

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

### **February 24, 2005**

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met February 24, 2005 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Blose called the meeting to order and recognized Ms. Sharon Warren, Proxy for Senator Wallace from Kilby.

The following senators were present: Adams, Bates, Blose, Brewton, Brown, Cai, Foote, Ford, Gaston, Gaunder, Hallock, Holley, Leonard, Loew, Makowski, Martin, McDaniel, Myhan, Parris, Richardson, Robinson, Rock, Roden, Thorne, Turner, VanRensselaer, Ward, Webb, and Wilson.

President Blose introduced Mr. Allan Flowers, new senator from the Department of Music.

The following senators were absent without proxy: Adler, Atkinson, Bruce, Crisler, Davidson, Fennell, Gorham, Takeuchi, and Tunell.

President Cale and Vice-President Newson were also present.

Senator Loew moved the adoption of the agenda. Senator Rock seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

President Blose introduced Gordon Stone from the Higher Education Partnership. Mr. Stone presented the history of the Higher Education Partnership with its beginnings in 1997, established by university presidents and lobbyists to provide a grass roots voice for education in Montgomery. It is an effort to allow the university perspective to be included in any debate concerning education. It is an opportunity to send a strong message that there is a large group viewing what is going on in Montgomery. For the first time in nearly two decades, the governor's budget request follows our request. The partnership supports the following:

1. The education budget is no less than last year.
2. Fund the legislated mandates for PEEHIP and retirement contributions
3. Provide a compensation pool of at least equal to percent given to other educational entities.
4. If there is a comprehensive bond issue, higher education be made a part of it.

Mr. Stone stated that we must continue to be a strong voice of encouragement, making sure that people know the value of the investment in higher education, and encouraging that the legislature kept things moving equitably. He encouraged attendance at the Higher Education Day rally next Thursday and urged senators to respond to their legislators on educational issues.

Senator Wilson moved the approval of the January 27, 2005 minutes. Senator Thorne seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- A. President Blose reported that the ACUFP meeting is scheduled for the Thursday and Friday after Higher Education Day in Montgomery. He and Senator Makowski, president of ACUFP, will be attending. Senator Makowski reported that Richard Lindsey, House Chair of Funding, Gordon Stone, the chair of the university presidents council, the head of ACHE, and Bill Jones, chief lobbyist for the University of Alabama system would be attending.  
Senator Barrett asked that faculty be encouraged to be lenient with students attending Higher Education Day.
- B. President Blose encouraged the faculty to complete the library survey they have received by email.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. President Cale reported he has talked with outside consultants, law firms, the legal council for the Texas State System, the State of Pennsylvania System consultants, and the Department of Justice training facility in Atlanta and asked for recommendation or guidance as to who to consult concerning the ADA policy. He proposed the use of a small committee which would consider and make recommendations concerning accommodations under the ADA policy and a method established to allow faculty asked to give accommodations access to data. He proposed:
1. Have training sessions for faculty and staff.
  2. Work with a small committee to finalize a new policy.
  3. Implement the new policy.

President Blose asked that faculty keep him informed concerning any further problems with the current ADA policy. Senator Gaunder moved that the Senate Executive Committee meet with President Cale and make recommendations concerning how we should proceed. Senator Brewton seconded. Senator Webb moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on the issue. Senator Rock seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed 30-0-1. The motion passed with a vote of 25 – 1 – 4.

- B. Senate Committee Reports:
1. Dr. Janice Nicholson, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented a report on the Withdrawal Policy after looking at data from 2004-2004. (See Attachment A) There was not a significant increase in the number of withdrawals with this new policy which eliminated the WF option. The

Committee did feel that with this present policy, a student could attend two or three times, not attend for the majority of the semester, and then ask for a withdrawal and not be penalized. The Committee is now working on the Readmission policy and the Final Exam schedule.

Senator Makowski seconded the committee report. The motion passed. There was a discussion whether there needed to be such a motion. Senator Thorne stated that he was confused.

There was concern express as to where this issue should be sent. If it is sent to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of Shared Governance and changes made there, would it be sent back to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate. Senator Gaunder moved that the report be sent to the VPAA. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion and second were later removed.

2. Dr. John Clark presented a report on Office Hour Policy from the Faculty Affairs Committee. (See Attachment B) Senator Gaunder moved that the report be accepted. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Quinn Pearson presented a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee related to Promotion and Tenure Policy. (See Attachment C) Senator Makowski moved to accept the report. Senator Adams seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. The Faculty Attitude Survey Committee reported that they would be testing the on-line version soon.
4. Senator Makowski reported that the State Political Relations Committee had not yet met. He reported that there is another bill proposed in the legislature to expand the power of ACHE. Our support is needed to help defeat this bill. The budget bills are available on the web. Because he will get an opportunity at ACUFP to communicate with policy makers in education, he requested that any faculty concerns be forwarded to him.

B. Shared Governance Committee Reports:

1. The Shared Governance Committee is moving through the document point by point and plans to present the proposed changes at one time.
2. Senator Webb reported from the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee that there was a change in the climate on campus. She stated that Dr. Newson had reported on academic needs and that President Cale plans to ask for additional money in the budget for promotion and faculty development. The protocol for accessing the Non-technology equipment fund has been established. The request from the faculty goes to the chair, to the dean, and then to the VPAA where the requests will be prioritized.
3. Senator Brewton reported that the Academic and Student Affairs

Committee decided to postpone considering the withdrawal policy because the senate was considering the issue. The ADA policy was tabled because President Cale was investigating this issue. The committee voted against the recommendation that the committee be reorganized in an effort to form two committees, one responsible for academic affairs issues and one responsible for student affairs issues.

4. Senator Ward reported that the International Program/Offerings Committee is planning an International Week the week of March 13. He encouraged faculty to find time to attend at least one activity during the week. He encouraged faculty to contact him with any questions.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. Senator Makowski moved to suspend the rules to vote on the resolution of appreciation for the Presidential Search Advisory Committee and Board of Trustees. (See Attachment D) Senator Brewton seconded. Senator Makowski stated that we need to especially thank the service of the faculty members on the committee and the open participation of the campus in the process. Senator Makowski moved the adoption of the resolution. Senator Brewton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. Senator Adams discussed the PLUS program. (See Attachment E) We have seven students coming within a week. These are excellent students coming from disadvantaged areas. Dr. Wakefield felt that faculty mentors working through the Community Friends program would be beneficial. He asked that we establish a committee that would be willing to serve as faculty mentors. Senator Webb moved to suspend the rules to vote on the resolution. Senator Gaston seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Senator Makowski moved the adoption of the resolution. Senator Ward seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- C. President Cale requested that the senate give names of faculty to serve on a committee focusing on retention with relation to cohort scheduling, a technique of placing groups of freshmen in two or three common classes and assigning peer mentors (junior or senior). Senator Gaunder stated that he thought this was a good idea to study but that other areas of retention also need to be studied.

