

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 17, 2005

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met November 17, 2005 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Adams called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies: LTC Atencio for Senator Fennell from Military Science, and Dr. Jerry Ferry for Senator Holley from Accounting.

The following senators were present: Adams, Adler, Atkinson, Bates, Blose, Brewton, Bruce, Bunn, Crisler, Davidson, Flowers, Gaston, Gaunder, Gossett, Green, Hallock, Leonard, Loew, Makowski, Martin, McDaniel, Myhan, Price, Robinson, Rock, Roden, Takeuchi, Thorne, Turner, Ward, Webb, and Williams.

The following senators were absent without proxy: Brown, Cai, Ford, Hunter-Mintz, Richardson, and Wallace.

Senator Blose moved the adoption of the agenda. Senator Myhan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Flowers moved the approval of the October 13, 2005 minutes. Senator Gaston seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

President Cale addressed the Senate and requested that a group of faculty serve to aid in the selection of Commencement speakers. He requested that the senate and the shared governance committee work together to form a group of advisors for the selection of Commencement speakers. He reported that this year Pam Long, actress, former Miss UNA, former Miss Alabama and former runner-up to Miss America, will be the commencement speaker. President Cale reported that enrollment continues to do well. He also reported that the Education Trust Fund at the moment has exceeded expectations and it will be interesting to hear the arguments concerning how it should be divided. He stated that he is encouraged about the direction of Higher Education in the state.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- A. President Adams reported on the questions which were raised at the last meeting concerning the decision about the placement of the new science building. There was no vote taken by the Infrastructure Committee regarding the building placement. On Tuesday the Committee was given a tour of the three sites being considered with the advantages and disadvantages presented. President Cale stated that the Infrastructure Committee will be consulted in December concerning this issue.
Senator R. Gaunder expressed concern relative to the process of arriving at decisions about the science building. The process used thus far does not satisfy

reasonable protocol as established by the Kaleidoscope Document which outlines steps toward the construction of a science building.

- B. The Tenure and Promotion Policy changes which were recommended last February have gone to the academic deans, then to the Faculty/Staff Welfare Committee for review, next to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and finally to President Cale.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Committee Reports:

- 1. Senator Blose, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented the following attendance policy resolution:

Faculty Senate Resolution – Attendance Policy

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate has polled the faculty regarding the attendance policy and found that the majority of the faculty prefers the policy as it is stated in the UNA Bulletin,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA THAT

THE ATTENDANCE POLICY AS STATED IN THE UNA BULLETIN BE RETAINED.

Senator Blose also presented the following withdrawal policy resolution:

Faculty Senate Resolution – Withdrawal Policy

WHEREAS there has been an inconsistency in the UNA Bulletin between the attendance policy and the withdrawal policy, to remedy this inconsistency

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA THAT

THE DEADLINE FOR A STUDENT TO WITHDRAW FROM A CLASS WILL BE ON THE EIGHTH FRIDAY OF THE SEMESTER. A STUDENT MAY BE WITHDRAWN FROM A CLASS BY ADMINISTRATIVE CHANNELS AFTER THAT DATE.

- 2. Dr. Brent Elliot from the Faculty Affairs Committee presented a draft proposal for faculty development leave. (See Attachment A). President Adams thanked the committee for their expeditious work on this issue. Dr. Elliot reported that the committee looked at sixty-four peer institutions. Compensations ranged from half

year to full year. Issues like when the leave could be taken and what obligations were required afterwards were considered. Senators are to take this draft back to their departments, discuss and have any amendments to the proposal circulated so that the senate can take action at the next meeting.

3. President Adams reported from the Senate Executive Committee concerning the investigation of the questions raised at the last meeting with regard to Tenure and Promotion Policies. (See Attachment B) Although some of the questions have been answered, others will take considerably more investigation. Senator Robinson moved that the committee continue the investigation. Senator Adler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Shared Governance Committees

1. The Strategic Budget and Planning Committee is looking at budget requests, faculty positions, the strategic plan, and the mission/vision statement. The committee thanked the faculty for their input in the mission/vision statement.

2. The Shared Governance Committee meets each Monday. Next semester there will be a room (318) in Bibb Graves with a student worker who can help with committee clerical work. Senator Makowski reported that committee members will also spend time there as well. The committee has been requested by members of the staff to investigate the hiring and reclassification of staff positions. They are also working on the composition of the Readmissions Committee. Students will serve in meetings to design procedures but will not be able to sit on actual hearings. The committee is also tracking the process of the new science building. They questioned why the process is not being driven by the science faculty needs and recommended that the process needs to be reconsidered.

