

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 11, 2013

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met April 11, 2013 in Room 102 of Floyd Science Building at 3:30 p.m.

President Lee called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies:

Cameron Gren for Senator Figueroa from Chemistry and Industrial Hygiene,
Glenn Marvin for Senator Davison from Biology,
Brenda Webb for Senator Statom from Physics and Earth Science, and
Shilpa Dasgupta for Senator Stenger from Mathematics.

Senator Barrett moved the adoption of the agenda with the amendments under New Business:

- D. Suggested Faculty Handbook change and
- E. Shared Governance EC.

Senator Loeppky seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Peterson moved the approval of the March 14, 2013 minutes. Senator Gafford seconded. The motion passed.

President Cale began with a word of apology concerning the language used within last month's discussion of the two incidents of alleged rape on campus. He stated that he was glad to see the proposed Campus Safety Task Force on the agenda. He urged inclusion of each campus constituency on the task force.

President Cale shared that last week when he attended the Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting he was surprised with a discussion concerning whether he should attend the regular Faculty Senate meetings. He indicated concern about closing the meetings and whether it could be done legally.

Vice-President Thornell reported that following his discussion of online learning last month, an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* discussed the sensitive nature of the topic. Some faculty have a negative attitude of online learning due to the lack of assurance of quality. He stated that he looks forward to recommendations from the Distance Learning Committee.

REPORTS:

A. Standing Committees:

1. Senator Hubler, chair of Academic Affairs Committee, presented the Final Grade Appeals Process. (See Attachment A) The proposal passed.
2. Senator Townsend, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, responded to the University Tenure and Promotion Portfolio Committee recommendations. (See Attachment B) Faculty Affairs Recommendations for Faculty Handbook Section 2.5.3 p. 2-11, which had been moved and seconded in the March meeting, was presented again for senate consideration. After further discussion the senate unanimously approved the changes. Senator Franklin moved to suspend the rules to vote on the *Faculty Handbook* Section 2.2 Nepotism, p. 2-2. Senator Austin seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed. The wording for Section 2.2 passed. The senators were encouraged to take the remainder of the proposal back to discuss with their colleagues. Senator Townsend reported that all changes to the *Faculty Handbook* approved by President Cale are present in the document.
3. President Lee reported that the Constitutional Review Committee requested that senators encourage their faculty to vote on the changes to the Senate Constitution and Bylaws on May 2 before the luncheon in the Banquet Halls. (See Attachment C) There will be tables at each entrance with ballots and sign-in sheets.
4. The Faculty Attitude Survey Committee indicated their report is not ready and asked if they could conduct the vote electronically on whether to release the report to the entire faculty. The motion to conduct the vote on the release of the report passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- A. Brenda Webb moved the approval of the Isbell Scholar Resolution. (See Attachment D) Senator Hulsey seconded. The motion passed.
- B. The proposed deletion of the resignation section and the timeline change in retirement notification passed.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. President Lee presented the list of Senators with term expiring. (See Attachment E)
- B. Senators Franklin, Carrasco, and Townsend were selected for the Nominating Committee to present a slate of officers: President-Elect, Secretary, and two Board Members.
- C. Senator Peterson moved the approval of the resolution concerning the formation of a Campus Safety Task Force. (See Attachment F) Senator Williams seconded. It was clarified that the phrase “the president” refers to the university president. It was also clarified in the third paragraph to read “Faculty Senate Executive Board”. The motion

passed.

D. Senator Garfrerick moved to suspend the rules to vote on the proposed change to the *Faculty Handbook*. (See Attachment G) Senator Shadburn seconded. The motion to suspend the rules to vote passed. Senator Peterson moved approval of the resolution. Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed.

E. Brenda Webb presented changes to the Shared Governance document. The changes were approved.

INFORMATION ITEM:

Senator Martin moved to continue the practice of having open senate meetings. Senator Carnes seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Roden moved the meeting be adjourned. Senator Gafford seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

ATTACHMENT A

5.7 GRADING PRACTICES Final Grade Appeals Process

The grades awarded by a faculty member are expected to be based on sound academic standards, on sufficient and appropriate evaluations, and through orderly procedures announced to and understood by the student. Faculty retention of coursework records is recommended in 5.2 of the Faculty Handbook. The university grading system is defined in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. Appeals on allegations of academic dishonesty shall follow the steps in the Academic Honesty policy (see Undergraduate Catalog-)

The faculty member is the sole determiner of the grade awarded in a course* and is responsible for the justification of the grade. Students are entitled to an appropriate grade review on request, and students who question the grade received are referred directly to the faculty member for review. Should a student wish to continue further have a grade reviewed, the following process should be followed.

—Should the student, after cConsultation with the faculty member from whom the grade in question was received.

1. If the student, wishes to continue further review of the grade, he/she The student should submit the Final Grade Appeal form indicating the nature of the complaint contact to the department chair in the department where the course is housed and request a review of the assigned grade, indicating that an initial review has been performed by the faculty member issuing the grade. Final Grade Appeals form is available on the VPAA website.
2. Should the student, after consultation with the department chair, wish to continue further review of the grade, he/she should indicate this on the Final Grade Appeal form and contact the dean of the college where the course is housed and request a review of the assigned grade. The Final Grade Appeal form should be forwarded to the dean by the department chair.
3. At either the department chair and/or dean level the faculty member may be asked to 4ecomputed reevaluate the assigned grade. However, any change of grade is the sole prerogative of the faculty member.
4. If the student wishes to appeal further, i.e., to the VPAAProvost, in these rare and unusual circumstances the student shall indicate his/her decision on the Final Grade Appeal form. The Final Grade Appeal form will be forwarded to the VPAA by the dean. The VPAA will determine if the evidence is strong enough to warrant further review, i.e., the burden of proof is on the student to make a strong case that merits committee review. In this case ease will the appeal shall be forwarded to the university Grievance Committee (appointed by the President annually). Any members of the department where the grade appeal resides would be excused from this review. an ad hoc committee composed of faculty members appointed by the Dean of the College in which the course is housed. These Grievance committee will make a recommendation to the VPAAProvost. In rare and unusual circumstances changes in course grades may be initiated by the Provost/VPAA in consultation with the department chair and college dean where the

~~course is housed. In such cases, t~~

5. ~~Following the decision, of the Provost, the student and the faculty member must~~ shall be notified and provided a rationale for the ~~change~~ decision.

