

**The University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Faculty Senate **Amended** Agenda**

Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 3:30 PM
Thomas School of Business Room 225-26

AND

<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/holden.hansen>

Members of the Senate:

To 2023	To 2024	To 2025
ART Vacant <i>Academic Affairs</i>	ART Holden Hansen <i>Faculty Senate Chair</i>	ART Beata Niedzialkowska <i>Academic Information and Technology</i>
CHS Julie Harrison-Swartz <i>Academic Affairs</i>	CHS Jennifer Wells <i>Committee on Committee and Elections Chair</i>	CHS Jennifer Jones-Locklear <i>Academic Affairs</i>
EDUC Camille Goins <i>Academic Information and Technology Chair</i>	EDUC Gerald Neal <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>	EDUC Jennifer Whittington <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>
LETT Richard Vela <i>Academic Affairs</i>	LETT Peter Grimes <i>Student Affairs and Campus Life Chair</i>	LETT James Hudson <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>
NSM Maria Pereira <i>Faculty Senate Secretary</i>	NSM Roland Stout <i>Academic Affairs</i>	NSM Timothy Anderson <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>
SBS Lauren Norman <i>Student Affairs and Campus Life</i>	SBS Porter Lillis <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>	SBS Matt Schneider <i>Student Affairs and Campus Life</i>
At-Large Renee Lamphere <i>Academic Affairs Chair</i>	At-Large Kelly Charlton <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs Chair</i>	At-Large Carla Rokes <i>Committee on Committees and Elections</i>
At-Large Melissa Schaub <i>Committee on Committees and Elections</i>	At-Large Tracy Vargas <i>Faculty and Institutional Affairs</i>	At-Large Rachel Morrison <i>Academic Affairs</i>
Chancellor Robin G. Cummings Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Cherry Beasley		

Order of Business

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of Minutes ([Appendix A](#))
- III. Adoption of Agenda
- IV. Reports from Administration
 - ~~a. Chancellor – Dr. Robin Cummings~~
 - ~~i. Comments from the Chancellor~~
 - b. Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Dr. Cherry Beasley
 - i. Comments from the Interim Provost
- V. Reports of Committees
 - a. Operations Committees
 - i. Executive Committee – Holden Hansen, Chair
 1. Comments from the Chair
 - ii. Committee on Committees & Elections – Dr. Jennifer Wells, Chair
 1. **(For Information)** CCE Vacancy Appointments
 - a. Faculty Hearing Committee 2022-23 – Will Collier, Jeff Chaumba
 2. **(Vote Required)**
 - a. CCE 2022-23 Slate of Appointments ([Appendix B](#))
 3. Committee Update
 - iii. Committee on Faculty Governance – Dr. Mohammed Ashraf, Chair
 1. **(For Information)** Proposal to amend Article III, Section 8 of the Faculty Constitution ([Appendix C](#))
 - iv. Committee on the Oversight of the Faculty Handbook – Dr. Rachel Smith, Chair
 1. **(Vote Required)** Proposal **revise** to Section I, Chapter 1, page 6 of the Faculty Handbook ([Appendix D](#))
 2. **(For Information)** Changes to Section I, Chapter 3; Section II, Chapter 1; and Section II, Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook ([Appendix E](#))
 - b. Standing Committees
 - i. Academic Affairs Committee – Dr. Renee Lamphere, Chair
 1. **(For Information)** Curriculum Proposals – New Course Proposals from the Departments of Accounting and Finance, Biology, Chemistry & Physics, Counseling, Sociology & Criminal Justice, Mathematics & Computer Science, Kinesiology, Geology & Geography, History, and Music ([Appendix F](#))
 2. **(Vote Required)** View at <https://uncp.curriculog.com/>
 - a. **From the Department of Accounting and Finance**
 - 1) Program Revision: Accounting, B.S.
 - b. **From the Department of Chemistry and Physics**
 - 1) Program Deletion: Chemistry, Analytical, B.S.
 - 2) Program Deletion: Chemistry, Environmental, B.S.
 - c. **From the Department of Counseling**
 - 1) Program Revision: Play Therapy Graduate Certificate
 - d. **From the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science**
 - 1) Program Revision: Cybersecurity, B.S.
 - e. **From the Department of Kinesiology**

- 1) New Program: Master of Science of Occupational Therapy
- 2) New Program: Coaching Sports Minor
- f. **From the Department of Political Science & Public Administration**
 - 1) Program Revision: General Political Science Minor
 - 2) Program Revision: Political Science, Pre-Law Option, B.A.
 - 3) Program Revision: Requirements for a Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.)
- g. **From the Department of History**
 - 1) Program Revision: Teaching with Middle Grades Social Studies Education Specialization, M.A.T
 - 2) Program Revision: Teaching with Social Studies Education (9-12) Specialization, M.A.T.
 - 3) Program Revision: History, Social Studies Education, B.A.
- h. **From the Department of Music**
 - 1) New Program: Music, Music Industry Emphasis - Songwriting Track, B.A.
 - 2) New Program: Songwriting Minor
- i. **The Department of Inclusive Education**
 - 1) Program Revision: Special Education (K-12), B.S.
3. **(Vote Required) General Education Subcommittee Proposal:** View at <https://uncp.curriculog.com/proposal:2607/form>
 - a. **From the Department of Music**
 - 1) New Gen Ed Course Proposal: Add MUS 1181 (University Marching Band) to General Education Physical Education and Wellness Section
 4. **(Vote Required)** Proposed revisions to policy on adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses (Academic Catalog <https://catalog.uncp.edu/content.php?catoid=31&navoid=1884>) (Appendix G)
- ii. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee – Dr. Kelly Charlton, Chair
 1. **(Vote Required)** Changes to the handbook regarding description of SEI use (Appendix H)
 2. **(Vote Required)** Recommendation for IR to include a “Non-Guaranteed Anonymity Statement” to accompany Student Evaluations of Instruction for any surveyed course with 3 or fewer registered students: *"Note that for courses with low total enrollment, the anonymity of your responses may not be as complete as it would be in a larger course, even though student names are never attached to the results."*
 3. **(Vote Required)** Recommendation for IR to include a “Small Sample Size Statement” to accompany the release of Student Evaluations of Instruction data to anyone who has a role in evaluation in either of the following circumstances:
 - a. A course with 3 or fewer registered students -or-
 - b. A course that received 3 or fewer SEI responses

“Student Evaluations of Instruction are instrumental in allowing students an opportunity to provide feedback on the effectiveness of course instruction. However, Faculty, Department Chairs, and other administrators should interpret evaluations with small sample sizes with caution, as small sample sizes reduce the power of the feedback and increase the likelihood of skewed or non-representative feedback. In other words, evaluations with low response rates should not be used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in the faculty review process, including but not limited to, Annual Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure decisions, and conferment of Teaching Awards. A comprehensive evaluation of teaching effectiveness should include student feedback, peer observations, evaluation of instructional materials and learning management systems (e.g., Canvas), and instructor self-reflections.”

- iii. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee –Dr. Peter Grimes, Chair
 - 1. No Report
- iv. Academic Information Technology Committee – Dr. Camille Goins, Chair
 - 1. **(Vote Required)** Recommendation to upgrade to Turnitin Originality. Proposal Detail: Originality offers increased features (such as Draft Coach for review of drafts). The team reviewed both SimCheck and Originality for two weeks and met with a Turnitin rep. The cost is \$11,664 per annum for SimCheck vs. \$27,849 per annum for Originality. AI detection is included on both platforms. Review team recommendation is for adopting Originality.
 - 2. Committee Update
- v. Budget Advisory Committee - Dr. Melissa Schaub, Chair
 - 1. No Report

VI. Faculty Assembly Updates:

- a. **Brief Report** – Dr. Renee Lamphere, Faculty Assembly Delegate
- b. **Faculty Assembly 22-23 Documents**

VII. Graduate Council – April 24, 2023 Unapproved Minutes ([Appendix I](#))

VIII. Other Committees

- a. **CEPP** – March 15, 2023 Minutes ([Appendix J](#))

IX. Unfinished Business

- a. **(Vote Required)** Proposal: Revision to Classroom Management Policy ([Appendix K](#))

X. New Business

XI. Announcements

XII. Adjournment

Appendix A

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

Faculty Senate **Unapproved** Minutes

Wednesday, April 5, 2023, at 3:30 PM

Thomas School of Business Room 255

AND

<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/holden.hansen>

Order of Business

- I. **Roll Call** - A quorum was present, and the Senate Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM
Members Present: Timothy Anderson, Cherry Beasley (Interim Provost), Kelly Charlton, Robin Cummings (Chancellor), Camille Goins, Peter Grimes, Holden Hansen (Chair), Julie Harrison-Swartz, James Hudson, Jennifer Jones-Locklear, Renee Lamphere, Porter Lillis, Rachel Morrison, Beata Niedzialkowska, Lauren Norman, Maria Pereira (Secretary), Carla Rokes, Melissa Schaub, Matt Schneider, Jennifer Wells, Jennifer Whittington
Members Absent: Gerald Neal, Roland Stout, Tracy Vargas, Richard Vela
- II. **Approval of Minutes** (Appendix A) - **Approved as circulated**
- III. **Adoption of Agenda** - **Approved as amended** [Amendments: (1) Under V.a.i.2. – ‘Report’ replaced ‘Discussion’ and Appendix BB was added; (2) Under V.b.i.2. – correction - ‘Vote Required’ strike out; (3) Under v.b.i.2.a.-b. – add ‘For Information,’ under c. add ‘Vote Required,’ under c.vii. add ‘For Information;’ (4) Under V.b.2.d.i. – add ‘Vote Required’ and change the word ‘Practitioner’ to ‘Practice;’ (5) Under V.b.2.d.ii. – add ‘For Information ii.-x.;’ (6) Under V.b.2.e.i.-ii. – add ‘Vote Required’ and under iii. add ‘For Information;’ (7) Under V.b.2.f.i.-ii. – add ‘For Information;’ (8) Under IX. – remove a. (including Appendix G); (9) Move ‘Announcements’ to X.
- IV. **Reports from Administration**
 - a. **Chancellor** – Dr. Robin Cummings
 - i. Comments from the Chancellor
 1. **Searches:**
 - a. Provost search nearing the end
 - b. Enrollment Management (removed from the Provost’s purview) is now a VC position. Search is now being conducted by a search firm
 2. Talked to 300+ high school ROTC juniors – UNCP left a positive impression on them
 3. VC for Advancement, Steve Varley is joining NPR. The Registry is the nation's best source for senior interim leadership, and we are using them to choose our Interim VCA
 4. During this month (April) we will have BOT on-campus (next week), BOG (the week after), and the Student Governing Bodies (all SGAs together elect one individual to serve on the BOG)
 5. Commencement is May 5 and 6 – please attend as it is an extremely important day for our students
 - a. Commencement speaker for both ceremonies will be Chief Lynn Malerba (she is the first native to be named U.S. Treasurer and the first female to be named in 2010 as a Chief of the Mohegan Tribe’s modern history and she became the 18th Chief of the Tribe. The position is a lifetime appointment made by the Tribe’s Council of Elders). Among many other

accomplishments, Chief Malerba has a Bachelor of Science in Nursing, a master's degree in Public Administration from the University of Connecticut, she is a Registered Nurse, and earned a degree as a Doctor of Nursing Practice at Yale University. She was awarded an Honorary Doctoral Degree in Science from Eastern Connecticut State University, and an Honorary Doctor Degree in Humane Letters from the University of Saint Joseph West Hartford, Connecticut

b. Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Dr. Cherry Beasley

i. Comments from the Interim Provost ([Appendix B](#))

1. 75+ faculty and staff volunteered to be with the BOG
2. Events going on outside of the classroom (participate and encourage students to participate so we can embrace learning inside and outside of the classroom):
 - a. Women's Empowerment Summit
 - b. Southeastern American Indian Conference
 - c. Old Main Scholars
 - d. The School of Nursing took a group of students to the General Assembly
 - e. Native American Speaker Series (America Indian Nurse representing NIH)
 - f. PURC Symposium
3. School of Education had its virtual accreditation this week and got a positive initial report
4. Searches (key positions that go along with the future Provost that we hire):
 - a. Registrar's Search Committee has been charged and is looking for applications
 - b. Director of Online Learning led by Dr. Ashley Adams
5. Hires:
 - a. Executive Director of the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies
 - b. Executive Director of University College
6. System's Office has received and accepted our request for a Master of Healthcare Administration (MHA) and Optometry degrees
7. Students will be surveyed, and meetings will be happening with SGA so students can have a voice in academic course scheduling
8. Faculty Handbook does not state raises people get with promotion and tenure. At this point, everybody who comes up for promotion and tenure will get 3% going from Assistant to Associate and 5% going from Associate to Full
9. VC for Finance and Administration, Gabe Eszterhas was invited to give a financial update on the Budget. The initial report was given in the General Faculty Meeting Report on 2022.12.09 and the current situation is:
 - a. System Office told us in the Spring 2023 that we can do NC Promise in the Summer 2023 - summer tuition is a non-recurring fund for now

- b. Compared to December 2022, we got slightly more credit hours, and we are going to get slightly more in the enrollment model [we did not qualify for the 1-time stop loss (400K) but gained 200K]
 - c. Last December the prediction was 3M dollars less revenue for next year but now we are 3.5M in the red – Unit budgets remain unchanged
 - d. The reserves (revenues from outside the university) are good (6.1 M) which places us in a good position for next year – however, we still have a need for 3.1M (reductions due to reallocations)
 - i. Some units will not be affected while others will get 3.1% reduction starting July 1st
10. The Provost added that a freeze has been put on positions and each of them is being evaluated in conjunction with the Deans. Furthermore, two things must happen at the same time: (1) moving forward (increasing programs that we are offering) but also (2) making sure that we stay within the budget