Senator Thorne moved that the meeting be adjourned. Senator Roden seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

## ATTACHMENT A

To: Academic Senate Members  
From: Academic Affairs Committee  
Re: Withdrawal Policy

After reviewing the former WP/WF policy, the present W policy, and data showing the number of students who have received W's from 2002-2004, the Committee recommends the present policy be amended as follows:

After the "RW" (register/withdrew) period, students will receive a "W" until 14 calendar days prior to the beginning of final examinations. **If absences exceed the university's attendance policy before the student officially withdraws from the course, no credit may be earned for the course and the grade reported will be F.**

## ATTACHMENT B

TO: UNA Faculty Senate

FR: Faculty Affairs Committee  
John Clark  
Brent Elliott  
Richard Hudiburg  
Doris McDaniel  
Quinn Pearson  
Craig Robertson (Chair)

Re: Assessment of UNA Office Hour Policy

The Faculty Affairs Committee was assigned the task of examining UNA's current faculty office hours policy. An e-mail was distributed to the general faculty February 1, 2005 soliciting their input on possible revisions to the current policy (which appears below).

### 4.3.3 Office Hours

Faculty members will be available for consulting and advising with students a minimum of 10 hours a week with hours scheduled each workday at times that best accommodate student access. Faculty members will list their office hours on a Faculty Schedule and Workload Sheet at the beginning of each semester. The respective department chair and dean should also have a copy. Office hours shall be posted on office doors and made available to students. Alternate office hours may be made with the approval of the department chair and dean for faculty members who have evening or weekend classes, off-campus assignments, or other university-related responsibilities. In addition to preparation of coursework, grading student work, and student advisement, faculty will be expected to do departmental, college, and university committee work as well as selected research and public service.

The remainder of this memo presents these responses to the e-mail request and a tabular and text-based analysis of several schools whose office hour policy was available via the web. Our work closes with a suggested **revision of the UNA policy (see page 14)**.

#### Faculty Comments

1. How did we arrive at 10 hours per week for a 12 hour teaching load? It seems a little arbitrary.
2. The policy needs language that equates consulting and advising as something that can take place outside of the traditional in-office setting.
3. We are primarily a teaching university. It is not wise for us to undermine that

mission by reducing the number of office hours each week. It is equally unwise for us to move away from the existing language specifying that hours be "scheduled each workday".

4. If the issues of what to do with professors teaching DL/Internet courses is at the root of this policy analysis, do we really need to do anything with this policy. It clearly states that "Alternate office hours may be made with the approval of the department chair and dean for faculty members who have evening or weekend classes, off-campus assignments, or other university-related responsibilities." I think this language subsumes the DL oriented faculty members.

5. Why does the last sentence in the current policy even exist in this section. Let's remove it.

6. My opinion is that the policy as written has two major drawbacks. First, it leads people (e.g., in the community) to believe that we work 22 hrs./wk. (4 classes + 10 office hrs.), and this perception hurts us. Many other faculty as well as I are here in great excess of 40 hours, and that perception is a bit insulting.

Secondly, the policy as written does not state that you must be in your office, but it has surely been enforced as though it does in some departments. The policy is purported to help students, not to be used as a billy club with which to discipline faculty. If I happen to be working on research or a committee, I may well have to be out of my office during an "office hour," but I am certainly working. The idea that someone could walk by my office and assume that I am "unavailable to students" is ludicrous.

The fact is that all classes differ. In some math classes, an instructor may well see several students during a scheduled office hour, and spill over for several more hours. Someone in another department may see two students in a month. In my case, I may well have several students during a scheduled office hour and run over to two to three (unscheduled) hours. If I happen to miss an hour the next day due to a committee meeting, I would consider it out of bounds for someone to complain.

My suggestion is that each department should monitor "faculty availability." If a faculty member wants to publish office hours, then he or she should be able to do so. If not, ditto. The ultimate arbiter will be the chairs and deans, as they will surely hear about it if someone is unavailable on a regular basis. The bottom line is whether we are getting the job done. Diligent faculty will see that their students are helped, and others will not. But please do not make us all pay for those who do not with continued use of this mandatory policy.

7. In my opinion, as far as office hours are concerned, in this day of email, online degrees and WebCT where faculty can schedule online chats with students as a

class requirement, physical presence of a faculty member in her/his office to attend to student questions has become pretty obsolete. However, I do think that the availability of faculty to students for a certain amount of time is important. While there are faculty who spend their entire workday in the office, there are others who are available only during office hours, (and still others who are a rare sight indeed). Given these varied situations, it might be important for the University to have some minimum standards to ensure that faculty are available for students etc. So perhaps the present requirement can be brought down to 5 hours per week. If the requirement is to remain at ten hours, then the

faculty member should be allowed to maintain some of these hours as scheduled online chat/email hours. As it is, many of us spend a lot of time responding to student emails outside office hours.

8. My only concern is that there are no specifics on office hours for half-time faculty. I currently have 5 hours/week available with at least some time everyday.

9. There has been concern about the phrase "each workday." If you have a Tuesday-Thursday schedule, you should only be required to have office hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays. That should be spelled out in the policy because some people don't seem to understand that concept.

10. I believe this is adequate if it were just enforced by deans and dept. chairs.

11. It might be helpful to see what other institutions do in Alabama. According to students at Auburn, faculty are available 5 hours a week and "that is way more time than we actually need to see them". That quote is from a student campus tour guide and supported by the various faculty members with whom I have spoken. On top of that, my youngest daughter is a student at Auburn and according to her, students have plenty of time to see their advisors in those five hours a week. I'm not disagreeing with the current policy at UNA, but for those of us who regularly teach a fairly heavy overload, the ten hours gets a bit much.