~~Proper grade changes are made by the instructor via e-mail to the Office of the Registrar or on the Change of Grade Form available in the Office of the Registrar.~~

~~1-6. All grades, and other academic appeals, shall be initiated no later than six weeks after the term in which the grade was issued. beginning of the next following fall or spring semester the end of the following semester after cause for the appeal occurred. If the problem remains unresolved at this level, further appeal may be directed through the established academic channels and grievance procedures. Grade distributions are prepared each term by level, college, department, and individual faculty member (coded), and the grade distributions are subject to review by the faculty member, chairs of departments, deans, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.~~

Faculty members are expected to exercise proper care in the determination and recording of grades. ~~Once submitted, a grade may be changed by the instructor only for correction of clerical or recording error. Change for other reasons requires review and approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.~~

~~2. To coincide with the grade appeals procedure, faculty members are required to keep all coursework records (see section 5.2 for description of course records) one full semester year after each course is taught. These records may include but are not limited to: examinations and answers; quizzes and answers; homework assignments; course papers; term papers; and essay assignments. Following this time period, these course records may then be disposed of properly. Not part of grade appeals process.~~

*Amendment proposed by the Faculty Senate Executive

Green highlighted = language proposed by the VPAA and Faculty Affairs committee

Blue highlighted = recommendations of the Academic Affairs committee

**University of North Alabama
Final Grade Appeals Form**

1. Background Information:

Name of Student _____ Student Number L _____

Phone _____ Email _____ Major _____

2. Course or Academic Evaluation: (please check)

___ Course Grade (provide course number & name) _____

___ Comprehensive oral exam ___ Comprehensive written exam ___ Thesis defense

Course Term: ___ Fall ___ Spring ___ Summer ___ Year

Course Instructor: _____

Grade Received or Academic Action Taken: _____

Desired Outcome: _____

3. Nature of Complaint: (Check the grounds for the appeal that applies to this case)

___ Arithmetical or clerical error

___ Arbitrary or inequitable evaluation on the part of the instructor

___ Substantial failure of the instructor to follow course syllabus or other announced grading policy

___ Other (Briefly state) _____

On a separate page or pages, explain your reason(s) for filing this complaint. In particular, describe how the grounds indicated above apply in this case. Attach any documentation that supports your complaint. **Clarity and thoroughness in documentation are important factors in determining whether this complaint will be dismissed or heard by the appropriate administrative unit.**

Number of pages attached: _____

Have you attempted to resolve this matter with the instructor? ___ Yes ___ No

Was your attempt to resolve this matter with the instructor completed? ___ Yes ___ No

Date of informal meeting with instructor: _____

Outcome of meeting with instructor (If no meeting took place, explain why): _____

Is this appeal to the department chair within the required 6-week time frame? ___ Yes ___ No

(Note: Deadline is 6 weeks after the end of the term in which grade was issued.)

Grade Appeals Form Received by: _____

(Signature: Department Chair)

(Date)

A COPY OF THIS SIGNED AND DATED GRADE APPEALS FORM HAS BEEN RETURNED TO ME:

Student Signature: _____

Date: _____

4A. Result of Appeal to the Department Chair

Date of meeting with Department Chair _____

Outcome of meeting:

- Grievance was resolved.
- Grievance was not resolved.

Explanation: _____

4B. Student Decision: (if grievance was not resolved after meeting with department chair):

- The student accepts the original grade given.
- The student wishes to file an appeal to the Dean (*original forwarded to Dean*).

The student acknowledges receipt of signed and dated copy of this document showing the student's decision.

_____	_____
Student Signature	Date signed
_____	_____
Department Chair Signature	Date signed

5A. Result of Appeal to the College Dean

Date of meeting with the Dean _____

Outcome of meeting:

- Grievance was resolved.
- Grievance was not resolved.

Explanation: _____

5B. Student Decision: (if grievance was not resolved after appeal to the Dean):

- The student accepts the original grade given.
- The student wishes to file an appeal to the VPAA (*original forwarded to VPAA*).

The student acknowledges receipt of signed and dated copy of this document showing the student's decision.

_____	_____
Student Signature	Date signed
_____	_____
Dean Signature	Date signed

6A. Result of Appeal to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs

Refer appeal to Grievance Committee

Yes (if yes, see 6B)

No (if no, see 6C)

6B. Results of Appeal to Grievance Committee

Date of meeting of Grievance Committee _____

Recommendation of Grievance Committee to VPAA

_____ Original grade of instructor should be upheld.

_____ Modification(s) to original grade of instructor should be made.

Suggested modification(s) _____

Explanation: _____

Signature: Chair of Grievance Committee

Date signed

6C. VPAA Decision:

_____ Original grade of instructor is upheld.

_____ Grade is changed from _____ to _____ (*forward grade change to registrar*).

Signature: Vice-President of Academic Affairs

Date signed

Date written notification of decision sent to student, instructor, department chair, and dean:

(attach copy of written notification)

ATTACHMENT B

Response to Recommendations from the University Wide Tenure and Promotion Portfolio Committee

Faculty Affairs Recommendations – Faculty Handbook Section 2.5.3 p. 2-11

4. ~~A cover letter (optional) in which the faculty member may indicate which of the areas in item 3 should be weighed more heavily or less heavily than others.~~ **A cover letter in which the faculty member indicates degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of work specific to his/her area, in order to demonstrate quality of scholarship for university-wide committee members who may be unfamiliar with the field, as well as indicating which of the areas in item 3 should be weighed more heavily or less heavily than others.**

5. Departmental and/or college promotion guidelines.

Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health, this committee will consist of all tenured members in a candidate's department who are not applying for promotion. The department chair will not serve on the committee; however, the department chair will convene the first meeting and supervise the election by secret ballot of a chairperson, from among the members of the committee. In Collier Library and Educational Technology Services, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's area who are not applying for promotion. The dean/director will then perform the functions of the department chair as outlined above.

The peer promotion committee members will review the candidate's portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 1. **This written evaluation, composed by the candidate's peer committee and department chair, should provide information directly addressing the degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of scholarly outlets cited within the candidate's portfolio. These should include, but not be limited to, the quality of academic journals in which manuscripts or scholarly works appear, as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate).** In the event that the peer promotion committee is evaluating more than one candidate, it may choose whether or not to rank the candidates.

For departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health where two or fewer tenured faculty are eligible for the peer promotion committee, the department faculty will complete a committee of three, adding to that department's tenured faculty (not applying for promotion), other tenured faculty from the college.

Responsibility of the Department Chair

When a faculty member applies for promotion, it is the responsibility of the department chair (or dean) to form a peer promotion committee by October 20. The department chair will evaluate the portfolios of the candidates in his or her department and prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (**highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified**) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The department chair will forward the candidate's portfolio, the peer promotion committee's recommendation, and his or her own recommendation for each candidate to the college or area dean no later than November 15. **This written evaluation, composed by the candidate's ~~peer committee and~~ department chair, should provide information directly addressing the degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of scholarly outlets cited within the candidate's portfolio. These should include, but not be limited to, the quality of academic journals in which ~~manuscripts or~~ scholarly works appear, as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate).** The department chair will also provide written feedback to each candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's portfolio when the final promotion decisions are announced in March. It will be the responsibility of the department chair to confirm the candidate meets the university's eligibility requirements (e.g., years of service) for promotion to the rank being sought.

Report Re: Year End Process and Procedures Review

To: Marilyn Lee (cc: John Thornell, VPAA)

From: University Tenure and Promotion Committee

Submitted: March 11, 2013

The following is a report from the UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee in response to the charge as detailed in the current Faculty Handbook: “The committee will perform a year-end process/procedures review and prepare a report to be distributed at all levels of the process. This report should include what worked well, what did not work, and remediation recommendations.”

