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), Rob Sanders (Graduate Studies), Tyler Hardin (SGA) and Anna Oakes (Watauga Democrat).

II. Minutes

A. Chair Koch asked for a motion to approve the minutes for December 8, 2014. Senator Hageman moved and Senator Peterson-Sparks seconded to approve the minutes. Motion to approve the amended minutes for December 8, 2014 passed. (Vote #1)

B. Chair Koch then asked for a motion to approve the minutes for January 12, 2015. Senator Hageman moved and Senator Peterson-Sparks seconded to approve the minutes. Motion to approve the minutes for January 12, 2015 passed. (Vote #2)

III. Visitors’ Reports

No visitors’ reports.

IV. Provost’s Report

A. Dr. Tim Burwell was present to distribute some information that had been gathered related to the discussion during the January meeting about Distance Education Supplemental Pay Policy. Interim Provost Aeschleman was out of the country, but will be present at the March meeting to address this issue further.

In his overview, Dr. Burwell presented the first document which dealt with what other institutions in the State, as well as a couple of peer institutions outside the system, are doing in relation to distance education. The question that was posed is: “Does your campus pay additional stipends or any supplemental salary to faculty for the delivery of distance education courses taught as part of the
normal teaching load? If so, what is the amount and how is it determined?”
None of the institutions had a formal policy for providing supplemental pay/stipend for distance education courses, though some departments may choose to offer such to their faculty.

The second document presented the savings that would be realized if the proposed change to distance ed stipends were adopted; that amount is $570,000.00. There are 165 faculty members involved in distance ed. The topic of compensating for mileage driven in distance ed was not addressed with the other institutions. ASU currently pays mileage in addition to the distance ed stipend. Each Dean was asked how he/she would utilize the savings for his/her college. The projected uses for those savings are indicated on the document. It was repeatedly noted that “projected uses” does not guarantee that the savings will indeed remain in the salary pool for faculty. Senator Pollitt stated that perhaps the proposal would be more palatable if the savings were simply distributed to all faculty.

There were many questions posed by the Senators about the information gathered as a result of posing this question to the other institutions; e.g. there was no comparison of base salary for teaching a base load; there was no distinction between online courses and courses that involved driving to other locations.

Dr. Burwell reiterated that the proposal does not eliminate the stipend for distance ed, it just reduces it. Of 900+ faculty at ASU, less than 20% would be losing funds as a result of this proposed reduction. The biggest change would be for those faculty driving more than sixty miles to teach a distance ed class.

Senator Peterson-Sparks noted that the Chancellor wants to revitalize off-campus programs but the Senator questioned how to incentivize faculty to travel for these courses. Faculty often do not have a say in whether or not they will be assigned to distance ed and are asked to teach in the summer to ensure that a program will survive. Dr. Burwell responded that the impetus behind this proposal is that there needs to be a more balanced approach among all of the competing interests for funds. The current system of stipends often creates exceptions to the caps that have been set and creates inequity relative to other roles in departments, such as department chairs.

Other questions posed were: Why could this change not be accomplished through attrition? Could the cap which is part of this policy be utilized without including the other pieces of the proposal? Are department chairs actually aggrieved over the amounts involved in this proposal? Has there been discussion of how this might affect enrollment in distance ed courses?

Dr. Burwell stated that the goal of the proposal is to continue to incentivize distance ed but to do it in a more equitable manner.
Chair Koch then asked a question (not related to the proposal being discussed) about the cut that the University has been asked to give back. Dr. Burwell said that they have been notified that there could be an allotment hold-back, which would be a budget cut, in essence. The proposed budget depends on tuition and fees and the legislature. If the State doesn’t collect enough tax dollars to support the budget, there is the potential for a cut. He briefly discussed various pools that could be a source of funds if the allotment hold-back becomes a reality.

B. Dr. Mary Reichel represented Interim Provost Aeschleman to provide an overview of promotion and tenure statistics for 2015. There were a total of 40 tenure cases which were reviewed, ten of which came up a year early (25%). Stan wanted to know how many assistant professors were in their fifth year and how many were eligible to come up early. There were 41, ten of which came up early (24%). From Assistant to Associate, there were 37 cases, nine of which came up early (24%). Some tenure cases were already associates. There were 19 reviews, with one early promotion request (5%).