V. Reports of Committees

a. Operations Committees

- i. Executive Committee – Holden Hansen, Chair
 - 1. Comments from the Chair
 - a. Reminder – Dr. Wade Maki, Chair of the Faculty Assembly, will be on campus April 18th, 3:30-5:00 in Thomas 130 (attend face-to-face or online)
 - b. The last Senate meeting of the year is May 3rd in Thomas 225 and the General Faculty meeting is May 5th in Thomas 130
 - c. Welcome to Julie Harrison-Swartz joining the Senate to fill an unexpired to 2023 CHS position
 - 2. SEI Participation Rates **Report Discussion (Appendix BB)**
 - a. Chair Hansen summarized Appendix BB and informed the Senate that the Provost is going to report to the BOT (the following week) and relay to them our efforts to increase SEIs participation
 - i. One specific concern of the BOT is the participation rate of the online courses
 - b. The Executive Committee presented 5 short term strategies that do not require policy change to the Faculty Handbook, and which will be employed in April, 2023
 - i. Many other good ideas can be implemented next fall
 - c. Need to make sure that faculty has the link available on the Canvas navigation menu
- ii. Committee on Committees & Elections – Dr. Jennifer Wells, Chair
 - 1. **(Vote Required)** CCE Vacancy Appointments:
 - a. Academic Support Services Subcommittee
Misti Harper - LETT (2021-2023) - Appointment made by CCE was **adopted by general consensus**
 - 2. **(For Information)**
 - a. Faculty Senate

Julie Harrison-Swartz – CHS (to 2023) – CCE ran an election for an open Faculty Senate seat and Dr. Harrison-Swartz is joining us today

3. Committee Update – CCE is running an election (closing tomorrow at 5 PM) for a Faculty Hearing seat – we have 2 nominees (from same dept) for the 4 open positions. Those nominations will be open again immediately. Once Faculty Hearing has been filled, Faculty Grievance must be filled as well. There are several other positions that we will continue to call for and, we will be sending out the Committee Preference Poll for the next academic year
 - iii. Committee on Faculty Governance – Dr. Mohammed Ashraf, Chair
 1. Committee Update – the committee asked the Senate to consider the situation when Senators are committee members (after 2 missed meetings will be removed from the committee) – will those Senators be removed from the Senate as well? The Handbook does not state anything therefore, a proposal will have to come from the Senate about it. Senate Chair Hansen added this recommendation to his list of things to do and will bring it to the Executive Committee for discussion. FGC is also considering changing the structure of the Senate from division representatives to dept representatives
 - iv. Committee on the Oversight of the Faculty Handbook – Dr. Rachel Smith, Chair
 1. No Report
- b. Standing Committees**
- i. Academic Affairs Committee – Dr. Renee Lamphere, Chair – Apologies for all the changes below – there is a problem with the routing in Curriculog that we had not realized and therefore requests were being routed to the Senate when actually they did not need to be
 1. **(For Information)** Curriculum Proposals – New Course Proposals from the Departments of Mathematics and Computer Science, History, Kinesiology, Political Science and Public Administration, and Sociology and Criminal Justice (Appendix C)
 2. **(Vote Required)** View at <https://uncp.curriculog.com/agenda:205/form>
 - a. **(For Information) From the Department of American Indian Studies**
 - i. Course Revision Proposal: AIS 4050 (Contemporary Issues of American Indians)
 - b. **(For Information) From the Department of Biology**
 - i. Course Revision Proposal: BIO 2180 (Principles of Genetics)
 - ii. Course Revision Proposal: BIO 3750 (Neurobiology)
 - c. **(Vote Required) From the Department of Mathematics & Computer Science**
 - i. Program Revision Proposal: Computer Science Minor with Emphasis on Programming
 - ii. Program Revision Proposal: Computer Science, Cybersecurity Track
 - iii. Program Revision Proposal: Computer Science, General Track

- iv. Program Revision Proposal: IT Minor with Emphasis in Software Application Development
- v. Program Revision Proposal: Information Technology, General Track, B.S.
The program revisions proposals (i-v) were all taken together, and they were adopted by unanimous consent (19-0-0)
- vi. New Program Proposal: Cybersecurity Minor
New program proposal for a minor is Cybersecurity – the proposal was adopted by unanimous consent (19-0-0)
- vii. **(For Information)** Course Revision Proposal: ITC 2060 (Human Computer Interaction)
- d. **From the Department of Nursing**
 - i. **(Vote Required)** New Program Proposal: Doctor of Nursing Practice ~~Practitioner~~ (DNP) in Population Health
The proposal was adopted by unanimous consent (19-0-0)
 - ii. **(For Information ii.-x.)** New Course Proposal: NUR 6000 (Population and Public Health Theory: Problem Discovery)
 - iii. New Course Proposal: NUR 6010 (Advanced Nursing Health Policy, Practice, and Ethics)
 - iv. New Course Proposal: NUR 6020 (Evidence-Based Practice, Research Methods, and Clinical Data Management)
 - v. New Course Proposal: NUR 6031: Clinical Practicum I: Organizational and Public Health Systems Leadership
 - vi. New Course Proposal: Clinical Practicum II: Population Health and Health Promotion Modeling
 - vii. New Course Proposal: NUR 6034 (Clinical Practicum IV: Project Evaluation and Dissemination)
 - viii. New Course Proposal: NUR 6101 (Nursing Inquiry: DNP Project 1)
 - ix. New Course Proposal: NUR 6102 (Nursing Inquiry: DNP Project 2)
 - x. New Course Proposal: NUR 6103 (Nursing Inquiry: DNP Project 3)
- e. **From the Department of Political Science & Public Administration**
 - i. **(Vote Required)** Program Revision Proposal: Legal Studies Minor
 - ii. **(Vote Required)** Program Revision: Public Administration Minor
Two program revisions from the Dept of Political Science & Public Administration – The two proposals were adopted by unanimous consent (19-0-0)
 - iii. **(For Information)** Course Revision Proposal: PAD 5520 (Principles of Budgeting and Finance)
- f. **From the Department of Social Work**
 - i. **(For Information)** Course Revision Proposal: SWK 5060 (Social Work Practice with Individuals)

- ii. **(For Information)** Course Revision Proposal: SWK 5300 (Foundation Practicum I and Seminar)
 - 3. **(Vote Required) General Education Subcommittee Proposal:** View at <https://uncp.curriculog.com/agenda:205/form>
 - a. **From the Mathematics & Computer Science**
 - i. New Gen Ed Course Proposal: MAT 1055 (Quantitative Reasoning)
 - The proposal was adopted by general consensus (19-0-0)**
 - ii. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee – Dr. Kelly Charlton, Chair
 - 1. Committee Update
 - a. **It will not be economically feasible to remediate Village Apartments – the goal is to demolish**
 - b. **The air purifiers present in different classrooms are part of a state grant, and use UV light for bacterial and viral control**
 - iii. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee –Dr. Peter Grimes, Chair
 - 1. No Report
 - iv. Academic Information Technology Committee – Dr. Camille Goins, Chair
 - 1. Committee Update
 - a. **No TikTok on Government devices – If legislation passes, information will be sent regarding these changes**
 - b. **Annual security training is required for staff and recommended for students. See DoIT projects on their dashboard**
 - c. **Library has a new audiobook/e-book app (Hoopla) to be downloaded on mobile phones – login to sign up**
 - v. Budget Advisory Committee - Dr. Melissa Schaub, Chair
 - 1. Proposal to Revise Budget Advisory Committee Principles (**Appendix D**)

The original document was produced during the pandemic summer (by an ad hoc committee) and in the following fall the Budget Committee came into official existence. The document stated that BAC would review it every 3 years. The document itself is designed to be a statement of the will of the faculty (a survey of the faculty was conducted) and about what the faculty consider to be our priorities if the administration is faced with the need to make budget cuts in a short period of time and have no time to do a full consultation with the faculty. Dr. Schaub asked the Senate for a vote to endorse the document in Appendix D as it would become a record of the general will of the faculty concerning budget cuts. The final document (Appendix A to the Minutes**) will be listed as **Revised April 2023** (the next revision will be in spring 2026). Chair Hansen stated that the request comes from a committee and therefore does not require a second. **The proposal passed unanimously (19-0-0)****
- VI. **Faculty Assembly Updates:**
 - a. **Brief Report** – Dr. Renee Lamphere, Faculty Assembly Delegate - **The Faculty Assembly did not meet in March and therefore, Dr. Lamphere did not have a report**
 - b. **Faculty Assembly 22-23 Documents**
- VII. **Graduate Council** – March 20, 2023, Meeting (**Appendix E**) - Dr. Irene Aiken commented that graduate council had the Graduate Research Symposium the day before, with a tremendous crowd. Appreciation was extended to all those that helped (mentors, moderators, judges, etc.) and to the students themselves
- VIII. **Other Committees**

- a. CEPP – February 8, 2023, Meeting (Appendix F) – Dr. Loury Floyd present to answer any questions

IX. Unfinished Business

- a. ~~(Vote Required) Proposal: Revision to Classroom Management Policy (Appendix G)~~
- b. **(Vote Required)** Proposal: Revision to Faculty Awards Processes (Appendix H) – Chair Hansen stated that in summary, the proposal was presented in the March meeting and was referred back to the FAC so that they could have the proper amount of time to adjust the Holshouser award, which also showed incorrect dates on the calendar. Furthermore, the Executive Committee found a couple of things that needed adjustments, after the FAC had voted on it. Therefore, Chair Hansen proposed to add those as friendly amendments (listed in red among the green text in **Appendix H on the Agenda**), as they are not changing the original intent of the proposal. A new friendly amendment was made during the meeting under - “**Suggested Schedule: Board of Governors’ James E. Holshouser Award** and under - *Early-October _ UNCP nominee selected by Provost Office in ~~consult~~ consultation with the chancellor.*”. The proposal came from the Faculty Awards Committee, therefore, does not require a second. **The proposal carried unanimously (19-0-0)**

X. Announcements

- a. Appreciation was extended by the Chancellor to the:
 - i. Arts Dept and the beautiful art sculptures in the back yard of the residence and asked individuals to go see it especially in the evening when the lights are on
 - ii. Music Dept, the band director, and the band for their performances (new instruments and uniforms were acquired with newfound funds)

Chair Hansen asked for a motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. **The motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously**

All guests were asked to leave the room, the WebEx was turned off and the Faculty Senate went into closed session

XI. New Business

- a. Closed Session - A nomination was made by the Honorary Degree Committee for an individual to be awarded the Honorary Degree of *Doctor of Laws for Outstanding Public Service or Enterprise*. **The Faculty Senate approved unanimously (19-0-0)**

XII. Adjournment - The Senate came out of closed session and **the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM**

Suggested Principles for Addressing Budget Shortfalls

In line with the shared governance principle of faculty participation in university matters focused on curriculum and pedagogy, the Budget Advisory Committee has sought to identify the values of faculty when addressing potential budget shortfalls. As part of our charge to “serve in a consultative role to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration regarding the University’s strategy and management of fiscal resources and ensure that the University meets its fundamental mission, vision, and core values and future aspirations,” we offer the following as a record of the general will of the faculty concerning budget cuts.

General Principles

- These recommendations shall be reviewed every three years by the Budget Advisory Committee.
- Transparency about funding sources and how funding is allocated to programs and expenditures leads to greater faculty understanding of budget decisions and increases the value of shared governance. Faculty who serve in shared governance roles must be involved in defining mission-critical functions and services across campus. The Vice Chancellor’s participation on this committee is appreciated, and the Budget Advisory Committee should be involved in most consultative interactions, but if budget crises develop with short notice or over time periods when regular committee meetings are not possible, it is our expectation that the chair of the committee and the chair of the Faculty Senate, at minimum, would be consulted.

Protection of Positions and Compensation

As a guiding principle, furloughs are preferred to salary reductions and salary reductions are preferred to the elimination of filled positions. Furloughs are defined as mandatory unpaid days off, while salary reductions are cuts in permanent base pay. If the UNC System creates early retirement incentives, the institution should leverage these as far as possible to avoid other cuts.

- If furloughs or salary reductions are needed, progressively scale them (lower salaries are cut by a lower percentage, higher salaries are cut by a higher percentage, ideally with a zero-cut bracket for the lowest salaries).
- Maintain all tenured and tenure-track lines, with the current teaching load policies and practices, for the sake of academic and pedagogical productivity and continuity.
- Protect mission-critical departments and their human capital, regardless of productivity.
- Define “mission-critical” not solely by enrollment in courses; other factors include but are not limited to longevity of service, role in student progress to degree, significance of service to the local or campus community, and ability to maintain continued access to high quality teaching faculty in the local area.
- Protect mission-critical faculty and academic staff lines; if maintaining a line is not possible, offer best faith efforts of continued job security in complementary roles.
- If cuts are so severe as to involve the elimination of positions or whole departments, it is especially vital for faculty governance to be involved in the process as described above, particularly in determining the definition of “mission-critical” or in any type of academic program review.

Maintaining Student and Pedagogical Support

- Hold harmless, to the greatest extent possible, services that have a direct impact on student success in the realms of academics (including the Mary Livermore Library and subscriptions to scholarly works, Accessibility Resource Center, Writing Center, Center for Student Success, Teaching and Learning Center, Office of Online Learning and other essential support staff), soft skill development (e.g., Career Center, Diversity and Inclusion, etc.), and health (e.g., CARE Team, Student Health Services).
- Protect those services and activities (both academic and non-academic) that are essential to face-to-face instruction equally with those essential to online instruction.
- Reduce departmental operating budgets, with a focus on promoting more environmentally-friendly and health-conscious operations (e.g., minimize printing of course materials).

Professional Development

- Prioritize conference and professional development funding for faculty who present or perform at a conference/performance, and for conferences or continuing education tied to accreditation, licensure, certification, and grant development.
- Create a transparent, efficient, and inclusive process for approving professional development funding.