Development of current recommendations and report: Following review of portfolios for tenure (Fall 2012) and promotion (Spring 2013), a request was made of committee members to submit issues or suggestions relative to the process as described in the handbook. One issue was also brought forth from the VPAA. The chair of the committee compiled all issues and distributed a copy to committee members for review. The committee met on March 5 to discuss items on the agenda. The Tenure and Promotion Committee forwards the following recommendations as a product of this meeting. Issues are described followed by committee recommendations. All committee members have reviewed this document and it is forwarded with approval from all. Please contact me should clarification be necessary.

Kind Regards,

Matt Green – UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair on behalf of the UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee

Issue 1: The current system for rating candidates for promotion (“less,” “moderately,” “highly” qualified) lacks precision making differentiation difficult. A candidate whose portfolio warrants a rating better than “moderately qualified,” but is not at a level considered “highly qualified” MUST be rated incorrectly – either in the candidate’s favor or at a level lower than the actual subjective rating of the individual’s application.

Recommendation

- It is recognized that an expanded system (4 ‘levels’ rather than 3) is currently under consideration by the Faculty Senate. The recent review of applicants accentuated the explicit need for a system that permits greater distinction than what is permitted in the currently utilized system. Consequently, this committee re-emphasizes unanimous support for this agenda item in the Faculty Senate.
-

Issue 2: Regarding promotion to Full Professor, wording in the Faculty Handbook indicates that “...the applicant shall have established a sustained and consistent record of excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.” Current evaluation approach does not differentiate regarding success/productivity in independent categories (teaching, research/scholarship, service). Consequently there is potential for an area to be lacking, yet potentially overshadowed by exceptional performance in alternate areas.

Recommendation

- Candidates applying for promotion to FULL professor should be evaluated independently for EACH of the 3 categories to determine whether ‘a record of excellence’ has been achieved across the board. During evaluation, specific attention should be given to the departmental and/or college criteria applicable for respective candidates. Evaluation in the independent categories should occur at all levels beginning with the peer committee in the department. It is noted that the Faculty Senate is currently considering adoption of a novel evaluation system involving four rather than three categorical ratings (highly, moderately, less qualified). The current recommendation from this committee is that, regardless of the evaluation tool, applicants pursuing rank of full professor be assessed independently for each of the three principle roles of the university faculty (teaching, research/scholarship, service) as a model.
-

Issue 3: There exists great variation within academic disciplines with regard to the quality of a given piece or ‘body’ of scholarly work. Local vs. national/international artistic performances as well as the ‘tier’ system for peer-reviewed journals are examples. It is unreasonable to expect Tenure and Promotion committee members charged with evaluation of applicants from all disciplines to be familiar with ‘quality’ of a single piece or a body of scholarship for an applicant, yet this information may be critical in conducting an accurate assessment of candidates.

In March, 2012 the Faculty Senate approved a wording change essentially requesting greater detail from peer promotion committee and department chairs of each candidate applying for promotion. Exact wording is below.

Previous Language

The--- (peer promotion committee, chair, and dean) will review the candidate’s portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean), indicating the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. Proposed Language

Adopted Language

The --- (peer promotion committee, chair, and dean) will review the candidate's portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended.

Recommendation

It is recommended that evaluation letters composed by a candidate's peer committee and department chair provide information directly addressing the quality of scholarship cited within the candidate's portfolio. That would include, but not be limited to the quality of academic journals in which manuscripts or scholarly works appear as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate). Further, it is recommended that candidates be encouraged to provide similar information regarding quality of scholarship as part of the portfolio.

Issue 4: Currently, evaluation of applicants is completed via review of a hard-copy portfolio which is handled through the office of the VPAA. Having only hard copies creates multiple issues. Transporting portfolios from the VPAA's office to a holding location in the library where committee members can review is an issue. Further, portfolios can only be viewed by committee members during library hours. Portfolios also contain information (letters from the applicant's peer committee, department chair/head and respective dean) deemed sensitive and the existence of hard copies presents a confidentiality issue if a portfolio were lost or misplaced.

Recommendation

It is recommended that a mechanism be formulated such that portfolios are submitted electronically with access restricted to those permitted to view the portfolios as part of the evaluation process. Creation of access codes could be distributed to appropriate individuals during the review period. These codes could be set to expire upon completion of the review.

Issue 5: There is no formal wording in the Faculty Handbook or otherwise providing guidance during the review process when conflicts of interest arise. Conflicts of interest may take various forms from collegial to familial relationships existing between candidates and members reviewing a candidate's portfolio. Further, it is noted that that such conflicts of interest are possible at any level of review beginning at the departmental committee of peers.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the appropriate sub-committee of the Faculty Senate develop guidelines clarifying procedures for handling conflicts of interest throughout the review process. It is recommended that the established policy (in the Faculty Handbook 2.2) regarding nepotism be considered as it is plausible that an extension of this existing policy may provide a foundation for handling conflicts of interest.

Issue 6: Current wording in the Faculty Handbook outlines minimum requirements for a faculty member to be eligible for promotion to the next rank. Wording exists indicating that exceptions may be made.

Faculty Handbook 2.5.2

Exceptions: In rare and unique circumstances, a petition by the department for a waiver of the aforementioned credential and experience requirements for any rank may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean.

However, as seen from the wording, there is no detail regarding precisely what circumstance constitutes grounds for exception. Further, there is no clear procedure regarding evaluation of a candidate granted an exception. That is, it is not clear at what point an exception should be granted from the VPAA for the applicant to be considered eligible and the respective portfolio be forwarded through the review process.

Recommendation

While it is acknowledged that wording should permit some degree of interpretation, it is recommended that clarification be made regarding the minimum circumstances under which an exception can be considered.

Further, pursuant to this issue, it is clear that the VPAA makes the decision on whether to permit an applicant an exception. It is recommended that the timeline for an exception be clarified. If an exception (which permits an applicant's portfolio to be evaluated) is granted, this should be completed prior to the portfolio being vetted through the evaluation process. Specifically, it is recommended that candidates receiving an exception from the VPAA should be required to provide documentation that the exception has been granted by the VPAA within the portfolio submitted to their Department Chair by the October 10 deadline established in the Faculty Handbook. Portfolios lacking written documentation that an exception has been granted should not be permitted to continue in the review process.

Issue 5 University PRC Recommendations from March 2013

It is recommended that the appropriate sub-committee of the Faculty Senate develop guidelines clarifying procedures for handling conflicts of interest throughout the review process. It is recommended that the established policy (in the Faculty Handbook 2.2) regarding nepotism be

considered as it is plausible that an extension of this existing policy may provide a foundation for handling conflicts of interest.

Faculty Handbook Section 2.2 Nepotism, p. 2-2

2.2 NEPOTISM

The Alabama Nepotism statute provides that:

No officer or employee of the state or of any state . . . institution . . . shall appoint any person related to him within the fourth degree of affinity or consanguinity to any job, position or office of profit with the state or with any of its agencies Alabama Code, Section 41-1-5 (1975).

This statute is applicable to all university positions, including non-tenure-track, adjunct, and student positions.