Stan also wanted to give a breakdown of recommendations for tenure. There were 98% positive recommendations for tenure, similar to the previous five years. For promotions to assistant and associate, there were again 98% positive recommendations, also similar to the range from previous years.

The Faculty Governance Committee and the Senate were interested in the Vote Justification Forms. Forty-six faculty from 11 departments filled out Vote Justification Forms, less than 10% participation of the tenured faculty. Because many faculty filled out two forms for promotion and tenure decisions, there were a total of 117 forms submitted. Seventy-four (63%) were signed.

Senator Strazicich asked whether the percentage of those going up early for promotion and tenure was greater this year than in previous years. Dr. Reichel stated, “Yes, definitely.” Chair Koch interjected that the changes in early promotion and tenure policy has opened the flood gates – 25% receiving early promotion/tenure is too high and causes ASU to be out of compliance with AAUP standards, so the policy needs to change. Senator Reck asked whether those who were denied promotion/tenure were going up early. Dr. Reichel said that the process is not yet finished because these are only recommendations, and the Board of Trustees makes the final decisions. She stated that she preferred to defer this question to Stan.

V. Chair’s Report

A. Chair Koch reported that Faculty Assembly had not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting, but that there is lots going on in Chapel Hill. The next meeting on February 20, 2015 will center around how to react both overtly and with structural
changes based on President Ross’ removal. Apparently, the Board of Governors is making changes to the selection process. The Faculty Assembly has offered a critique to the Board of Governors about that policy, but has not had any response, along with a lack of response on several issues. The Faculty Assembly needs more information before deciding how to react to the situation. Chair Koch maintains that a structural change needs to take place, making the Faculty Assembly part of the University system code. The Faculty across the state need to speak with one voice. All of the members of the Board of Governors have been appointed since 2010. Because of the current climate, everyone must be prepared to be on alert for changes that may be coming.

B. Chair Koch also mentioned the Faculty Club that the Chancellor has organized for each month. The Board of Trustees has been specially invited to attend the Faculty Club in March. This group of individuals contributes much time and money to ASU, in addition to being very supportive. He encouraged faculty to attend this Faculty Club and to make connection with the Board members and to express appreciation for all they do.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policy Committee (Campbell, Crepeau, Ortiz, Osinsky, Zrull)
   No report.

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)
   No report.

F. Committee on Committees (Gates, Everhart, Morehouse, Oliver, Villanova, Weddell)
1. Vice Chair Gates announced that February is election month, and it has been determined who is eligible to continue in the Senate. There are also three At-large Seats to be filled. The ballot has been drawn up for other University committees. He encouraged all Senators to persuade their colleagues to participate on committees in order to make faculty governance work. The dates for nominations and then elections will be forth-coming.

A question was raised about whether there are some committees which are more difficult to fill than others. Senator Gates said that the Faculty Grievance Hearing and the Faculty Grievance Assistance are a little more difficult to fill because of some requirements of membership. Senator Hindman added that these committee memberships were a bit harder to fill; but that one just needs a good sense of justice and fair play, and that they are very important and can be very interesting to serve on.

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

1. Chair Koch introduced the first item for consideration regarding the Faculty Handbook. It related to the change in language for early promotion and tenure. As was discussed earlier, 25% of eligible faculty going up for early promotion and tenure is too high a percentage, and we are out of compliance with AAUP guidelines. There were requests from the Interim Provost and the department chairs to tweak the language such that it is more specific about meeting the level of performance required for early consideration. The department chairs felt that they could be open to legal challenge given the current language. In order to come up early, there needs to be exceptional performance. Specific criteria to define exceptional cannot be set in the Handbook language because departmental criteria are too varied.

Senator Reed posed the question of whether Dr. Reichel and Chair Koch could give a sense of how many people who came up for early promotion would not have under the proposed guidelines? Chair Koch responded that he had no idea, but that efforts are being made to tighten the language so that department chairs will feel that in a case where someone is doing good work and on track to get tenure, they could indicate that the work is good, but not exceptional enough for early consideration.

There was some concern expressed by the Senators that this tweaking of the language may still not solve the issue.
A motion and second were not needed because these changes were recommended by the Faculty Governance Committee. **Motion FS 14-15/02-01 passed supporting the recommended changes to Section 3.8.5.13 of the Faculty Handbook.** (See Appendix A) (Vote #3)

2. Chair Koch then referred to Appendix B with proposed changes to Section 7.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook. This includes language for creation of a new committee – the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. The Graduate Dean had talked about changing the structure of the current Graduate Council, selected by the Dean, to a University committee which would be elected and then approved by the Senate. How other institutions handle this issue was also explored. Creation of this committee would reduce the current burden of AP&P, which will become the Undergraduate AP&P Committee.