12. I think a more important issue than the number of hours is whether or not faculty follow the policy as it is now. The impression that I get from students and from other faculty members is that some colleges on campus and some departments within those colleges are very lax about keeping the required hours, while other faculty are closely monitored regarding their hours.

13. First, let me thank you for the time and effort you're putting into this. I really do appreciate it. In my case, the office hours number is a moot point, since I regularly exceed that number. I don't, however, see colleagues at other institutions, such as Memphis State and Middle Tennessee State, posting as many as 10 office hours. I also believe that even with keeping to the 10 hour minimum, the edict for daily office hours is excessive and isn't conducive to the

goal of more research and scholarship on the part of faculty. A faculty member who is so fortunate as to arrange a schedule with an open day should not have to come to campus on that open day just to keep an office hour. I also think that a faculty member who is so fortunate as to have all evening or all morning classes should not be required to keep both morning and afternoon hours. The statement regarding times that best accommodate students a little heavy-handed as well. Again, thanks for reviewing this policy

14. The current policy is adequate.

15. 4.3.3 does not include SS (both patterns - June, July or June and July. I strongly endorse the concept of office hours, and have no problem with setting a minimum; however, a "rigid" policy may create some problems. For example, a student comes to my office at a time not designated as an office hour (and a time when I am doing research, or grading papers, or doing committee

work etc.). Will there be guidelines to deal with this? Another point that is not covered in any policy deals with field trips on Sat. or Sun. or on otherwise holiday(s). That certainly is part of the work-load, but is "not counted". whatever....

16. I believe that our current office hour policy is in need of reform. I am not opposed to ten hours per week, but if a faculty member is able to create (through) creative course scheduling) a day or two that is open for research, he or she should be encouraged to do so. Also, given student access to the Internet and to our phone system, students have much more opportunity to contact faculty members than in the past.

17. I'll put my two cents in. I'd really like to see an office hour policy that is more appropriate for the fact that this is 2005 and we have things like voice mail, email, cell phones, etc. I would also like the policy to be VERY faculty friendly.

For starters, we could reduce the minimum to 6 office hours per week. For those who have reduced teaching loads, we could also reduce the minimum proportionally. For example, those with nine hour loads would be required to keep 4.5 hours. Additionally, I see no reason why a faculty member should be required to show up for office hours on days when they don't teach classes. Some administrators are ridiculous about enforcing such a stupid policy. Let's be sensible about this. I know we want to be student-friendly here, but the antiquated office hour policy needs to change. I also think there ought to be some uniformity in the policy as well as its enforcement. Certain colleges (not ours) seem not to enforce any office hour policy at all.

I'm really interested to hear about what kind of feedback you get. Good luck on this issue.

18. I think the current policy is fine. I am my office far more than 10 hours, but I see no need to mandate more than ten specific hours.

19. Given the common [mis]perception by the public regarding the work life of a college professor (you teach 12 hours per week?), I do not think we should reduce office hours below the current 10 (nor do I think there needs to be an increase). The current policy indicates that office hours should be held each day of the week (or at least that's my interpretation). Because this "rule" is violated so often, particularly in certain colleges, it would probably be best to do away with this requirement. If not, start enforcing the requirement.

20. I believe the current policy is adequate. I believe the current policy does meet the students needs. In my case, I am usually willing to schedule an appoint with students at other times than regular office hours if the student will make advanced arrangements.

21. I believe the current policy is reasonable and adequate.

22. I am of the opinion that faculty should have one day "out of the office" to dedicate to **research/publication/scholarly work/practice/faculty development (academic pursuit)**, since this is a major thread for promotion here at this University. As a previous faculty who came here from "elsewhere", my research (several in progress at the time) "died" on the shelf because once I came into the office for "one hour", I was there "all day" and therefore, had no block of time which was needed to concentrate and continue my research. I have worked in places that allowed this to take place. However, if this occurs or is allowed, faculty who do not perform or have outcomes to show for this time, should be mandated to the "every day" requirement for office hours (can have additional advisement/recruitment responsibilities, etc). **"Just my opinion"**.

23. I think it is OK as is.

24. I think 10 hours per week of office hours is just right.

25. I feel the current policy on office hours is adequate and no changes are needed.

26. I think the idea of HAVING to have office hours every day of the week is no longer necessary in this age of technology. Communication by e-mail and cell phone is a much-preferred method by some people and should be an option. There are days that I have hours posted that students who might need to see me aren't even on campus. Certainly face-to-face availability is important, but not mandatory. Our schedules in nursing involve class and clinicals, necessitating us to be available more on certain day than others. Another issue I have is being charged 8 full hours for taking two hours personal leave or such. On days that one would have just office hours in the morning, I don't feel that should

necessitate losing 8 hours. Maybe half day charge would be more equitable.

Thanks for allowing the input. We look forward to seeing a fresh update and approach to office hours.

27. I like our present policy. I think that it is about as good as you can get.

28. John...yes the office hours are ample to meet the needs of students..almost all of the faculty members will meet with students outside of those hours if required to meet any special cases..coupled with working with student organizations and university committees the hours are more than acceptable...

29. The number of office hours should be reduced. The current requirement probably does more to limit our availability than increase it. I would note that I am in my office or teaching over 40 hours per week.

Most student contact occurs outside office hours, either via email, voice mail, notes, or brief meetings before class.

The only issue I would alert the committee to is the perception of reduced availability and possible accusation of working less. Most faculty would probably be more productive under a reduced scenario.

If the committee recommends a reduction, a clear rationale for it should be developed.

Perhaps a new policy may read:

"The mentoring of students is an important faculty role. As such, faculty members should make themselves reasonably available for consultation, advice, and mentoring of students. It is recommended, therefore, that faculty maintain no less than 6 posted office hours per week, or half of their normal teaching load. This policy recognizes that faculty are routinely available via voice mail, email, or phone, and their availability easily exceeds this minimum requirement. Office hours may be scheduled at times when students are likely to be on campus".

30. My question about the office hour policy is whether it is consistently implemented in the various schools? The committee may want to look at the Faculty Workload sheets for the different schools and compare scheduled office hours. I also find that more students are communicating with me via email and voice mail. When I first started here, I had frequent visits by students during office hours. Thank goodness, they don't come by anymore when they are sick to tell me they won't be in class

31. I am satisfied with the current policy. I keep more hours than required, but

between teaching and advising and committees.... I do not think it is necessary to require more hours than presently required. I am assuming that you mean more hours, not less hours, which might be a consideration.