Relatives may be employed as peers within an academic department or administrative unit; however, no supervisory relationship may be allowed between persons who are related within the fourth degree by blood or marriage. The President's Executive Council may, for compelling reasons, make limited exceptions to this policy, but its reasons for doing so must be reflected in its report to the Board of Trustees Executive Committee.

Proposed Language from the Faculty Affairs highlighted in yellow below

The Alabama Nepotism statute provides that:

No officer or employee of the state or of any state . . . institution . . . shall appoint any person related to him within the fourth degree of affinity or consanguinity to any job, position or office of profit with the state or with any of its agencies Alabama Code, Section 41-1-5 (1975).

This statute is applicable to all university positions, including non-tenure-track, adjunct, and student positions. Furthermore, any committee membership, i.e., University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee, in which there may be a possible conflict of interest due to relationships shall be subject to this statute.

Issue 1: From the University PRC

Current guidelines provide little clarification regarding the years which should be considered when evaluating candidates.

Recommendation

- Incorporate wording at appropriate points in guidelines which clarifies that the totality of a candidate's work is expected to be strong overall with particular emphasis placed on productivity since the candidate's last promotion.

[Responses to this recommendation suggested by Faculty Affairs are in blue.](#)

Issue 3: From the University PRC

Regarding promotion to Full Professor, wording in the Faculty Handbook indicates that “the appointee shall have established a record of excellence in teaching, in service to the university, the community, and the profession, and in scholarly or creative performance.” Current evaluation approach does not differentiate regarding success/productivity in independent categories (teaching, scholarship, service). Consequently there is potential for an area to be lacking, yet overshadowed by exceptional performance in alternate areas.

Recommendation

- Candidates applying for promotion to FULL professor should be evaluated independently for EACH of the 3 categories to determine whether ‘a record of excellence’ has been achieved across the board. Evaluation in the independent categories should occur at all levels beginning with the peer committee in the department.
It is noted that the Faculty Senate recently voted on revisions of this component of the handbook. A review of potential changes would not negate the current recommendation from this committee as the notion of requiring acceptable performance in all of the categories was consistent within the suggested revisions.

[Responses to this recommendation suggested by Faculty Affairs are in red.](#)

(from Faculty Handbook, Section 2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Promotion, Tenure, and Appointment, pp. 2-9 – 2-10; Section 2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion pp. 2-9 – 2-14):

2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Promotion, Tenure, and Appointment

Minimum Qualifications by Rank

1. Instructor/Visiting (open rank) Professor. Appointment to this rank requires possession of a master's or higher degree in the field of assignment. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching and for a successful academic career.

2. Assistant Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service; as well as for a successful career.

3. Associate Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as assistant professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the eight years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.

4. Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of 12 years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as associate professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the twelve years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have established a sustained and consistent record of excellence in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.

Exceptions: In rare and unique circumstances, a petition by the department for a waiver of the aforementioned credential and experience requirements for any rank may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean.

2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion

A. Faculty Members Who Are Not Department Chairs

The promotion process will be initiated when the faculty member submits an application and portfolio by October 10 to the department chair. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit documentation to confirm that he/she meets the minimum criteria for promotion to the next rank.

The portfolio will contain:

1. Application for Promotion (See Appendix 2.B)
2. Current Resume or Vita (maximum length five pages)
 - a. Education (Institution, major, minor, degrees awarded, and when)
 - b. College/university teaching or library experience as appropriate to field (include position and dates)
 - c. Other teaching or library experience (describe and include dates)
 - d. Other related experience (describe and include dates)

3. Supporting information for the following items, limited to a 10-page maximum**

- a. Teaching/Library Effectiveness
- b. Scholarly or creative performance
- c. University and community service
- d. Any other relevant information

**The candidate is provided the flexibility to use his or her own discretion as to how best to demonstrate effectiveness in the categories listed in item 3. In addition to addressing the essential portfolio components in the limits given above, the candidate may place material or objects referenced in the portfolio in a designated review area as established by the college dean. The additional referenced work may be reviewed by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion process.

4. A cover letter (optional) in which the faculty member may indicate which of the areas in item 3 should be weighed more heavily or less heavily than others.

5. Departmental and/or college promotion guidelines.

Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health, this committee will consist of all tenured members in a candidate's department who are not applying for promotion. The department chair will not serve on the committee; however, the department chair will convene the first meeting and supervise the election by secret ballot of a chairperson, from among the members of the committee. In Collier Library and Educational Technology Services, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's area who are not applying for promotion.

The dean/director will then perform the functions of the department chair as outlined above. The peer promotion committee members will review the candidate's portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 1. In the event that the peer promotion committee is evaluating more than one candidate, it may choose whether or not to rank the candidates.

For departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health where two or fewer tenured faculty are eligible for the peer promotion committee, the department faculty will complete a committee of three, adding to that department's tenured faculty (not applying for promotion), other tenured faculty from the college.

Responsibility of the Department Chair

When a faculty member applies for promotion, it is the responsibility of the department chair (or dean) to form a peer promotion committee by October 20. The department chair will evaluate the portfolios of the candidates in his or her department and prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The department chair will forward the candidate's portfolio, the peer promotion committee's recommendation, and his or her own recommendation for each candidate to the college or area dean no later than November 15. The department chair will also provide written feedback to each candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's portfolio when the final promotion decisions are announced in March. It will be the responsibility of the department chair to confirm the candidate meets the university's eligibility requirements (e.g., years of service) for promotion to the rank being sought.

Responsibility of the College Dean

The college dean shall establish a file of the promotion portfolios and all recommendations sent to the dean's office by the department chairs. Access to the portfolios shall be limited to the respective department chair, peer promotion committee members, and the dean of the college or area. It is the responsibility of the college or area dean to review and evaluate the individuals' portfolios as well as the recommendations of the peer promotion committees and department chairs. The dean will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The portfolios containing the dean's recommendations as well as all previous recommendations and actions on the promotion shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by January 10.

Responsibility of the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee

A university-wide portfolio review committee will serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. This committee is to be drawn from all five faculty constituencies (four colleges and Library/Educational Technology Services faculty). The committee will have nine (9) members consisting of a minimum of one (1) member (tenured Associate and Full Professors) from each constituency plus at-large faculty to total nine. The committee will select a vice chair to serve as assistant to the chair during the first year of a two-year term and to assume the role of chair during the second year. Annually, the Faculty Senate will identify a pool of at least 15 eligible members from all tenured professors at the Associate and Full Professor ranks for recommendation to the President to serve on this committee. From this pool of candidates, the President of the University will annually, in October, select members to serve for two (2) academic years. No faculty member from a faculty constituency will be appointed for additional terms

until the entire pool from that constituency has been exhausted. Only then may professors be appointed to serve another term. Exemptions from service should only be granted in extreme circumstances and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to, reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content; reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; ensuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various colleges, and specific departments are being met in concordance with one another with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; and concurring with, or not, the recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. The University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee will focus on the 10-page portfolio (including all forms as described in section 2.5.3). Supplementary materials will be maintained separately from those portfolios. The location of the supplementary materials will be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The language specified in section 2.5.3 with regard to evaluation of candidates' credentials [indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended] should be used at all levels and on all evaluation documents. The candidate should also include departmental and/or college promotion and tenure guidelines with the portfolio. All portfolios that are incomplete or not in compliance with the stated guidelines (section 2.5.3) will be considered as non-responsive and rejected. All portfolios submitted by eligible candidates, regardless of recommendation(s), will move through the entire process. The timeline for reviewing promotion materials can be found in Appendix 2.B.

