FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
October 13, 2005

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met October 13, 2005 in the Auditorium of Stevens Hall at 3:30 p.m.

President Adams called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies: LTC. Rae Atencio for Senator Fennell from Military Science, and Dr. Hurren for Senator Davidson from Education.

The following senators were present: Adams, Atkinson, Bates, Blose, Brewton, Brown, Bruce, Crisler, Flowers, Ford, Gaunder, Gossett, Green, Hallock, Holley, Leonard, Loew, Makowski, McDaniel, Myhan, Richardson, Robinson, Rock, Roden, Takeuchi, Turner, Wallace, Ward and Williams.

The following senators were absent without proxy: Adler, Bunn, Cai, Gaston, Hunter-Mintz, Martin, Price, Thorne, and Webb.

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

Senator Blose moved the approval of the September 15, 2005 minutes. Senator Loew seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

President Cale was unable to attend the meeting due to a conflict with the celebration of the birthday of the University at the LaGrange site where he will be speaking.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Committee Reports
   1. Senator Blose, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, reported that they have met and will be meeting on October 25 with the Academic/Student Affairs Committee under Shared Governance. Senator Blose reviewed the issues being considered: the ADA Policy, the Attendance and Withdrawal Policy, and the Readmissions Policy.
   2. The Faculty Affairs Committee is compiling information from peer institutions concerning sabbatical leave. They have been tasked with having the information ready for the November meeting.

B. Shared Governance Committee Reports
   1. Strategic Planning and Budget Committee is working on a Mission/Vision statement and a strategic plan with a set of forms required by the state which will link the University and College goals to the budget items.

2. Senator Richardson, chair of the Athletic Committee, expressed concern that administrators on the committee were having difficulty having time to meet which in turn prevents the committee from having a quorum. Senator Makowski invited Senator Richardson to discuss this with the Shared Governance Committee.
3. Senator Makowski reported from the Shared Governance Committee which is looking at the budget. He reported that an information group which met with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs was preparing data for the Distance Learning Committee to consider.
4. President Adams reported that the Infrastructure Committee was moving forward with plans for a Science Building to be placed in the parking lot beside Flowers Hall. There is also activity to begin around Rogers Hall to work on the drainage around the foundation. A donor has given money which requires matching money to be raised in order to fund the repair. Questions concerning what role did the Committee play in the placement of the building, whether the committee voted on the placement of the building, and whether the committee had any voice with regard to the parking under the building were raised. President Adams stated that since he was a new member, he would ask the other members the answers to the above listed questions. He also mentioned the refurbishment of Collier Library and Keller Hall as projects underway.

C. Updates on Searches:
1. Senator Blose reported that the Search Committee for the Assistant Vice-President for Advancement had received eleven applications so far and hopes to get more. They hope to complete their work by the first of the year but it may take longer.
2. There was no representative present from the Search Committee for the Vice President for Student Affairs.

D. President Adams presented a slate for Shared Governance Committee assignments. (See Attachment A) Senator Makowski moved the approval of the slate. Senator Brewton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Senator Loew reported that the ADA Task Force needs feedback and names of volunteers to serve to review requests for accommodation. They would like a large pool of volunteers so that a group of three to five could be formed as needed and no one would be overly burdened with time commitment. She requested that anyone interested contact her.

NEW BUSINESS:

President Adams presented an issued which had been presented to the Senate Executive Committee. (See Attachment B) Because this is in regard to an unresolved personnel issue, we could not discuss the particular details which led to the consideration of this issue. He asked if the Senate wished to consider this issue and if so, what committee

should be tasked with studying it. He stated that the questions of concern have far-reaching implications for more than the person and department involved. We are dealing with a time constraint since the promotion process is already in progress and the tenure process begins in March. Senator Makowski moved that the Senate consider the set of questions. Senator Rock seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Senator Gaunder reported that the last SACS self-study had statements and recommendations related to how faculty is evaluated for tenure and promotion, namely developing standards. Senator Makowski moved that the Senate communicate formally in writing to President Cale the seriousness of this issue, with the questions of extraordinary importance and that we look forward to his cooperation. Senator Richardson seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Senator Gaunder requested that we provide the details from the SACS self-study as well. Senator Makowski moved that the Executive Committee of the Senate be given the task of considering the questions. Senator Flowers seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

ATTACHMENT A

SLATE FOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

DISTANCE LEARNING ADVISORY

1 COLLEGE OF ED

NOMINEES

Dr. Katrina Hunter-Mintz; Ed.

READMISSIONS

1 EACH BUS, ED, NUR & 2 A & S

NOMINEES

Dr. Lynn Aquadro;Nur.
LTC Jose Atencio; A&S
Ms. Mary Ann Allan; A&S
Dr. B. Lee Hurren; Ed.
Dr. Tom Lovett; Bus.

HUMAN SUBJECTS

1 COLLEGE OF ED

NOMINEES

Dr. Sandra Loew

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1 COLLEGE OF ED

NOMINEES

Dr. Pam Fernstrom; Ed.

SAFETY & EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

1 GEN FACULTY

NOMINEES

LTC Michael Fennell; A&S

AT WILL POOL

NOMINEES

Dr. Susan Bobek; Nur.
Ms. Dena Bates; Nur.
Dr. Philip Robinson; A&S
Ms. Evelyn Bruce;A&S
Ms. Jackie Winston; A&S
Dr. Bob Daly;A&S
Ms. Kathy Crisler; A&S
Ms. Anita Garner; A&S
Dr. Lavin Rowe;Nur.
Dr. Keith Lindley; A&S

ATTACHMENT B

Concerning Tenure and Promotion Policies.