32. I believe that the number of office hours currently stated is enough.

33. I find the current requirements for office hours to be appropriate.

34. I think that our office hour requirement is ridiculously antiquated. Ninety percent of my contact with students is through email, and I am available all day, every day this way. For example, on the weekends, my responsible students email me about the papers they are writing and I advise them. My less responsible ones are emailing with questions late at night on the night before the paper is due.

I also think that this requirement is more about administrative resentment than anything else. I believe that administrators feel that faculty do not work as they do (because faculty's schedules are flexible). Consequently, the office hour policy is a means of turning a flexible schedule into more of an eight-to-five type of job like theirs. I have suggested repeatedly that we log all of our work (grading papers, hours of course prep, etc), so that admin can accurately see what we accomplish, instead of these required hours that serve no purpose anymore.

If the argument is that we should see students to advise them in person, then we could be available on those particular days prior to registration--when we are really needed. Most schools have faculty keep one office hours per course (for us, that would be 4 hours).

35. I would like to comment on a statement "advising ... students ... with hours scheduled EACH workday". I believe "EACH workday" should be eliminated from the Office Hour Policy. Firstly, university faculty members are not high school teachers; they must have time to do research as well, and one workday free, at least, from consulting would help to concentrate on research activities. Secondly, nowadays students are bombing professors with e-mailed questions regardless of their office hours, so that anyway the faculty member is effectively engaged in more than 10 office hours per week - one more reason to get rid of "EACH workday" in the policy, and maybe to reduce office hours to 8 instead of 10.

36. I feel that setting 10 hours as a minimum is more than adequate. However, mandating specific hours or days of the week for faculty to hold office hours is unnecessary given the widespread use of e-mail, online chat rooms, etc... As long as the instructor is promptly responding to student requests, available to speak with them outside of class either during office hours (to be left at the discretion of the instructor) or by appointment is acceptable. If numerous complaints are filed by students about difficulty in meeting with a particular

instructor - it should then be addressed by the chair or dean. Just my thoughts...hope it helps.

37. I propose a minor modification of the first sentence of the policy paragraph: In order to more closely match the office hours to the needs of students, we should recognize that many students are only on campus for a MWF schedule or a T,TR schedule, or evening schedule. Therefore, replace the word 'workday' with 'weekday that class meets'. It is highly unlikely that a MWF student will want to return to campus on a T,TR, and so a professor with a MWF schedule will be wasting time in the T,TR office hours for the majority of T,R hours.

I would also contend that the stated policy ignores the seasonality of demand for office hours. Even if the average demand for office hours is 10, it is quite likely that the demand varies from a low near zero for some weeks to a high well above 10 for the weeks just prior to an exam. Some flexibility in the policy could recognize and encourage faculty to be responsive to students at the time when students actually need a response. And with the advent of voice mail and email, students can contact their professors to find an appointment time which is amenable to both student and professor. Rigid office hours ignore the possibility of such superior arrangements.

While an appointment based and flexible office hours policy would be difficult to spell out and enforce, we should admit that merely devising a set of enforceable rules does not guarantee that those rules will accomplish the intended result of improving student access to faculty. Rules do not guarantee quality, high quality faculty are the greatest guarantee of student contact quality.

38. The current policy is too restrictive and not uniformly enforced across campus. There is no need to have "scheduled office hours" when appointments can readily be made and most all professors can be contacted via email just about 24/7. Internet technology has made "office visits" just about a thing of the past.

39. On-campus availability of a faculty member should be handled at the department level. This should be seen as a "university service" and if a dept. chair sees that a faculty member is not around enough to accommodate students then the chair, through reprimand or promotion consideration, should take action with that faculty member. There is no need for a "blanket" policy that is largely not enforced and is basically punitive to those who stay around and try to get other work accomplished.

40. With email and voice mail at their disposal, students almost never come to my office for help or advisement. I find I put in a good deal of time answering email from home because they are nocturnal in their habits. Therefore, I think we need to adjust both the # of hours required and the idea that they must be spread

over all five days. A more realistic policy would be a statement that says that the faculty member will be available for consultation via the several methods available. By actual count, I have had three students come to my office during my office hours this semester. I have at least 2-4 emails from students a day and usually a couple of voice mail questions.

Thanks for your work on this issue.

41. I think the minimum of 10 hours a week for office hours is adequate. I think that maybe the statement about "hours scheduled each workday" may be unnecessary because of the other statement that reads "Alternate office hours may be made with the approval of the department chair and dean for faculty members who have evening or weekend classes, off-campus assignments, or other university-related responsibilities."

42. I think that last sentence should also include a statement about "distance learning classes." Maybe this would be better wording:  
"Faculty members will be available for consulting and advising with students a minimum of 10 hours a week. The office hours do not have to be scheduled daily if the department chair and the faculty member's dean approve alternate office hours for faculty members who have evening or weekend classes, distance learning classes, off-campus assignments, or other university-related responsibilities."

I have not had a need to do this, but I think you may find some faculty members who are teaching distance learning classes who would prefer to devote the office hours for those DL students online in their own home. I spend a good bit of "distance learning office hours with students" when I'm online at home, but I have also kept my minimum 10 hours of physical presence in my office. I do think, though, that there is room for discussion on "virtual office hours" for the distance learning classes. I generally set up some "virtual office hours" for the distance learning students in my office hours schedule and make that available to my students and post it on my office door. These hours have been at other times of the day and night in addition to my 10 office hours. I'm not sure whether or not it would be appropriate for faculty members to be able to post those "virtual office hours" for the online student access as part of their 10 office hours. I think your committee could discuss this, though. I suppose this COULD set the stage for some random office hour abuse.

THANKS for your committee's work!

43. I believe that 10 hours is more than satisfactory for regular office hours. To be honest--many of the "ivy league" schools only require 5 hours per week. I don't believe that faculty should be forced to schedule something everyday of the week--I should be able to limit my office hours to three or four days a week as long as my hours are posted on my door and in my syllabi. In this age of electronic mail and voice mail, students have no excuse for not being able to

contact faculty whenever they choose. And an overwhelming majority of faculty on this particular campus would go out of their way to set up a meeting outside of office hours if it was absolutely needed. The problem is that UNA is creating a student body of spoiled brats who think of the faculty as their personal servants. I am a good teacher, advisor and mentor--but I am not a servant.

