

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

Wednesday, Feb. 4, 2015, at 3:30 p.m.
213 Chavis University Center

Scott Hicks, Chair
Roger Guy, Secretary

Members of the Senate:

To 2015	To 2016	To 2017
ART June Power	ART Aaron Vandermeer	ART Jonathan Maisonpierre
EDN Marisa Scott	EDN Susan Edkins	EDN Joe Sciulli
LET Susan Cannata	LET Polina Chemishanova	LET Cynthia Miecznikowski
NSM Maria Pereira	NSM Dena Evans	NSM Tom Dooling
SBS Mike Spivey	SBS Rick Crandall	SBS Brooke Kelly
At-Large Vacant	At-Large Vacant	At-Large Scott Hicks
At-Large Jesse Peters	At-Large Jose D'Arruda	At-Large David Nikkel
At-Large Sailaja Vallabha	At-Large Roger Guy	At-Large Sara Simmons
Chancellor Kyle Carter		
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Ken Kitts		

Order of Business

- A. Roll Call**
- B. Approval of Minutes** ([Appendix A](#))
- C. Adoption of Agenda**
- D. Reports from Administration**
 - 1. Chancellor—Kyle Carter
 - 2. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Ken Kitts
- E. Reports of Committees**
 - 1. Operations Committees
 - a. Executive Committee—Scott Hicks
 - 1. With the support of faculty and administration following the Jan. 27 open forum, the Executive Committee asks for the Senate’s approval to amend promotion and tenure guidelines and policies as follows: All references to “academic program” or “program” shall be stricken from the Faculty Evaluation Model, replaced by “department.” ([Appendix B](#))
 - 2. With the support of faculty and administration following the Jan. 27 open forum, the Executive Committee asks for the Senate’s concurrence in recommending that the submission of Disciplinary

Statements for Promotion & Tenure be postponed for one year.

3. The Executive Committee asks for the Senate's affirmation of a UNC Faculty Assembly resolution praising the leadership of President Tom Ross and calling on the Board of Governors to articulate its rationale for effecting a "transition in leadership" against the president's wishes. ([Appendix C](#))
 4. The Chair asks for the Senate's approval of Ryan Anderson (History), Irina Falls (Educational Specialties), Rita Hagevick (Biology), Bishwa Koirala (Economics, Finance & Decision Sciences), John Labadie (Art), John Roe (Biology), and Richard Vela (English) to the Faculty Research Advisory Board. ([Appendix I](#))
- b. Committee on Committees & Elections—Susan Cannata
1. The Committee on Committees & Elections shall conduct the election of the 2015-2016 Senate Chair and Senate Secretary.
 2. The Committee requests the approval of the appointments of Bill Brandon (Natural Sciences & Mathematics) to the Subcommittee on Faculty Development & Welfare (to 2015, replacing April Ventura), Dorea Bonneau (Education) to the Subcommittee on Faculty Development & Welfare (to 2015, replacing Kim Sellers), and Frederick Stephens (Social & Behavioral Sciences) to the Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee (to 2015, replacing Lydia Gan).
- c. Faculty Governance Committee—Beverly Justice
1. The Faculty Governance Committee requests the Senate's approval of the Faculty Awards Committee's request to stipulate that it shall consider only the first four letters of recommendation received in support of candidates for the Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching. ([Appendix D](#))
2. Standing Committees
- a. Academic Affairs Committee—Jose D'Arruda
 1. The Master of Business Administration Program proposes to replace MGT 5300: Human Resources with MGT 5362: International Business in the MBA core program and to create MBA concentrations in Supply Chain Management and Financial Services. ([Appendix E](#))
 - b. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee—Sara Simmons
 1. The Committee seeks the approval of General Administration-mandated revisions to post-tenure review. ([Appendix F](#))
 - c. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee—Brooke Kelly

- 3. Special Committees
- F. **UNC Faculty Assembly Report** ([Appendix G](#))
- G. **Teacher Education Committee**
- H. **Graduate Council** ([Appendix H](#))
- I. **Other Committees**
- J. **Unfinished Business**
- K. **New Business**
- L. **Announcements**
- M. **Adjournment**

Appendix A

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Faculty Senate Minutes
Wednesday, Dec. 3, 2014
213 Chavis University Center

Scott Hicks, Chair
Roger Guy, Secretary

Members of the Senate:

To 2015	To 2016	To 2017
ART June Power	ART Aaron Vandermeer	ART Jonathan Maisonpierre
EDN Marisa Scott	EDN Susan Edkins	EDN Joe Sciulli
LET Susan Cannata	LET Polina Chemishanova	LET Cynthia Miecznikowski
NSM Maria Pereira	NSM Dena Evans	NSM Tom Dooling
SBS Mike Spivey	SBS Rick Crandall	SBS Brooke Kelly
At-Large Judy Curtis	At-Large Tony Curtis	At-Large Scott Hicks
At-Large Jesse Peters	At-Large Jose D'Arruda	At-Large David Nikkel
At-Large Kim Sellers	At-Large Roger Guy	At-Large Sara Simmons
Chancellor Kyle Carter Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Ken Kitts		

Members Present: Susan Cannata, Kyle Carter, Judy Curtis, Tony Curtis, Jose D'Arruda, Tom Dooling, Susan Edkins, Roger Guy, Scott Hicks, Brooke Kelly, Kenneth Kitts, Jonathan Maisonpierre, Cynthia Miecznikowski, David Nikkel, Maria Pereira, Jesse Peters, Joe Sciulli, Marisa Scott, Kim Sellers, Sara Simmons, Mike Spivey, Aaron Vandermeer

Members Absent: Polina Chemishanova, Rick Crandall, Dena Evans, June Power

Guests: Scott Billingsley, Stephen Bukowy, Carole Graham, James Doyle, Deborah Hanmer, Beverly Justice, Sharon Kissick, Tula Lightfoot, Mark Milewicz, Wendy Miller, Elizabeth Normandy, Melissa Schaub, Jack Spillan, David Young

Order of Business

- A. **Roll Call**
- B. **Approval of Minutes** The Minutes were approved.
- C. **Adoption of Agenda** The Agenda was adopted.
- D. **Reports from Administration**
 1. Chancellor—Kyle Carter

The Chancellor began with several announcements about campus holiday events, and encouraged the Senate and community to attend these events. Dr. Carter continued by mentioning that UNCP will be part of a pilot program to reduce tuition of border counties within a 50-mile radius of the university. The Chancellor reported that he is actively preparing the university for the process of transition with his retirement, and the departure of Provost Kitts and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Mark Canada. The Chancellor assured the Senate that there would be a smooth transition, stated that he was committed to placing the Senate and the Board of Trustees in an optimal position for the future. He also stated that he is considering an external interim Provost following the departure of Dr. Kitts. He also urged the Senate to participate in the upcoming public forums for the chancellor search.

2. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Ken Kitts

Dr. Kitts announced pending name changes for two university units. The Native American Resource Center to Museum of the Southeast American Indian, and the Regional Center to Office of Regional Initiatives. The Provost stated that the departure of Dr. Mark Canada for a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at IU Kokomo will leave vacancy in largest academic unit at UNCP. Dr. Canada is expected to be here until March of 2015. The Provost also announced that that recent student appeals in cases of academic dishonesty have revealed disconnect with requirements of UNC Code. Dr. Kitts is monitoring the Spring 2015 enrollment closely, both for immediate budget impact. His goal is to have fall-to-spring shrinkage rate of 7% or less. He reported that the Board of Trustees had approved raising the tuition and fees, and the proposal was waiting on approval by the Board of Governors.