C. President Cale reported that the Search Committee for the Vice-President of Student Affairs has identified eight candidates and are conducting telephone interviews. They hope to schedule campus visits for January. Senator Blose reported that the Assistant Vice-President for Advancement Search Committee has received fourteen applications, will begin telephone interview soon and also hopes to have campus visits after the first of the year.

D. Senator Makowski reported that he and President Adams attended the ACUFP meeting two weeks ago. The format of the meetings has changed with the fall meeting occurring on a campus with campus reports given. The spring meeting coincides with Higher Education Day in Montgomery in an effort to better connect with the state senators and other elected officers. This was the second year that the entire Alabama and Auburn campuses were in attendance. Issues which are of concern on campuses were: Post tenure review, accountability/viability, questions about adding program FTE without adding faculty, undergraduate research projects at UAH, and the growth of the Education Trust Fund.

NEW BUSINESS:

The senate was encouraged to consider the absence and withdrawal policies as presented earlier by the Academic Affairs Committee. It was recommended that the actual wording of the statements as they would appear in the Bulletin be written. The addition of language requiring the faculty member's permission was recommended. Senator Thorne encouraged the senators to bring their copy of the UNA Bulletin to the next meeting. President Cale offered the possibility of using a WF if the student needs to withdraw while failing the course.

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

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT PROPOSAL for FACULTY DEVELOPMENT LEAVE

PURPOSE

A faculty member has three academic functions, teaching, service (to the university and community) and research (scholarly or creative pursuits). The faculty development leave program is undertaken to provide time for such scholarly and creative research, academic program development and to allow members of the faculty to keep abreast of developments in their fields of service to the University.

A faculty development leave is not a leave which a faculty member automatically “earns” by having been employed for a given period of time. Rather, it is an investment by the University in the expectation that the leave will significantly enhance the faculty member’s capacity to contribute to the objectives of the University. For this reason, faculty development leave applications are approved only if there is adequate reason to believe that they will achieve this purpose.

ELIGIBILITY

At the University of North Alabama, eligibility is limited to full-time, non-administrative, tenured faculty members (including department chairs) with:

- (1) at least six years of service at this University, and
- (2) with at least six years of service since his or her last Development Leave, and
- (3) who have submitted the report(s) from previous leave(s) in a satisfactory and timely manner.

Applicants may request developmental leave to engage in study, research, writing, academic program development, scholarly or creative pursuits and similar projects for the purpose of adding to the knowledge available to oneself, one’s students, one’s institution, and society generally. Development leaves are not available to support completion of an advanced degree.

APPLICATION & SELECTION PROCESS

Faculty Development Leave Application forms are located in the Appendix.

Applications for Faculty Development Leave must include (1) a Faculty Development Application Form, (2) a detailed, current Curriculum Vita, (3) a proposal not to exceed ten pages describing the activity and specifying how the leave is expected to lead to the faculty member's development, and how the leave will benefit the University of North Alabama and its students.

Upon receipt of applications by the department head, further routing will be as follows: Dean, Chair of Faculty Development Leave Committee for ranking and recommendation for funding, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Proposals from Department Chairs are submitted directly to the appropriate Dean. Each administrative unit will forward proposals with their written recommendation.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT LEAVE PORTFOLIO

The following guidelines will be followed by eligible faculty making application for a faculty development leave.

1. Prepare a Proposal Portfolio. The portfolio is to consist of two parts: (1) a formal written proposal (not to exceed 10 pages) and (2) an appendage of support documents. In general, the formal proposal should contain the following:

A. **SUMMARY:** a clear and concise summary of the request (one page maximum)

B. **INTRODUCTION:** a detailed statement of the request, its objectives, its benefits to the applicant and the University of North Alabama in definitive and measurable terms, the results expected, and the period of time covered by the proposed sabbatical

C. **METHODS AND EVALUATION:** a detailed description of the applicant's "Faculty Development Leave Program," including activities to be employed to achieve the desired results: a detailed plan for determining the degree to which the applicant's objectives will be met and can be assessed and evaluated.

D. **FUTURE PLANS:** if applicable, describe a plan for continuation of activities beyond the development leave period which will benefit the applicant's professional development and the University of North Alabama; the plan should relate to the objectives and expected outcomes of the development leave.

E. **BUDGET:** a clear delineation of cost, other than salary, associated with the applicant's "Faculty Development Leave Program," including funding sources (grants, stipends, additional salary or compensation, etc.), travel, etc.

NOTE: If applicant is requesting additional Faculty Development funds to support faculty development leave activities, it should be noted (Budget section) and a separate Faculty Development proposal, properly referenced to the Faculty Development Leave Proposal, should be submitted to the Faculty Development Committee.

The formal proposal is not to exceed ten (10) pages!