44. The current 10 hours are adequate but I would like to see ALL faculty held to the same standard.

45. If a teacher has online courses, then the amount of time spent in office hours at the university should be reduced. The original policy was probably developed with five courses in mind, so that would be two hours per course. If a faculty member has two on line courses and one face-to-face course he/she should only be required to have two hours of office hours on campus.

46. Based on the 12 hour teaching load that we have, I believe that 10 hours of office hours is too many. In order to continue and/or enhance our research, we need to have more hours available to be in the library or in the field or just time to write and think in a quiet (uninterrupted) environment. I think that 5 hours per week with "other times available by appointment" is suitable and is more in line with institutions that place a priority on research. The University is requiring (asking, or requesting for promotions and tenure) more research out of us (and rightly so) yet I do realize that we are a "teaching" university. However, we must all stay current with our research so that we are teaching our students the "latest and greatest" or the "state-of-the-art" in our field. So those are my thoughts. Hope they are not too late. Thanks for asking for input.

---

In addition to examining these UNA faculty responses, the committee also examined office hour policies at other colleges and universities. Below are the results from this examination.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Minimum Office Hours (Week)</b>	<b>*</b>
<i>California State Polytechnic University</i>	5	
<i>University of Wyoming</i>	3	
<i>University of Missouri, St. Louis</i>	Choice	
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	Choice*	Suggest 1 MWF and 1 TR
<i>University of Hawaii</i>	5	
<i>Penn State University</i>	4-6	
<i>Florida Atlantic University</i>	6	

<i>University of North Carolina</i>	Choice*	Suggest 2 each day
<i>Ohlone College</i>	5	
<i>University of Delaware</i>	Choice	
<i>Western Kentucky University</i>	Choice	
<i>Central Connecticut State University</i>	5	
<i>University of Montevallo</i>	10	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Minimum Office Hours (Week)</b>	*
<i>Texas Womens University</i>	Choice	
<i>Northern Illinois University</i>	Choice	
<i>Calvin College</i>	Choice	
<i>Bryn Mawr College</i>	Choice	
<i>University of Alabama</i>	Choice	
<i>Weber State University</i>	Choice	
<i>University of South Alabama</i>	6	
<i>Auburn University</i>	Choice	
<i>Jacksonville State University</i>	4*	1 for every 3 hours of course load

**California State Polytechnic University - Faculty Office Hours Policy**

For the purpose of consulting with students, full-time faculty members shall hold office hours totaling at least 5 hours per week. Office hours shall be scheduled on at least 3 weekdays at times that adequately serve the needs of students. Office hour schedules on fewer than 3 weekdays must be endorsed by the department chair and approved by the dean or director; they should be requested for reasons directly related to faculty workload, such as committee responsibilities, research, special assignments and other professional demands. When an office hour schedule is disapproved by the chair or dean, reasons must be provided in writing to the faculty member within 5 working days of the request. Office hour schedules (in terms of number of hours and number of days) shall be commensurate with the teaching fraction for part-time faculty. Problems that are related to office hour schedules are to be resolved by the dean or director in consultation with the department chair.

**University of Wyoming - Office Hours Policy**

It is the goal of the College of Arts and Sciences to provide students with maximum direct access to all faculty. To achieve this goal, faculty are available for consultation during office hours or by appointment. Students may arrange appointments directly with faculty or through the departmental clerical staff. In addition, faculty will include office hours on each syllabus and hours will be posted on or about faculty office doors. Although the great majority of faculty

maintain far more, the minimum number of office hours shall be three hours a week, hours which must be spread across at least two days of the week. When a faculty member cannot meet regularly scheduled hours, the departmental secretary will be notified of when the announced schedule will be resumed.

**University of Missouri, St. Louis, & University of California, Berkeley**

Office hours are decided by the faculty member, Berkeley suggests at least one on Tuesday or Thursday and at least one on Monday, or Wednesday or Friday.

**University of Hawaii**

Faculty will maintain minimum weekly office hours, posted on the office door, equal to the number of contact hours they teach, up to five hours per week. The office hours will be spread over the days of instruction and at times that are reasonable for the students who make up the class(es).

**Penn State University**

Full-time faculty members are to have four to six office hours per week. Further, during the first week of class, faculty should be on campus each day for generous periods. There are also times during the semester, such as registration or late drop periods, when additional office hours may be necessary.

**Florida Atlantic University**

Minimum of 6 hours per week

**University of North Carolina**

Although the university has no specific requirements regarding faculty office hours, each member of the faculty is expected to be available to students and advisees for at least two hours per day during the regular academic year, and at least one hour per day during the term of a summer session in which a faculty member teaches. Office hours should be posted on office doors and should be at times convenient for students. On any occasion when an unavoidable conflict arises, faculty should post a note (or have the secretary post a note) on their office door.

**Ohlone College**

Full-time faculty are required to hold five office hours per week for student consultation and to assist with student advisement and job placement.

**University of Delaware**

The posting of office and teaching hours by faculty members is a courtesy as well as a necessary convenience for students. It is anticipated that faculty will post and keep a reasonable number of office hours each week.

**Western Kentucky University**

Faculty members are expected to post class schedules and office hours. Faculty members have a responsibility to provide to the department head and students each semester their office hour schedule. Inability to meet classes or to maintain office hours should be reported to the department head.

### **Central Connecticut State University**

The obligation of faculty to hold office hours is specified in article 9.9 of the CSU-AAUP contract. It states: "Teaching members are expected to be available to meet their obligations and confer with their students outside of class. Each full-time teaching member shall schedule and hold at least five (5) office hours per week each semester. These office hours shall be scheduled in agreement with the department Chairperson on at least three (3) teaching days per week at times reasonably convenient for students. Such hours shall be posted on the appropriate departmental office bulletin board and reported by the department Chairperson to the appropriate academic Dean or Academic Vice President. If in the judgment of the Dean, the reported hours do not meet the standard above, the Dean may require that the Chairperson establish appropriate office hours. Alternate office hour arrangements for full-time teaching members with substantial off campus loads, or with alternate duties, may be made with the approval of the Academic Vice President. Office hour requirements may be temporarily increased by the appropriate academic Dean during registration periods.