Appendix B

Committee on Committees and Elections Appointments beginning Fall 2023

Academic Information Technology Committee

- ARTS to 2024 – Darlene Natale
- SBS to 2024 – Junyong Kim
- CHS – 2023-2025 – Beverly Justice
- NSM – 2023-2025 – Haitao Zhao
- LETT – 2023-2025 – Cynthia Miecznikowski

Academic Support Services

- CHS – 2023-2025 – Nancy Ofendo-Reyes
- EDUC – 2023-2025 – Dorea Bonneau
- LETT – 2023-2025 – Brian Stratton

Budget Advisory Committee

- At-Large – 2023-2026 – Dena Breece
- NSM – 2023-2026 – Cornelia Tirla
- SBS – 2023-2026 – Mark Milewicz

Curriculum Subcommittee

- ARTS – 2023-2025 – Mark Tollefson
- CHS – 2023-2025 – Elisha Chambers
- EDUC – 2023-2025 – Jennifer Whittington
- LETT – 2023-2025 – James Hudson
- NSM – 2023-2025 – Andrew Latham
- SBS – 2023-2025 – Josiah Marineau

Enrollment Management Subcommittee

- CHS – 2023-2025 – Alice Kay Locklear
- LETT – 2023-2025 – Joe Sweet
- NSM – 2023-2025 – Jacob Juillerat

Faculty Conciliators, 2023-2024

- Silvia Smith
- Abigail Reiter
- Shannon Cousin

Faculty Evaluation and Review Subcommittee

- CHS – 2023-2025 – Mary Kozub
- ARTS – 2023-2025 – Naomi Lifschitz-Grant
- EDUC – 2023-2025 – Karen Granger
- NSM – 2023-2025 – Silvia Smith

Faculty Governance Committee

- Melissa Schaub – 2023-2026
- Ryan Anderson – 2023-2026
- Julie Harrison-Swartz – 2023-2026

General Education Subcommittee

- Kinesiology – 2023-2025 – Marian Wooten
- Humanities – 2023-2025 – Michael Berntsen
- Natural Science/Math – 2023-2025 – Amy Gross

Health Safety and Environment Subcommittee

- ARTS – 2023-2025 – Samuel Speir
- EDUC – 2023-2025 – Laura Staal
- LETT – 2023-2025 – Serina Cinnamon
- Library – 2023-2025 – Robert Arndt

Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee

- Abigail Reiter to 2024
- Clejeter Cousins to 2024
- Amber Rock to 2024

Student Publication Board

- Victoria Kurdyla

Appendix C

Senate Policies Regarding Absences

ARTICLE III

Section 7. No elected Senator may serve more than two successive terms; the filling of an unexpired term shall be deemed as one of the two successive terms.

Section 8. The position of an elected Senator whose term is unexpired shall be considered vacant upon:

- A. Notification by the Senator to the Chair of (1) their resignation, or (2) a leave-of-absence;
- B. The Senator's becoming ineligible through change in professorial status, either at this University or elsewhere;
- C. The Senator's absence from more than two regular meetings of the Senate in an academic year.
- D. The Senator's absence from more than two regular meetings of their assigned committee in an academic year.

Such vacancy shall be filled by special ballot in accordance with Article V, Section 2, A, 3 of the By-Laws for the Faculty Senate. Senators so elected shall serve the unexpired portion of the term.

Faculty *Handbook*, p.15.

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE ADDED TO AGENDA AS AMENDED AT SENATE 5.3.2023

Absences of Faculty Assembly Delegates

ARTICLE VII. ELECTIONS OF DELEGATES TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Any faculty member who is eligible to serve on the Senate is also eligible to serve as a Delegate or Alternate to the Faculty Assembly of The University of North Carolina. A delegate may serve no more than six of the preceding nine years; the terms of Alternates shall correspond to the terms of Delegates. Regular terms, three years in length, shall begin and end on July 1 of each year. Election of one Delegate and one Alternate shall be held in the spring. In the event of a vacant Delegate seat, the Alternate Delegate holding the same term will fill this position, becoming a Delegate. The Committee on Committees and Elections will fill the vacant Alternate Delegate seat during the regular spring election cycle for Faculty Assembly Alternate Delegate.

Faculty *Handbook* (2022-2023, page 32)

[UNC Faculty Assembly](#)

The UNC Faculty Assembly is a system-wide advisory body that meets regularly to discuss issues of concern to faculty and to advise the Office of the President with respect to those issues. The Faculty Assembly is the elected body of representatives of the faculty of the seventeen campuses of the University of North Carolina. Its objectives are set forth in the Assembly Charter. The Assembly is dedicated to upholding and exercising the principles of academic freedom, shared governance, tenure, and the faculty's primary responsibility for the University's curriculum. The UNCP faculty sends three representatives (or alternates), elected by the general faculty, to represent its interests and to express its views to the Assembly. For more information on the UNC Faculty Assembly, see the website for the UNC Faculty Assembly at <https://www.northcarolina.edu/faculty-assembly/>

Faculty *Handbook*, (2022-2023, page 34).

As it stands now, the UNCP Faculty *Handbook* does not provide any guidelines regarding Faculty Assembly Delegates missing Faculty Assembly meetings. The Faculty Governance Committee membership at its April 25, 2023, meeting suggested adding the following wording to the Faculty Handbook on page 34.

Motion. An Assembly delegate who misses more than two regular meetings during an academic year shall be removed from their position and the Alternate Delegate will become the Delegate.

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Appendix D

Oversight of the Faculty Handbook Proposal (Vote Required)

Item requiring vote of Faculty Senate:

p. 6

All the schools and universities welcome students ~~of both sexes and all races~~, regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran status.

Justification: The Committee changed the language to be consistent with UNC Code:

SECTION 103. EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN THE UNIVERSITY.

Admission to, employment by, and promotion in the University of North Carolina and all of its constituent institutions shall be on the basis of merit, and there shall be no unlawful discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran status.

Appendix E

Oversight of the Faculty Handbook Proposal (For Information Only)

Items reported to Faculty Senator for information:

p. 15

ARTICLE IV. DUTIES OF SENATORS

Section 1. Senators shall bring to the Senate proposals originating from (or endorsed by) Department Chairs, ~~from~~ academic supportive services, ~~or and from other areas of academic concerned of the~~ faculty. ~~Proposals shall be in writing and furnished in sufficient copies to facilitate review and action of the Senate.~~

p. 29

The Student Publications Board will be ~~co~~-chaired by the faculty member nominated by the Committee on Committees and Elections.

p. 40-41

Instructor

The rank of Instructor is appropriate for one who is appointed to the faculty in the expectation that in the normal course ~~they~~he/she will progress to professional rank in this or another institution but lacks, when appointed, one or more qualifications expected by the University for appointment to professorial rank. When ~~they~~he/she meets all those qualifications, the faculty member will usually be promoted to Assistant Professor or given a terminal appointment of one academic year.

The initial appointment to the rank of Instructor is for a probationary one-year term. The Instructor may be reappointed successively for six one-year terms, a total of seven such terms. At least 90 calendar days before the end of the first term and 180 calendar days before the end of the second consecutive term, the Instructor shall receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed at the rank of Instructor for another term, promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, appointed to a fixed term as provided in the section below on "Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments," or not reappointed.

During the last 180 days of the second consecutive year of employment, the institution may notify the Instructor that ~~their~~his/her 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 ~~their~~his/her employment will be ended in that year as provided in the preceding sentence will receive a written decision whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed to a fourth consecutive term, promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, appointed to a fixed term as provided in the section below on "Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments," or offered a terminal appointment for one academic year at the end of the current term. Decisions will be made with respect to these same options before the end of the fourth, fifth, and six consecutive terms.

No reappointment to the rank of Instructor may be made after seven consecutive years of employment at that rank. 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 at the same rank for one academic year. The decisions herein required will be made as provided in the section below on “Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments.” Promotion at any time from the rank of Instructor to the rank of Assistant Professor constitutes an initial appointment to the first two-year term at the later rank under the terms and conditions described below in the section on “Assistant Professor.”

Assistant Professor

The initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is for a probationary two-year term. Unless at any point the Assistant Professor is not reappointed, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed one additional two-year term and one three-year term before a decision is made to recommend permanent tenure at the same or higher rank or not to reappoint.

At least 180 calendar days before the end of the first two-year appointment, the Assistant Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed at the rank of assistant professor for an additional two-year term or not reappointed. Before the end of the first year of the second two-year term as Assistant Professor, the Assistant Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed to a three-year term or not reappointed. Before the end of the second year of the three-year term as Assistant Professor, the Assistant Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the same or higher rank or not be reappointed.

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 at the same rank for one academic year. The decisions herein required will be made as provided in the section below on “Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments.” Promotion at any time from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor constitutes an initial appointment to the first three-year term at the latter rank under the terms and conditions described below in the section on “Associate Professor.”

Associate Professor

When a faculty member’s initial appointment by the institution is to the rank of Associate Professor, the appointment is to ~~a~~one probationary term of ~~one~~ three years. Unless at any point the Associate Professor is not reappointed, ~~they~~he/she usually will be reappointed to one four-year term before a decision is made to recommend permanent tenure at the same or higher rank or not to reappoint. At least one year before the end of the three-year appointment, the Associate Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his/her current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed at the rank of Associate Professor for a four-year term or not reappointed. Before the end of the third year of

the four-year appointment, the Associate Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~his~~their current term expires, ~~they~~he will be reappointed with permanent tenure at the same or higher rank or not reappointed.

The failure to offer 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 at the same rank for one academic year. The decisions herein required will be made as provided in the section below on "Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments." 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 ~~President~~Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

Professor

An initial appointment by the University to the rank of Professor is for a probationary term of three years. Before the end of the second year of the three-year term, the Professor will receive written notice whether, when ~~their~~his current term expires, ~~they~~he/she will be reappointed at rank with permanent tenure or not reappointed. 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. The decisions herein required will be made as provided in the section below on "Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments."

Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments

Each initial appointment to a fixed or probationary term, each promotion in rank, each reappointment to a fixed term, and each reappointment of an Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, whether or not the reappointment recommends the conferral of permanent tenure, is initiated by recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs after consulting with the Chair of the Department concerned and the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be sent to the Chancellor. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor decides the faculty member should not be reappointed, promoted, or recommended for permanent tenure, ~~they~~s/he shall give the faculty member being considered a simple, unelaborated written statement of that decision.

If the Chancellor decides not to recommend reappointment, promotion or permanent tenure, ~~they~~he shall give the faculty member being considered a simple, unelaborated written statement of the decision. This decision is final except as it may later be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of the section below on "Non-Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members on Probationary Term Appointments." If the Chancellor concurs in a recommendation that will confer permanent tenure, ~~they~~he shall forward the recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The Chancellor will forward all other favorable recommendations in regard to appointments, reappointments, and promotions to the Board of Trustees for final approval unless that Board delegates the authority to give final approval.

Evaluation of shared faculty members will be consistent with current UNCP Faculty Handbook policies and criteria with the following exceptions: 1) Peer Evaluation Committees should contain representation from all affected departments; 2) the secondary Chair may provide a written report to the home Chair two weeks prior to the date of submission as mandated by the calendar of evaluation, which the home Chair may incorporate into ~~their~~~~his or her~~ Chair's Evaluation Report. Any grievance by the shared faculty member shall follow current UNCP policies.

Continued Availability of Special Funding

The appointment, reappointment, or promotion of a faculty member to a position funded in whole or in substantial part from sources other than continuing state budget funds or permanent trust funds shall specify in writing that the continuance of the faculty member's services, whether for a specified term or for permanent tenure, shall be contingent upon the continuing availability of such funds. This contingency shall not be included in a faculty member's contract in either of the following situations:

1. In a promotion to a higher rank if, before the effective date of that promotion, the faculty member had permanent tenure and no such condition is attached to the tenure.
2. If the faculty member held permanent tenure in the institution on 1 July 1975 and ~~their~~~~his~~ contract was not then contingent upon the continuing availability of sources other than continuing state budget or permanent trust funds.

Provisions for Less than Full-Time Employment

Special terms for less than full-time employment with commensurate compensation, or for relief from all employment obligations for a specific period, may be included in an appointment or reappointment to any faculty rank or may be added by a written memorandum of amendment during the term of an appointment. For compassionate reasons of health, or requirements of childbirth or ~~childcare~~~~child-care~~, or similar compelling reasons, such terms may, with the concurrence of the faculty member, include extensions of the period of a current probationary term of appointment to coincide with the extent and duration of the relief from the full-time employment obligation. Such special terms must be expressly stated in initial appointment documents or, if added by memorandum of amendment, must be approved by signature of the Chancellor and the faculty member, with a copy to be retained by each. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in the document of appointment, all appointments to any faculty rank are on the basis of a full-time employment obligation and confer the full incidents of academic tenure pertinent to the particular appointment. These provisions will not apply to informal temporary adjustment of the regularly assigned duties of faculty members by the Department Chair who is responsible for their direct supervision or to the University's granting of extended leaves of absence with or without compensation.

Special Faculty Appointments (Non-Tenure-Track, Contingent)

Special faculty members are appointed to a specific category. Appointments may be made to fixed-term faculty ranks with title designations "lecturer," "artist in residence," "writer in residence," and any faculty rank designation with the prefix-qualifier "adjunct," "clinical," or "research." Appointments may be to full-time or part-time and paid or unpaid positions. The qualifications of persons hired for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Adjunct, and Visiting positions will depend on the needs and standards of the

departments. The minimum qualification should be a doctoral or master's degree in the teaching discipline or a master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of eighteen graduate hours in the teaching discipline). A faculty member hired as an exception to this requirement must have documented qualifications on file with Academic Affairs. Other desirable qualifications may include: experience in effective teaching within the discipline, enthusiasm for teaching, and a commitment to developing as an educational professional.

Full-Time Appointments: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty are responsible primarily for teaching and the scholarship of teaching. They are also expected to provide service that supports the academic mission of UNCP such as student advising.

As tenure-track faculty members do, Lecturers have organizational responsibility for the courses they teach. They also adhere to departmental guidelines for course content if any exist. They perform service for the department or school (including the Faculty Senate and its subcommittees), and can be assigned student advising responsibilities. Supervision and mentoring of lecturers will be done in the same manner as for tenure-track faculty. Lecturers are eligible for long-term contracts and to be promoted to Senior Lecturers. Initial appointment is for a fixed term of one year. Subsequent appointments may be made for fixed terms of from one to five years.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching with at least satisfactory performance in service activities. After serving as a Lecturer at UNCP for five years, a Lecturer may notify the Chair of ~~their~~ ~~his or her~~ Department in writing that ~~they~~ ~~he or she~~ wishes to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer; the notification must be made by August 1st of the year in which the evaluation will take place. The evaluation will follow the procedures used for promotion to professorial ranks, with the exception that the applicant's professional academic activities may be evaluated in the place of scholarly achievement.