E. Reports of Committees

1. Operations Committees

a. Executive Committee—Scott Hicks

Dr. Hicks announced that Provost Kitts accepted the offer of the presidency at the University of Northern Alabama; Chancellor Carter has announced his retirement, after more than 40 years in higher education, to begin July 1; and Dean Canada has accepted the offer of vice chancellor for academic affairs at Indiana University, Kokomo. He thanked them for their service, and wished them the best as they begin the next chapters in their lives.

Dr. Hicks represented the Senate at the November meetings of the UNC Faculty Assembly and Board of Trustees Educational Planning & Personnel Committee. He referred the senators to Mario Paparozzi's report on the meeting of the UNC Faculty Assembly. He added that system administrators are working to create system-wide standardized assessments of critical thinking and writing, and encouraged the Sanate to take part in upcoming webinars and workshops related to the development of assessment instruments in these areas. System administrators seek faculty support and assistance in developing competency-based degree programs, expanding online, strategizing international experiences for students, and

determining credit for prior learning. At the EPP Committee meeting, Trustee Pearson was interested in learning more about expanding online teaching and learning.

The Senate's Committee on Faculty Governance and Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee join Provost Kitts and the Office of Academic Affairs in hosting an open meeting on the revised tenure and promotion policy and encourage the attendance of all faculty. The meeting will be held Jan. 27 from 3:30 to 5 p.m. in this room.

Dr. Hicks stated that he, The Provost, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Executive Committee remain committed to developing an academic strategic plan.

Finally, he accepted the Academic Affairs Committee's request to pursue the adoption of an electronic management system for the curriculum development and revision process and academic catalog. He will work with Provost Kitts, Associate Vice Chancellor Schaub, and others to ascertain potential options. He thanked Dr. D'Arruda and Dr. Martinez for their work in exploring this issue.

1. The Faculty Senate requests that the Board of Trustees name the Chair of the General Faculty to the Chancellor Search Committee (Appendix B in the agenda).
Motion approved 19-0-0
 2. The Faculty Senate requests the Chancellor Search Committee to make public the finalists for the position of Chancellor and to partner with the Faculty Senate in engaging the General Faculty in meeting and assessing the finalists (Appendix C in the agenda)
Motion approved 19-0-0
 3. The Faculty Senate recommends that University administrators fully update the rosters and chairs and include all minutes and agendas of all University committees on University Governance websites (Appendix D in the agenda)
Motion approved 18-1-0
- b. Committee on Committees & Elections—Susan Cannata
Dr. Cannata announced the Senate election results for 2015-18 June Power (ART), Jesse Peters (LETT), Carol Higy (EDN), Marilu Santos (NSM), Xinyan Shi (SB&S), and Beverly Justice, David Young, Cliff Mensah (At Large)
 - c. Faculty Governance Committee—Beverly Justice

2. Standing Committees

a. Academic Affairs Committee—Jose D'Arruda

1. The Speech Test shall be removed as a requirement from the General Education program, and as a graduation requirement effective immediately. (Appendix E in the agenda)

Motion approved 19-0-0

2. The policy on midterm grades shall be revised such that faculty shall submit midterm grades by the close of business on the Monday after Fall Break in the fall semester and by the close of business the Monday of Spring Break in the spring semester (Appendix F in the agenda)

Motion approved 19-0-0

Motion: That the Academic Affairs Committee consider tethering the withdraw deadline to the week of advising

Motion approved 11-6-2

b. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee—Sara Simmons
Dr. Simmons reported that FIAC is working on a campus smoking policy. The Faculty Evaluation and Review Subcommittee is continuing to work on the revisions of the promotion and tenure policy.

c. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee—Brooke Kelly
Dr. Kelly reported that SACL is working on the interim suspension policy.

3. Special Committees – No Special Committees

F. UNC Faculty Assembly Report (Appendix G in the agenda)

G. Teacher Education Committee (Appendix H in the agenda)

H. Graduate Council (Appendix I in the agenda)

I. Other Committees (Appendix J in the agenda)

1. Academic & Financial Aid Appeals Committee
2. Advising & Retention Council
3. Athletic Grant-in-Aid Review Committee
4. Athletics Hall of Fame Committee
5. Bookstore Advisory Committee
6. Campus Appeal Board
7. Campus Judicial Board
8. Campus Health & Safety Committee
9. CARE Team
10. Commencement Speaker Committee
11. Committee on Substance Abuse Prevention

12. Data Standards Committee
 13. Emergency Operations Committee
 14. Equal Employment Opportunity Committee
 15. Faculty Grievance Committee
 16. Faculty Research Advisory Board
 17. HEALTH (Workplace Wellness) Committee
 18. Holiday Gala Committee
 19. Homecoming Committee
 20. Honorary Degree Committee
 21. Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee
 22. Institutional Review Board
 23. Integrated Marketing Committee
 24. Intellectual Property Committee
 25. Pembroke Day Committee
 26. QEP Committee
 27. Residency Appeal Committee
 28. Sexual Misconduct Advocacy & Resource Team
 29. Space Use & Property Acquisition Committee
 30. SPA Grievance Committee
 31. Strategic Enrollment Planning Council
 32. Student-Athlete Transfer Committee
 33. Student Grievance Panel
 34. Student Services Committee
 35. Sustainability Council
 36. Task Force on Teaching Excellence
 37. Textbook Committee
 38. Traffic Appeal Board
 39. Tuition & Fee Review Committee
 40. Tuition Surcharge & Refund Appeal Committee
 41. University Athletics Committee
 42. University Calendar Committee
 43. University Honors Council
 44. University Oversight Committee
- J. Unfinished Business** - No unfinished business
- K. New Business** - No new business
- L. Announcements** - No announcements
- M. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn passed 18-0-0

Meeting adjourned 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Roger Guy, Secretary

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix B

With the support of faculty and administration following the Jan. 27 open forum, the Executive Committee asks for the Senate's approval to amend promotion and tenure guidelines and policies as follows: All references to "academic program" or "program" shall be stricken from the Faculty Evaluation Model, replaced by "department."

Background

In accordance with a UNC system mandate that all campuses review their promotion and tenure guidelines and policies at least every five years, Chancellor Carter convened a Promotion & Tenure Review Committee in fall 2012. In his charge to the committee, Chancellor Carter stated, "The ultimate goal will be to clarify policy and procedures to assure consistent and fair promotion and tenure decisions to benefit faculty." During AY 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the Committee reviewed promotion and tenure policies at system campuses, surveyed UNCP faculty, and drafted a set of recommendations.

In spring 2014, the Committee presented its recommendations to the Faculty Senate. It advocated that Departments should create and adopt disciplinary statement(s); eliminate Peer Evaluation Committees, to be replaced by Departmental Evaluation Committees to evaluate all candidates for promotion and tenure in a department; expand the Promotion & Tenure Committee; and include the Provost as a nonvoting member of the PTC.

During a special called meeting of the Faculty Senate chaired by Chancellor Carter in April 2014, the Faculty Senate discussed these recommendations. At its subsequent meeting May 7, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved these recommendations:

1. Proposal 1: Departments will draft and submit disciplinary statements for approval by the appropriate Dean and the Provost.
2. Proposal 2: All tenured faculty in an academic program will vote on each candidate for tenure. All tenured faculty in an academic program will vote on each candidate for promotion, provided that they hold academic rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate. Voting will be conducted by secret ballot.
3. Proposal 3: The department chair will conduct an independent evaluation of each candidate separate from the program faculty. The chair does not vote with the program faculty.
4. Proposal 4: The size and scope of the campus wide Promotion and Tenure Committee will be expanded from five to nine members to create broader disciplinary knowledge.
5. Proposal 5: The initial recommendation on a candidate will come by vote of the tenured faculty in the candidate's academic program. The Peer Evaluation Committee will function as part of this process. The PEC's report and recommendation becomes advisory to the tenured faculty, with the vote

of the tenured faculty representing the first formal stage of the evaluative process.