### **University of Montevallo**

All full-time faculty members shall maintain a minimum of ten office hours a week in addition to their regular teaching loads and other responsibilities. Part-time faculty members shall be accessible to their students before and/or after each class period and shall make themselves available by appointment.

Each academic term, all faculty members shall establish, publicize, and maintain scheduled office hours during which they are available to students for conferences and individual instruction. Faculty office hours shall be posted in a prominent and appropriate place with a copy to the department chair or dean.

### **University of Texas, Dallas**

It is essential that students have access to faculty members for individual consultation. In accordance with Regents' Rules, Part One, Chapter III, Section 12) members of the faculty are expected to maintain regular office hours and conference periods most advantageous to students and to post such hours on their office doors.

### **Texas Womens University**

Faculty members are expected to make themselves available to their students for academic consultation as needed outside of class hours. They will partially meet this requirement by posting and maintaining regular office hours, distributed throughout the week.

**Northern Illinois University**

Faculty members who teach must maintain regular office hours or provide other means to promote student-faculty consultation. These office hours are included in course syllabi and publicly posted each academic term. Arrangements more convenient to students than office visits (e.g., e-mail or chat groups) may be substituted for office hours.

**Calvin College**

Faculty members are expected to maintain regular office hours during the regular academic year. These hours should be clearly posted and announced to each class.

**Bryn Mawr College**

Faculty members are expected to have regular, convenient, weekly office hours in which to advise and consult with students. These hours should be announced to students in class at the beginning of the semester and posted on the door to the office.

**Oklahoma State University**

Faculty are expected to keep regular office hours which, at a minimum, meet the University's standard expectation of five hours per week. Office hours are to be posted and on file with a designated member of each School's staff. When faculty will be away from the offices during official office hours, a designated staff member must be informed.

**University of Alabama**

All faculty members must maintain regular and reasonably convenient office hours to answer questions from students and to advise students. In addition, faculty members are expected to schedule individual appointments as needed. The schedule of office hours must be posted and must be available in the departmental/program office.

**Weber State University**

Faculty members should keep regular office hours for student consultation and/or otherwise make themselves accessible to students (provide e-mail address, telephone numbers, etc). The office hours should be scheduled at times convenient for students and should be posted on the faculty member's office door and/or the course syllabus. Office hours should be honored at all times.

**University of South Alabama**

Faculty members will post and keep office hours each semester and, as a minimum, indicate six hours a week for conferences with interested students. With respect to evening classes, (those scheduled after 4 p.m.) and weekend

classes, faculty members teaching those courses will make suitable and adequate arrangements to carry out the advising function by scheduling office hours accordingly. A common practice is to state that, in addition to regularly scheduled office hours, appointments may be arranged at other times.

### **Auburn University**

To maintain regular, posted office hours each week for conferences with students.

### **Jacksonville State University**

All faculty members shall be available for consultation with students enrolled in their classes. During pre-registration advisory periods and during registration itself, faculty members shall be available for scheduled advising periods.

Full-time faculty members shall be regularly available on campus during class days. A part-time faculty member shall regularly be available on campus in proportion to the percentage of time for which he or she is employed. Part-time faculty shall be available for student consultation at least one hour per week for each three-hour course taught. Full-time faculty teaching off campus shall be available at the off-campus location, for student consultation, at least one hour per week for each three-hour course taught. Each faculty member shall establish, post, and make students aware of regular and adequate office hours so distributed throughout the week as to be convenient to students. Adjustment of office hours may be needed during registration and examination periods. A copy of the office hours schedule is to be submitted to the department head and dean for filing. The department head is responsible for notifying the faculty member if office hours are inadequate.

## Justification for the Proposed Faculty Office Hour Policy Revision

The committee opted to retain the current number of weekly office hours. Our rationale is that we identify ourselves to be a student-centered institution. Decreasing the number of office hours per week seems inconsistent with the goals of this institution and how we market ourselves. Further, considering the perception of professor's workload among the public, it would not be in our best interest to reduce student/professor contact.

Our research pointed to the need for a more progressive and flexible office hour policy in light of twenty-first century pedagogy. The committee realized that the current policy emphasizing the posting of office hours "each workday" was not flexible. So, a change is suggested in that regard.

We viewed the rest of the policy as sound.

## Office Hour Recommendation From the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty members will be available for consulting and advising with students a minimum of 10 hours a week with hours scheduled ~~each workday~~ at times that best accommodate student access. Faculty members will list their office hours on a Faculty Schedule and Workload Sheet at the beginning of each semester. The respective department chair and dean should also have a copy. Office hours shall be posted on office doors and made available to students. Alternate office hours may be made with the approval of the department chair and dean for faculty members who have evening or weekend classes/courses, Internet and distance-learning courses, off-campus assignments, or other university-related responsibilities. ~~In addition to preparation of coursework, grading student work, and student advisement, faculty will be expected to do departmental, college, and university committee work as well as selected research and public service.~~

ATTACHMENT C



UNIVERSITY  
*of* NORTH  
ALABAMA

Florence, Alabama 35632-0001

*Department of Sociology*  
[www2.una.edu/sociology](http://www2.una.edu/sociology)

UNA Box 5010

(256) 765-4200

Fax (256) 765-4179

TO: UNA Faculty Senate

FR: Faculty Affairs Committee  
John Clark  
Brent Elliott  
Richard Hudiburg  
Doris McDaniel  
Quinn Pearson  
Craig Robertson (Chair)

RE: Analysis of and revision to UNA's promotion and tenure policies

The Faculty Affairs Committee was tasked with the issue of reviewing UNA's promotion and tenure policies back in October, 2003. The product of our labor presented to you today may not seem commensurate with the time devoted to the project. I can assure all of you that our time was not wasted but rather was frustrated by what we see as a larger issue affecting the concept and procedures related largely to promotion. In brief that issue is the oversupply of promotion eligible candidates and the lack of promotions. We have phrased the issue exactly this way so as to draw attention to the missing variable since that variable—money allocated for promotions—can be viewed in at least a couple of ways.

Our research of peer institutions suggests that while salary increases for promotions were substantially higher at UNA than at peer institutions, cost of living increases, merit, and other increases at these institutions generally resulted in higher mean salaries at the associate professor and professor ranks. As a result our findings suggest that salary compression and lack of promotions continue to be a concern at UNA.