As tenure-track faculty members do, Senior Lecturers have organizational responsibility for the courses they teach. They also adhere to departmental guidelines for course content if any exist. Senior Lecturers may participate in course and curriculum development and advise students. Senior Lecturers may also contribute to the ~~S~~school, ~~C~~ollege, or ~~D~~epartment beyond teaching-related activities through campus service (including the faculty senate and its subcommittees) and academic discipline professional activities. Initial appointment as a Senior Lecturer is for a fixed term of one year. Subsequent appointments may be made for fixed terms of from one to five years.

p. 44

Initial appointments for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty are for one academic year. Reappointments will depend on performance reviews and the educational needs of the department. After the initial appointment, multiyear contracts may be awarded to Lecturers, Senior

Lecturers, and Adjunct faculty whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. No obligation exists on the part of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke to give any notice, other than statement of the length of appointment in the appointment contract, before a current term~~s~~ expires as to whether appointment will be offered for a succeeding term. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, upon the faculty member's written request made no earlier than 180 calendar days nor later than 90 calendar days before ~~their~~~~his~~ current term expires, shall, as a matter of professional courtesy, within 20 calendar days after ~~he~~~~they~~ receives the request give the faculty member a written statement as to whether the University would like to negotiate a new appointment with the faculty member and, if so, the proposed terms. Failure to communicate a decision shall not affect or replace the notice of non-reappointment deemed to have been made with the original appointment contract and shall not constitute a new determination of non-reappointment or an offer.

p. 46

With respect to their teaching responsibilities, duties of part-time faculty members are generally consistent with those of full-time faculty members. The following elements are expected. Others may be negotiated for the purposes of particular departments, programs, or courses.

- Prompt attendance at each class meeting and appropriate use of the entire class period. Should an emergency arise prohibiting the faculty member from attending a class, ~~they~~~~he/she~~ must notify the department chair prior to the class meeting.
- Standards and expectations of students in keeping with the university setting.
- Timely and early assessment of students so that the mid-term grades, issued to all students at UNCP, are clearly related to performance. Attention to appropriate handling of midterm and final grades.
- Accessibility to students either before or after class on a regular and announced basis. The time of availability should total at least 30 minutes for each class period.
- Attention to development of student skills in computer literacy (where appropriate) and written and oral communication.
- Prompt and timely submission of all grades, reports, etc.

p. 49

If, within fourteen calendar days after the faculty member receives the notice referred to above, the faculty member makes no written request for a hearing, ~~they~~~~s/he~~ may be discharged without recourse to any institutional grievance or appellate procedure.

The Chancellor will ensure that a process is in place for a timely hearing. If the faculty member makes a timely written request for a hearing, the Chancellor will ~~ensure~~~~insure~~ that the hearing is accorded before the Hearing Committee. The hearing will be on the written specifications of the reasons for the intended discharge. The Hearing Committee will accord the faculty member thirty calendar days from the time it receives ~~their~~~~her or his~~ written request for a hearing to prepare a defense. The Hearing Committee may, upon the faculty member's written request and for good cause, extend this time by written notice to the faculty member. The Committee will make every reasonable effort to complete the hearing within ninety calendar days of receiving the faculty member's request for a hearing. (To meet this deadline, faculty are

encouraged to consider scheduling hearings during the evening, weekend, or other non-class time. It is strongly recommended that several days and times be established for the hearing when scheduling the first day for the eventuality that the hearing may take two or more sessions).

The hearing will be closed to the public unless the faculty member and the Hearing Committee agree that it may be open. The faculty member will have the right to counsel, to present an argument, present the testimony of witnesses and other evidence, to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses, and to examine all documents and other adverse demonstrative evidence. A written transcript of all proceedings shall be kept; upon request, a copy thereof shall be furnished to the faculty member at the institution's expense. The Provost, or the Provost's delegate or counsel, may participate in the hearing to present evidence, cross-examine witnesses, and make argument.

The hearing committee shall make written recommendations to the Chancellor within 14 calendar days after its hearing concludes or after the full transcript is received, whichever is later. In reaching its written recommendations to the Chancellor, the Hearing Committee will consider only the evidence presented at the hearing and such written and oral arguments as the Hearing Committee, in its discretion, may allow. The campus has the burden of proof; the basis for upholding the dismissal must be clear and convincing.

Following receipt of the committee's written recommendations, the decision as to whether to discharge or impose serious sanction on the faculty member is the Chancellor's. If the Chancellor decides to discharge the faculty member, the institution's obligation to continue paying the faculty member's salary shall cease upon issuance of the Chancellor's decision. If the Chancellor decides to impose one or more serious sanctions upon the faculty member, the institution may impose such sanctions upon issuance of the Chancellor's decision. If the Chancellor concurs in a recommendation of the Hearing Committee that is favorable to the faculty member, the Chancellor's decision will be final with no appeal available. If the Chancellor either declines to accept a Hearing Committee recommendation that is favorable to the faculty member or concurs in a Hearing Committee recommendation that is unfavorable to the faculty member, the faculty member may appeal the Chancellor's decision to the Board of Trustees. An appeal must contain a brief statement that alleges one or more of the following as the basis for the appeal: (1) that the process for making the decision was materially flawed, so as to raise questions about whether the faculty member's contentions were fairly and reliably considered, (2) that the result reached by the Chancellor was clearly erroneous, or (3) that the decision was contrary to controlling law or policy. If the faculty member elects to appeal the Chancellor's decision to the board of trustees, this appeal shall be transmitted through the Chancellor and be addressed to the chair of the board. Notice of appeal shall be filed with the board of trustees by certified mail, return receipt requested, or by another means that provides proof of delivery, within 14 calendar days after the faculty member receives the Chancellor's decision.

The appeal to the board of trustees shall be decided by the full board of trustees. However, the board may delegate the duty of conducting an initial review to a standing or ad hoc committee of at least three members. The board of trustees, or its committee, shall consider the appeal based on the record of the proceedings below, and may, in its discretion, consider written or oral arguments, subject to any policies, regulations or guidelines as may be adopted by the Board of Governors or board of trustees.

The board of trustees' decision shall be made as soon as reasonably possible after the Chancellor has received the faculty member's request for an appeal to the trustees. This decision shall be the end of the University's appeals process.

The procedures prescribed herein shall take effect with any discharge or serious sanction proposed on or after July 1, 2019.

SECTION II CHAPTER 2 FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

General Information

This Faculty Evaluation Model has the following sections: principles and criteria upon which faculty evaluations are based: principles informing the roles of different parties in the faculty evaluation; evaluation procedures for each type of evaluation, evaluation forms, and Calendars of Events for each type of evaluation.

This Model covers evaluations of full-time faculty members and evaluations by faculty members of Department Chairs, but does not cover administrators or academic support personnel even though they may hold faculty rank. Full-time teaching faculty are those who teach at least nine semester hours. Some faculty who would normally be considered full-time but who have been reassigned to other non-teaching duties are to adjust the weights in their self-evaluations to account for those other responsibilities.

Performance in such non-teaching functions will be evaluated by ~~whomever~~ the individual faculty member to whom the faculty member reports ~~to for those responsibilities~~.

Full-time faculty receive annual evaluations, evaluations for promotion and/or tenure, and evaluations for contract renewal. They also may receive advisory evaluations. Tenured faculty receive a comprehensive, periodic, cumulative evaluation every five years or five years from the last review related to tenure and/or promotion. Procedures for non-tenure-track faculty are also described. Faculty members are evaluated in three areas: 1) Teaching, 2) Scholarship, and 3) Service, ~~(teaching, scholarship, and service)~~ to which flexible area weights are assigned. Overall evaluation is recorded on standard evaluation forms and measured in accordance with a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale taking the faculty member's area weights into account. Overall performance ratings become the basis for annual recommendations for merit salary increases as well as for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal recommendations. In this Model, the phrase "major evaluations" denotes evaluations for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal.

Librarians with faculty rank are evaluated under the provisions of the Faculty Handbook in the section below on "Policy Statement on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Professional Librarians." Evaluation of library services, including performance of library personnel, is delegated to the Academic Support Services Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Evaluations (contract renewal, annual, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) of professional librarians with faculty rank will follow the same general procedures that are applied to teaching faculty, with exceptions dependent on the special responsibilities of librarians. Those responsibilities are outlined in general terms as criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure in Section II, Chapter 1 on Faculty Personnel Policies and Section II, Chapter 3 on Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy.

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion are advised to consult Section II, Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook that outlines University-wide criteria for tenure and promotion. They should also be cognizant of ~~respective department~~ ~~their department's~~ Disciplinary Statements.

Guiding Principles

The underlying philosophy of this Model is that evaluation of faculty performance is a complex process that should promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency for all individuals and academic departments. While acknowledging differences between departments and disciplinary fields, the Model should be implemented in a way that enhances faculty development and promotes faculty achievement and satisfaction while also promoting the mission of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. (See section entitled, “Disciplinary Statements.”)

All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth **in the following pages below**. Individual faculty members have latitude in the roles they assume as they fulfill their responsibilities to the University and its mission. The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria for each area of faculty evaluation, allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines. The Model also specifies procedures that promote consistency in evaluation. This Evaluation Model will be reviewed periodically by the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee and amended as the Faculty Senate deems appropriate.

As a means to help ensure fairness in all formal evaluations, a faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by Deans, Department Chairs, Peer Evaluation Committees, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each entity in the evaluation process, therefore, is to submit a copy of its report to the faculty member being evaluated.

While this Model attempts to be reasonably comprehensive with respect to policies and procedures, faculty members should also be familiar with other sections of the Faculty Handbook concerning tenure and promotion criteria (Section II, Chapter 3), grievance procedures (Section II, Chapter 1), and hearing procedures (due process: Section II, Chapter I). Further, employment at the University and conduct as a faculty member are governed by sections of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina* (available at the website for the UNC General Administration at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php>) Faculty members should consult this document as well as the Faculty Handbook.

For purposes of evaluation, all faculty responsibilities are divided among three general areas of teaching, research, and service as reflected in The University of North Carolina at Pembroke Mission Statement. Some activities, such as grant-related work, may fall into several areas and should be evaluated accordingly. Throughout the following sections, the term “knowledge” is used as a broad summary term intended to include factual information; epistemological and empirical principles; artistic technique; empirical and interpretive methodologies; reasoning skills; and so forth.

Disciplinary Statements

To supplement general information provided in **UNCP's** faculty evaluation policies, each academic department develops Disciplinary Statements corresponding to each of the three areas of faculty evaluation—teaching, scholarship, and service. These statements are department and discipline-specific guidelines to the interpretation of general requirements described here in Chapter 2, Faculty Evaluation Policy and in Section II, Chapter 3, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy. While remaining respectful of the academy's principle of academic freedom and UNCP's system of allowing faculty to choose area weights, these statements serve as a guide for faculty as they negotiate the path towards tenure and promotion. **Additionally, the statements They** aid in the evaluation of candidate performance at all levels of **that** review **process**. Finally, **the statements they** are also used in contract renewal and annual evaluations.

The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (“*The Code*”) provides valuable guidance on the development and use of Disciplinary Statements in evaluation as it states, Within the University, important faculty personnel decisions are based on evaluations of performance rendered by a candidate's immediate colleagues and supervisors, who are in the best position to make such judgments. These assessments are not the product of mechanically applied checklists, criteria or formulas; there is no simple litmus test for outstanding teaching, research or service. Rather, these decisions must reflect careful exercises of discretion, in which the faculty colleagues draw on their own academic knowledge, experience and perceptions to evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance. (UNC Policy Manual, Section 101.3.1) <http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=toc&id=s1>

As can be seen, *The Code* prohibits the mechanical use of “checklists” in faculty evaluation. Thus, Disciplinary Statements should not take a checklist form nor ~~should they~~ state ~~that~~ a candidate must complete a specific number of activities in a particular area of evaluation in order “to be eligible” for tenure and/or promotion. Further, while evaluators are strongly advised to take the department’s Disciplinary Statements into account before rendering an evaluation, the above section of *The Code* also states evaluators should draw on their own experience. As a result, faculty should not assume these statements are binding on evaluators.

Used properly, Disciplinary Statements offer useful insights into specific expectations within a discipline and/or department. The statements are not a vehicle for creating substantially new or more stringent requirements for faculty nor can they be used to create new faculty evaluation procedures that go beyond the general requirements laid out in the *Faculty Handbook* in Section II, Chapter 2, Faculty Evaluation Policy and Chapter 3, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy. Rather, Disciplinary Statements are intended to ensure a common understanding of the ways university expectations for faculty apply across heterogeneous disciplines and departments. Departments that prefer to substantially modify criteria or procedures are strongly encouraged to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan described in the subsection entitled, “Optional Departmental Evaluation Plan.”

Combined academic departments may develop an overall set of Disciplinary Statements that incorporate expectations for each departmental discipline or may choose to develop a separate set of statements for each discipline. Departments offering more than one degree program may choose to develop subsets of program-specific statements if department members believe such subsets are warranted.

All Disciplinary Statements must be approved by the Dean and the Provost prior to implementation. Disciplinary Statements should be reviewed by academic departments not less than once every five years to ensure they remain an accurate representation of the department’s expectations. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will notify Department Chairs in August of the academic year in which departmental review of the Disciplinary Statements should take place. The departmental review of the Disciplinary Statements may result in approval of the statements already in use, or in changes that departmental faculty may formulate. The Disciplinary Statements, including revisions, should be approved by a majority of the General Faculty members in the department and signed by the Department Chair. If a majority of departmental faculty does not approve the revisions the current

Disciplinary Statements will remain in effect. The Department Chair records the department vote count in the appropriate section of the Disciplinary Statements before submitting them to the Dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

While changes may be made more often than every five years if exigent circumstances warrant, statements should be reasonably consistent across time so that evaluations are not affected by temporary, arbitrary, or radical changes. Departments may initiate the review of Disciplinary Statements by notifying the Provost and Chancellor for Academic Affairs no later than the first day of the academic year during which revisions are to be considered. All revisions must be completed by March 1 so that faculty undergoing evaluation in the next academic year will have ample time to prepare.

All revisions must be approved by the Dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs prior to implementation. Under normal circumstances, revisions approved during an academic year will become effective at the start of the following academic year. The Office for Academic Affairs maintains an online listing of all approved Disciplinary Statements and their effective dates for examination by all faculty and evaluators. Older sets will be archived online.

Under normal circumstances, when faculty members undergo review (e.g., tenure, promotion, and annual) the evaluation is guided by the Disciplinary Statements in effect in their department at the time of the evaluation. However, if a department revises its Disciplinary Statements a faculty member may elect to be evaluated under the previous set of Disciplinary Statements without penalty for a period of up to two academic years after the effective date of the new Disciplinary Statements. In such cases, the faculty member should notify ~~their~~~~his or her~~ Department Chair in writing within 30 calendar days of the effective date of the new Disciplinary Statements. This letter must indicate whether a one or two-year grace period has been elected. If a tenure and/or promotion review occurs during the grace period, a copy of the faculty member's letter to the Department Chair should be included in the portfolio. In no case will a faculty member be permitted to be evaluated for any purpose under a portion of an older set of Disciplinary Statements and a portion of a newer set of Disciplinary Statements.