As soon as the new committee membership is determined and constituted, the chair will call a meeting for the express purpose of orienting the committee, especially incoming new members, to the established procedures and guidelines for the committee. All members of the committee must participate in this orientation. Departmental criteria with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, unique college criteria and policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, and university policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, will be made available to each member of the committee. After orientation, the new committee will begin its work with review of promotion portfolios, followed by review of tenure portfolios. As soon as the portfolios become available, the chair will notify the committee of the location of the portfolios and the committee will begin the review process. Every member of the committee will review each portfolio submitted, regardless of recommendation and concurrence at previous stages in the process. After all members have reviewed the portfolios, the committee will meet en masse to discuss each portfolio. While all members of the committee will review all portfolios, in the event a consensus agreement cannot be reached by the committee, then only full professors will vote in making the final decision on a candidate for full professor. Upon reaching a decision for each portfolio, the chair will schedule a meeting of the committee with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. After discussing the portfolios with the committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will forward the committee's concurrence, or lack thereof, to the President.

The committee will perform a year-end process/procedures review and prepare a report to be distributed at all levels of the process. This report should include what worked well, what did not work, and remediation recommendations.

Responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review the candidate's portfolio and the recommendations from each peer promotion committee, department chair, and dean. By March 8, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will evaluate each candidate, indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended.

Following the decisions made by the President as outlined below, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will inform the college or area dean of the success or failure of the candidates as soon as possible, but not later than March 15. Candidates will be notified by the deans. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will remove all forms from portfolios and maintain them for safe keeping. Portfolios will be available for candidates to pick up no later than March 30.

Responsibility of the President

The President will review the individual portfolios and all recommendations. Based upon these, and in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the President will establish a tentative promotion list, which will be shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the academic deans for their final input. Informed by this process, the President will make the final decision on promotion for each candidate by March 15. The President will give due consideration in these decisions to any extraordinary circumstances, budgetary constraints, and fiduciary obligations to the University. In addition, the President shall try to ensure that the number of promotions (including department chairs) each academic college and Collier Library/Educational Technology Services receives is fair and equitable.

Proposed Language: From Faculty Affairs Committee

Minimum Qualifications by Rank

1. Instructor/Visiting (open rank) Professor. Appointment to this rank requires possession of a master's or higher degree in the field of assignment. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching and for a successful academic career.

2. Assistant Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service; as well as for a successful career.

3. Associate Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A

minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as assistant professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the eight years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, with emphasis placed on professional accomplishments since the last promotion.

4. Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of 12 years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as associate professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the twelve years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have demonstrated a sustained and consistent cumulative record of excellence in each of the three areas: teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, with emphasis placed on professional accomplishments since the last promotion.

Exceptions: In rare and unique circumstances, a petition by the department for a waiver of the aforementioned credential and experience requirements for any rank may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean.

2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion

A. Faculty Members Who Are Not Department Chairs

The promotion process will be initiated when the faculty member submits an application and portfolio by October 10 to the department chair. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit documentation to confirm that he/she meets the minimum criteria for promotion to the next rank.

The portfolio will contain:

1. Application for Promotion (See Appendix 2.B)
2. Current Resume or Vita (maximum length five pages)
 - a. Education (Institution, major, minor, degrees awarded, and when)
 - b. College/university teaching or library experience as appropriate to field (include position and dates)
 - c. Other teaching or library experience (describe and include dates)
 - d. Other related experience (describe and include dates)
3. Supporting information for the following items, limited to a 10-page maximum**
 - a. Teaching/Library Effectiveness

- b. Scholarly or creative performance
- c. University and community service
- d. Any other relevant information

**The candidate is provided the flexibility to use his or her own discretion as to how best to demonstrate effectiveness in the categories listed in item 3. In addition to addressing the essential portfolio components in the limits given above, the candidate may place material or objects referenced in the portfolio in a designated review area as established by the college dean. The additional referenced work may be reviewed by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion process.

4. A cover letter (optional) in which the faculty member may indicate which of the areas in item 3 should be weighed more heavily or less heavily than others.

5. Departmental and/or college promotion guidelines.

Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health, this committee will consist of all tenured members in a candidate's department who are not applying for promotion. The department chair will not serve on the committee; however, the department chair will convene the first meeting and supervise the election by secret ballot of a chairperson, from among the members of the committee. In Collier Library and Educational Technology Services, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's area who are not applying for promotion.

The dean/director will then perform the functions of the department chair as outlined above. The peer promotion committee members will review the candidate's portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. When preparing written evaluations for a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the peer promotion committee should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 1. In the event that the peer promotion committee is evaluating more than one candidate, it may choose whether or not to rank the candidates.

For departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health where two or fewer tenured faculty are eligible for the peer promotion committee, the department faculty will complete a committee of three, adding to that department's tenured faculty (not applying for promotion), other tenured faculty from the college.

Responsibility of the Department Chair

When a faculty member applies for promotion, it is the responsibility of the department chair (or dean) to form a peer promotion committee by October 20. The department chair will evaluate the portfolios of the candidates in his or her department and prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. When preparing written evaluations for a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the department chair should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The department chair will forward the candidate's portfolio, the peer promotion committee's recommendation, and his or her own recommendation for each candidate to the college or area dean no later than November 15. The department chair will also provide written feedback to each candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's portfolio when the final promotion decisions are announced in March. It will be the responsibility of the department chair to confirm the candidate meets the university's eligibility requirements (e.g., years of service) for promotion to the rank being sought.

Responsibility of the College Dean

The college dean shall establish a file of the promotion portfolios and all recommendations sent to the dean's office by the department chairs. Access to the portfolios shall be limited to the respective department chair, peer promotion committee members, and the dean of the college or area. It is the responsibility of the college or area dean to review and evaluate the individuals' portfolios as well as the recommendations of the peer promotion committees and department chairs. The dean will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. When preparing written evaluations for a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the dean should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The portfolios containing the dean's recommendations as well as all previous recommendations and actions on the promotion shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by January 10.