In sum, the monetary issue created a problem for this committee and its work related to the process of promotion. We regularly voiced comments that our work on process would have very little desired effect on the annual March 10<sup>th</sup> outcomes when those outcomes hinged so much on resolution of debate surrounding promotion money allocation and/or distribution. We repeatedly asked, "What good will revising procedure do, when the system's foundation lacks respect?" The committee is disheartened by UNA's recent history of

promotions, COLA allocation, and salary compression since they have had a dramatic impact on faculty moral. The committee has not resolved this problem. It was not part of our charge and the Strategic Planning and Budget Study Committee is currently addressing this issue.

The work we submit today reflects recommended changes to section 3.5 (Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure) of the Faculty Handbook. Our recommended changes appear as **underlined bolded text**.

### **3.5 CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

#### **3.5.1 General Criteria**

General criteria for faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure are established in the following three areas:

1. Effectiveness as a Teacher. The individual is **evaluated based** upon knowledge of subject matter, including current developments; active concern for the student's academic progress; and ability to organize and effectively present and evaluate coursework, including effectiveness in oral and written communication, ability to motivate student interest and participation, ability to relate coursework to other fields with a view to broadening the student's general awareness, evidence of conscientious preparation for all instructional situations, and use of effective methodology and teaching techniques.
2. Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities. **The individual is evaluated based upon several criteria including, but not limited to the following:** the quality of scholarly attitude, the capacity for independent thought, originality and quality in published and unpublished contributions to knowledge, creativeness in approach to new problems, effectiveness in planning for future research and study for himself or herself and for students, professional recognition of research efforts, and effectiveness in the administration of research projects.
3. Effectiveness in Rendering Service. The individual is **evaluated based** upon recognition in the professional field; consultation of high professional quality in business, cultural, educational, governmental, and industrial endeavors; activities in learned and professional societies; potential for continuing professional growth; contribution to total university development and growth; performance on committee assignments **as well as with shared governance committees and structure**; performance on administrative assignments; **performance in student advising**; and contributions to the improvement of student life.

It is not expected that every individual will excel in all of the general criteria, but neither is it expected that the individual will have a complete void in any of the

three areas. These criteria will be interpreted in varying degrees for each academic rank and for the different academic fields.

In addition to the three general criteria, an applicant should satisfy regional and specialized accreditation standards.

### **3.5.2 Special Criteria By Ranks**

Faculty ranks of the University, including librarians and supervising teachers at Kilby School, are instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The qualifications stated below are a minimum which do not imply a guarantee of promotion.

The following criteria and procedures 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. Appointment as an instructor requires the 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 or promotion to this rank requires possession of a master's degree in the field of assignment and a minimum of six years' appropriate experience, or possession of a doctor's degree or the terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy and a minimum of two years' appropriate experience. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching and for a successful academic career.
3. Associate Professor. Appointment or promotion to this rank ordinarily requires possession of a doctor's degree or the terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy and a minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching and scholarly or creative performance. There shall also be evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession.
4. Professor. Appointment or promotion to this rank requires possession of the doctor's degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy and a minimum of 12 years of appropriate cumulative experience. In addition, the appointee shall have established a

record of excellence in teaching, in service to university, community, profession, and in scholarly or creative performance.

### 3.5.3 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 3.C)
2. Current Resume or Vita\*
  - 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\*\*
  - a. Teaching/Library Effectiveness
  - b. Scholarly or creative performance
  - c. University, community and student service**
  - d. Any other relevant information

\* One page

\*\* Applicants for promotion will limit their portfolios to a 10-page maximum on Section III. In addition to addressing the essential portfolio components in the 10-page limit, 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. 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 3.

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.

#### Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education, 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 of a chairperson, from among the members of the committee, by secret ballot. In the College of Nursing and Allied Health and in Information Technologies, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's college or area who are not applying for promotion.

The dean 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), indicating the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 15. In the event that the peer promotion committee is evaluating more than one candidate, it may choose whether or not to rank the candidates. **Committee rankings can only occur between or among candidates applying for the same promotion level. Candidates applying for different promotion levels cannot be ranked with each other.**

For departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education 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 recommendation for each candidate. 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 December 1. **The department chair may rank order candidates in his or her recommendation letter to the college or area dean. These rankings can only occur between or among candidates applying for the same promotion level. The department chair is precluded from ranking candidates applying for**

**different promotion levels.** The department chair will **inform candidates whether they were recommended for promotion and will** provide written feedback to each candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's portfolio **immediately upon arriving at a promotion recommendation.**

#### 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 to the dean of the college or area. It is the responsibility of the college or area dean to review and evaluate the individual portfolios as well as the recommendations of the peer promotion committees and department chairs. The dean will **inform candidates whether they were recommended for promotion and provide written feedback to the candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio immediately upon arriving at a promotion recommendation.** 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 February 1.

#### 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. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will rank, in order, the candidates (including department chairs) who have been recommended for promotion from all of the colleges.

Following the decisions made by the President as outlined below, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will inform the college deans, candidates, and their department chairs, in writing, of the success or failure of the candidates as soon as possible, but not later than March 10. 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 20.

#### Responsibility of the President

The President will review the individual portfolios, recommendations, and rankings by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for all candidates. 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 1. 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 Information Technologies receives is fair and equitable.

#### B. Department Chairs Applying for Promotion

Department chairs who are applying for promotion will be evaluated using a process similar to that described for other faculty members. In the case of department chairs, however, the evaluation completed by the peer promotion committee will be sent directly to the dean of the college no later than November 15. **The peer promotion committee will inform candidates whether they were recommended for promotion immediately upon arriving at a promotion recommendation.** The administrative effectiveness of the department chair will be evaluated within the category of university and community service. The college dean will evaluate the department chair's portfolio, and will forward his or her evaluation, the peer promotion committee's evaluation, and the candidate's portfolio to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by February 1. **The college dean will inform candidates whether they were recommended for promotion immediately upon arriving at a promotion recommendation.** The college dean and the peer promotion committee will provide written feedback to the department chair regarding strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review the department chair's portfolio, recommendations from the peer committee and college dean, and rank, in order, all candidates for promotion who have been recommended for promotion, including department chairs. These recommendations will be forwarded to the President and reviewed as in part A.