During summer 2014, Provost Kitts and the outgoing Chairs of the Senate met to incorporate these recommendations into the University's Faculty Evaluation Model contained in the Faculty Handbook. Following the Senate's receipt of the revised handbook, Chancellor Carter and Provost Kitts presented the revised guidelines and policies to the Board of Trustees, which approved the revisions and transmitted the amended policies to the Office of the President of the UNC system.

Current Concerns

Faculty report that to date, they have not engaged in dialogue as to their membership in or affiliation with "academic programs." Their difficulties in forming programs stem from a variety of questions, such as whether programs are to be constituted according to teaching, research, or service and whether faculty might belong to multiple programs within or across departments.

Moreover, faculty report that departments have been widely inconsistent in their development of Disciplinary Statements for Promotion & Tenure. Some departments have engaged all departmental faculty in drafting a shared statement; some departments have engaged some departmental faculty in drafting a single statement, while other departments have engaged some departmental faculty in drafting multiple statements; some departments have engaged faculty but have not begun drafting a statement; and some departments have neither engaged departmental faculty nor begun drafting a statement. In response, the deadline for submission of Disciplinary Statements has been delayed.

Shared Consensus on a Path Forward

It is imperative in the interest of consistency, clarity, and equity that the University move forward in implementing promotion and tenure guidelines and policies that have administrative support, have been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate, and are workable and tenable across diverse departments and disciplines.

To that end, and with the support of faculty and administration, the Executive Committee asks for the Senate's approval to amend promotion and tenure guidelines and policies as follows: All references to "academic program" or "program" shall be stricken from the Faculty Evaluation Model, replaced by "department." For more information, please see the appendix to this memo, in which proposed changes are highlighted in magenta.

The implications of this revision are as follow:

- The articulation of Disciplinary Statements for Promotion & Tenure are delinked from program affiliation, thus allowing needed flexibility in their authorship and revision as necessary.

- Because Disciplinary Statements are delinked from program affiliation, their status as advisory documents is affirmed.
- PECs shall make their report available and advisory to the voting-eligible faculty of the department, not simply the voting-eligible faculty of a program, per the Faculty Evaluation Model's existing guidelines and policies regarding their constitution and responsibilities.
- Thus, more faculty now shall play a role in adjudging their peers' promotion and tenure, for the revision expands faculty voting rights beyond program affiliation to departmental appointment.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if I may provide further information or explanation.

In the following markup of the Faculty Handbook's promotion and tenure guidelines and policies, revisions effected by this motion are highlighted in magenta. Material highlighted in yellow and turquoise reflect previously approved revisions.

Optional Departmental Evaluation Plan (p. 70)

An acceptable plan must (a) adhere to the guiding principles and procedural objectives in this document; (b) conform to all deadlines established herein; (c) 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; (d) be approved by a two-thirds majority of the department's full-time faculty; and (e) be approved by the Faculty Senate. The plan must conform to the department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure as approved by the appropriate Dean and Provost. 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 for examination by all faculty members.

Guiding Principles (pp. 70-71)

All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth 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 as described in the department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. 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.

Disciplinary Statements are drafted using the form provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and submitted for approval by the appropriate Dean and the Provost. These statements create a common understanding of university expectations for faculty. These statements serve as a model and guide for faculty as

they negotiate the path toward promotion and tenure and aid in the evaluation of candidate performance at all levels of the review process. Disciplinary Statements shall be reviewed by departmental faculty every five years on a schedule that coincides with the Chancellor's review of promotion and tenure policy. Changes recommended by departmental faculty require the approval of the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. Faculty applying for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure shall be evaluated using the Disciplinary Statement in place at the time of their initial appointment. Faculty applying for promotion to full professor shall be evaluated using the Disciplinary Statement in place at the time of their promotion to associate professor (70-71).

Evaluation of Teaching (p. 72)

Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review 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 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). Reference should be made to activities that are unique or unusual discipline-specific attributes of teaching as described in a department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure.

Evaluation of Scholarship (p. 73)

Scholarship is evaluated primarily against specialized criteria appropriate to the disciplines of each department and consistent with a department's evaluation plan. Discipline-specific attributes with regard to scholarship are described in a department's Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. 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 for work in progress. 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.

Evaluation of Service (p. 73)

Service is divided into three categories: 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. Unique or unusual discipline-specific attributes are described in a department's Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure.

The Faculty Member Being Evaluated (p. 75)

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 his or her performance. 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 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 are taken into account by evaluators in developing overall performance evaluations. Evaluators also take into account a department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. In all formal evaluations, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by the Dean, Department Chair, or the Peer Evaluation Committee.

Tenured Faculty in a Department (p. 76)

The initial recommendation on a candidate for tenure and/or promotion will come by vote of the tenured faculty in the candidate's department. All tenured faculty in a department will vote on each candidate for promotion, provided that they hold academic rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate. Individual faculty members shall, on a case-specific basis, recuse themselves from the review and voting process if there is a conflict of interest due to a familial, amorous, or financial relationship with the candidate. The department chair will not participate in this vote.

There must be at least three tenured faculty members available to vote in each case under review at the departmental level. In cases where this threshold is not reached using the process described above, the dean, in consultation with the department chair, shall appoint tenured faculty from allied disciplines to reach the threshold of three voting members.

Faculty eligible to vote on promotion and tenure applications will have access to the candidate's portfolio, inclusive of all PEC reports and any candidate rebuttal, before voting occurs. It is expected that voting faculty will review and consider the portfolio prior to expressing a summative judgment through the vote.

Eligible faculty have a professional obligation to vote on promotion and tenure decisions. All voting will occur by secret ballot. A tally of the vote of the tenured faculty will be recorded on the appropriate form and included in the candidate's portfolio for consideration by all evaluative parties above the level of department chair.

The Peer Evaluation Committee (p. 76)

The Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC) will function as part of this process in the vote of the tenured department faculty. The PEC's report and recommendation becomes advisory to the tenured faculty, with the vote of the tenured faculty representing the first formal stage of the evaluative process.

A Peer Evaluation Committee's first task is to elect a chair who then notifies the Department Chair of his or her election. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report that in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion will become advisory to the tenured faculty in the department, as well as contract renewal evaluations and in post-tenure review evaluations. ...

In preparing the Peer Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Peer Evaluation Committee must use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale and a department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s).

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (p. 77)

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with Department Chairs and Deans to develop a uniform set of norms for interpreting the meaning of the Standard Performance Rating Scale. These norms will necessarily represent some discipline-related variations across departments, especially in the area of scholarship. Discipline-specific attributes of faculty performance are described in the department's approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. Beyond such variations, no Department Chair should be permitted to use standards that deviate from the general norms and practices of the University.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated (p. 82)

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure must submit a portfolio and a Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/aa/forms/>) to the Department Chair by August 29. The Peer Evaluation Committee will be formed from tenured faculty within the candidate's department to best match the disciplinary and subdisciplinary expertise of the candidate. The candidate shall be assured her or his nomination of one member of the committee, so long as the assured nominee is qualified. The remaining two members of the PEC will be appointed to the PEC by the chair after consultation with the tenured faculty. When there are insufficient

tenured faculty within the program to constitute a PEC, the dean, in consultation with the chair, will appoint additional members from allied disciplines.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair (p. 83-84)

Department Chairs are responsible for convening members of the tenured faculty to announce candidates for promotion and/or tenure and to receive notices of recusal from consideration of individual cases. All tenured faculty in a department will vote on each candidate for tenure. All tenured faculty in a department, provided that they hold academic rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate, will vote on each candidate for promotion. Individual faculty members should, on a case-by-case basis, recuse themselves from the review and voting process if there is a conflict of interest due to a familial, amorous, or financial relationship with the candidate. The Department Chair will not participate in this vote. Once the PEC has been charged, the Department Chair will exit the proceedings and play no further role in committee deliberations and actions with regard to individual cases.