Again, because this came as a recommendation from the Faculty Governance Committee, no motion or second were needed. **Motion FS 14-15/02-02 passed to add Section 7.3.4.9 to the Faculty Handbook, creating the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.** (See Appendix B) (Vote #4)

3. Language describing the current Graduate Council will disappear, and in its place, a committee will be established, no longer appointed but elected like other committees. The Undergraduate and Graduate AP&P Committees will send out an agenda to all the campus. Cross-listed courses will have to go before both committees. There will need to be some renumbering in the Faculty Handbook to reflect the addition of the Graduate AP&P. Attrition will be used to replace members. When someone’s term expires on the Graduate Council, he/she will be replaced through elections.

This recommendation from the Faculty Governance Committee was put to a vote. **Motion FS 14-15/02-03 passed to renumber components of Section 7.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook and to alter the language in other parts of the Handbook to reflect the addition of the Graduate AP&P Committee and to address membership.** (See Appendix C) (Vote #5)

4. The last item presented by Chair Koch was for information-only related to Post Tenure Review (Faculty Handbook Section 4.7). There is to be a change in the policy mandated by the Board of Governors. This process is not well received by anyone – administration, deans, faculty. The new changes will add another layer of work for the Deans, who must now review every person. From a faculty perspective, not much will change.
Chair Koch asked the Senators to look at the background and the proposed language changes and to take this issue to their colleagues for discussion. (See Appendices D & E)

Some of the members of the Board of Governors want to eliminate tenure. This change in Post Tenure Review will address their concerns regarding tenure. The Board of Governors is presenting this as a compromise to save it. They feel that the universities should be more aggressive in policing themselves.

If a faculty member should show up deficient in the Post Tenure Review, a remedial work plan would be established to ensure better productivity. Chair Koch stated that there can often be ramifications for changes such as this which are often not understood by the Board. Standing with accrediting agencies such as SACS can be impacted by such things as removal of tenure, for example. Once a faculty member achieves tenure, he/she must maintain research responsibilities or teach a 4-4 load, such that productivity is on-going. Chair Koch affirmed that there is some concern that the “flagship” institutions will become the research institutions, and everyone else would be teaching 4-4.

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

No report.

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

1. Senator Stoddard reported that they are currently engaged in Deans’ Evaluations and that data is being collected. Reading committees are being formed, and then recommendations will be made. Deans Pelto (MUS) and Whitt (HS) are under review.

VII. Unfinished Business

None.

VIII. New Business

A. Chair Koch introduced a resolution from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly. (See Appendix G) Chair Koch has also included for consideration the Joint Statement of the UNC Board of Governors and President Tom Ross. (See Appendix F) There is concern that this transition may be in a direction that faculty will not be happy with. The Faculty Assembly would like answers about
what the change in leadership means for policy and for the direction of the UNC system more generally. Implicit in the resolution are qualities for a new President. It has already been endorsed by other campuses in the system. Vice Chair Gates moved that the resolution be brought to the floor and endorsed. Senator Hageman seconded the motion. **Motion FS 14-15/02-04 passed to endorse the resolution from the Faculty Assembly regarding the transition in leadership and direction of the UNC system. (Vote #6)** Chair Koch will send the endorsed resolution to the Chair of the Board of Governors.

**IX. Adjournment**

Senator Aycock moved and Senator Reck seconded to adjourn the meeting. **Motion to adjourn passed. (Vote #7)** Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

<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 December 8, 2014 as amended passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Motion to approve the Faculty Senate minutes for January 12, 2015 passed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/02-01 passed supporting the recommended changes to Section 3.8.5.13 of the Faculty Handbook. (See Appendix A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Motion FS 14-15/02-02 passed to add Section 7.3.4.9 to the Faculty Handbook, creating the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. (See Appendix B)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motion FS 14-15/02-03 passed to renumber components of Section 7.3.4 and to alter the language in other parts of the Handbook to reflect the addition of the Graduate AP&amp;P Committee and to address membership. (See Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Motion FS 14-15/02-04 passed to endorse the resolution from the Faculty Assembly regarding the transition in leadership and direction of the UNC system. (See Appendix G)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</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>Eli Bentor</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Campbell</td>
<td>E</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>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Everhart</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fenwick</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>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Hamilton</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Hester</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Hindman</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Howard</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanah Mitchell</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Morehouse</td>
<td>Y</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>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Spaulding</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stallworth</td>
<td>Y</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>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Wangler</td>
<td>Y</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>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Wheeler</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zrull</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Current Language

3.8.5.13 An Assistant Professor may request review for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure one year earlier than the mandatory year….