Optional Departmental Evaluation Plan

The general objectives of the Faculty Evaluation Model may be attained by other methods. Departments that prefer to modify criteria or procedures are strongly encouraged to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan. That plan may provide specific criteria as supplements to the [section entitled "Guiding Principles"](#) and may substitute alternatives for the Format for Evaluation Reports, the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, and the Department Chair Evaluation Form. In developing any alternative Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, a department should obtain input from its students.

An acceptable plan must (a) adhere to the guiding principles and procedural objectives in this document; (b) include Disciplinary Statements approved by the Dean and the Provost; (c) conform to all deadlines established herein; (d) produce a final output that can be expressed in terms of the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form; (e) be approved by a two-thirds majority of the department's full-time faculty; and (f) be approved by the Faculty Senate. Departmental plans are required to be reasonably consistent across time so that no individual's evaluation

is affected by temporary, arbitrary, or radical changes. The Office for Academic Affairs will maintain a file of all approved departmental plans and will post them online for examination by all faculty members.

Evaluation of Teaching

At The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, teaching is the single most important responsibility of regular full-time faculty members. According to our Mission Statement, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke “exists to promote excellence in teaching and learning, at the graduate and undergraduate levels, in an environment of free inquiry, interdisciplinary collaboration, and rigorous intellectual standards.” Teaching thus receives an area weight of 50%-70% in a faculty member’s evaluation, unless an exception is granted in writing.

The teaching area has two components. Classroom teaching includes all activities involved in preparing and conducting the courses that a faculty member is assigned to teach. Auxiliary teaching activities may include submitting grades, supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to an assigned course, administering teaching-related grants, cooperating with colleagues in planning curricula, cooperating with university-wide and departmental curricular objectives, and pursuing professional growth as a teacher.

Classroom teaching effectiveness is evaluated in terms of six broad dimensions:

1. Imparting general knowledge: Effective teachers impart a sound, **current and up-to-date** understanding of the concepts, categories, principles, summaries, and other generalizations that apply to the topics within a course, providing a foundation for other learning. Even courses in applied techniques present conceptual frameworks that may be communicated through demonstrations, exercises, and discussions as well as lectures. Typically, success in imparting general content is evidenced by students’ capacity to explain what they have learned; to understand new information in the area; to apply their knowledge to new problems and contexts; and to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information.
2. Imparting specific knowledge: Effective teachers impart a representative, unbiased, selection of facts, examples, and other **information details** that enrich **a course’s** general content. In a successful course, specific content authenticates and illustrates concepts, stimulates the imagination, and presents logical relationships between specific and general content clearly.
3. Developing skills: Effective teachers develop students’ **capacities** to perform various types of skills. Some of these skills reinforce course content. Other skills involve broader intellectual operations that underlie most university courses, such as creativity, oral and written communication skills, critical thinking, research methods, computer proficiency, and basic quantitative reasoning. Since many students need to develop basic skills, success in this area is an important component of effective teaching.
4. Motivating students: Effective teachers elicit from students a strong desire to learn. Motivated students prepare for class sessions, pay attention during class, participate in discussions, complete assigned work, rehearse skills, and study for examinations. Motivated students also show confidence, curiosity, and creativity; they strive for excellence in completing assignments; and they take an interest in non-required material and further course work in the area covered. Effective teaching practices to stimulate motivation are also addressed below.
5. Setting requirements and evaluating performance: Effective teachers fairly and accurately evaluate student learning while also providing students with specific feedback that promotes further learning. Performance standards are appropriate to course content and course level. Examinations, papers, and other assignments are sufficient, varied, and challenging; are appropriate to course content, course objectives, and students’ background; and allow students to demonstrate their learning. Student work is graded carefully and returned in a timely manner with appropriate feedback. Student failure is handled constructively.

6. Success with effective teaching practices: Effective teachers provide syllabi with clear course objectives and requirements; use teaching techniques (e.g., lectures, demonstrations, exercises, and discussions) that are effective and appropriate to fulfill course objectives; meet their classes as scheduled; set high expectations and help students meet them; involve students in active and cooperative learning; and continually review and revise courses. Effective teachers are enthusiastic and intellectually involved, treat students with respect and courtesy, offer extra assistance to students, and encourage students to consult with them outside of class.

Auxiliary teaching activities are evaluated by criteria appropriate to these activities, such as submitting valid grades in a timely manner, effectively supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to an assigned course, working constructively with peers to develop curricula, supporting University and departmental objectives, and participating in activities for professional development as a teacher.

Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, and promotion will include documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation typically includes copies of representative syllabi, tests, assignments, and handouts; samples of student work and the faculty member's response to the work; and Student Evaluation Reports. This extensive documentation is typically not required for annual evaluations. Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, and promotion require reports on classroom observations by the Department Chair and members of a ~~PEC Peer-Evaluation Committee~~. Auxiliary teaching activities may be documented by copies of student research projects, outlines of new curricula to which a contribution was made, and records of participation in activities for professional development as a teacher (workshops, seminars, conferences, etc). Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation should ~~reflect the tie the faculty member's teaching work to the teaching~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

Evaluation of Scholarship

Though teaching is their fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced ~~record pattern~~ of scholarship and service over the previous three years of employment at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Scholarship receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing. Scholarly work in progress, if appropriately documented, is recognized as a component of scholarship, but completed works of scholarship receive greater weight in evaluation. In promotion and tenure decisions, a consistent pattern of completed scholarly projects is expected.

Scholarship (scholarly research and/or scholarly publication) is defined as a set of disciplined intellectual activities that create or refine knowledge and exert influence through public dissemination in an academically respectable format. This definition of scholarship includes creative activity appropriate to the arts. Scholarly research is defined as (a) creating basic knowledge, (b) compiling or synthesizing knowledge, (c) applying existing basic knowledge to the solution of practical problems, (d) applying professional knowledge and skills to artistic problems, or (e) completing a special program of intellectual development. Scholarly research may include research involved in the dissemination of scholarship or the preparation of scholarly publications as an editor or reviewer.

Attendance at professional conferences and workshops can contribute to a faculty member's scholarly research and may count among scholarly activities in a given year. Over time, however, conference attendance without scholarly publication (see below) is not considered scholarship. Preparation and administration of grants qualifies as scholarly research only insofar as it entails the activities cited above.

Scholarly publication is defined as employing accepted techniques to publicly communicate research to (a) scholarly audiences, (b) student audiences, or (c) general audiences. Although most scholarly publication is intended primarily for other scholars, a publication that informs a broader audience is acceptable as long as the format of the publication is appropriate to a discipline.

Scholarship is evaluated primarily against specialized criteria appropriate to the disciplines of each department and consistent with a department's Disciplinary Statements. The quality of scholarly publication is typically ensured through a peer review process appropriate to its audience. General criteria for evaluating scholarship include (a) significance as indicated by judged intellectual depth and scope, originality, and potential benefit to academia or society at large; and (b) peer review or recognition as indicated by publication in a refereed journal, publication in book form by a scholarly press or other recognized publisher, or presentation at a recognized forum. National and international forums are typically accorded greater significance than regional ones. In tenure and promotion decisions, completed projects carry more weight than works in progress.

Typical documentation of scholarship includes copies of scholarly publications, books, conference papers, catalogs, or programs, and similar evidence of professional productivity in the faculty member's discipline. Less important is evidence of attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences, performances, or other activities even when they may directly contribute to a faculty member's scholarly or creative projects. When such projects require longer periods of time to complete, a faculty member may provide evidence of significant progress toward completion, including paper presentations, contracts for book publication, or external peer comments on a paper or partial manuscript. In cases where the confidential nature of a research project prevents its wider dissemination, a faculty member should provide appropriate documentation. Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation ~~reflect should tie the faculty member's scholarly work to the scholarship~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

Evaluation of Service

Though teaching is a fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced ~~record pattern~~ of ~~scholarship and~~ service at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Service receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing.

Service is divided into three categories: ~~u~~University service, professional service, and community service. In a given year, faculty members may apportion their service activities among these categories as they deem appropriate or in accordance with the needs of the University (e.g. required service to area public schools). Although a faculty member may choose to emphasize one or more areas of service, candidates for tenure and/or promotion should show some level of service in each of the three categories.

University service includes any ~~u~~University-related activities other than teaching and scholarship that promote the welfare of the University. Activities within and outside one's academic department (academic advisement of students, mentoring, preparation of grant applications, administrative activities associated with external grants and student activities, committee work and involvement in faculty governance, revision of curricula, preparation of accreditation reports, and similar voluntary activities not assigned as position responsibilities) are considered ~~u~~University service.

University service is evaluated when possible by results: advisees grant applications completed, grants successfully administered, activities of student organizations, valuable contributions to a committee's projects, completion of reports, gaining accreditation, and similar accomplishments. Listing committee membership as a form of service implies that one has fulfilled at least the basic responsibilities of

membership. Professional service and community service are evaluated when possible by results: by the importance of contributions made, by how demanding activities were, and by how well objectives were achieved.

Professional service consists of activities that benefit a faculty member's field of professional expertise. Professional service may include serving on professional committees and governing boards, serving as an officer in a professional organization, organizing and chairing sessions at professional meetings, and performing routine editing and reviewing. A professional activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium).

Community service connotes activities that (a) are charitable; (b) are performed for the benefit of individuals or groups separate from the University and from the wider profession whether in a secular or non-secular context; and c) involve a commitment in time and use of professional expertise. Examples of community service include participating on committees and governing boards; speaking to non-professional audiences about topics in one's discipline; providing consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies; or providing leadership on public matters related to the faculty member's professional expertise. A community service activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium). UNCP Serve, under the auspices of the Office of Civic and Community Engagement, may be helpful in identifying local service venues for faculty; however, faculty are free to seek out any service opportunity that interests them and makes use of their professional expertise.

Collegiality (willingness and ability to cooperate with colleagues) may be considered relevant to evaluation of service. If so, assessment of collegiality should be based solely on the faculty member's capacity to relate constructively to peers, including ~~their~~^{his or her} impact on others' work rather than on perceived personality characteristics.

Appropriate materials that demonstrate service contributions commensurate with the area weight assigned must be used to document service. In general, letters of appreciation from organizers of service opportunities should be used as documentation only if they indicate an exceptional contribution. University service may be documented by materials such as lists of advisees; copies of reports or grants prepared; and supporting statements by Department Chairs, committee chairs, or the Office for Sponsored Research and Programs. Professional service and community service may be documented by materials such as conference programs, flyers, or by statements from chairs or presidents. Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation ~~reflect should tie the faculty member's service work to the service~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

Participants in Faculty Evaluation

~~All~~ Evaluators should be guided by the traditions of academic freedom. They ~~must are required to~~ adhere to the tripartite Faculty Evaluation Model when making judgments about a faculty member's performance. Also, all evaluators are required to maintain confidentiality about all the information and decisions involved except for disclosures required by their formal reporting responsibilities.

The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

The main kinds of evaluations of faculty members are as follows. Each full-time faculty member, even a faculty member not tenured or in a tenure-track position, receives annual evaluations. In addition, faculty members in tenure-track positions receive evaluations for tenure and for each promotion. Untenured tenure-track faculty receive contract renewal evaluations and may receive advisory evaluations. Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually.

Because of the complexity and specialized nature of academic work, a faculty member's self-evaluation should be a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degree of success associated with ~~their~~^{his or her} performance. The Self-Evaluation Report should ~~reflect~~^{tie the faculty member's work} to the Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department. Faculty members are responsible for representing their work accurately and providing appropriate documentation for their claims. Faculty members should have considerable freedom to allocate their time and effort in ways that use their competencies most productively while still fulfilling their responsibilities to their department and to the University. To allow individual choices to play a meaningful role in self-evaluation, the faculty member indicates a set of annual area weights when completing a Self-Evaluation Report. These weights must be taken into account by evaluators in developing overall performance evaluations.

In all formal evaluations, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by the Dean, the Department Chair, the Peer Evaluation Committee, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Students Evaluation of Instruction

Students who take a faculty member's courses play an important role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. They submit information on a Student Evaluation of Instruction Form consisting of numerical data and student comments from which summaries are compiled for each course. Student evaluations must be administered in a manner that conveys their importance and protects students' sense of freedom to give candid evaluations. Students should also have significant input in developing or selecting the instruments used to gather their evaluations of teaching.

Student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's ~~teaching~~^{teaching} performance. ~~as a teacher; hence,~~ Evaluation of ~~teaching~~^{teaching} effectiveness involves a variety of types of documentation. In addition, all parties involved in faculty evaluation are cautioned to avoid placing undue emphasis on individual student comments, as these comments may not be reflective of the opinions of the majority of students in a given course. The Student Evaluation of Instruction completion rate in each course should also be taken into account ~~by all evaluators~~ when weighting the numerical data summary. The data should be viewed with ~~extreme~~ caution when completion rates for the listed course were low.

The Department Chair

~~At the department level,~~ ~~the~~ Department Chair is responsible for (a) coordinating the evaluation process ~~at the departmental level,~~ (b) providing the primary administrative evaluation of the faculty member's performance, and (c) promoting the professional growth of the department's faculty in a manner consistent with the department's Disciplinary Statements. In years prior to tenure and/or promotion decisions, the Department Chair is strongly encouraged to provide each faculty member with constructive, timely guidance about the means by which any deficiencies can be corrected.

A Department Chair's Evaluation Report includes assigning performance ratings, recommending merit salary increases in annual evaluations, and reporting on classroom observation for major evaluations. In preparing the Department Chair's Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Chair should use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms>). Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s). In the case of a positive tenure and/or promotion review, the Department Chair should provide specific information about the faculty member's success in meeting expectations. If a review for tenure and/or promotion reaches a negative conclusion, the Department Chair must provide specific instances in ~~their~~^{his or her} report to illustrate the faculty member's failure to meet expectations. In either case, the Department Chair's conclusion should be informed by the department's Disciplinary Statements.

The Peer Evaluation Committee

A Peer Evaluation Committee's (PEC's) first task is to elect a chair who then notifies the Department Chair of ~~his or her~~ their election. The ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC is responsible for preparing and submitting a ~~Peer Evaluation~~ PEC Report in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion, as well as for contract renewal ~~and requested~~ evaluations.

The report is based on documentation submitted by the faculty member being evaluated, classroom observations, and external review if called for. The ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC is given access to the faculty member's ~~entire~~ portfolio including previous annual chair Evaluations. However, no discussion should take place between the ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC and the Department Chair (or between the ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC and the Dean in the case of a Department chair) during the course of the review.