The Department Chair obtains the completed Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form from the candidate. (Forms available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/aa/forms/>.) The Peer Evaluation Committee will be formed from tenured faculty within the department to best match the disciplinary and subdisciplinary expertise of the candidate. The Department Chair is obligated to appoint the candidate's assured nominee, so long as the nominee is qualified. The remaining two members of the PEC will be appointed by the Department Chair after consultation with the department's tenured faculty. When there are insufficient tenured faculty within the program to constitute a PEC, the dean, in consultation with the chair, will appoint additional members from allied disciplines. Department Chairs from departments other than that of the evaluated faculty member may also serve on Peer Evaluation Committees. The members of the Committee should be faculty whose rank is equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate. Faculty members in phased retirement are eligible to serve. ...

The Department Chair must conduct an independent evaluation of each candidate separate from the department faculty, prepare a report, and make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. In completing this report, the Department Chair considers the faculty member's self-evaluation, supporting documentation, student evaluations, and classroom observations. Other input from students, colleagues, external sources, and University administrators may also be used. The Standard Performance Rating Scale is to be followed in making the final recommendation. See the Format for Evaluation Reports for the areas to be addressed in the Chair's Evaluation Report for tenure and/or promotion.

Responsibilities of the Program and Department Faculty (pp. 84-85)

All tenured faculty in a department will vote on each candidate for tenure. All tenured faculty in a department will vote on each candidate for promotion, provided that they hold academic rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate. The emphasis on academic program is designed to ensure that the tenured faculty

most knowledgeable of the candidate's discipline have an opportunity to participate in the review and vote. In cases where departments comprise more than one degree program or where disciplinary boundaries are unclear, the department chair will consult with the tenured faculty of the department to determine program membership for voting purposes. The department chair will not participate in these votes. ...

Each application for promotion and tenure must be reviewed by no fewer than three tenured faculty members at the departmental level. In cases where this threshold is not reached using the process described above, the Department Chair will notify the dean as soon as possible, who, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall appoint tenured faculty from allied disciplines until it is assured that each candidate will reach the threshold of three voting members.

Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee (pp. 85-86)

Under the guidance of its chair, the Peer Evaluation Committee is charged with preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report based on the the portfolio submitted by the faculty member undergoing evaluation for tenure and/or promotion and classroom observations. A Peer Evaluation Committee's first task is to elect a chair, who then notifies the Department Chair of his or her election. The Committee chair is responsible for conducting meetings, ensuring that all pertinent provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model are followed, using standard parliamentary procedure in reaching all major decisions, ensuring confidentiality of the proceedings, and preparing and distributing the Committee's report to the tenured faculty in the candidate's department. The Department Chair provides to the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee the candidate's portfolio. ...

The Committee's report consists of a narrative Peer Evaluation Report; a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form; and any minority report. The Committee chair prepares the report, obtains the signatures of other members on the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, and provides the candidate with signed and dated copies of the Peer Evaluation Report and of the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. Within three days, the Committee chair obtains the candidate's signature on one copy of the Peer Evaluation Report and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. The PEC chair will place these materials, including any candidate rebuttal, in the portfolio and submit it to the department's tenured faculty.

Principles and Criteria (p. 90)

All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook) and departments' approved Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. Thus all "Principles and Criteria" relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in that document are also relevant to the post-tenure evaluation process and consequently are not repeated in this present document. These include principles and definitions, criteria, and documentation for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

The report of the Department Chair and the tally of the vote of the department faculty are independently submitted to the Dean. The Dean shall place these materials in the candidate's portfolio and check completeness and proper placement of materials prior to additional reviews.

Typical Calendar of Events for Tenure and/or Promotion (pp. 96-99)

Early September The Department Chair meets with the voting-eligible faculty of the department to announce candidates, emphasize the need for confidentiality and alignment of actions with UNCP policy and guidelines, and announce the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committees (PEC).

Mid-September to early
November Observation of the candidate's teaching by the Department Chair and members of the PEC. If the faculty member is teaching online, provisions must be made for observation of online teaching.

The PEC deliberates on all materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation that is advisory to the voting tenured faculty in the department. A report is drafted and the PEC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form is completed and signed by the PEC members. Two copies of the PEC report, including any minority reports, are transmitted to the faculty member by the PEC Chair. The faculty member signs the reports and the Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form acknowledging content but not necessarily agreement. The faculty member retains one signed copy of the report and has 3 business days to write a rebuttal if desired.

The PEC Report, any rebuttal, and the candidate's portfolio are transmitted to the department's voting faculty.

Voting departmental faculty will review and consider the portfolio and the PEC report, including any rebuttal, and express a summative judgment through a vote by secret ballot. A tally of the vote of the tenured faculty will be recorded on the appropriate form and included in the candidate's portfolio for consideration by all evaluative parties above the level of department chair. The candidate will sign one copy of the form and retain one copy acknowledging receipt but not agreement.

The Department Chair prepares and signs an independent report and completes and signs the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal form.

Two copies of the Department Chair's report are transmitted to the faculty member who signs the report and the Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form acknowledging content but not agreement. The faculty member retains one signed copy of the report.

Report signing
+10 business
days

The faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the tenured faculty department vote and/or Department Chair's report, if desired, to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college within 10 business days of signing the report.

Mid-November

The report of the Department Chair and the tally of the vote of the departmental faculty are independently submitted to the Dean. The Dean shall place the materials in the candidate's portfolio and check completeness and proper placement of materials prior to additional reviews.

Report signing
+10 business
days

Optional Rebuttal of Dean's Evaluation: If the Dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the Department Chair or department voting faculty, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Dean's evaluation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 business days after signing the report.

Mid-December

Dean submits the Dean's report, Chair's report, departmental faculty vote, PEC report, minority reports, rebuttals, and the candidate's materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the Office of Academic Affairs.

The PTC may request, if they desire, a counter rebuttal or corrected report responding to candidate's rebuttal to the departmental vote, PEC report, and/or Department Chair report.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria (pp. 108-109)

Recognizing that the quality of an institution rests largely on the quality of its faculty, it is imperative that there be at least minimal criteria to assist in tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty members need to be informed and to understand from the beginning of their employment that neither tenure nor promotion is a right or an automatic consequence of years of service, that each is earned through demonstrated excellence. In tenure decisions, consideration must be given additionally to the faculty member's potential for future contribution and institutional needs and resources. Discipline-specific degree requirements are described in a department's Disciplinary Statements for Promotion and Tenure. The

terminal degree is required for all professorial ranks beginning with the Assistant Professor level. While the criteria for tenure and promotion are largely the same and while tenure and promotion decisions might be made at the same time, it should be understood that they are separate decisions.