The Proposal Appendage is to contain support documents, including, but not limited to, (1) a detailed, current Curriculum Vita, (2) a summary of previous activities which uniquely qualify the applicant to undertake the proposed sabbatical activity, (3) a summary of previous activities which demonstrate clearly that the applicant has the potential to successfully complete the "Development Leave Program," and, if applicable, (4) verification that support grants, stipends and consortia arrangements relating to the "Development Leave Program" have been authorized and approved.

The Proposal Appendage should include only relevant documents and summaries such as bibliographies, rather than copies of all publications, etc.

2. Complete and sign the Memorandum of Agreement stating the applicant's understanding and agreement to the terms of the Faculty Development Leave Program.

Faculty Development Leave Committee

The Faculty Development Leave Committee, which shall consist of three tenured faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, two from the College of Business, two from the College of Education, one from the College of Nursing and one from the Library, who shall be elected by a vote of full-time faculty from each College and Library. Elections will be held in a timely manner in order that the committee may commence its work in September of each year.

The initial election to be held immediately upon approval of the policy shall be for all members, who shall after election, determine by lot, which members shall have one- and two-year terms respectively.

All subsequent elections shall be for two-year terms.

Should a vacancy occur on the Faculty Development Leave Committee, the Faculty Senate shall designate a replacement to fill the unexpired term.

Criteria for Selection

The proposed activity should be considered in view of the value it would have for the individual's professional growth and the contribution it will make toward improving his/her value to the University of North Alabama. Some likely proposals would be for:

A. Advanced education **not** to be applied to a degree. A leave proposal should emphasize how the leave will update or improve knowledge in a field that will be taught in the immediate future as certified by the faculty member's department chair and dean.

B. Scholarly research. A leave proposal should explain why the research necessitates leave from the applicant's other assigned duties (teaching, service, etc.). The Faculty Development Committee may appoint a select panel to review and advise the Committee on the merits of the candidate's proposed research. The panel should submit its findings and recommendations in writing to the Faculty Development Committee.

C. Scholarly writing. A leave proposal should emphasize the probability of subsequent publication. The Faculty Development Committee may appoint a select panel to review and advise the Committee on the merits of the candidate's proposed writing project. The panel should submit its findings and recommendations in writing to the Faculty Development Committee.

D. Potential of candidate. In case there are candidates of equal merit according to the above areas, the decision to recommend recipients should be based on the Faculty Development Committee's confidence in the candidate's potential for success.

Application Process & Deadlines

The annual deadline for application submission is November 1 of the academic year prior to the academic year of the proposed leave. (For example, if you would like to take a leave during the Spring 2008 semester, then you must submit your proposal by November 1, 2006) If that date falls on a weekend, the due date is the Monday following November 1.

Chair

The applicant will submit a completed application to the chair of the department. The chair verifies the applicant's eligibility, provides the required information including an evaluation of the request, and forwards the application to the dean on or before November 10. If that date falls on a weekend, the due date is the Monday following November 10. Comments from Chair should address program and curriculum matters only.

Dean

The dean adds an evaluation of the application and a statement on the chair's plan to replace the faculty member during the developmental leave and forwards the application to the Faculty Development Leave Committee on or before November 20. If that date falls on a weekend, the due date is the Monday following November 20. Comments from Dean should address program and curriculum matters only.

Committee Evaluation & Review

The Faculty Development Leave Committee will determine which proposals merit consideration and rank those proposals in the appropriate college. The Faculty Development Leave Committee submits its recommendations with written reasons to the VPAA & Provost on or before February 20. If that date falls on a weekend, the due date is Monday following February 20.

1. The Faculty Development Leave Committee shall meet to evaluate, rank, and recommend faculty leaves. Committee minutes should be kept and made available to the public.
2. The Faculty Development Leave Committee will make its recommendations in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.
3. The Faculty Development Leave committee will provide applicants with written feedback concerning strengths and weaknesses of a proposal upon request.

Vice President of Academic Affairs & Provost

The VPAA & Provost evaluates all applications, recommendations, and plans for replacing the faculty member during the developmental leave. After the VPAA & Provost makes a decision, taking into account the quality of the applications as well as the financial implications, he/she will inform the dean, the chair, and the faculty member of the decision. The VPAA & Provost will provide applicants with written feedback concerning strengths and weaknesses of their proposal upon request.

Acceptance, Reconsideration & Appeals

The potential recipients must make a firm decision by April 4, on their willingness to accept or reject the faculty development leave if awarded. This decision must be confirmed in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with copies to the faculty member's department chair, dean and chair of the Faculty Development Committee. An applicant not receiving a leave may submit an updated application for reconsideration during succeeding application periods.