In preparing the ~~Peer Evaluation~~ PEC Report ~~for a faculty member~~, a ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC should use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale. Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s) as well as the department's Disciplinary Statements. In cases of tenure and/or promotion review, the ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC Report must include sufficient information to justify the Committee's decision.

Peer Evaluation Committee Eligibility

Peer Evaluation Committee members should be at or above the rank sought by the faculty candidate. No more than one member should come from outside the candidate's department. When circumstances dictate, however, the Department Chair may appoint additional members from outside the candidate's department or below the rank sought with the approval of the Dean and Provost. Department chairs outside the candidate's department and faculty members in phased retirement are eligible to serve. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) are ineligible to serve on PECs in Tenure/Promotion evaluations; however, they may serve on PECs of evaluations that are not seen by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (Contract Renewal, Post-Tenure Review-only). Prohibited from serving on a Peer Evaluation Committee are the Department Chair of the faculty member's department, faculty members above the rank of department chair (including Assistant Deans), and any faculty member undergoing the same type of evaluation during the same academic year (Contract Renewal, Tenure/Promotion, or Post-Tenure Review). A faculty member simultaneously undergoing Tenure/Promotion and Post-Tenure-Review evaluations may not serve as a PEC member for either type of evaluation. Faculty members undergoing review during the same academic year may not serve on each other's PECs, regardless of the types of evaluation.

The Deans of Schools and Colleges

The Deans of Schools and Colleges are responsible for monitoring the evaluation process for procedural compliance with the Faculty Evaluation Model as well as for overall fairness and equity. After reviewing the materials submitted by the Department Chair, ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC (provided for major reviews, advisory reviews, and post-tenure reviews only), and the faculty member under review, the Dean will complete the Dean's Recommendation ~~or~~ Report form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms>) which

will then be forwarded, with the materials the Dean has reviewed, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

When a Department Chair (or equivalent position) is the faculty member being evaluated, the Dean will act as the Department Chair would in other evaluations. In this case, the Dean will use the Format for Evaluation Reports form instead of the Dean's Recommendation or Report form. When Deans act as Department Chair, they will likewise remain independent of the Peer Evaluation Committee.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee advises the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on matters of promotion and tenure. This University-wide committee attempts to ensure a fair and consistent application of published promotion and tenure standards. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to (a) read and carefully consider the reports of the appropriate Dean, Department Chair, and Peer Evaluation Committee; (b) request any additional information that it deems necessary; (c) examine all facets of the application including the faculty member's portfolio; ~~and~~ (d) reach an equitable final decision taking into account the weights chosen by the faculty member and the Disciplinary Statements of the faculty member's department; and (e) write a report that supports ~~in~~ the decision of the Committee. Responsibilities in the tenure and/or promotion process are described in Section II, Chapter 3.

The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee is responsible for representing the norms and values of the general faculty in all matters related to the Faculty Evaluation Model. When the current provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model do not provide adequate instruction on a specific procedural matter, the ~~party~~ **the faculty candidate or reviewing body** involved may request an ad hoc ruling from the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee. This ruling will be forwarded for consideration to the ~~Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee's parent committee~~, the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for making recommendations about a faculty member's salary increases, merit salary increases, tenure, promotion, and contract renewal to the Chancellor based on recommendations and materials submitted by the Department Chair and other evaluators. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is also responsible for establishing and maintaining a general climate conducive to successful implementation of the Faculty Evaluation Model and for fostering conditions in which high levels of faculty achievement can occur. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may modify deadlines in the evaluation process as circumstances warrant. The Provost, in consultation with the chairs of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee, the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Senate, shall also have the authority to make non-substantial changes in the execution of the Faculty Evaluation Model as related to evolving technologies and features in our digital Faculty Evaluation portfolio system. The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee will adjudicate whether a proposed change is substantial in the event of uncertainty.

In reviewing Department Chairs' and Dean's salary recommendations, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should balance the need for institutional accountability with the need to provide equitable opportunities for annual merit salary increases. In cases of tenure, promotion, and contract renewal, the recommendations of the Dean and Provost to the Chancellor should provide the faculty member with a fair, reasonable decision that adheres to the tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model and serves the interests of the University.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with Deans to approve Disciplinary Statements submitted by each academic department and for ensuring that the

Disciplinary Statements are consistent with provisions of Section 101.3.1 of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina*. These statements are used to guide the application of the Standard Performance Rating Scale. Beyond disciplinary variations expressed in the departmental Disciplinary Statements, no evaluator (e.g., Department Chair, Dean, Peer Evaluation Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee) is permitted to use standards that deviate from the general norms and practices of the University. Current definitions for each level of performance on the Standard Performance Rating Scale may be found here: <https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms> in the section entitled “Faculty Evaluation Forms.”

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should, through Deans, facilitate faculty development in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should encourage Department Chairs to schedule teaching assignments judiciously and appropriately and to award reassigned time to faculty members as necessary. Working with the **Faculty Research and Development Committee and the Center for Office of Sponsored Research and Programs**, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should promote a healthy program of both internal and external funding for scholarly and creative work. Working with the Office of Civic and Community Engagement, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should promote opportunities for faculty service.

The Chancellor

As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor is responsible for facilitating the work of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and others in implementing the Faculty Evaluation Model and promoting faculty achievement. The Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions regarding salary and employment.

Procedures for Annual Evaluation

Procedures for Evaluating Faculty: General Considerations

The evaluation procedures described in this section are designed to attain the following objectives: (a) provide every faculty member with adequate information on how evaluations will be conducted; (b) promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency both within and among departments; (c) provide procedures that allow a reasonable degree of flexibility for faculty; and (d) define the relationship between the various components of an evaluation and the final decision of the evaluator. New faculty members should be informed of the evaluation procedures during their orientation to the University and should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Faculty Evaluation Model and their department’s Disciplinary Statements.

The annual evaluation provides the basis for merit salary increases and ongoing administrative supervision of faculty. It consists of a Self-Evaluation Report, Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report, Chair’s Evaluation Report, an Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, ~~the~~ Dean’s Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and a recommendation by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Every full-time faculty member is evaluated annually. Faculty members on leave of absence are not evaluated, and Department Chairs evaluate part-time faculty using procedures developed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

All faculty are evaluated each academic year. ~~Every faculty member is evaluated every academic year.~~ The annual evaluation includes a(n): (1) Self-Evaluation Report, (2) Student Evaluation Report, (3) Chair's Evaluation Report, (4) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (5) the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (6) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Procedures for compiling these reports are listed below. The Calendar of Events for Annual Evaluations appears below.

Self Evaluation Report

In the Self-Evaluation Report, the faculty member must discuss ~~their~~ ~~his or her~~ teaching, scholarship, and service in the context of ~~their~~ ~~his or her~~ department's Disciplinary Statements. In addition, each component is assigned an area weight reflective of the time, effort, and accomplishments in each area. The following sections present guidelines to assist the faculty member in compiling the Self-Evaluation Report. These guidelines are intended as a general overview of the specific information (~~including subheadings and area weights~~) that should appear in ~~the a faculty member's~~ Self-Evaluation Report ~~both in terms of area weights and subheadings.~~

A faculty member must specify an area weight for ~~the each of the~~ three areas of evaluation. For faculty with a regular 12-hour teaching load, these percentages must conform to the following ranges: teaching, 50% - 70%; scholarship, 10% - 40%; and service, 10% - 40%. For any given academic year, the sum of these weights must equal 100%. Faculty members with unusual teaching loads are to adjust the ranges appropriately. A request for an exemption from these standards must be submitted in writing and approved by the ~~C~~Chair of the faculty member's department. Exceptions to these standards will be granted in reference to department needs. Grounds for an exemption may include, for example, additional teaching duties, administrative or grant activity, additional service activity, or retraining and retooling in the methodology appropriate to a faculty member's discipline. Faculty members may discuss their area weights with the Department Chair ~~at any time~~ prior to completing their self-evaluation.

When circumstances create special demands on a department, a ~~Department C~~Chair may require a faculty member to adjust ~~apt~~ ~~his or her~~ ~~their~~ pattern of responsibilities to meet such demands. The Department Chair must inform the faculty member in writing of the circumstances and the adjustments required. The faculty member may then adjust ~~his or her~~ ~~their~~ area weights on the Self-Evaluation Report as ~~he or she~~ ~~they~~ deems appropriate. If the Department Chair is concerned that a prior pattern of area weights is not generating a record adequate for tenure in the department, the ~~e~~Chair should recommend that ~~a~~ ~~the~~ faculty member adjust ~~his or her~~ ~~their~~ weights in future years. Adjustments in area weights may also be needed if a faculty member's teaching load is reduced to allow for other types of activities, such as research, service, or administrative responsibilities.

The ~~faculty~~ Self-Evaluation Report should be structured so that subheadings indicate the items reported and ~~indicate~~ appropriate area weights for each subheading. See the Format for Evaluation Reports (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms>) for an example of how the report should be structured and the subheadings listed.

Appendix F

Curriculum Proposals Passed by Curriculum and/or Academic Affairs Committee (For Information)

- A. Proposals from the Department of Accounting and Finance**
 - 1. New Course: ACC 3400 (Data Analytics for Accounting)**
 - 2. New Course: ACC 4700 (Accounting Ethics and Case Study)**
 - 3. New Course: ACC 4800 (Accounting Internship)**
- B. Proposal from the Department of Biology**
 - 1. New Course: BIO 2060 (Animal Reproductive Physiology)**
- C. Proposal from the Department of Chemistry and Physics**
 - 1. New Course: EGR 1100 (Introduction to Engineering Design)**
- D. Proposals from the Department of Counseling**
 - 1. New Course: CNS 5815 (Sand Tray in Counseling)**
 - 2. New Course: CNS 5825 (Neuroscience and Play Therapy)**
- E. Proposals from the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice**
 - 1. Writing Intensive Course Proposal: CRJ 3680 (Law and Society)**
 - 2. Writing Intensive Course Proposal: CRJ 4140 (Restorative Justice)**
- F. Proposals from the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science**
 - 1. New Course: CYB 3500 (Laws, Ethics and Compliance in Cybersecurity)**
 - 2. New Course: CYB 4020 (Network Security)**
 - 3. New Course: CYB 4030 (Introduction to Digital Forensics)**
 - 4. New Course: CYB 4600 (AI in Cybersecurity)**
 - 5. New Course: CYB 4700 (Cloud Security)**
 - 6. New Course: CYB 4800 (Securing Self-driving Networks)**
 - 7. New Course: CYB 4970 (Internship in Cybersecurity)**
 - 8. New Course: CYB 4990 (Independent Study in Cybersecurity)**
 - 9. New Course: CYBS 4XXX (Special Topics in Cybersecurity)**

10. New Course: ITC 3300 (Secure System Integration & Administration)

G. Proposals from the Department of Kinesiology

- 1. New Course: KIN 3100 (Coaching Sports)**
- 2. New Course: KIN 3200 (Officiating Sports)**
- 3. New Course: OCCT 5000 (Theories and Foundation in Occupational Therapy)**
- 4. New Course: OCCT 5005 (Special Topics in Occupational Science)**
- 5. New Course: OCCT 5100 (Functional Anatomy and Physiology)**
- 6. New Course: OCCT 5150 (Clinical Kinesiology)**
- 7. New Course: OCCT 5200 (Psychosocial Approaches & Mental Health)**
- 8. New Course: OCCT 5350 (Clinical Decision Making I)**
- 9. New Course: OCCT 5400 (Clinical Neuroscience)**
- 10. New Course: OCCT 5450 (Pediatrics in Occupational Therapy I)**
- 11. New Course: OCCT 5475 (Assessment in Adult Physical Dysfunction)**
- 12. New Course: OCCT 5500 (Research Methods)**
- 13. New Course: OCCT 5600 (Assistive Technology)**
- 14. New Course: OCCT 5650 (Management, Advocacy and Leadership)**
- 15. New Course: OCCT 5680 (Health Promotion and Aging)**
- 16. New Course: OCCT 6000 (Hand Therapy and Upper Extremity Disorders)**
- 17. New Course: OCCT 6351 (Clinical Decision Making II)**
- 18. New Course: OCCT 6480 (Interventions in Adult Physical Dysfunction)**
- 19. New Course: OCCT 6490 (Pediatrics in Occupational Therapy II)**
- 20. New Course: OCCT 6500 (Professional Ethics in Clinical Practice)**
- 21. New Course: OCCT 6600 (Clinical Pathophysiology)**
- 22. New Course: OCCT 6800 (Senior Seminar I)**
- 23. New Course: OCCT 6850 (Fieldwork Level IIa)**

24. New Course: OCCT 6870 (Fieldwork Level IIb)

25. New Course: OCCT 6880 (Senior Seminar II)

26. New Course: PED 1181 (Marching Band)

H. Proposal from the Department of Geology and Geography

1. Writing Intensive Course Proposal: GGY 3720 (North America)

I. Proposals from the Department of History

1. Writing Intensive Course Proposal: HST 4330 (The Russian Empire and the Soviet Union in the Twentieth Century)

2. New Course: HST 5400 (Themes in World History)

3. New Course: SSE 5350 (Curriculum and Assessment in the Social Studies)

4. New Course: SSE 5820 (Social Studies Seminar)

J. Proposals from the Department of Music

1. New Course: MUS 1015 (Commercial Music Ensemble)

2. New Course: MUS 2305 (Songwriting I)

3. New Course: MUS 3305 (Songwriting II)

4. New Course: MUS 3645 (Arranging for Songwriters)

K. Proposal from the Department of Inclusive Education

1. Course Revision: EDN 5480 (Advanced Educational Theory and Trends)

Appendix G

Revision to policy on adding, dropping and withdrawing from courses

Proposed revisions to policy on adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses (Academic Catalog <https://catalog.uncp.edu/content.php?catoid=31&navoid=1884>) put forth by EMS

Adding, Dropping, and Withdrawing from Courses

The adding and dropping of courses during open registration can be done online for current students through BraveWeb. New freshmen students will need to see their University College advisor to request changes to their schedule. After the drop/add period, students can add a course by completing a Late Add form. The Late Add form will need to be submitted to the Office of the Registrar for processing (form must have all necessary signatures before it will be processed).

A student may withdraw from a course after the drop/add period through the last day to withdrawal from a class (see academic calendar for dates). Students will receive a W grade. The Course Withdrawal form is available online, ~~and in Brave Central~~. The Course Withdrawal form must be completed and submitted to the Office of the Registrar for processing (form must have all necessary signatures before it will be processed). Students entering UNCP will have the option of withdrawing from a maximum of 16 semester hours of coursework.