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix C

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

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly on January 24, 2015

Whereas:

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

Whereas:

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

Whereas:

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

Whereas:

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

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

Whereas:

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

Therefore Be It Resolved:

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

Be It Further Resolved:

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

Be It Further Resolved:

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

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix D

Proposal to amend FAP as it relates to BOG Award for Excellence in Teaching (p. 2/Nominations and Procedures/Item #5/p 127 Faculty Handbook)

(Endorsed by Faculty Governance Committee on 1-20-15)

(To be considered by Faculty Senate 2-4-15)

Rationale for Proposed Changes: Every year the FAC has BOG candidates that ask students and colleagues to submit only the required four letters of recommendation (2 from colleagues, 2 from former students), while other candidates ask multiple colleagues and/or students to write on their behalf and thus end up with as many as 15 letters of recommendation. While every FAC chair has instructed the committee members not to grant extra weight to these additional letters, it is inevitable that bias creeps into the process as long as the committee members still read them. Having the FAC chair pick only two letters from students and two from colleagues out of the bunch will only introduce another type of bias. Thus, the committee believes that explicitly limiting the number of letters to the first four received would restore the necessary balance in our deliberations and produce a more objective assessment of the candidates' portfolios.

Section II, Ch. 6, Faculty Awards Policy

The Board of Governors' Award for Excellence in Teaching

To underscore the importance of teaching and to encourage, identify, recognize, reward and support good teaching in the university, the Board of Governors created system-wide teaching awards designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." One recipient is selected annually from each of the 16 constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina to receive a stipend and a citation.

Criteria

Outstanding teaching faculty stand out in all areas associated with teaching excellence. Outstanding teachers demonstrate enthusiasm and commitment to professional growth. Outstanding teachers are effective through clear course materials and presentations, varied instructional strategies, and suitable measures of student learning. Outstanding teachers are successful at engaging student interest, challenging students, and eliciting high levels of student achievement. The Board of Governor's Award recognizes long-term teaching excellence while the UNCP Teaching Awards recognize teaching excellence in the two years preceding the granting of the award.

Eligibility

Those eligible for the BOG Award are full-time faculty members with tenure who have taught at least seven years at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. The recipient must have demonstrated exceptional teaching ability over a sustained period of time. Nominees must be teaching during the academic year in which they are nominated. A faculty member in Phased Retirement is ineligible for the BOG Award for Teaching Excellence. A faculty member on leave from teaching for one term during the academic year is eligible for consideration for the BOG Award for Teaching Excellence. The Board of Governors' Award can be granted only once to a faculty member. Nominees for the Board of Governors' Award who do not receive that award are automatically nominated for the UNCP Teaching Awards in the same year, and finalist *not*

chosen as the UNCP nominee for this award will automatically receive reconsideration for the following BOG Award cycle.

Nominations and Procedures

Each Fall the Chair of the Faculty Awards Committee emails a call for nominations with an attached nomination form to the faculty listserv, to the student listserv (via Student Affairs office), and to alumni (via Director of Alumni Relations) and corresponds with nominees according to the suggested schedule (see table below). Faculty, students, administrators and alumni are invited to submit nominations (by mail or electronically) to the Chair of the Faculty Awards Committee. Individuals cannot nominate themselves. Members of the Faculty Awards Committee cannot submit nominations. The nomination form or letter explains why the nominee deserves this prestigious award. The basis for nomination must be demonstrated excellence in teaching and a record of accomplishments and contributions in teaching over a sustained period of time.

To be considered for the Board of Governors Award a nominee must submit to the Chair of the Faculty Awards Committee a portfolio of supporting materials in a three-ring binder (1-2 inches) with dividers. Each candidate's portfolio includes the following materials:

1. a current resume or curriculum vitae
2. copies of self-evaluations for the three years preceding the nomination
3. copies of Department Chair's evaluations for the three years preceding the nomination
4. a statement of teaching philosophy (approximately four pages, double-spaced), including comments about how the philosophy is carried out in practice and how other professional activities relate to teaching
5. four letters of recommendation from two colleagues and two former students in support of the nomination (the faculty nominee leaves this notebook section empty). BOG candidates should ask that letters of recommendation be sent directly to the Chair of the Faculty Awards Committee who places these in the portfolio along with the original letter of nomination. **The FAC will only consider the first four letters of recommendation received (two from colleagues and two from former students). Any additional letters will not be considered in the FAC review of the candidates.**
6. copies of syllabi and relevant course materials, including assignments and representative student work, from three different regularly taught course.
7. the summary statistics and the comments from the five most recent sets of student evaluations; a set is defined as evaluations from all courses taught in a given academic year, as described under "Schedule of Student Evaluations" in the Faculty Handbook. (The faculty nominee leaves this notebook section empty and asks the Department Chair or Dean to submit these materials to the Chair of the Faculty Awards Committee)
8. documentation of any professional activities which exhibit a commitment to teaching beyond the classroom, such as publications, presentations, and grant writing. The Chair of the Awards Committee places the nomination letter, support letters, and the student evaluation reports in the portfolio.

After naming two finalists, the Committee will conduct classroom observations of both finalists. After selecting the BOG nominee, the Committee will forward to the Office of Academic Affairs the portfolio of the nominee and a 500-word letter in support of the nominee. The name of the nominee must remain confidential until the UNC BOG announces the statewide awards. At the Faculty Appreciation Dinner, the BOG Award winner assists the Provost in presenting Faculty Awards.

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix E

9.3 Program Proposal: Replace MGT 5300 Human Resources with MGT 5362 International Business in the MBA Core Program requirements.

Rationale: This change will better prepare students for the needs and demands of an increasingly international business community. MGT 5300 Human Resources will remain an elective.

Dept vote: 22 for; 0 against; 0 abstain

Affect others: No

Additional Resources: No

Additional Resources required:

Affects Degree Pathway: Yes

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

Catalog Copy: See below

9.4 Program Proposal: Create MBA concentration in Supply Chain Management using existing core and four existing courses (MGT 5210, MGT 5350, and ITM 5370).

Rationale: Aid in expanding MBA program and provide niche offering for the Graduate School in a growing field.

Dept vote: 20 for; 0 against; 2 abstain

Affect others: No

Additional Resources: No

Additional Resources required:

Affects Degree Pathway: Yes

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

Catalog Copy: See below

9.5 Program Proposal: Create MBA concentration in Financial Services using existing core and four existing courses (MKT 5450, BLAW 5280, FIN 5020, FIN 5050, FIN 5210).

Rationale: Aid in expanding MBA program and provide niche offering for the Graduate School in a growing field.

Dept vote: 20 for; 0 against; 2 abstain

Affect others: No

Additional Resources: No

Additional Resources required:

Affects Degree Pathway: Yes

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

Catalog Copy

Requirements for the Master of Business Administration		Sem. Hrs.
Professional Entrepreneurial Competence and Integrative Applications (all are		24

required) DSC 5100 Quantitative Methods ECN 5150 Managerial Economics FIN 5200 Managerial Finance MGT 5250 Organizational Theory & Behavior MGT 5300 Human Resources Management MGT 5362 International Business MKT 5400 Marketing Planning and Strategy ACC 5500 Managerial Accounting MGT 5750 Strategic Planning	
Professional Enhancement Courses (choose four* or complete one of the concentrations listed below) DSC 5120 Research Methods MGT 5270 Leadership and Change MKT 5450 Services Marketing ACC 5520 Tax Implications of Business Decisions BLAW 5280 Legal Issues for Managers MGT 5290 Entrepreneurship ITM 5370 Management Information Systems FIN 5210 Investment Analysis MGT 5300 Human Resources Management MGT 5350 Operations Management FIN 5250 Entrepreneurial Finance FIN 5020 Personal Financial Planning FIN 5050 Behavioral Finance BLAW 5320 Law for Entrepreneurs MGT 5700 Entrepreneurial Strategy MGT 5210 Supply Chain Management ACCS/BLWS/DSCS/ECNS/FINS/ITMS/MGTS/MKTS 5xxx Special Topics	12
	Total: 36

*In addition to the courses listed as Professional Enhancement courses, students may choose courses from another graduate program as substitutes to fulfill their required 4 elective courses (Requires permission from both MBA director and other program director).