Responsibility of the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee

A university-wide portfolio review committee will serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. This committee is to be drawn from all five faculty constituencies (four colleges and Library/Educational Technology Services faculty). The committee will have nine (9) members consisting of a minimum of one (1) member (tenured Associate and Full Professors) from each constituency plus at-large faculty to total nine. The committee will select a vice chair to serve as assistant to the chair during the first year of a

two-year term and to assume the role of chair during the second year. Annually, the Faculty Senate will identify a pool of at least 15 eligible members from all tenured professors at the Associate and Full Professor ranks for recommendation to the President to serve on this committee. From this pool of candidates, the President of the University will annually, in October, select members to serve for two (2) academic years. No faculty member from a faculty constituency will be appointed for additional terms until the entire pool from that constituency has been exhausted. Only then may professors be appointed to serve another term. Exemptions from service should only be granted in extreme circumstances and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to, reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content; reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; ensuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various colleges, and specific departments are being met in concordance with one another with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; and concurring with, or not, the recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. The University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee will focus on the 10-page portfolio (including all forms as described in section 2.5.3). Supplementary materials will be maintained separately from those portfolios. The location of the supplementary materials will be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The language specified in section 2.5.3 with regard to evaluation of candidates' credentials [indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended] should be used at all levels and on all evaluation documents. The candidate should also include departmental and/or college promotion and tenure guidelines with the portfolio. All portfolios that are incomplete or not in compliance with the stated guidelines (section 2.5.3) will be considered as non-responsive and rejected. All portfolios submitted by eligible candidates, regardless of recommendation(s), will move through the entire process. The timeline for reviewing promotion materials can be found in Appendix 2.B.

As soon as the new committee membership is determined and constituted, the chair will call a meeting for the express purpose of orienting the committee, especially incoming new members, to the established procedures and guidelines for the committee. All members of the committee must participate in this orientation. Departmental criteria with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, unique college criteria and policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, and university policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, will be made available to each member of the committee. After orientation, the new committee will begin its work with review of promotion portfolios, followed by review of tenure portfolios. As soon as the portfolios become available, the chair will notify the committee of the location of the portfolios and the committee will begin the review process. Every member of the committee will review each portfolio submitted, regardless of recommendation and concurrence at previous stages in the process. When evaluating a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the university-wide portfolio review committee should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area. After all members have reviewed the portfolios, the committee will meet en masse to discuss each portfolio. While all members of the committee will review all portfolios,

in the event a consensus agreement cannot be reached by the committee, then only full professors will vote in making the final decision on a candidate for full professor. Upon reaching a decision for each portfolio, the chair will schedule a meeting of the committee with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. After discussing the portfolios with the committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will forward the committee's concurrence, or lack thereof, to the President.

The committee will perform a year-end process/procedures review and prepare a report to be distributed at all levels of the process. This report should include what worked well, what did not work, and remediation recommendations.

Responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review the candidate's portfolio and the recommendations from each peer promotion committee, department chair, and dean. By March 8, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will evaluate each candidate, indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. When evaluating a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area.

Following the decisions made by the President as outlined below, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will inform the college or area dean of the success or failure of the candidates as soon as possible, but not later than March 15. Candidates will be notified by the deans. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will remove all forms from portfolios and maintain them for safe keeping. Portfolios will be available for candidates to pick up no later than March 30.

Responsibility of the President

The President will review the individual portfolios and all recommendations. When evaluating a candidate's portfolio for promotion to full professor, the President should evaluate independently each area, teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service, to determine an established record of excellence for each area. Based upon these, and in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the President will establish a tentative promotion list, which will be shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the academic deans for their final input. Informed by this process, the President will make the final decision on promotion for each candidate by March 15. The President will give due consideration in these decisions to any extraordinary circumstances, budgetary constraints, and fiduciary obligations to the University. In addition, the President shall try to ensure that the number of promotions (including department chairs) each academic college and Collier Library/Educational Technology Services receives is fair and equitable.

ATTACHMENT C

**CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA
FLORENCE, ALABAMA**

PREAMBLE (no changes)

To promote the growth and improvement of higher education at the University of North Alabama and in the State of Alabama; to facilitate communication and cooperation among administrative and faculty personnel; and to insure the continuing development of our educational programs and policies, we, the faculty, do hereby adopt this Constitution and establish the Faculty Senate.

ARTICLE I. NAME (no changes)

The name of this organization shall be the Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama. As used in this Constitution, the term "faculty" means those who are eligible to vote for nominees for election to the Senate as specified in this Constitution.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSES (no changes)

It shall be the purpose of the Faculty Senate: (1) to achieve effective participation by the faculty in the governing of the University; (2) to exercise leadership for the faculty in developing proposals and making recommendations for the promotion, initiation, and implementation of sound policies and plans and to review periodically the policies and programs of the University; (3) to be available for consultation with the President and the Board of Trustees. Upon request, (4) to serve as an executive committee in fulfilling the purposes and function herein stated and in performing such other duties as may be assigned to the Senate by the faculty.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

A. The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama shall have its membership drawn from the following sources:

1. The Vice President of Academic Affairs shall be a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate.
2. **Each department offering academic credit shall elect from its members full-time faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions. For the purposes of apportioning representation and voting, Collier Library professional staff, Educational Technology Services professional staff, and Kilby School teaching staff shall each be counted as a department. Fractional teaching loads of part-time and adjunct faculty members shall be considered in determining the number of representatives from a department. In no case shall a department gain or lose a Senator as a result of one of its members being on leave. Each department shall be allowed to have at least one representative.**

Under this article, the following non – provisional bylaws to this Constitution may only be amended under the requirements detailed in Article VIII, Section A:

- A. Nominees for election and electors in each department shall be full-time faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions that are at least two-thirds non-administration.
- B. Election shall be by secret ballot in each department or staff. In the event that a department or area is electing more than one Senator, separate ballots shall be held for each Place as designated by the Secretary in accordance with Article IV, Section D, of this Constitution. Senators shall be elected by a majority of votes cast.
- C. If a Senator is absent and fails to provide a proxy for three consecutive scheduled meetings of the Faculty Senate (within one year beginning May 1), the President shall declare the position vacant and shall instruct the department concerned to elect a replacement to complete the unexpired term. The person having been removed will not be eligible for such election.

Under this article, the following provisional bylaws to this Constitution may only be amended under the requirements described in Article VIII, Section B:

- D. **Apportionment of department representation shall consist of members that are** at least two-thirds non-administrative, one representative for departments having 1 to 13 members, two representatives for departments having 14 to 22 members, or three representatives for departments having 23 or greater number of members.
- E. The term of service shall be for three years, except as provided for in Article III, Section F, below.
- F. Senators shall be eligible for re-election.

G. For the purpose of establishing staggered terms in departments with more than one Senator, when the Secretary has designated Places in accordance with Article IV, Section D, of this Constitution, elections for Place One shall be for a full three-year term, elections for Place Two shall be for an initial term of two years, and elections for Place Three shall be for an initial term of one year; after the initial terms, elections for each Place shall be for a full three-year term.

H. Election of Senators to the Faculty Senate shall take place during the last week in April.

I. Newly elected Senators shall take office on May 1.

J. Any unexpired term shall be filled by special election in the department involved. Changes in organization of the University, changes in departmental assignments, or reduction in the staff of a department that cause the department to have too many Senators to the Faculty Senate shall be cause for such department to elect from its Senators with continuing terms of office the number of Senators it is entitled to have.