First, let me apologize for not being able to share details or get into the particulars that prompt this discussion. Our focus is with ramifications of an unresolved personnel action. Several questions of procedure and policy have arisen out of a recent tenure decision. In consideration of the good name and reputation of any and all of the parties to this action, the Faculty Senate must address the following questions:

- Does shared governance impose an obligation on the administration to consult with the faculty before establishing standards for teaching effectiveness?

- Is it acceptable to include performance standards used in measuring adjuncts and temporary faculty, who do not participate in policy-making decisions within a given department or school, in determining acceptable standards for tenured or tenure-track faculty?

- Does the *Faculty Handbook* obligate the reviewers/determiners of faculty members' performance as teachers to give prior notice to those faculty members seeking tenure or promotion of necessary modifications in their practices? (Please note that 4.12.2 of the *Faculty Handbook* requires the Vice President For Academic Affairs to review the results of the Faculty Evaluation program each year and make appropriate recommendations for improving faculty performances.)[1]

- Do the standards for determining teaching effectiveness truly reflect achievement and performance of students in a given class? In other words, can an instructor conscientiously seek to ensure that students demonstrate a working knowledge of course content without being classified as an ineffective teacher when measured by these standards?

- Why do students withdraw from a given class? Is it appropriate to assume students withdraw because they find the teacher ineffective in explaining course content or in testing comprehension of course material? Is it possible the current liberal withdrawal policy encourages underperforming students to withdraw rather than put forth the required time and effort needed to succeed in a given class? (Please note that in certain subject areas, nearly 70% of the entering freshmen at UNA are under the national averages in ACT scores.)

- Are standards for measuring/determining teacher effectiveness consistent with stated goals aimed at improving academics on the UNA campus, or do they in fact encourage faculty to lower their academic standards in order to be tenured or promoted?

1

4.12 FACULTY EVALUATION

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to provide uniform, reliable data to improve the quality of teaching, research, and public service; promote faculty development; provide more reliable information for faculty personnel decisions; and comply with a regional accreditation criterion requiring "periodic evaluations of the performance of individual faculty members" for "the improvement of the faculty and the educational program." All faculty members are expected to participate fully and in good faith in this process as part of terms and conditions of employment at the University.

4.12.1 Components of the Program

Expanded Curriculum Vitae. The vitae shall contain basic background data - educational background, degrees, teaching experience, scholarly activities, service to the department, university, and community - and any information deemed relevant to the department or faculty member. The vitae shall be updated yearly **by May 15** and placed in the faculty member's file in the departmental office, in the dean's office, and in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Faculty Member's Annual Goals and Objectives and Summary Evaluations. Each full-time faculty member will establish yearly goals related to departmental and institutional goals for the upcoming year. These goals shall be qualitative and measurable and shall reflect language related to teaching, service, and scholarly activity. Each goal will describe what is to be accomplished and the procedures to be used to accomplish the goal. The faculty member will contact the department chair to establish a meeting date **prior to May 15** in order to discuss, come to a consensus, and submit goals for the coming year. (See Appendix 4.C, Summary Evaluation Report and Goal Planning Form) During the conference, the faculty member and department chair shall come to a consensus on the following year's goals. If the faculty member was employed the previous year, he/she will complete and submit on this form a summary and evaluation of the prior year's goals. The faculty member and the department chair will, during the meeting, discuss the specific goals and the improvements made which the faculty member has documented. This form will be transmitted to the appropriate academic dean for approval. A signed copy of the faculty member's yearly goals and summary evaluation is to be kept in the individual's permanent personnel file in the department chairperson's office, the appropriate dean's office, and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Student Rating of Faculty. Student rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and Collier Library) to collect information about students' perceptions of courses and faculty. Departments may add items to the campus form. (See Appendix 4.C.) Student evaluations will be administered at a minimum of one time each school year for non-tenured, non-tenure-track, and adjunct faculty, and every other year for tenured faculty. Faculty members have the option of administering the student evaluation form and process more frequently than the minimums stated above. The faculty member will announce

to the class in advance that the rating forms will be administered. The faculty member should give the envelope with the blank forms and instructions to the student proctor, who is to be chosen from the class by the faculty member. The faculty member will leave the classroom. The faculty member will allow students ample time to complete the form. The professor will read the following statement to the class: "The evaluation you are about to complete is intended for constructive feedback. After your final grades in this course have been submitted, your tabulated responses will be seen by the instructor of the course and the chair of the department or dean. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of the evaluation is improvement, if you are going to be critical, try to document your criticism in your responses in such a way that the instructor can benefit and improve his/her teaching of this course. Be as responsible in completing this form as you would be if you were going to sign it. The instructor of this course will not see the results of these forms until the semester is over and the final grades have been submitted. A blank sheet of paper is provided should you wish to make comments." As students finish the questionnaires, they will place their evaluation responses in the envelope so marked. When everyone has put his/her form in the proper envelope, the student proctor will seal the envelope and take it to the office of the department chair or dean. The processed results shall be distributed to the department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The summary of the ratings shall become a part of the faculty member's file and shall be shared with the faculty member.

4.12.2 Use of the Results of the Program

The results of the Faculty Evaluation Program shall each year be summarized by the department chairs and reviewed by the respective deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Following such review, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall make such recommendations as he or she shall deem appropriate for improvement of the faculty and the educational program.