~~The Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment~~ A designee from the Office of the Provost may approve withdrawal from a course or courses at any time without academic penalty if serious extenuating circumstances, such as serious illness, exist. Unsatisfactory academic performance does not by itself constitute an extenuating circumstance. As soon as possible, the student petitioning to withdraw from a course due to extenuating circumstances must meet with ~~the Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment~~ a designee from the Office of the Provost present the appropriate medical or legal documentation, and complete the necessary forms. Withdrawal under these circumstances will not count toward a student's career withdrawal limit. Approved requests receive a grade of WX. In addition, the following conditions apply:

- i. a WX will be recorded on the transcript;
- ii. the course(s) will count as attempted hours;
- iii. the course(s) will not count in GPA calculation;
- iv. the course(s) are subject to all Financial Aid and SAP rules and calculations.

Students denied a request for the grade of WX may appeal to the Provost or designee whose decision will be final.

Withdrawal from the University

Up to the last day to receive a W in a course, a student may complete an Undergraduate Withdrawal Application, available on the Office of the Registrar webpage at www.uncp.edu/registrar. The student should get the required signatures and submit the form to the Office of the Registrar for processing. Students are encouraged to discuss financial implications with ~~a Brave Central~~ their Financial Aid Counselor. After the last day to withdraw ~~al~~ from a course, or if the student wishes to withdraw on time with grades of WX, ~~the Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment~~ a designee from the Office of the Provost approves withdrawal from the University without academic penalty only when unusual and documentable circumstances warrant. Unsatisfactory academic performance does not by itself meet the

requirement. As soon as possible, the student petitioning to withdraw from the University must meet with ~~the Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment~~ a designee from the Office of the Provost, present the appropriate medical or legal documentation, and complete the necessary forms. Withdrawal under these circumstances will not count toward a student's career withdrawal limit. In addition, the following conditions apply:

- i. a WX will be recorded on the transcript;
- ii. the course(s) will count as attempted hours;
- iii. the course(s) will not count in GPA calculation;
- iv. the course(s) are subject to all Financial Aid and SAP rules and calculations.

Students denied a request for the grade of WX may appeal to the Provost or designee whose decision will be final.

Students who stop attending classes without completing the withdrawal procedure ordinarily receive an F in courses for which they are registered.

Appendix H

Changes to the handbook regarding description of SEI use (Appendix E)

(page 85 2023 Word Version)

Student Evaluations of Instruction

All teaching faculty (full- and part-time faculty, Department Chairs, and administrators who teach) are evaluated by students using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) ~~Form~~ form. Although student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher, and are documented to be susceptible to bias, they do contribute to the overall faculty evaluation process. The data are summarized in a Student Evaluation Report.

Full-time and part-time faculty, teaching graduate or undergraduate courses, are evaluated during each semester of each academic year. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve the ~~Student Evaluation of Instruction Form~~ SEI form. A department may add up to five supplementary items or scales to this form without approval from the Senate. Alternatively, a department may develop a substitute ~~Student Evaluation of Instruction Form~~ SEI form in lieu of the general form. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve any alternate forms.

Student evaluations of instruction are conducted using an online survey. Students and instructors receive an automated email to their UNCP account when the survey opens. In the email, students are provided a link and instructions for how to complete the survey and the amount of time they have left to complete it. Students have two weeks to complete the SEI evaluations. The invitation to complete SEI's is sent out at 6:00 am the Monday two weeks before exam week and is closed at 5:59 am on the Monday of exam week. Instructors of face-to-face classes are encouraged to set aside 15 minutes of time in class for students to complete the survey online during which the instructor is not to be present.

Student evaluation of graduate instruction follows the same procedures as in undergraduate instruction using the Student Evaluation of Instruction instrument. In addition, graduate courses are evaluated using the Graduate Course Analysis (GCA) form following procedures approved by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. These procedures can be found in the Graduate Faculty Handbook. Data from the ~~analysis of graduate courses~~ GCA form are not used in faculty evaluation but instead are used for program improvement and accreditation purposes.

A quantitative summary of the ratings in each course as well as a transcript of student comments are prepared as soon as possible. The faculty member being evaluated must not receive any report on his or her evaluations until grades for the current semester have been submitted. **Note that student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher, and all parties involved in faculty evaluation are cautioned to avoid placing undue emphasis on individual student comments, which may not reflect majority opinions. The SEI completion rate in each course should also be taken into account by all evaluators when weighing the numerical data summary.**

When sample sizes are relatively low, the data in general should be viewed with caution; evaluators should look more for trends over time than for particular target scores. Additionally, Chairs, Deans, and Peer Evaluation and other committees are reminded that SEI instruments nationally have strong, documented evidence of racial, gender, and other biases, and must be used carefully.

After grades have been submitted, the faculty member and Chair receive the quantitative summaries and the student comments. The Department Chair prepares the Student Evaluation Report, based on both undergraduate and graduate student evaluations of instruction. It provides quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students and is included in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report.

Appendix I



Minutes
UNCP Graduate Council Meeting
Monday, April 24, 2023, 3:00 p.m.
<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/irene.aiken>
or Graduate School Conference Room

- Agenda approved by consent
- March 20, 2023 [Minutes](#) were approved by consent
- The Following Graduate Faculty Nominations were approved:

Last Name	First	Deg	Dept	Program	Status
Walker	Ash	DHS	Kinesiology	Sport Admin.	Full
McAllister	Terrence	Ed.D.	Ed. Lead. & Specialties	School Admin.	Adjunct
Moore	Sarah	Ph.D.	Couns	CMHC	Adjunct
Jenkins	Leah	Ph.D.	Couns	CMHC	Adjunct
Thompson	Cara	Ph.D. <i>pend</i>	Couns	CMHC	Full, pending PhD completion
Kozub	Mary	Ph.D.	Nursing	MSN, DNP	Full
Ziemnowicz	Christopher	Ph.D.	Marketing	MBA	Full
Solano	Christopher	D.B.A.	Accounting	MBA	Full

- **Graduate Faculty Renewals were approved as they appear in Appendix A**
- **The following proposal was approved:**
 - **Public Administration, Health Administration, M.P.A.**
 - Program Revision-This proposal is made in response to a catalog error. This change was originally approved when the criminal justice and emergency management tracks were changed.
 - Change concentration options to read:
 - Any HAD or HADS courses at the 5000 level in consultation with an advisor.
- **Graduate School Items/Report (Aiken and Bell)**
 - Recruitment/Enrollment
 - Fall and summer are looking fine (up slightly over last year)
 - Ad campaign for new programs (PE, BK, and Spanish)
 - Please keep in touch with current students
 - PLEASE check for applications and interest throughout the summer. Have someone cover in your stead if you are away or allow TGS to address.

- Graduate Symposium, Review/suggestions
- Orientation
 - Fall Orientation August 15th, 6:00 pm; 6:30 Program Orientations
 - Visitation Day August 16th, 3-5 pm (first day of classes): PDs be available
- Graduate Research Symposium: April 2nd, 5:30 until. Please mark your calendars.

- **Unfinished/New Business**
 - Dr. Roger Ladd was recognized and thanked for his many (17) years of service on Graduate Council

- **Announcements/Reminders**
 - Upcoming Graduate Council meetings for 2023-2024 at 3:00 pm: September 18, October 16, November 20, January 15 (2024), February 19, March 18, April 15
 - Fall Orientation August 15th, 6:00 pm (only); Visitation Day August 16th, 3-5 pm (first day of classes): Invitations forthcoming

- **Adjournment**

Appendix A

Renewals

Last Name	First Name	School/ College	Program	Field	Rank at Nominati on	Tenure status	Dept	Current Rank	Grad Fac status	Appointed	Renewed
Chae	Youngsuk	A&S	English	English	Assistant	T	ETFL	Assistant	Full	10/20/2008	4/23/2018
Hakala	Laura	A&S	English	English	Assistant	TT	ETFL	Assistant	Full	10/15/2018	
Laminack	Zachary	A&S	English	English	Assistant Prof.	TT	ETFL	Assistant Professor	Full	10/1/2018	
Miller	Wendy	A&S	English	English	Assistant	TT	ETFL	Assistant	Full	10/20/2008	4/23/2018
Schaub	Melissa	A&S	English	English Literature	Assistant	TT	ETFL	Assistant	Full	10/20/2008	4/23/2018
Dickerson	Jordin	A&S	MPA	Political Science	Adjunct	NTT	PSPA	Adjunct	Prof. Affil	2/15/2021	
Jang	Sojin	A&S	MPA	Public Admin	Assistant	TT	PSPA	Assistant	Full	4/23/2018	
Sharum	Emily	A&S	MPA	Political Science	Assistant	T	Political Science	Assistant	Full	9/21/2009	4/23/2018
Santisteban	Maria	A&S	Science Ed	Biology	Assistant	T	Biology	Assistant	Full	3/7/2013	4/23/2018
Dran	David	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Assistant	TT	Social Work	Assistant	Full	9/15/2008	4/23/2018
Edwards	Sherry	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Professor	T	Social Work	Professor	Full	9/15/2008	4/23/2018
Frauenholtz	Susan	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Assistant Prof.	TT	Social Work	Assistant Professor	Full	10/1/2018	
Freeman	Latricia	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Lecturer	NTT	Social Work	Lecturer	Prof. Affil	10/21/2019	4/19/2021
Gore	Rezell	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Lecturer	NTT	Social Work	Lecturer	Prof. Affil	9/20/2021	
Jahosky	Jeanne	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Adjunct	NTT	Social Work	Adjunct	Adjunct	2/17/2020	
Locklear	Cindy	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Assistant	TT	Social Work	Assistant	Full	2/14/2011	3/19/2018
McDougald	Zavery	CHS	MSW	Social Work	Adjunct	NTT	Social Work	Adjunct	Prof. Affil	10/21/2019	4/19/2021

Beasley	Cherry	CHS	Nursing	Nursing	Associate	T	Nursing	Associate	Full	3/18/2013	4/23/2018
Harrison-Swartz	Julie	CHS	Nursing	Nursing	Assistant	TT	Nursing	Assistant	Full	9/19/2016	4/23/2018
Hummer	Deborah	CHS	Nursing	Nursing	Assistant	TT	Nursing	Assistant	Full	1/25/2016	4/23/2018
Wells	Jennifer	CHS	Nursing	Nursing	Assistant	T	Nursing	Assistant	Full	3/18/2013	4/23/2018
Wooten	Marian	CHS	Kin.	Physical Ed	Univ	TT	HHP	Assistant	Full	9/15/2008	4/23/2018
Bishwa	Koirala	SOB	MBA	Economics	Full	TT	Ecn & Fin	Professor	Full	1/22/2013	4/23/2018
Kang	Zhixin (Richard)	SOB	MBA	Business Admin	Assistant	TT	Ecn & Fin	Assistant	Full	10/21/2013	4/23/2018
Shi	Xinyan	SOB	MBA	Economics	Assistant	TT	Ecn & Fin	Assistant	Full	9/16/2013	4/23/2018
Spillan	John	SOB	MBA	mgt, mkt, int'l	Professor	T	MMIB	Professor	Full	10/21/2013	4/23/2018
Thomas	W. Stewart	SOB	MBA	IT	IT	NT	ACC	Assistant	Full	10/15/2007	4/23/2018
Westerman	Leah	SOB	MBA	Accounting	Adjunct	NTT	ACC	Adjunct	Adjunct	2/17/2020	
Xiong	Charles	SOB	MBA	mkt, mgt, int'l	Professor	TT	MMIB	Professor	Full	1/22/2013	4/23/2018
Beese	Gayle	SOE	CMHC	Counselor Ed	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Prof. Affil	9/20/2021	
Benshoff	James	SOE	CMHC	Couns	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Adjunct		
Bundy	Atticia	SOE	Couns	Couns	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Adjunct	1/9/2013	4/19/2021
Cox	Amy	SOE	PSC	Couns	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Prof. Affil	9/20/2021	
Dobens	Sarah	SOE	CMHC	Expressive Therapies	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Prof. Affil	9/20/2021	
Dongre	Leigh	SOE	CMHC	Couns	Adjunct		Couns	Adjunct	Adjunct	1/27/2020	
Garris	Bruce	SOE	CMHC	Couns	Adjunct	NT	Couns	Adjunct	Prof. Affil.	10/15/2018	4/20/2020
Kennedy	Stephen	SOE	PSC	Couns	Adjunct	NTT	Couns	Adjunct	Adjunct	1/27/2020	
Robinson	Stephanie	SOE	Couns	Couns	Assistant	TT	Couns	Assistant	Full	10/15/2018	
Suggs	Charlamane	SOE	CMHC	Couns	Lecturer	NT	Couns	Lecturer	Prof. Affil	1/28/2019	4/19/2021

Walters	Courtney	SOE	Couns	Couns	Adjunct	Non Tenure Track	Couns	Adjunct	Adjunct	1/23/2017	4/20/2020
Staal	Laura	SOE	Edu	Special Education	Assist	TT	Ed. Leader. & Spec.	Assistant	Full	10/20/2008	4/23/2018
Neal	Gerald	SOE	MSA	Ed.Leader.		TT	Ed. Leader. & Spec.	Assistant	Full	10/1/2018	
Sullivan	Keri	SOE	Spec Ed	Special Education	Lecturer	NTT	Ed. Leader. & Spec.	Lecturer	Adjunct	9/19/2020	

Appendix J

EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Council for Educator Preparation Programs

March 15, 2023, Minutes

3 - 5 pm

WEBEX <https://uncp.webex.com/meet/lisa.mitchell>

VOTING LINK: <https://forms.gle/gndFMAVqakeGY8TY9>

CEPP ONEDRIVE [March 2023](#)

Recording: <https://uncp.webex.com/uncp/ldr.php?RCID=3367893bcd022066f987303b3ffe42a7>

Password: UNCP2023cepp

Attendees: Q. Jones, L. Mitchell, M. Ash, M. Rivera, E. Jeon, S. Cinnamon, M. Freeman, L. Locklear, G. Robinson, L. Smith, D. Dubisky, D. Chilcote, R. Newman, M. Edwards, A. Lara, J. Ricks, K. Ficklin, A. Lowery, K. Sellers, N. Vincett, R. Hagevik, S. Plata-Potter, T. Trendowski, Dean Floyd, H. Sessions, J. Whittington, K. Granger, N. Lifschitz-Grant, K. Fitzgerald (GoReact), R. Ladd, J. Rivera, B. Winters