Master of Business Administration with Concentration in Financial Services

Professional Entrepreneurial Competence and Integrative Applications Required Core (24 credits)

And

MKT 5450 Services Marketing
BLAW 5280 Legal Issues For Managers

And 2 of the following:

FIN 5020 Personal Financial Planning
FIN 5050 Behavioral Finance
FIN 5210 Investment Analysis

Master of Business Administration with Concentration in Supply Chain Management

Professional Entrepreneurial Competence and Integrative Applications Required Core (24 credits)

And
MGT 5210 Supply Chain Management
MGT 5350 Operations Management
ITM 5370 Management Information Systems
And one additional Professional Enhancement Course

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix F

The following revision reflects alterations to pp. 87 to 92 and 105-106 of the UNCP Faculty Handbook.

Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

Tenured faculty must undergo a cumulative review process every five years, ~~commencing from date of the tenure review~~ following the award of tenure (or ~~from date of review for following the award of promotion~~, if such review occurs within the five-year period after tenure review).

In consultation with department chairs, faculty shall develop five year goal(s) or plans that should include milestones that are aligned with annual performance evaluation. These plans can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair.

Waiver of the periodic performance evaluation review may be granted by the Provost for faculty who have made an official ~~irrevocable~~ decision to retire within two years from the date the review is scheduled to begin. Request for the waiver should be made in writing by the faculty member and must include notice of the confirmed date of retirement. In the event that personal or departmental exigencies create circumstances that warrant a delay in the planned retirement date, the faculty member must complete the performance evaluation review in the next year. ~~order to be eligible for continuance beyond the original retirement commitment.~~

The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose performance has been found satisfactory to “meet or exceed expectations,” (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three years for improvement of performance of faculty whose performance has been found ~~unsatisfactory~~ to “not meet expectations,” and (c) for those whose performance ~~remains~~ continues to “not meet expectations,” providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include a recommendation for discharge in the most serious cases of incompetence.

In response to the July 7, 2014, request of the Board of Governors and General Administration of The University of North Carolina ~~request to develop institutional policies and procedures with regard to post-tenure review~~, the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee (FERS) of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke has ~~prepared~~ revised this document outlining UNC Pembroke’s post-tenure review process. It is felt that this document adheres not only to the (1) ~~broad principles outlined in the Executive Summary as found in the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review that was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on 16 May 1997,~~ UNC Policy 400.3.3 Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, Revised June 20, 2014; (2) ~~the Guidelines as found in the Administrative Memorandum Number 371 issued by President C. D. Spangler, Jr. on 24 June 1997~~ UNC Policy 400.3.3 [G] Guidelines on

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, Revised June 20, 2014, and (3) Chapter VI of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina* (~~August, 1988~~), but **that it** also parallels and reflects the basic tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model as found in the UNCP Faculty Handbook. It must furthermore be noted that nothing in this Post-Tenure document prohibits the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor from making personnel decisions and taking personnel actions relative to reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal of faculty in warranted cases as indicated by the dismissal, non-reappointment, and termination policies of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 1) and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*.

In the words of the Executive Summary ~~cited above~~ **of the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review that was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on 16 May 1997**, "Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality" (I). This document further states that "institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the review process." In addition, it was noted in that report that the recommendations contained therein were intended "to strengthen the system of tenure and academic freedom while assuring on-going quality in the teaching, research, and service mission of the University of North Carolina."

Thus presented below are the necessary 1) principles and criteria upon which the UNCP post-tenure review process is based, 2) principles governing the roles of individuals and groups, 3) evaluation procedures to be followed, 4) forms needed for the cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, 5) a calendar of events for cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, and 6) a specified time line of not more than three academic years for the implementation of the review process.

Principles and Criteria

Faculty at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke who are tenured must undergo the cumulative review process outlined below every five years, **following the award of tenure**. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found ~~satisfactory~~ **to "meet or exceed expectations,"** (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found ~~unsatisfactory~~ **to "not meet expectations,"** and (c) for those whose performance ~~remains~~ **continues to "not meet expectations,"** providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include in the most serious cases of incompetence a recommendation for discharge. ("A faculty member, who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure, shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a

member of the faculty” (*The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, Section 603(1), <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>).

All UNCP faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale. This annual review includes a(n) (a) Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) Chair’s Evaluation Report, (d) Chair’s Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (e) Dean’s Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (f) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In addition to these reports, Evaluations for Contract Renewal and Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion include a Peer Evaluation Report. The latter of these evaluation processes also includes a Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Report. The comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review process outlined herein for tenured faculty in no way detracts from, replaces, or diminishes the importance and significance of this annual performance review. Furthermore, a comprehensive review undertaken for promotion decision purposes may preclude the need for the cumulative review process outlined in this document until the fifth year following such review. As is true for all phases of the UNCP faculty evaluation model, a faculty member has the right to receive written feedback and to submit a rebuttal to any aspect of reports submitted by Deans, Department Chairs or Peer Evaluation Committees.

Written feedback from the Department Chair and Dean should include recognition for exemplary performance. A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties. Any faculty response to a negative review will be forwarded with the packet to all subsequent levels of review.

In situations where a faculty member has received a rating of “~~unsatisfactory~~ **does not meet expectations**,” an individual development or career plan will be created that includes (a) specific steps designed to lead to improvement, (b) a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and (c) a clear statement of consequences should adequate improvement not occur within the designated time line. These consequences may include dismissal as allowed by the UNC Code, 603 (1). During the period allowed for improvement, the Department Chair or Dean (in the case of a Department Chair) will meet with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis to review progress toward meeting the development plan’s specifications. If the faculty member’s duties are modified as a result of an ~~unsatisfactory~~ “**does not meet expectations**” rating, the revised duties are specified in the development plan.

All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook). Thus all “Principles and Criteria” relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in that document are also relevant to the post-tenure evaluation process and consequently are not repeated in

this present document. These include principles and definitions, criteria, and documentation for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Principles Governing the Roles of Individuals and Groups for Post-Tenure Review

The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

All tenured faculty will undergo a cumulative review process every five years ~~commencing from date of the tenure review~~ following the award of tenure. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is promoted, this cumulative review will not be necessary until the fifth year following the promotion review. When tenured faculty apply for promotion and undergo post-tenure review at the same time, separate decisions will be made on each. As indicated in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model, the faculty member's self-evaluations should be "a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degrees of success associated with his or her performance." As is also stated therein, the annual weights assigned to each area by the individual being evaluated are to be taken into account by subsequent evaluators. Furthermore, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspect of the reports submitted by the Department Chair or the Peer Evaluation Committee or Dean.

Students

As is the case with all evaluation procedures at UNCP, student evaluations, while thought to play a prominent role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching, do not by themselves provide sufficient information to judge fully a faculty member's performance as a teacher. Hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness at UNCP involves a variety of types of documentation. (For more information on the role that students play in the evaluation process at UNCP, see the section above on "Student Evaluation of Instruction.")