Replace with:

An Assistant Professor who has demonstrated exceptional performance by exceeding departmental criteria during their probationary period may request review for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure one year earlier than the mandatory year…
Appendix B

7.3.4.9 Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee

7.3.4.9.1 The Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee formulates and recommends policies governing the administration of graduate studies and provides final faculty review of graduate curriculum proposals.

7.3.4.9.2 Members on the Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee: 14 – 13 Faculty holding full graduate faculty status, excluding affiliate members, and one graduate student as voting members. The faculty voting members shall include at least one faculty member from each college or school offering graduate programs and the library, with additional faculty members to be based on the current proportion of full graduate faculty in the colleges or schools. The graduate student member shall be selected by the Graduate Student Association Senate (GSAS).

The ex-officio non-voting membership of the Graduate Committee shall include the Graduate Dean and Associate Dean, the Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (or their designee), and one person from each of the following areas: dean’s office in each college/school, Registrar, Distance Education, Office of Research, Division of Enrollment Management, and Faculty Senate. The provost and executive vice chancellor, or his/her designee, will convene the first meeting and facilitate the selection of a chair, or co-chairs, from among the voting members of the committee.

7.3.4.9.3 Report to: the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

7.3.4.9.4 Areas of Responsibility: graduate curriculum, policies affecting graduate programs, appeals concerning academic matters coming from graduate programs in any college/school, department, members of the faculty or students and matters referred to it by the provost and executive vice chancellor or the Chancellor.

7.3.4.9.5 The Graduate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee will send its agenda to the entire faculty at least six days prior to a scheduled meeting.
Appendix C

If the addition of language for Graduate AP&P passes, then:

1. The Faculty Senate supports the renumbering of the components of Section 7.3.4 in the Handbook.

2. The Faculty Senate supports the alteration of language in other parts of the Handbook to reflect the addition of the Graduate AP&P.

3. The Faculty Senate supports the following method for replacement of the current membership of Graduate Council with membership of the new Graduate AP&P.

“Current members of the Graduate Council will continue as delegates to the Graduate AP&P until their terms expire. New members will be selected according to the rules for Graduate AP&P outlined in the Handbook.”
Appendix D

Background: Proposed Changes to Faculty Handbook 4.7 Post-Tenure Review

The Post Tenure Review Task Force was appointed in October 2014 to respond to a charge from UNC General Administration “that [the Provost] work with stakeholders on your campus to update your policies on the performance review of tenured faculty and submit to General Administration for approval by May 29, 2015.” This charge came in response to changes made by the UNC Board of Governors in June 2014 to “Performance Review of Tenured Faculty” UNC Policy 400.3.3.

Task Force members are Tony Calamai, Dean, Arts and Sciences; Mike Dotson, Professor, Marketing; Sue Edwards, Professor and Chair, Biology, Chair, Council of Chairs; Tracy Goodson-Espy, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction; Andy Koch, Professor, Government and Justice Studies, Faculty Senate Chair and Chair of Task Force; Brian Raichle, Associate Professor, TED; Mary Reichel, Special Assistant to the Provost; Allan Scherlen, Professor, Library; Bair Shagdaron, Professor, Music; and Dave Williams, Associate Professor, Nutrition and Health Care Management.

The attached proposal for revisions to Faculty Handbook 4.7 ‘Post-Tenure Review’ was approved by the Task Force on January 20, 2015 and revised and approved by the Governance Committee on January 22, 2015.

Relevant Policies

UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3 (Performance Review of Tenured Faculty); UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3.1[G] (Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty); the ASU Faculty Handbook 4.7 Post-Tenure Review; and ASU “Post-Tenure Review Guidelines for Procedures.

Faculty who undergo post-tenure review in 2014-15 will be evaluated under the current (new) policy and guidelines (400.3.3 and 400.3.3[G]).
Appendix E
Proposed Handbook Language

4.7 Post-Tenure Review (Approved by the PTR Task Force and Governance Committee)

4.7.1 Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to support and encourage faculty excellence. Post tenure review requirements can be found in the UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G].