I. **Welcome** - *Dr. Loury Floyd (2) Lisa Mitchell @ 3 pm*

II. **Approval of the Minutes**

a. **February** Approved

III. **Dean's Report** – *Dr. Loury Floyd (15)*

a. School Social Work

i. Last week was Social Work Week

b. [Licensure Exam prep](#)

c. CAEP prep sessions

i. We've had 4 thus far and have more forthcoming

d. UNC System Literacy update

i. Continuing to meet weekly and that is on Thursday's from 10:30 until 12, Room 102

ii. Met with TPIS

e. ISTE EPPs for Digital Equity and Transformation Pledge

<https://www.iste.org/EPP-pledge>

IV. **Curriculum**

a. **Initial Curriculum updates**

i. MAT: Social Studies Education, Serina Cinnamon

1. MAT Middle Grades and Secondary

2. Added 2 courses, SSE 5820, and SSE 5350, Approved and Kelly Ficklin 2nd

b. **ADV Curriculum updates**

i. MA: Social Studies Education, Approved and Kelly Ficklin 2nd

- ii. MA: Science Education, Rita Hagevik, Science Faculty voted Yes, Approved and Serina Cinnamon 2nd.
 - 1. 12 Credits of Content and can be in any area
 - 2. 3 Year rotation schedule
 - 3. Final Product, 3 Choices
 - a. Thesis
 - b. Project
 - c. National Board
- iii. [MA: English Education](#), Roger Ladd, Approved and Serina Cinnamon 2nd
 - 1. Kept the 36 Hour Total
 - 2. 9 Shared Hours

V. **CAEP – (20)**

- a. [CAEP Prep](#) – *Dr. Mabel Rivera*
- b. Educator Disposition System – *Dr. Mabel Rivera & Nicholas Vincett*
 - i. [Approved and Updated Checkpoints](#)
 - ii. Reminder: Review dispositions across courses
 - iii. [Brave Educator Dashboard Self-Assessment Guide](#)
 - iv. [Brave Educator Dashboard Disposition Assessment Submission](#)
- c. Technology – *Dr. Lisa Mitchell*
 - i. Resources
 - 1. Office of Online Learning
<https://www.uncp.edu/academics/academic-resources/online-learning>
 - a. [Faculty resources](#)
 - 2. Division of Information Technology
 - a. [Faculty resources](#)
 - b. [Student resources](#)
 - ii. Digital Learning Plan System office [Digital Learning Progress Rubric](#)
 - iii. [STNA Faculty survey](#) - complete using Qualtrics link coming by email
 - iv. Updates for our [Transition Plan: Digital Literacy and Technology](#)

VI. **Educator Engagement and Student Success – Dr. Leslie Locklear (10)**

- a. Pre-Internship (Fall 2023 Interns)
 - i. CP 1 Interviews: March 20-24
 - ii. [Fall 2023 Intern List](#)
- b. EPP student meetings March 16, 2023
 - i. Undergraduates: 4pm
 - ii. MAT: 5pm
 - iii. Focus: Checkpoints & Dispositions
- c. Internship
 - i. EdTPA Submission: March 21 & March 28
- d. GoReact, Kelly Fitzgerald
 - i. Video Feedback Platform
 - ii. Reports and Rubrics
 - iii. Self-Reflection for Students

- VII. **Announcements - Council Members (5)**
a. **[240 Tutoring opportunity](#) - Licensure exams**

VIII. **Adjourned @ 4:27 pm**

Important Dates to Remember

- March 16 – Brave Educator for a Day
- March 20 – 24 – Pre-Intern Interviews ([CLICK HERE](#) to sign up)
- March 23 – Sports Empowerment Event
- March 24 – BranchED Virtual Technical Assistance - 10:00-11:30am
- March 24 – Student Teacher of the Year Nominations Deadline
- March 29 – Brave Scholar Signing Day
- April 1– Admitted Students Day
- **April 2-4 – CAEP Site Visit**
- April 28 – EDA and Pre-CPAST Due
- April 29 – UNCP Open House
- April 30 – Annual CAEP and Title II Reports due
- **May 4 – End of Semester Celebration**
- June 30 – EPP Performance Reports due

Appendix K

Classroom Management Policy

Classroom Management

Faculty Handbook (2021-22, pp. 170-72) – PROPOSED REVISIONS

Student Discipline

~~All faculty members should feel a sense of responsibility to report any type of behavior, whenever it may occur, which may reflect unfavorably upon the University community. Whenever possible, names of students involved and a descriptive account of the behavior in question should be reported. Typical examples of such behavior might be obscenity, vulgarity, and vandalism. Such reports should be made to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.~~

~~At times it may be appropriate for an instructor to refer problems of personal conduct in his/her class to other agencies. Such conduct as, for example, cheating, stealing, and unusual boisterousness may appropriately be referred to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for study and action.~~

~~Addressing disruptive behavior in the classroom is left to the discretion of the individual faculty member. However, it is suggested that the faculty member make clear to the class in the syllabus or at an early class meeting that any behaviors that disrupt the teaching and/or educational process will not be tolerated. If a student displays such behavior, the faculty member should deal with it early and directly by speaking to the student. If it continues to be a problem the faculty member may ask the student to leave the classroom and should report the student to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.~~

~~Written documentation should be kept for each instance, including how it was addressed. At the faculty member's request and with appropriate documentation, the Office for Academic Affairs will administratively withdraw the student from class(es) as a result of repeated disruptions to the academic process.~~

Classroom Management

Classroom management is the responsibility of each faculty member. They should address disruptive behavior in the classroom at their own discretion, but it is recommended that each faculty member make clear to the class in the syllabus and at an early class meeting that any behaviors that disrupt the educational process will not be tolerated. The procedure described below is intended to be a graduated process that will lead to a positive classroom environment for all students and faculty. It is not intended to lead to a student's dismissal from the course, although that may happen. If a student has clearly violated the Student Code of Conduct as outlined in REG 11.30.01, the instructor may file a written complaint with the Office of Student Conduct according to the guidelines provided in the Student Disciplinary Procedures regulation (REG 11.30.03).

If a student displays disruptive behavior in the classroom, the faculty member should address it early and directly by speaking to the student. It is recommended that the faculty member

document any conversations with a student regarding their behavior. If the student does not adjust their behaviors, the faculty member should ask the student to leave the classroom or speak with the student at the end of class and provide written documentation immediately to the department chair. A written summary statement should be provided to the student before the next class meeting outlining the conditions under which the student may return to the class. If the student's disruptive behavior persists, the faculty member should meet with the student and department chair. If they cannot resolve the matter, the department chair should schedule a meeting with the dean or their designee. If the faculty member, department chair, and the dean determine that the student should be permanently removed from the class, they shall submit that recommendation in writing to the Office of the Provost.

The provost or their designee will review the documentary evidence and, if necessary, meet with the dean, the department chair, the faculty member, and/or the student. If there is sufficient evidence to warrant further review, the provost will refer the matter to the Office of Student Conduct to determine if the Student Code of Conduct has been violated. The Conduct Hearing Board (CHB), in consultation with the Office of the Provost, may suspend or permanently remove a student from the class in accordance with guidance outlined in the "Disciplinary Sanctions for Individual Students" in the Student Handbook.

Student Disciplinary Procedures

~~Student disciplinary actions are the responsibility of the Office for Student Affairs.~~ Under the direction of the chancellor, the vice chancellor for Student Affairs has primary responsibility and authority for the administration of student discipline. Further delegation of this authority may be made by the vice chancellor for Student Affairs to the director of Student Conduct and/or other disciplinary bodies, such as the Conduct Hearing Board and the Committee on Extraordinary Disciplinary Emergencies. ~~The UNCP Student Handbook, available on request from the Office for Student Affairs~~ The UNCP Student Handbook, available online at <https://www.uncp.edu/campus-life/student-affairs/policies-regulations-and-student-handbook>, contains a complete description of the ~~student judicial system~~ Code of Conduct and its procedures; faculty members should become familiar with those procedures. Very briefly, student misconduct can be ~~adjudicated administratively by the Dean of Students or in a hearing before the Campus Judicial Board. Students whose cases are heard by the Campus Judicial Board have the right to appeal that Board's decision to the Campus Appeals Board, and ultimately to the Chancellor. See the website for the Student Handbook at~~ ~~<https://studentaffairs.uncp.edu/one-stop-shop/student-handbook/>~~ adjudicated administratively by the Director of Student Conduct or their designee or in a hearing before the Conduct Hearing Board. Students whose cases are heard by the CHB have the right to appeal that Board's decision to the Conduct Appeal Board (CAB), and ultimately, for a second level to the Chancellor or their designee. (See the Student Handbook at <https://www.uncp.edu/campus-life/student-affairs/policies-regulations-and-student-handbook>.)

All faculty members should feel a sense of responsibility to report any type of behavior, whenever it may occur, which may reflect unfavorably upon the University community. Whenever possible, names of students involved and a descriptive account of the behavior in question should be reported. Typical examples of such behavior might be obscenity, vulgarity, and vandalism. ~~Such reports should be made to the Director of Student Conduct.~~ Such reports should be made through the submission of an online Incident Report at https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UNCPembroke&layout_id=0. If the situation is an emergency, the faculty member should call 911 or Campus Police.

Code of Conduct

Any student whose conduct on or off campus ~~becomes unsatisfactory and is determined to have a detrimental impact on the mission of the University will be subject to appropriate judicial action.~~ violates university policies, regulations, or federal, state, or local law may be subject to disciplinary action through the Office of Student Conduct. No student will be permitted to graduate or officially withdraw from the University while disciplinary action is pending against him or her.

~~According to the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, ratified in March of 1968, the administration of the University is responsible for all phases of student discipline.~~ University administrators are responsible for all phases of student discipline. The administration holds that a student enrolling in the University assumes an obligation to conduct himself/herself in a manner compatible with the University's function as an educational institution. Further, the Board of Trustees has directed the administration to take appropriate disciplinary action against students and student organizations that are found to be in violation of the University's Code of Conduct. ~~A UNCP student shall refrain from the prohibited behaviors that reflect conduct unbecoming of a student at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. The full text of the Code of Conduct is available in the Student Handbook at <https://studentaffairs.uncp.edu/one-stop-shop/student-handbook/>~~ A UNCP student shall refrain from engaging in behaviors that violate the Code of Conduct, which reflect conduct unbecoming of a student at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke. The full text of the Student Code of Conduct Regulation may be found at <https://www.uncp.edu/pr/reg-113001-student-code-conduct-regulation>.

University Judicial System

~~Subject to any policies or regulations of the Board of Governors or of the Board of Trustees, it is be the duty of the Chancellor to exercise full authority in the regulation of student affairs and in matters of student discipline in the institution. In the discharge of this duty, the Chancellor may delegate such authority to faculty committees and to administrative or other officers of the institution or to agencies of student government in such a manner and to such extent as the Chancellor may deem necessary and expedient. In the discharge of the Chancellor's duty with respect to the matters of student discipline, it is the duty of the Chancellor to secure to every student the right of due process and fair hearing, the presumption of innocence until found guilty, the right to know the evidence and to face witnesses~~

~~testifying against the student, and the right to such advice and assistance in the individual's defense as may be allowable under the regulations of the University approved by the Chancellor. In those instances where the denial of any of these rights is alleged, it is be the duty of the President of the University of North Carolina to review the proceedings.~~ The university embraces and strives to uphold the freedoms of expression and speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and the North Carolina Constitution. The university has the right under appropriate circumstances to regulate the time, place, and manner of exercising these and other constitutionally protected rights.

All students are responsible for conducting themselves in a manner that helps enhance an environment of learning in which the rights, dignity, worth, and freedom of each member of the academic community are respected.

Violations of the Code of Conduct, university rules or regulations, or federal, state, or local law may result in a violation of the Student Code of Conduct and imposition of student discipline in accordance with outlined outcomes of disciplinary sanctions.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

Students who apply for admission to the University of North Carolina at Pembroke and are subsequently admitted are not enrolled as a legal or constitutional right. Authority to determine academic admission standards is delegated to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. When a student is admitted to UNCP, he or she accepts the rules, regulations, and procedures that apply to the campus. Students attend UNCP as a voluntary act and accept substantial benefits that the State of North Carolina provides. In taking such action, and accepting the benefits that accrue, students must accept the rules and regulations that have been developed pursuant to law. Upon enrollment, a student receives no sanctuary from obedience to law. A student is not entitled to greater immunities or privileges before the law than those enjoyed by other citizens generally. In addition to the federal, state, and local laws that pertain to all citizens, a student must accept the institutional rules and regulations necessary to accomplish the purposes for which the institution was established. The student does not, however, lose constitutional or legal rights by an act of voluntary enrollment. The Code of the University of North Carolina specifically refers to the important right of a fair hearing and due process. Federal and state statutes and court cases have established certain student rights which are not to be infringed upon, except in situations which are themselves outlined in law and court procedures. Among these are:

1. ~~No student may be denied access to university facilities or programs on the basis of sex, race, religion, or national origin.~~ No student may be denied access to university facilities or programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, disability, or because of the individual's honorable service in the armed services of the United States.
2. No student may be denied the protection of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and Article I of the Constitution of the State of North Carolina, which refer to

freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom to assemble peacefully.

3. No student may be denied the continuance of his/her education for disciplinary reasons without being afforded the right to due process.

UNCP recognizes these additional rights:

1. The right to read and study free from undue interference in one's room. (Unreasonable noise and other distractions inhibit the exercise of this right.)
2. The right to sleep, the right to one's personal belongings, the right to free access to one's room and suite facilities during the period that the residence halls are open, the right to a clean environment in which to live. (Optimum physical conditions are essential, as they support, reinforce, and provide positive conditions in which to learn and live.)
3. The right to redress of grievances. If the academic and residence hall communities are to function in the most educationally profitable manner, the right to initiate actions and referrals for impartial and fair adjudication of grievances is held paramount. In exercising this right, the student further holds the right to be free from fear or intimidation, physical and/or emotional harm, and without imposition of sanctions apart from the due process.
4. The right to personal privacy. All persons should have freedom from interference with their personal activities and should be able to maintain privacy for other than academic reasons.
5. The right to host guests. All students should have the opportunity to maintain personal contacts and friendships with other persons to fulfill their needs for socialization. Guests are to respect the above stated rights of the host's roommates and of other residents.