#### 3.5.4 Tenure

An award of tenure is not a right but a privilege which must be earned by a faculty member on the basis of his or her performance during a probationary period. The granting of tenure is never automatic. Normally, tenure is granted after a faculty member has been evaluated by the tenured faculty members in a department, the department chair, the college dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and the President. However, the President may, after appropriate consultation, grant tenure at any time if good and sufficient reasons exist for doing so.

Policy on tenure, or continuing contract status, as adopted by the Board of Trustees of the University of North Alabama, provides that a person appointed to the faculty rank of instructor will serve a probationary period of six successive

academic years and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the seventh consecutive academic year. A person appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of assistant professor will serve a probationary period of five successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the sixth consecutive academic year. A person appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of associate professor will serve a probationary period of four successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the fifth consecutive academic year. A person appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of (full) professor will serve a probationary period of three successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the fourth consecutive academic year. A faculty member holding the academic rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor may, at the discretion of the university administration, be granted leave without breaking the successive years of employment for tenure purposes, but years of leave will not count as years of service toward tenure unless specifically granted in writing at the time leave is granted.

Except as otherwise stated herein, the following process will be followed in determining whether a faculty member will be awarded tenure:

1. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall notify a probationary faculty member by October 1 of the academic year prior to the final academic year of probationary status that failure to apply for tenure by the appropriate deadline could result in an offer of a non-renewable or “terminal” academic year contract. This notice shall be made in writing and placed in the faculty member’s campus mailbox. Failure to notify by this deadline does not automatically constitute a grant of tenure or extension of the employment contract. In such situations, appropriate adjustment of deadlines for notification and portfolio submission will be made.
2. By May 1 of the academic year prior to the final academic year of probationary status, the faculty member will present to the department chair an updated tenure review portfolio which describes the following about the faculty member:
  - a. Teaching or other professional effectiveness
  - b. Scholarly or creative performance
  - c. University, community and student service**

Applicants for tenure will limit their portfolios to 10 pages.

3. If a member of the teaching faculty has not presented a student evaluation composite or overview as part of teaching effectiveness, it will be the

responsibility of the department chair to forward such materials to the department tenure committee and to the college dean.

4. The department chair shall convene a department tenure committee, consisting of all tenured faculty in the department, supervise the election, by secret ballot, of the chairperson from among the members of the committee, and provide copies of the faculty member's tenure review portfolio. It is the responsibility of the department tenure committee by majority vote to recommend for or against the granting of tenure and to submit through the department chair to the college dean all of the information relating to the tenure recommendation by June 1.

5. It is likewise the responsibility of the department chair to recommend for or against the granting of tenure and to forward to the college dean all of the information relating to the tenure recommendation by June 1. **A department chair's recommendation must be justified in writing when his or her vote is contrary to that of the department tenure committee.**

6. The college dean will review the materials presented by the department tenure committee and the department chair and will be responsible for scheduling a meeting with the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost to discuss recommendations being presented for tenure. Copies of all tenure documents will be prepared by the college dean for the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and submitted to him or her by August 1 in advance of the meeting.

7. The President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will meet after all conferences have been held with the various college deans to consider all tenure recommendations.

8. The decision for or against the granting of tenure will be made by the President, and letters will be mailed to all candidates, with copies to the respective dean and department chair, no later than October 1 of the faculty member's final academic year of the probationary period.

The following persons may notify the department chair in writing that they elect to be exempted from this process and to abide instead by the policy stipulated in the UNA Faculty Handbook for the year when he or she was first appointed to the faculty:

Persons appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of instructor during and following the academic year 1991-92 but before 1997-98.

Persons appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of assistant professor during and following the academic year 1992-93 but before 1997-98.

Persons appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of associate professor during and following the academic year 1993-94 but before 1997-98.

Persons appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of (full) professor during and following the academic year 1994-95 but before 1997-98.

The granting of tenure requires written notice regardless of the number of years in service. This tenure policy does not apply to non-tenure-track or adjunct faculty.

### **3.5.5. Renewal or Termination of a Probationary Appointment**

Written notice of renewal or termination of a probationary appointment will be given as follows: for the second year, not later than March 1; for the third year, not later than December 1; and for the fourth and subsequent years and until tenure is granted, not later than October 1. Written notice placed in a faculty member's campus mailbox on or before the specified dates shall be deemed sufficient notice. Otherwise, offers of reemployment will be made by an offer of appointment as specified in Section 3.3.2 above. Acceptance of an offer of reemployment must be made in writing and received by the President not later than 30 calendar days following the offer.

The recommendation to renew or not to renew a probationary appointment normally will originate with the department chair or other immediate supervisor. Tenured members of the department also will be consulted. After review of the recommendation by the appropriate college dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and the President, the President makes the decision to renew or not to renew the appointment. The person affected will be advised of that decision in writing by the President.

## **ATTACHMENT D**

Faculty Senate Resolution – Appreciation to Presidential Search Advisory Committee  
And Board of Trustees

WHEREAS the Presidential Search Advisory Committee for the position of President of the University of North Alabama conducted an outstanding search for the new University President,  
and

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees of the University of North Alabama fully supported the search process and allowed it to reach a very positive conclusion with the hiring of President Bill Cale,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA THAT THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES BE COMMENDED AND THANKED FOR THEIR EFFORTS IN THE SEARCH PROCESS.

## **ATTACHMENT E**

### **A RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State has accepted the University of North Alabama as a partner institution in the pre-academic component of the Partnerships for Learning Undergraduate Studies (PLUS) program;

WHEREAS, students in the PLUS program have completed two years of undergraduate study at home or in regional institutions; and have been selected by a regional panel composed of university professors and exchange professionals for their academic ability, motivation, adaptability, and leadership qualities;

WHEREAS, PLUS students are from underserved regions and social groups, and are undergoing intensive English language study and academic preparation at select universities prior to enrolling at other U.S. universities in order to complete an undergraduate degree program, then return to make a difference in their home countries;

WHEREAS, the pre-academic component of the PLUS program is also designed to include home-stay opportunities and cultural enrichment activities that introduce the students to American culture, society and values;

WHEREAS, the Community Friend program of International Student Services at UNA is designed to serve international students in this capacity;

WHEREAS, each UNA cohort of PLUS students consists of no more than ten students for six months (March through August) each year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UNA Faculty Senate establish an ad hoc committee to identify faculty who would host PLUS students as Community Friends during the following spring and summer terms, and to communicate this list to the director of International Student Services no later than March 1 of each year that UNA is a partner institution.