4.7.2 In addition to the annual review for all faculty, described in section 4.3.2, each tenured member of the teaching faculty will be subject to a comprehensive, cumulative review on a regular and systematic basis, no less frequently than every five years. A review undertaken to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.

This comprehensive review shall provide for the evaluation of all aspects of the professional performance of faculty, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily in one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.

Faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the University, college, and program. Exemplary faculty performance will be recognized and rewarded. Because performance rewards are often part of the annual review process (described in section 4.3.2), the post-tenure review may provide additional support for this form of recognition.

Any academic year during which a tenured faculty member is on approved leave for more than twenty-five class days of the academic calendar or receives a total teaching-load reduction of more than six credit hours for medical or family reasons (6.2) or other adjustments of employment obligation (6.2.3) will not count for the post-tenure review five-year cycle unless the faculty member requests in writing to the departmental chair that it be counted. Such a request must be made within one calendar year following the end of the leave or course-load reduction.

4.7.3 At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member shall develop with his/her department chair a five-year goal or plan. This plan can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Annual performance evaluations should be considered as a component of post-tenure review, but alone are not a substitute for a comprehensive 5-year evaluation.

4.7.4 A post-tenure review committee for a department or academic unit will be elected by a vote of the tenured faculty in the department or academic unit. The tenured faculty will elect from among themselves three tenured faculty, who will serve staggered, non-renewable, three-year terms. The post-tenure review committee elects a chair from among its members. The tenured faculty will elect tenured faculty members to fill any vacancies each year. The tenured faculty
may also fill vacancies caused by resignation or other contingencies.

In the event that there are not three tenured faculty in the department or academic unit, the tenured faculty will make nominations and will elect from among those nominated a tenured faculty member or members from an allied discipline to serve on the post-tenure review committee.

4.7.5 The campus will ensure that all members of post-tenure review committees and administrators have training and ongoing support available in how to perform a meaningful and unbiased review of the faculty member.

4.7.6 At the time of review, the faculty member under review will provide the committee with a brief one-page summary of their accomplishments over the previous five years and a current vita. The department chair will provide the review committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual reviews for the previous five years, and a copy of the faculty member’s five year plan.

4.7.7 After review of submitted materials, the post-tenure review committee shall provide to the faculty member being reviewed and the departmental chair a one page summary concerning its evaluation and shall designate the faculty member’s performance as “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” or “does not meet expectations.” The summary with designations shall be provided to the faculty member and chair within fifteen (15) working days (barring extenuating circumstances) of receiving the materials. The post-tenure review committee’s feedback should include recognition for exemplary performance.

4.7.8 The faculty member under review may provide written responses to the post-tenure committee and chair’s reviews. A written response to the post-tenure review committee’s evaluation shall be submitted to the department chair within ten (10) working days (barring extenuating circumstances) after receipt of the committee’s evaluation, and will not be shared with the post-tenure review committee. A written response to the chair’s review may be submitted to the dean within five (5) working days (barring extenuating circumstances) after receipt of the chair’s review and will not be shared with the chair.

4.7.9 Department chairs shall provide a written review in addition to the review of the committee. The chair shall provide a written copy of his/her evaluative review to the faculty member within fifteen (15) working days (barring extenuating circumstances) from the time that the department chair receives the review committee’s summary or from the time that the faculty member provides his or her written response to the committee recommendation (see Section 4.7.8). The chair shall forward the candidate’s material, the post-tenure committee summary and recommendation, his/her recommendation, and faculty response, if any, to the dean within this same time period.

4.7.10 Deans shall provide an evaluative review in addition to the reviews conducted by the committee and the department chair. The dean’s review is cumulative and taken to be the final evaluation. This review will be shared with the faculty member within ten (10) working days
(barring extenuating circumstances) from the time that the dean receives the chair’s and the committee’s written reviews or from the time that the faculty member provides his or her written response to the chair’s recommendation (see Section 4.7.10).

In cases where the dean functions as a department chair in an academic unit without departmental divisions, the higher administrative review will be performed by the provost.

4.7.11 All reviews must include a statement of the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and delineate specific strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the faculty member’s performance in teaching; scholarship and/or creative activities; and service.