The Peer Evaluation Committee

The department or unit selects the Peer Evaluation Committee by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit. The faculty member being evaluated cannot make the final selection of Committee members. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report to the Dean of the faculty member's college or school. This group is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. **Following completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee's work, the Department Chair (or Dean, if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair) must consult with the Committee before completing his or her evaluation.**

The Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs)

The Department Chair (Dean of the Chair's school or college for Department Chairs), **subsequent to the completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee Evaluation and consultation with the Peer Evaluation Committee,** is responsible for writing his/her

own recommendations (see Format for Faculty Evaluation Reports), and submitting this document to the Office of Academic Affairs **Dean**.

The Dean of the Faculty Member's School or College

The Dean will review the reports from the Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee as well as any supporting materials and rebuttals. The Dean will assess the performance of the faculty member based on the materials presented and will complete the Dean's Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the Dean's recommendation and submit that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Based on the materials submitted by the Dean, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for taking appropriate actions concerning the status of each tenured faculty member who has undergone the cumulative review process. (For further information regarding the responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, see the section below on "Evaluation Procedures"). The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member, the faculty member's Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs), and the Dean of the relevant college or school, will also be responsible for constructing, monitoring, and evaluating ~~satisfactory~~ a **"meets or exceeds expectations" level** of completion of any plan for improvement of performance for any faculty member whose performance has been judged ~~unsatisfactory~~ to **"not meet expectations."** **The Provost must certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with policy and guidelines.**

The Chancellor

After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions as deemed appropriate. In situations where a tenured faculty member has received a rating of ~~unsatisfactory~~ **does not meet expectations,** and the identified deficiencies are not removed in the specified period of time, the Chancellor may impose sanctions, which may include discharge as allowed by *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, Section 603 (1).

Evaluation Procedures

The cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty provides a basis for the support and encouragement of excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found ~~satisfactory~~ to **"meet or exceed expectations,"** (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found ~~unsatisfactory~~ to **"not meet expectations,"** and (c) for those whose performance ~~remains unsatisfactory~~ **"does not meet expectations,"** providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which can include a recommendation for discharge. All tenured faculty will undergo this cumulative review process every five years. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is evaluated for promotion, this cumulative review may not be

necessary until the fifth year following the conclusion of that process. The cumulative review process includes the faculty member, the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Department Chair (~~Dean of relevant college or school in the case of~~ **or Dean's evaluation of the Department Chairs**), the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. **The institution will provide ongoing support and training for all post-tenure evaluators, including peer review committee members, department chairs or deans. The Provost will certify that required training has been conducted.**

At the point in time when the cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty process is to begin, the faculty member involved will be so notified in writing by his/her Department Chair or by the Dean of the relevant college or school if the review involves the Department Chair (see Calendar of Events below). The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school for Department Chairs) a copy of (a) Self Evaluations for the previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, (d) Dean's annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, (e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and (f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form . In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office for Academic Affairs).

The Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee in the manner described above, (b) calls this group together for its initial meeting in order to orient the members to the process, and (c) makes available to the members the materials cited above.

The responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be consistent with those described in the sections above on other evaluation processes. The Peer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school ~~for~~ **if Department Chairs is being evaluated**), ~~working independently of each other~~, are responsible for preparing and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form (available from the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/aa/forms/>) to the Dean of the faculty member's college or school and, through the Dean, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These reports, based on the various documents that have been submitted, will include a rating of the overall performance of the faculty member as ~~either satisfactory or unsatisfactory~~ **"exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations,"** and a narrative justification. If the ranking indicates ~~unsatisfactory performance~~ **"does not meet expectations,"** the Committee's report has the option of including specific suggestions that might lead to improvement. The faculty member undergoing this cumulative post-tenure review process will be given two completed, signed, and dated copies of each of these reports (the Peer Evaluation Committee's report and the Department Chair's report). Within three

days, the faculty member being evaluated returns one copy that has been signed and dated. This signature indicates merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he/she agrees with it. In all cases, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal to the Dean within ten days of having received these reports. The respective Chair (Peer Evaluation Committee or Department) submits these two reports to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college.

The Dean of the relevant college or school will review the reports from the Department Chair (if available the evaluated member is not the department Chair) and the Peer Evaluation Committee, including any supporting materials provided by the Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee and any rebuttals submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. The Dean will then complete the Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review, including his or her evaluation of the faculty member's performance as ~~satisfactory or unsatisfactory~~ "exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations." The Dean's Report will serve as a cover letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will include as attachments the reports from the Department Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee along with all supporting documents. Within three days, the faculty member will sign the Dean's Report, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. The faculty member will retain one copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation. The Dean will then forward his or her report, with the attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

If the Dean does not agree with the evaluation of the Chair and/or the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Dean must justify that judgment with appropriate comments. The faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal to the Dean's evaluation within 10 days of signing the report.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review the Dean's report, with the reports of the Department Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee and all supporting documents attached. In the event that the ratings in the reports submitted unanimously indicate ~~unsatisfactory performance~~ "does not meet expectations," the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will communicate this finding in writing to the faculty member, the Department Chair (unless the faculty member is the Department Chair), and the Dean of the faculty member's college or school. It will be responsibility of the Department Chair (or Dean if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair), in collaboration with the faculty member evaluated, to draw up an individual development or career (remediation) plan. The plan will include steps designed to lead to improvement in the faculty member's performance to a ~~satisfactory~~ "meets expectations" level, a specified time frame of not more than three academic years in which this improvement is to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement to a ~~satisfactory~~ "meets expectations" level of performance not occur within the specified time frame. After review and concurrence by the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the plan will be submitted to the Provost and

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who must approve the plan, taking into account the need for institutional resources to support the faculty member's efforts to remediate identified deficiencies in his or her performance.

At the end of the time period specified in the remediation plan, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member's Department Chair (Dean, if the faculty member is a Department Chair), and Dean of the faculty member's college or school, will determine if the provisions of the plan have been met. If so, the faculty member will be judged ~~satisfactory~~ to have "met expectations" in performance for the current post-tenure review cycle. Note that the existence of a remediation plan does not defer or postpone any succeeding post-tenure review. If the provisions of the remediation plan have not been met and the required improvement not occurred, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall recommend sanctions to the Chancellor, under the provisions of University policy on Discharge and the Imposition of Serious Sanctions and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*. Such sanctions may include reduction in rank, discharge, or other disciplinary action.

If performance ratings unanimously indicate ~~satisfactory~~ **meets or exceeds expectations performance** or if there is disagreement among the reports on the ~~satisfactory or unsatisfactory~~ performance of the faculty member being evaluated, the Provost and Chancellor for Academic Affairs will accept the performance review report with no further action. In the case where a faculty member's performance is found to be ~~unsatisfactory~~ "not meet expectations," the Provost will take appropriate action (s). If any elements of ~~unsatisfactory~~ performance that "do not meet expectations" have not been improved to a ~~satisfactory~~ "meets or exceeds expectations" level in the specified period, the Provost's action may include discharge as specified by *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina* Section 603 (1).

[...]

Typical Calendar of Events for Post-Tenure Review

The events listed below are intended as guidelines; dates may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found elsewhere in this document and in the full UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model. If a date listed in this table falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically moved to the next business day.

DATE	EVENT OR DOCUMENT
April 15	Notification: Department Chair notifies faculty member that the post-tenure review process will occur during the following academic year.