K. Senate membership, excluding the officers, shall expire on April 30; the terms of officers who will no longer be Senators will expire May 31, with the possible exception of a President-Elect. The President-Elect will assume the position of President even if his/her term as Senator has expired. Officers whose Senate term has expired will not have a vote in any Senate matter after April 30, except that the President may vote to break a tie.

L. Representation in the Faculty Senate shall be determined on the basis of the faculty employed during the spring semester.

M. Departmental assignments of faculty members shall be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS (no changes)

The officers of the Senate shall be a President, a President-Elect, a Secretary, and two (2) Executive Board members. These five (5) officers shall constitute the voting membership of the Executive Board. Persons nominated for the position of President-Elect, must have at least one full year (beginning May 1) after the current year remaining of their present term in the Senate. The immediate past President shall be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Executive Board. In the event the Senate membership term of the immediate past President has expired and he/she had not been reelected by his/her department, he/she shall be also an ex officio, non-voting member of the Senate.

A. Election of Officers. During the last regularly scheduled meeting of the academic year, the Senate shall elect its officers from its elected membership. The officers shall be elected by a majority of votes cast by secret ballot. They shall take office on the next June 1 and shall serve until their successors assume office, but if an officer's term as an elected Senate member has expired before he/she is superseded as an officer, he/she shall not be allowed to vote.

B. Duties of the President. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Senate and of the Executive Board and perform other functions as necessary to his/her office.

C. Duties of the President-Elect. The President-Elect shall act in the absence of the President and shall become President of the Senate in the event that the President is unable to complete his/her term of office, in which case the Executive Board of the Senate shall select an interim President-Elect. The President-Elect shall normally assume the office of President on the second June 1 following his/her election.

D. Duties of the Secretary. The Secretary shall keep a permanent record of the minutes of all meetings of the Senate and the Executive Board. He/she shall be responsible for the distribution of copies of the minutes as directed by the Senate. The Secretary shall survey each department or area early in the spring semester to establish the number of seats to which it is entitled for the next academic year. In the event that two or more Senators are to be elected from a department, the Secretary shall designate the seats by Place number.

E. Duties of the Board Members. The Board Members shall attend and have power to vote in Executive Board meetings, shall assist the other officers, and shall perform such duties as may be assigned by the Executive Board.

ARTICLE V. FACULTY MEETINGS (no changes)

A. The President and/or President-Elect shall be available for consultation in the preparation of agenda and programs for regular and called meetings of the faculty and staff presided over by the President of the University or his/her designated representative. The Senate or Executive Board may request the President or his/her designated representative to call a faculty meeting. The President of the Senate, upon the specific authority of the Senate, may call and preside over a meeting of the faculty.

B. The President of the Senate or anyone authorized by him/her shall report to the faculty on policy recommendations or other Senate matters included in the agenda of regular or called meetings of the faculty.

C. The Senate shall receive for study, recommendation, and/or action any matter referred to it by action of the faculty. Such reference is to be encouraged especially when matters are presented for faculty action without adequate informational preparation.

ARTICLE VI. FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

Under this article, the following non – provisional bylaws to this Constitution may only be amended under the requirements detailed in Article VIII, Section A:

A. The incoming President shall appoint a member of the faculty to serve a one-year term as Parliamentarian, such term to begin June 1; the duties of the Parliamentarian shall be to interpret the application of Robert’s Rules of Order, Revised, in those instances when called upon by the President or other presiding officer.

B. In addition to the regular meetings (as provided in Article IV, Sec. B), the Senate shall hold an election meeting during the period May 1 – May 31 for the purpose of electing officers of the Senate and members of various Senate and University committees and panels.

C. The Senate shall elect a Nominating Committee at its regular April meeting (preceding the elections meeting provided above); this committee shall consist of three Senators elected by the Senate and shall report its nominations for officers of the Senate for the coming year at the elections meeting. Nominations for members of the Nominating Committee shall be made from the floor of the Senate and voting shall be done for one position at a time. Current Senate officers shall be ineligible for election to the Nominating Committee.

Under this article, the following provisional bylaws to this Constitution may only be amended under the requirements described in Article VIII, Section B:

D. The Senate shall: (1) report to the faculty on its own initiative or at the direction of the faculty; (2) establish such Senate committees as it deems desirable and determine the appropriate means for the selection of adjunct personnel to serve on such committees; (3) consult with the University Administration for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary duplication and providing for proper coordination and cooperation among committees and between the committees of the Senate and such other University committees as may operate separately and distinctly from those established by the Senate; (4) develop and continuously evaluate formal statements of recommended principles, practices, and procedures for more effective operation of committees; (5) make studies and develop recommendations regarding matters of faculty interest and welfare such as salary schedules, fringe benefits, leaves of absence, standards for promotions in rank, academic freedom, tenure policies, research teaching load, course and

curriculum requirements, academic standards, and requirements of re-admission, retention, and graduation.

E. The Senate shall meet once each month of the fall and spring semesters and at such other times as necessary. *Robert's Rules of Order, Revised*, shall govern the conduct of all business of the Senate and its Executive Board except as otherwise provided by the Senate.

F. When unable to attend a meeting of the Senate because of illness, assigned duties, or other good cause, a Senator may appoint from among the members of his/her department a proxy to attend the meeting in his/her stead. The Senator must send to the President or Secretary a written statement, signed by him/her, stating the reason for his/her absence and giving the name of the proxy. The written statement may be brought to the meeting by the proxy. In no case shall a proxy be seated until such a statement has been received by the President or Secretary. Upon being seated the proxy shall have, during that meeting, all the privileges of membership (making motions, debating, voting, etc.), restricted only by the Senate's rules of procedure and by any specific instructions given him/her by the Senator for whom he/she is a proxy.

G. Committees:

1. The President shall appoint four standing committees to serve one-year terms beginning June 1:

a. Committee on Faculty Affairs – this committee shall consist of seven faculty members including a Chairperson; its duties shall consist of considering and preparing a written report of its recommendations on any matter assigned to it by the Senate or by the Executive Board of the Senate.

b. Committee on Academic Affairs – this committee shall consist of seven members including a Chairperson; its duties shall consist of considering and preparing a written report of its recommendations on any matter assigned to it by the Senate or by the Executive Board of the Senate.

c. Faculty Attitude Survey Committee – this committee shall consist of five members including a Chairperson; its duties shall consist of preparing and administering a faculty attitude survey during the spring semester of each year and reporting on the results of such survey to the Senate.

d. Committee on Elections – this committee shall supervise departmental elections for the Senate at the request of the President or a department.

e. Members of standing committees do not have to be Senators; vacancies shall be filled by appointment of the President of the Senate.

f. The Chairperson of each standing committee shall be elected by members of that committee from among their group at their first meeting, the time and place to be set by the President of the Senate.

2. The Senate may elect or direct the President to appoint such additional committees as it deems appropriate.

ARTICLE VII. ADOPTION (no changes)

This Constitution shall become effective when adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the faculty present and voting at a faculty meeting called for the purpose, provided that two-thirds of the faculty are present at such meeting and provided that all faculty members will have been given at least ten (10) days in which to examine this constitution, and when after such approval by the faculty, it is approved also by the President of the University.