COMPENSATION & BENEFITS

Faculty Development Leaves for one academic year are granted for half of the recipient's regular salary, leaves for one-half academic year (4.5 months) are granted at the recipient's full regular salary. No paid leaves are authorized for summer sessions. After a faculty development leave has been granted, any change in the terms of the leave requires prior written approval from the faculty member's department Chair, Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost.

A faculty member on Development Leave will retain the right to and eligibility for benefits to medical insurance, income protection, life insurance, and other such programs in force for full-time faculty members, as well as all other rights of a full-time faculty member. The University administration shall cause to be deducted from salary, the member's cost of such programs as are legal and/or elected by the faculty member on leave.

CONDITIONS

Faculty members may have a Faculty Development Leave for one academic year at one-half their regular salary, or for one-half academic year at their full salary. (An academic year is defined as the nine-month period contained in the fall and spring semesters; development leaves are not authorized for summer sessions.)

Faculty members having signed a legal agreement to serve one full academic year after completion of the leave shall be required to reimburse the university in the amount they receive as salary and fringe benefits from the University while on leave if they should refuse to fulfill the year of service after the leave. Permanent disability attested to by a medical doctor and extenuating circumstances approved by the President will constitute reason for exemption.

Within three months of their return from leave, recipients of Faculty Development Leaves must submit a written report of their activity to the appropriate chair and dean.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SELECTIONS

Media Relations and Publications will prepare a suitable news release to announce the recipients of Development Leaves and their proposed activities. The information will be made available by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ASSESSMENT

Within three months following completion of leave, each applicant will present to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President a brief written report on accomplishments

resulting from the leave. Eligibility starting date for succeeding faculty development leave begins with the delivery of the report of accomplishments to the department chair.

Recipients of Faculty Development Leaves must submit a written report of their activity while on leave by May 1 for a Fall semester leave and by November 1 for a Spring semester leave. Those on a full year leave must submit a progress report before February 1, and the final report before September 1 after the leave period. The report will state specifically whether any possible patentable or copyrightable intellectual property was created during the leave and when such information will be submitted to the Patent and Copyright Committee. The report(s) should be submitted to the Provost with a copy to the Patent Committee and administrative individuals responsible for Copyright issues if intellectual property creation occurred during the leave.

ATTACHMENT B

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Larry Adams, Faculty Senate President for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

DATE: 14 November, 2005

SUBJECT: An Interim Report on Questions Concerning Tenure and Promotion Policies.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee was tasked at the October, 2005 Senate meeting to answer any and/or all of the following questions arising from an unresolved personnel action.

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

Rationale: Regardless of what may or may not be written in a shared governance document, the basic ideal of “shared governance” implies all constituencies affected by a decision be at the least consulted and informed. Optimally, all parties affected are included in all discussions and the decision-making process.

- 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? **NO** (with limitation).

Rationale: While there are certainly attributes/characteristics of an effective teacher that are common to adjunct/temporary faculty and tenure-track/tenured faculty, their positions and focuses are fundamentally different.

- 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.) **YES**

Rationale: Clear and definite language exists throughout the *Faculty Handbook* to suggest this is certainly the intent and spirit of the document, if not explicitly obligating such procedure. In fact, the Senate approved and passed on to the VPAA in the spring of 2005 language changes to the *Faculty Handbook* that

remove any ambiguity concerning this particular issue. Furthermore, candidates simply cannot be held responsible for assessment items not conveyed to the candidates.

- 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? **The committee cannot answer this question without further investigation and review.**

Rationale: Without a clear delineation of the standards used in a given tenure/promotion decision, the committee cannot determine if there is a direct correlation between student performance and the standards applied. In any event, the committee questions the efficacy of tying student performance to teacher effectiveness. The variables are myriad and may have little or nothing to do with the instructor's performance as a teacher.

- 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.) **The committee cannot answer this first question without further investigation and review. The committee does agree, however, that teacher ineffectiveness probably does NOT play a large role in why students withdraw from a given course. Furthermore, the committee agrees that the current policy does encourage withdrawal.**

Rationale: Without reliable, verifiable data, determining why students withdraw from a given class is impossible.

- 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? **The committee cannot answer the first half of this question without further investigation and review. We agree, however, that if, in fact, standards**

incorporating student performance and withdrawal from classes are being used to assess teacher effectiveness, then such standards would definitely encourage teachers to lower academic standards, leading to grade inflation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends further investigation into the exact nature of standards being used to determine teacher effectiveness. For all questions the committee was unable to answer definitely yes or no, we propose looking at peer institutions, SACS reviews and University responses, and any peer-reviewed information available in order to determine definite answers.