August 1	Optional Promotion Review: If a faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to a required post-tenure review, the faculty member must notify the Department Chair by this date.
August 15	Evaluation Announcement: If the faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to the required post-tenure review, the Department Chair notifies the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the impending promotion evaluation by this date. The faculty member should receive a copy of this notification.
August 29	Submission of Materials: The faculty member presents the Department Chair with the required documents. [In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office of Academic Affairs).]
September 7	PEC Formation: The Department Chair announces the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC).
September 17	Transmittal of Materials: By this date, the Department Chair meets with the PEC, reviews its charge, and gives the PEC the candidate's materials. The PEC elects its chair after meeting with the dept chair.
September 17 – November 1	Optional observation of teaching (when deemed appropriate) is carried out by Department Chair and members of the Peer Evaluation Committee. The PEC independently deliberates on all materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation. The PEC Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form is completed by the PEC. (Section II, Chapter 2)
November 5	Two copies of the PEC Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation form are transmitted to the faculty member.
Report transmittal + 3 business days	Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from PEC. The faculty member retains one signed copy.
November 5	Department Chair, after consultation with the PEC , completes the Chair's Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form. (Section II, Chapter 2)
November 5	Two copies of the Chair's Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation form are transmitted to the faculty member.

Report transmittal + 3 business days	Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from Department Chair. The faculty member retains one signed copy.
November 8	PEC and chair reports are submitted, along with the candidate's materials to the Dean
Report transmittals + 10 business days	[Optional] Faculty member being evaluated submits rebuttal to report(s) to the Dean.
December 1	For candidates undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC post-tenure report forms, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean's Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review (Form 4-12.M). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean's recommendation and submits that recommendation, with all attached post-tenure materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
January 15	For candidates not undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC reports, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean's Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review (Form 4-12.M). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean's recommendation and submits that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
February 15	Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs confers with the Dean concerning outcome of evaluation process
March 15	Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs gives recommendations to Chancellor.
December 1	Following successful outcome of Tenure/Promotion a Five Year Plan is submitted to the Chair (Dean, if Chair was evaluated).

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix G

Faculty Assembly Notes

January 9, 2015

Remarks by President Ross:

- Next week, the board will be discussing:
 - Tuition and fee increase proposals.
 - The current 5% cap on tuition and fee increases was passed last year.
 - A campus security fee to pay for recommendations made in the UNC campus safety report that came out two years ago.
 - A pilot program for reduced (in-state) tuition for border counties. The pilot involves ECSU and UNCP.
 - How to handle proposed budget issues related to centers and institutes; 90% of current institutes should not feel any impact.
 - Work that needs to be done with the general assembly for the next budget cycle.
 - What role the board of governors should be in the chancellor search committee process.

- UNC experiences incremental increases in costs over which it has no control (e.g., healthcare costs). The UNC system has to find money within existing budgets to pay for these incremental costs. These kinds of incremental cost increases often absorb funds that have been saved through increased efficiencies in other areas.

- The new senior VP Academic Affairs at GA will start January 26th.

Presentation by: Kiernan Mathews, COACHE:

- Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) and UNC collaboration (Kiernan Mathews, COACHE)
 - COACHE and UNC have worked together since 2005
 - COACHE conducts surveys on numerous topics that are related to higher education, faculty-centered issues, etc.
 - COACHE produces data and reports about institutional outcomes and actions at institutions that implement policies and practices that are grounded in data produced by COACHE.
 - COACHE has recently gathered data about provosts are talking about when they talk about faculty.
 - On minds of provosts:
 - Shared governance and distributive leadership.
 - Mentoring associate professors.
 - How do we create more/better/diverse leaders among our own?
 - What is the proper role of non-tenure track faculty in governance?

- There are several ways that COACHE data and reports can assist the faculty assembly.
- This is a link to a COACHE report on faculty job satisfaction: https://oira.auburn.edu/factbook/survey/coache/2013-14/COACHE_2014_Provost_Report_Auburn_University.pdf.
- Recently COACHE has increased its interest faculty perceptions about what shared governance is, or should be.
- This is a video about COACHE that was referenced during the presentation: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sGFwG9Y3nk4>.
- COACHE data can be used to support budget requests.
- Data are important only when somebody in charge really wants something to happen.
- Things we should be mindful of regarding COACHE:
 - Who is our COACHE liaison? Should be others engaged beyond the provost.
 - Is there a COACHE team – faculty must be involved.
 - Did anything change as a result of prior COACHE data?
 - Monitor response rates for COACHE surveys.

Presentation by UNC Kate Henz, UNCGA Associate Vice-President for Academic Policy, Planning, and Analysis:

- Board of Governors routinely asks for information on faculty teaching workload.
- The UNC system uses the University of Delaware Study to gather data on teaching workload. This enables comparisons with other universities included in the Delaware study.
- Teaching workload data are differentiated to accommodate the diverse missions of individual campuses (UNCP is a Masters (Comprehensive) I university).
- Data included in the Delaware study reveal that faculty teaching workload within the UNC system has not changed as a result budget cuts, with the exception of ECSU.
- Sections and credit hours are the easy things to measure at the UNC system level. UNCGA needs campus/department level data in order to capture other activities that are part of faculty workload, because section and credit hour data only tell part of the workload story.

Discussion on recent revisions to post tenure review policies (Steve Leonard, UNC-CH; Gregory Starett, UNCC; Linda Wilson-Jones, FSU; Warwick Arden, Interim UNCGA SVPA):

- All campus senates have passed resolutions opposing some parts of these revisions.
- There are ways of making the policy better by tweaking it at local campuses. Some of the remarks from the panel and the audience mentioned the following:

- Peer review should stay in the process.
- Preserve the autonomy of faculty by making as many decisions about performance evaluations at the department level. The same should apply to five year performance improvement plans.
- The five year performance improvement plan should be a statement of mutual expectations.
- There is a need to protect institutions from faculty who “may not be pulling their weight.”

Report provided by Mario Paparozzi

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix H

Faculty Senate Report Graduate Council February 4, 2015

Office for Graduate Studies

The Graduate Council met on January 26, 2015 in the UC Annex, Room 203. The following information may be particularly relevant to the Faculty Senate.

- As of August of 2015, undergraduate students who receive financial aid may receive that aid for graduate courses taken towards the completion of their undergraduate program of study (this is not currently the case). This is important because: *With prior approval, up to 6 hours of graduate coursework taken while an undergraduate student may count towards one's graduate degree (passed in November).*
- The MSN program will eliminate the GRE/MAT requirements for applicants for the 2015-16 academic year. The department will assess the impact of this action before determining entrance exam requirements for subsequent years.
- Spring Enrollment Numbers: 745 graduate students (up three from last spring).

	Spring 14	Spring 15
New Students	68	79
Continuing Students	674	666
Totals	742	745

Announcements:

- Graduate Appeals Committee will meet February 18.
- The Graduate Student Research Poster Session 2015: March 31, 2015, 5:30 to 7:00, UC Annex.

[Information/Sponsorship form](#)

Next Graduate Council Meeting: Monday, February 16, 2015, 3:00 pm, UC Annex Room 203

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix I

Committee Name: Faculty Research Advisory Board (FRAB)

Committee Description: The FRAB is a continuing committee of the Senate.

Committee Membership: “It shall consist of not more than seven members to serve three-year staggered terms. The members will be nominated by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and confirmed by the Senate. The Board shall elect a Chair from its membership” (UNCP Faculty Constitution, Art. VI, Sect. 10). According to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Art. VI, Sect. 6, members “shall be selected on the basis of demonstrated experience in research, scholarly or creative activity and be reflective of a diversity of disciplines.”

Committee Duties: FRAB “shall advise the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor with respect to issues affecting faculty research, scholarly and creative activity[;] ... propose initiatives that support faculty research, scholarship and creative activity; consider issues related to these activities submitted to it by the faculty; and monitor the general campus climate for such efforts” (Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Art. VI, Sect. 6).

Committee Meetings: “The Board shall meet at least once a semester and more frequently if needed” (Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Art. VI, Sect. 6).