4.7.12 The provost must certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policies and guidelines.

4.7.13 Any faculty member who receives a “does not meet expectations” rating in the post-tenure review will be given the opportunity to improve performance. In consultation with the dean, the faculty member’s chair will: (a) consider the evaluation from the post-tenure review committee and the faculty member’s response; and (b) prepare a written individual professional development plan for the faculty member.

A specific timeline including steps for improvement must be included in the development plan, with a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line. Consequences may include discharge or demotion for “sustained unsatisfactory performance” after the faculty member has been given an opportunity to remedy such performance and fails to do so within a reasonable time, pursuant to section 4.10.1.1 of the Faculty Handbook.

The chair is encouraged to assign one or more mentoring peers to the faculty member, and the chair must hold a progress meeting with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified time line. If the faculty member’s duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, the development plan should indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities.

History: Language revised and approved by Post-Tenure Review Task Force on 1/20/15. Language revised further and approved by Faculty Governance Committee on 1/22/15.
Appendix F

Joint Statement of the UNC Board of Governors and President Tom Ross
January 16, 2015

The University of North Carolina Board of Governors has decided to begin the process of leadership transition. The Board believes President Ross has served with distinction, that his performance has been exemplary, and that he has devoted his full energy, intellect and passion to fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of his office. This decision has nothing to do with President Ross’s performance or ability to continue in the office. The Board respects President Ross and greatly appreciates his service to the University and to the State of North Carolina. The Board and President Ross have agreed that he will continue to serve with the Board’s full support until his resignation becomes effective January 3, 2016, or when his successor is in place, whichever is later. Though the timeline President Ross had for transition is different from that of the Board, he fully understands, appreciates and accepts the prerogative of the Board of Governors to select the president of the University. He has assured the Board of his full commitment to fulfilling the responsibilities of the presidency during the period of transition and to continuing to serve honorably and effectively the nation’s best public university, as well as the people of his home State of North Carolina.

The Board of Governors and the President have agreed that the January 2016 resignation date is appropriate to allow the Board to conduct a national search for the next president and to ensure an orderly transition of leadership. President Ross has also agreed to be available to advise and consult with the Board and University officials following his service as President, while he is on research leave preparing to join the faculty of the UNC-Chapel Hill School of Government.
Appendix G

Resolution Regarding the Transition in Leadership and Direction of the UNC System

Whereas:
Chairman John Fennebresque of the UNC System Board of Governors (BOG) in his press conference on 16th of January, 2015 suggested the need for a “transition in leadership” of the UNC system to move the University in new directions; and

Whereas:
The stated need for transition required the precipitous decision to replace Tom Ross as President of the University of North Carolina System; and

Whereas:
The UNC Faculty Assembly has observed President Tom Ross to exhibit exemplary, visionary and inclusive leadership of the UNC System; and,

Whereas:
President Tom Ross continues to lead the UNC System in the best interests of the University and all the people of the State of North Carolina, in a manner that:

- Ensures access to the University system to all qualified students; and
- Provides higher education to North Carolina’s citizens, regardless of race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status, in a manner that is “as free as practicable,” by developing and protecting financial aid and tuition structures; and
- Attracts and retains the best faculty and staff for all UNC campuses; and
- Builds a strong leadership team at the UNC General Administration that works effectively with the BOG to develop and support the capacity of individual campuses to fulfill their missions in the context of the system; and
- Effectively manages the system’s complex budget during a period of drastically decreasing budgets; and
- Strengthens campus leadership by selecting Chancellors committed to academic excellence and the respective missions of the system’s diverse campuses; and
- Promotes a comprehensive liberal arts based education that prepares students for careers and lifelong learning; and

Whereas:
The UNC Faculty Assembly is deeply concerned that the precipitous decision to replace an acknowledged highly effective system leader will diminish the opportunities to attract and retain strong, effective and visionary leaders at all levels of the University system;

Therefore Be It Resolved:
That the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina expresses its most sincere thanks and highest respect for the exemplary work and leadership of President Tom Ross; and,

Be It Further Resolved:
That the UNC Faculty Assembly strongly endorses the manner in which President Tom Ross continues to lead the University of North Carolina System; and

Be It Further Resolved:
That the UNC Faculty Assembly calls upon the Board of Governors to articulate the rationale for their stated need for a “transition in leadership,” a transition that implies a change in direction that has neither been discussed nor vetted with campus leadership, faculty, or the people of North Carolina.