ARTICLE VIII. AMENDMENTS

A. **Non – provisional bylaws specified within each Article to** this Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting at a faculty meeting, provided that two-thirds of the faculty are present and provided that all faculty members will have been given copies of the proposed amendment(s) at least ten (10) days before such meeting. **In order to conduct senate business in a more efficient manner, this meeting may be conducted electronically.** Amendments adopted by the faculty shall become effective when approved also by the President of the University.

B. Provisional bylaws specified within each Article may be amended by a simple two – thirds vote of the Senators present at the last scheduled Senate meeting of any academic year and provided that all incumbent Senators or designated voting proxies will have been given copies of the proposed amendment(s) at least ten (10) days before such meeting. Amendments adopted by the Senate shall become effective when approved by the President of the University.

C. Proposed amendments, if any, shall be introduced to the faculty by the Senate. Any member of the faculty or administration may propose an amendment in writing to the Senate.

VOTE FOR CONSTITUTION CHANGE

As discussed in Faculty Senate on Thursday March 14th 2013, the senate executive has been working with an ad hoc committee for over three years to amend our constitution so that it will work better for the faculty at the UNA. The result of this hard work, led by Jeremy Stafford, is a proposed division of the constitution into structural (non-provisional) and operational (provisional) bye-laws. The only major change in the actual wording of the constitution is the addition of a bye-law to Article VIII:

B. Provisional bylaws specified within each Article may be amended by a simple two – thirds vote of the Senators present at the last scheduled Senate meeting of any academic year and provided that all incumbent Senators or designated voting proxies will have been given copies of the proposed amendment(s) at least ten (10) days before such meeting. Amendments adopted by the Senate shall become effective when approved also by the President of the University.

All other changes relate to wording that indicates if a bye-law is provisional or non-provisional.

In order to proceed with a vote on these constitutional changes the committee has proposed the following:

1. Each Senator (and department chair) receive a copy of the proposed constitutional changes.
2. Each Senator (and department chair) will provide a copy of the proposed Constitution changes to each department faculty member (excluding adjunct faculty) within 10 days of the University Wide Service Awards Luncheon on May 2nd in th^e GUC Banquet Halls.
3. The Service Award Luncheon will serve as a faculty meeting and voting will be conducted during the luncheon.
4. Each table at the luncheon will have a sign in sheet on which faculty members will be expected to sign their name. Each faculty member will obtain a ballot from the table where they are seated. After casting their vote on the ballot, faculty will place the ballot in the envelope provided at each table.

FACULTY BALLOT

Your senator has provided you with a proposed revised Faculty Senate Constitution. This is a ballot for you to vote. The motion is for approval of the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution. Please place a check mark in the box marked YEA if you are in favor of these proposed changes OR place a check mark in the box marked NAY if you are opposed to the proposed changes. Return this ballot to your department faculty senator. Thank you for participating in this important vote!!

YEA

NAY

ATTACHMENT D

FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION

April xx, 2013

TITLE: Support for the Raymond Isbell Scholars Program

AUTHOR: Faculty Senate

Whereas: Dr. Raymond Isbell, Professor and Chair of Chemistry and Industrial Hygiene, volunteered to teach his classes for one year after his retirement in 1997, and

Whereas: the Board of Trustees established permanent scholarship endowment funds to honor Dr. Isbell's volunteer service, and

Whereas: fourteen additional professors have followed Dr. Isbell's example and volunteered to teach their classes after their retirements, and

Whereas: to honor the volunteer service of these professors, the Board of Trustees has established permanent endowments with the money saved by delaying the replacements for these professors, and

Whereas: nineteen endowment funds totaling over \$1,500,000 have been established in honor of these professors' volunteer service, and

Whereas: the Board of Trustees has institutionalized this practice by naming these professors 'Raymond Isbell Scholars' and establishing a protocol whereby professors contemplating retirement can volunteer to become Raymond Isbell Scholars, and

Whereas: a bronze plaque with the names of all the 'Raymond Isbell Scholars' will be prominently displayed in Bibb Graves Hall near the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Therefore Be It Resolved: the University of North Alabama Faculty Senate endorses the Raymond Isbell Scholar Program and encourages professors contemplating retirement consider becoming a Raymond Isbell Scholar.

Item VII A.

ATTACHMENT E
SENATE OPENINGS

According to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

Election of Senators to the Faculty Senate shall take place during the last week in April.

I. Newly elected Senators shall take office on May 1.

Departments that have senate seats expiring

TERM EXPIRING SPRING, 2013

Jose Atencio
Will Brewer
Gabriela Carrasco
Paul Davison
Crescente Figueroa
Matt Fitzsimmons
Jerome Gafford
Greg Gaston
Victoria Hulsey
Kim Morris
Johnson Ogun
Leslie Peterson
Cynthia Stenger

Military Science
Nursing, Traditional
Psychology
Biology
Chemistry/Industrial Hygiene
History/Political Science
Management and Marketing
Geography
Elementary Education
Kilby Laboratory School
Human Environmental Sciences
English
Mathematics

ATTACHMENT F

Proposal for Faculty Senate Task Force

We affirm the need for the immediate formation of a task force empowered by the president to conduct relevant research on campus safety to provide comprehensive data that will guide a detailed and comprehensive plan of action for UNA. This plan of action will address areas of need as identified through research evidence. The Faculty Senate Executive (in consultation with staff senate and chair of SGEC) will identify the membership of this committee to include academic, staff, and student representation.

ATTACHMENT G

2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Promotion, Tenure, and Appointment

Faculty ranks of the University, including librarians, educational technologists and supervising teachers at Kilby School, are instructor, visiting (open rank) professor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Only positions at the assistant professor level or higher are considered tenure-track. All others are based on renewable appointment. Determination of rank is established at the time of initial appointment. The years of appropriate experience are calculated at the end of the academic year prior to appointment or submission of a promotion portfolio. Compensation for visiting (open rank) professors is determined by joint agreement of the department chair, college dean, and Provost/VPAA based on duties, needs of the University, and available funds.

The University understands that the interests and areas of emphasis for faculty members change as their career develops. It is the responsibility of departments, in cooperation with their respective deans, to develop guidelines for faculty professional growth that (1) adequately define for each faculty member what his/her departmental expectations are for promotion, tenure, and year to year success, and (2) are implemented through guidance provided by the department chair to the faculty member during the annual evaluation and at other appropriate times. It is the responsibility of the college deans and Provost/VPAA to monitor equity of expectations across the University.

The following criteria and procedures below do not apply to the Department of Military Science because of the special nature of that department. Faculty from the Department of Military Science will not serve on promotion committees.

Minimum Qualifications by Rank

1. **Instructor Visiting (open rank) Professor.** Appointment to this rank typically requires possession of a master's or higher degree in the field of assignment. ~~There shall also be evidence of potential for successful academic career.~~ For appointments without the master's or higher degree in the field of assignment, there must be evidence of related work experience in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes.
2. **Assistant Professor.** Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service; as well as for a successful career.
3. **Associate Professor.** Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as assistant professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the eight years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA.