee, which Tim Burwell chairs, was for a 5% increase. The Board of Governors has set a cap at 5% for both tuition and fees. The document includes both 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. The three largest categories which are slated for proposed increases are: 1) 50% of the dollars would go to salary equity funding, 2) 16% would go to restore lost faculty positions which have been lost because of cuts in the budget and 3) 16% to restore academic affairs operating budgets. Funding per FTE in 2011 was $3000. After that year, it was reduced to $2000 per FTE.

This proposal must be approved by our Board of Trustees, then by the Board of Governors and finally by the State legislature. There is some indication that the Board of Governors might not be willing to go as high as a 5% increase. It will be voted on in February. Even if the full 5% increase is not approved, they will recommend to the Chancellor that the amount of salary increases will remain as a priority. Even with the raises, ASU will not reach the 75% mark of the benchmarks that have been established.

Senator Murrell expressed some concern that the proposed tuition increase might be perceived as pitting students against faculty – that students have to pay more for faculty to earn more. He felt there should be good dissemination of information about why the increase is necessary. Members of the Tuition Committee reported that the students on the committee seem to be supportive and all voted for the increase, given the fact that faculty have not received an increase in salary for so long. The students had raised some questions about fee increases. Information was presented to the SGA that ASU ranks 7th in tuition in the State system and is ranked last among 18 peer institutions across the country.

Chair Koch observed that the only way this plan will be binding on the next Provost is if the Chancellor is committed to it. He asked if that is the case. The Interim Provost responded, “Yes, absolutely.”

Returning to retention issues, concern was expressed about getting more accurate data from Chairs about reasons that faculty are leaving. Dr. Burwell said that this data is already provided, if the faculty member chooses to share it. This is an “open field” on the document, so the data does not lend itself well to a summary. Individual cases must be examined.
Senator Campbell commented to Dr. Burwell and Interim Provost Aeschleman that their willingness to come before the Senate and share this information was very much appreciated and a refreshing change. This sentiment was echoed throughout the Senate body.

A question was raised about the possibility that the tuition increase would not be approved: Is there a Plan B? There is no Plan B, but Dr. Burwell responded that the worst case scenario would be that ASU would have to turn to Enrollment Growth monies, which will be increasing this year.

Senator Reed brought up promotion stipends being a set amount that is no longer adequate. Interim Provost Aeschleman said that they are collecting data on what sister and peer institutions do related to promotion stipends. A small minority bases these on percentages; most are fixed amounts. He will present that data in January.

V. Chair’s Report

A. Chair Koch said that there was no Faculty Assembly meeting this month, but that he had received an email from that body regarding two issues: 1) There is a hearing this week with the Board of Governors about closing centers and institutes across the UNC system. Chair Koch quoted the Raleigh News and Observer which stated that there is concern that some of these institutes/centers are being targeted for political reasons, since many provide services for poor and minority communities. Three of the centers are on the ASU campus. The three centers here that have been targeted are CERPA, Brantley Risk Insurance Center and RIEEE. Representatives from these centers must be available this week to present their cases. As to the question of what criteria were used to identify these centers/institutes, speculation was that the Board of Governors started the process to identify centers that they considered to be “wrong-headed”. Triggers were related to the source of funding and courses required. Dr. Burwell stated that he feels very good about the cases that the three centers at ASU will be presenting. 2) The Board of Governors is working on language in the code, dealing with political advocacy. The Faculty Assembly has not been asked for input. The question was raised as to why this language is seen as necessary. Chair Koch speculated that universities are considered to be hotbeds of radical, liberal, etc. ideas. He stated that they are not concerned about what is happening in the classroom, but about activities outside the classroom and whether people might be using campus resources for political parties.

B. In the Chancellor Advisory Committee meeting there was discussion about the backlog of students seeking help through the Counseling Center. The University is seeking to hire more counselors. The University is planning to add additional
counselors to relieve the backlog.

C. The large number of councils present at ASU was at the center of a lot of discussion. A council is a group of people assigned to a specific task in an advisory role, with the membership appointed by an administrator who oversees their work. Chair Koch observed that the more councils you have, the more you squeeze out more democratic governance institutions on campus. The Chancellor shared that, at her previous institutions, councils were bodies elected by faculty. She is sympathetic to the idea of moving more in the direction of more faculty-oriented structure. This is going to be a task for the Senate. The Governance Committee will be looking at this. The transition would be done slowly and incrementally and where it makes sense. There would be a change from councils to committees.

D. Chair Koch updated the Provost Search. The announcement has been finalized and will be distributed. For the timeline: mid-late January – the committee will be looking at applications. Mid-February: airport interviews. And mid-late March, the three finalists will appear on campus.

E. The PTR Task Force was very close to finishing the changes to the language in the Handbook. Their meeting was interrupted and will reconvene in January. Proposed changes to the Handbook will be presented in early spring.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policy Committee (Campbell, Crepeau, Ortiz, Osinsky, Zrull)

Senator Campbell reported that the Committee has met with Bindu Jayne to continue discussions about setting up an advisory committee that would be elected from faculty and other constituencies that would advise the Equity Office in its investigations. The Academic Policy Committee will bring a motion in January to create an ad hoc committee to work with her to create a more permanent structure. If there is a charge brought against a faculty member that deals with professional or academic issues, there would be elected and trained faculty who would advise the process. In the past, there has been no faculty voice, so this would be a tremendous step forward for the University. The Committee is pleased with the cooperation that they have been receiving in those discussions. AP &P has been very active, and the Faculty Senate representative, Senator Zrull, will provide some related comments.

Senator Zrull stated that some of the sub-committees of AP&P are going to be rewriting how they do business. One group, which has not yet met, will be getting better software, getting things online and generally streamlining the
process of AP&P. One committee has been working on rewriting the Academic Governance Handbook. This handbook is currently a mix of a variety of sources that were pulled together. Lots of redundancy was discovered, and it is difficult to make changes where this kind of redundancy exists. The Handbook will be simplified and will offer references to where policies can be found. Ultimately, the Faculty Senate will make the decision about whether the changes are OK. The Constitution is clear that, not only does the Faculty Senate have the responsibility to populate various committees, but also responsibility for their rules, policies, operating procedures. Proposed changes will be submitted toward the end of the year.

Chair Koch interjected that he has been in discussion with the new Chair of AP&P, Ben Powell, and that committee does not want to take ownership of the membership issue, but will bring it to the Senate instead.

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

No report.

C. Budget Committee (Dunston, Rice, Stallworth, Strazicich, Szeto)

No report.

D. Campus Planning Committee (Coffey, Frye, Hageman, Howard, Westerman)

No report.

E. Campus Technology Committee (Fenwick, Mitchell, Murrell, Reed, Spaulding, Wangler)

Senator Murrell reminded the Senate that this is an ad hoc committee, and the Senate will have to decide the value of this committee in terms of retaining it. The committee members are in agreement that there is a real need for communication between IT across campus and the faculty, and this is how the Committee sees its role. The Committee requests that Senators look at the web site: go to the Office of the CIO; under IT Governance, Technology Portfolio Committees will be found. (There are six of these, and the CTC will have a member from the CTC on each of them.) Scroll down to the bottom to find the IT Governance Framework. It is worth reading this document to understand where Cathy Bates and her office are coming from in terms of their expectations and their desires for what they hope to create across campus. The Committee is reviewing the policy on Information Security and will report its findings back to the Senate. That should be available in January.
As regards the transition to Google email, an informal poll of the Committee suggested support for that change. One benefit in using this platform is that students are already using it, and it will be easier to share materials. The concern is that this transition will not be easy and that a good consultant will be needed. The Committee is happy to have input from the Senators, and the status of the Committee will be discussed in January.

F. Committee on Committees (Gates, Everhart, Morehouse, Oliver, Villanova, Weddell)

Senator Gates stated that the status of needs is exactly the same as last month; we need five willing faculty to serve in the following positions: 1) a three-year vacancy on AP&P, 2) a one-year (realistically at this point, a one-semester) vacancy on Faculty Grievance Assistance, 3) a three-year position from Music for the Gifts Acceptance Committee, 4) a two-year position from the College of Business for the Gifts Acceptance Committee and 5) a three-year at-large seat for the Gifts Acceptance Committee. Senator Gates asked that Senators check with their colleagues, and he will be sending out an email to the entire campus.

G. Faculty Governance Committee (Koch, Gates, Aycock, Hindman, Mary Reichel for Academic Affairs)

Chair Koch reported the Committee has three proposed Faculty Handbook changes:

Item 1): Rewrite of section 4.1.8.8 (See Appendix A). The old language required that someone up for promotion must recuse themselves from all PTC voting for the entire year. Logically, this will only affect someone being promoted to full professor because, if you’re up for tenure and promotion, you would not be on PTC. There were complaints from some professors who had concerns about quid pro quo tradeoffs, but these were not sufficient to deny faculty voting rights for an entire year. This recommendation comes from committee and does not require a second. Motion FS 14-15/12-01 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.1.8.8 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #2)

Item 2): Rewrite of section 4.10.2.6 (See Appendix B). Recommendations of the Due Process Task Force that was created two years ago which gave faculty some input in decisions regarding suspension and reassignment of faculty members. Again, no second is required. Motion FS 14-15/12-02 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.10.2.6 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #3)
Item 3): More formalized language was needed in the Handbook regarding evaluations of Deans and other appropriate administrators. This required a rewrite of the whole section 4.13.2.1.3 (See Appendix C). This has been practiced for years, but we needed to get the language in the handbook. Chair Koch stated that there was a minor modification to section 4.13.2.1.3(b) after the proposed changes had been distributed. In this section, the word “approximately” was eliminated. Here is the newly proposed language in context:

4.13.2.1.3 Dean Evaluations
(a) All faculty in a college will be provided the opportunity to evaluate the Dean of that college.
(b) Dean evaluations will take place on a rotating basis. New Deans will be evaluated in their second year and thereafter, approximately every three years.

Motion FS 14-15/12-03 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.13.2.1.3 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (Vote #4)

H. Welfare of Students Committee. (Gosky, Gross, Hamilton, Peterson-Sparks, Phillips, Stanovsky, West)

No report.

I. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee. (Erickson, Flanders, Pitofsky, Pollitt, Reck, Stoddard)

Senator Stoddard stated that the Committee is reviewing the Deans' evaluations that have been used in the past. Chair Koch expressed thanks for their work on these documents.

VII. Unfinished Business

None.

VIII. New Business

A. Senator Flanders requested that a clarification be placed on the January, 2015 agenda regarding “emotional support animals” and “service animals”. The ADA states that only service animals are required to be allowed in the classroom, but the University Council says that it also applies to emotional support animals. Her understanding is that she is libel if something happens in the classroom.

B. Senator Strazicich suggested that a change be made to the October 13, 2014 minutes, such that in the last paragraph on page 7 which reads: “Returning to the Vote Justification Forms, in the context of litigation, they are not anonymous.
Ms. Krause pointed out that whether or not the form existed, the faculty member would be compelled to testify regarding how he/she voted and why.” He would like for it to state that a faculty member “could” be compelled instead of “would”. Senator Strazicich moved and Senator Peterson-Sparks seconded that the October 13, 2014 minutes be amended as stated above. **Motion FS 14-15/12-04 to approve the recommended change to the October 13, 2014 minutes passed. (Vote #5)**

C. Issues about the schedule of the academic calendar were raised by Senator Strazicich after a colleague had made a proposal to him. It was suggested to abolish fall break and to use that time for a full week off during Thanksgiving. It might improve student attendance. Chair Koch recalled that there was a proposal earlier this year that we find an extra day of class during the year so that we could come back a week later in the summer. So, if we did away with fall break, we might be able to recoup that day for the week in summer. It was mentioned that students who do not get a fall break get extremely tired by the time Thanksgiving arrives. These ideas will be explored by the Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee.

IX. Adjournment

Senator Aycock moved and Senator Gates seconded to adjourn the meeting. **Motion to adjourn passed. (Vote #6).** Meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motion to approve the Faculty Senate minutes for November 10, 2014 as amended passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Motion FS 14-15/12-01 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.1.8.8 of the Faculty Handbook passed.</strong> (See Appendix A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/12-02 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.10.2.6 of the Faculty Handbook passed. (See Appendix B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Motion FS 14-15/12-03 to approve the recommended changes to section 4.13.2.1.3 of the Faculty Handbook passed.</strong> (See Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/12-04 to approve the recommended change to the October 13, 2014 minutes passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motion to adjourn passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Aycock</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Campbell</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Coffey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crepeau</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Dunston</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Erickson</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Everhart</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fenwick</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Flanders</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Frye</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gates</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Gosky</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Gross</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hageman</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Hamilton</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Hindman</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Howard</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanah Mitchell</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Morehouse</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zack Murrell</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Oliver</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ortiz</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel Osinsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicka Peterson-Sparks</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Phillips</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Pitofsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe Pollitt</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Reck</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Reed</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dea Rice</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Spaulding</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stallworth</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stanovsky</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stoddard</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Strazicich</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-Yan Szeto</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Villanova</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wangler</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Weddell</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie West</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Westerman</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Wheeler</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zrull</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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New 4.1.8.8. language reads as follows:

A member may be present at the promotion and tenure committee meeting in which his or her case will be considered for the sole purpose of presenting information and answering questions. The candidate will be recused from the discussion and from the vote on his or her promotion. The candidate may rejoin the meeting for other considerations and will be allowed to participate in other PTC meetings during the year. Notification of results of the PTC vote for all candidates will not take place until the meeting is over. A member of the promotion and tenure committee may not address the PTC or cast a vote on any matter before the committee that concerns any related person.
Appendix B
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4.10 Discharge or the Imposition of Serious Sanction

4.10.2.6 When a faculty member has been notified of the University’s intention to discharge the faculty member, the chancellor may reassign the individual to other duties or suspend the individual at any time with full pay and continue the suspension until a final decision concerning discharge has been reached by the procedures prescribed above.

If, on the basis of a preliminary investigation, the Chancellor determines a) there is a reasonable basis to believe a dischargeable offense has occurred, and b) immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member’s continued presence in the classroom or otherwise on campus, a suspension may be imposed. Before suspending, the Chancellor shall consult confidentially with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate concerning the propriety, the length, and other conditions of the suspension. If an emergency precludes prior consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate, the consultation shall occur as soon after imposition of the suspension as is practicable. Any faculty member who has been suspended is entitled to a due process hearing.
Appendix C
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4.13 Appointment and Review of Academic Administrators

4.13.1 Appointment

4.13.1.1 Election of a chancellor is fixed by statute as a duty of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina.

4.13.1.2 Procedures for appointment to a senior administrative position, as determined by the Board of Governors, include the following:
(a) appointment by the chancellor of a nominating committee of no less than seven persons representing the faculty, administrative staff, students, and other groups as the chancellor may deem appropriate. The majority shall be full-time faculty members not currently serving as administrators.
(b) nomination to the chancellor by the committee of two or more persons qualified to fill the position.
(If the chancellor finds none of the nominees acceptable, additional nominations may be requested or another committee appointed.)
(c) appointment by the chancellor to positions other than those of provost or vice chancellor.
(d) recommendation by the chancellor to the Board of Trustees in the case of the positions of provost or vice chancellor; and
(e) approval by the Board of Trustees.

4.13.1.3 A member of the administrative staff does not attain tenure in an administrative position. If, however, the administrator holds academic rank and/or tenure at the time of the appointment, that person continues to hold such rank or tenure as a member of the department in which such status was held prior to appointment to an administrative position.
The appointment of a dean of a college/school will include tenure in an academic department/school.

4.13.2 Review

The chancellor or the chancellor’s designee will provide for periodic review of administrators.

The director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP) will convene the first meeting of each reading committee and will facilitate the selection of a chair, or co-chairs, from among the committee members.
4.13.2.1 Administrative Reviews

The chancellor, the provost and executive vice chancellor, and deans will be reviewed by the faculty every three years.

4.13.2.1.1 Chancellor Evaluation
(a) All faculty, staff, and students will be provided the opportunity to evaluate the Chancellor. (b) The evaluative questions will be revised as needed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee working with the Faculty Senate’s Welfare and Morale Committee and will be developed from the appropriate job descriptions. (c) The administrator under review will have the option to provide a statement that reflects on his/her goals and accomplishments. (d) The reading committee for the Chancellor’s evaluation and review will be comprised of the President of the Student Government Association, the President of the Graduate Student Association Senate, the Chair of Staff Council, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Chair of the Council of Chairs. All committee members and the Chancellor will be provided the raw data. The reading committee will meet to discuss the outcome of the evaluation process and write a document summarizing the results. The committee will then meet with the Chancellor to discuss their findings. After this meeting, the committee will write a final report and submit it to the Chair of the Board of Trustees and to the President of the University of North Carolina system. The review process shall be confidential including, but not limited to, such components as the raw data, committee deliberations, and the final report. (e) The Faculty Senate Chair will notify the faculty when the process is completed. (f) The Board of Trustees evaluates the chancellor every four years and will be provided with the necessary data from the most recent campus review.

4.13.2.1.2 Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Evaluation
(a) All faculty and direct report staff will be provided the opportunity to evaluate the Provost. (b) The evaluative questions will be revised as needed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee working with the Faculty Senate’s Welfare and Morale Committee and will be developed from the appropriate job descriptions. (c) The administrator under review will have the option to provide a statement that reflects on his/her goals and accomplishments. (d) The reading committee for the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor will be comprised of the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Council of Chairs and a Dean jointly appointed by the Faculty Senate Chair and the Chancellor. The committee will elect a chair. All committee members and the Chancellor will be provided the raw data. (e) The reading committee will meet and discuss the outcome of the evaluation process and write a document assessing the results. The committee will then meet with the Provost to discuss their findings. After this meeting, the committee will write a final report and submit it to the Chancellor. The review process shall be confidential including, but not limited to, such components as the raw data, committee deliberations, and the final report. (f) The Chancellor will notify the faculty when the process is completed.
4.13.2.1.3 Dean Evaluations
(a) All faculty in a college will be provided the opportunity to evaluate the Dean of that college.
(b) Dean evaluations will take place on a rotating basis. New Deans will be evaluated in their second year and thereafter, every three years.
(c) The task of developing and updating Dean evaluation instruments will be the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Committee for Welfare and Morale. Evaluation instruments will be tailored to the Dean’s job description with input from the Provost.
(d) The administrator under review will have the option to provide a statement that reflects on his/her goals and accomplishments.
(e) The reading committee for the Dean of a college will be composed of five members: a member of the Faculty Senate Committee for Welfare and Morale; a department chair from within the Dean’s college; a department chair from outside the Dean’s college; a faculty member with the rank of Professor from within the Dean’s college; and one faculty member with the rank of Professor outside the Dean’s college. The Reading Committee Chair will be elected by the committee and should not be in the college of the Dean being evaluated. For colleges or schools without formal departments (such as the Library or School of Music) a program head will substitute for the inside department chair.
(f) The reading committee will receive the raw data and meet to review it. The reading committee will then produce a written report summarizing the reading committee’s review of the administrator along with a data summary and compiled comments with any identifying information removed.
(g) The reading committee will then meet with the Provost and the Dean under review to discuss the findings. The Dean and Provost shall receive a copy of the report and the summary data at least three days prior to the meeting with the Provost. After meeting with the Dean and the Provost, the reading committee will write a final report. The Faculty Senate Chair shall receive the raw data and summary report at the completion of the administrative review. The evaluation meeting with the Provost should take place before the end of the spring semester of the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The review process shall be confidential including, but not limited to, such components as the raw data, committee deliberations, and the final report.
(h) The Provost will notify the faculty in the Dean’s unit when the process is complete.
(i) Faculty Senate-run reviews of Deans shall not in any way preclude other Dean evaluations by the Provost, but is designed to provide one component of a general performance evaluation of the dean.

4.13.2.1.4 Other Administrative Evaluations
Other administrators, such as Vice Chancellors and Vice Provosts, will be reviewed under the following conditions: 1. when requested by the Chancellor or Provost, or 2. when initiated by the Faculty Senate Chair, or 3. when directed by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate.
(a) The task of developing and updating evaluation instruments for other administrators will be the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Committee for Welfare and Morale. Evaluation instruments will be tailored to the administrator’s job description with input from the Provost.
(b) The administrator under review will have the option to provide a statement that reflects on his/her goals and accomplishments.
(c) The reading committee for other administrators will be composed of four members (where possible representing different colleges): a member of the Faculty Senate Committee for Welfare and Morale; a department chair (or program head, for units like LIB, or MUS); a Dean; and a faculty member holding the rank of Professor. The reading committee chair will be selected from among the committee members.

(d) Reading committees for other administrators will receive the raw data and meet to review it. The reading committee will produce a written report summarizing the reading committee’s review of the administrator along with a data summary and compiled comments with any identifying information removed. The reading committee will meet with the Provost (or other supervisor) and the administrator under review to discuss the findings. The administrator under review and Provost/other supervisor shall receive a copy of the report and the summary data at least three days prior to the evaluation meeting. After meeting with the Provost or supervisor, the reading committee will write a final report. The Faculty Senate Chair shall receive the raw data and final report at the completion of the administrative review. The evaluation meeting with the Provost/supervisor should take place before the end of the spring semester of the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The review process shall be confidential including, but not limited to, such components as the raw data, committee deliberations, and the final report.

(e) Faculty Senate-run evaluations of academic administrators who work regularly with faculty shall not in any way preclude other administrator evaluations by the Provost/their supervisor.

(f) The administrator under review’s supervisor will notify the faculty in that unit when the process is complete.