

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 10, 2009

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met February 10, 2009 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Bates called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies: Linda Lewis for Senator Davidson from Secondary Education and Vicky Hulsey for Senator Dumas from Elementary Education.

The agenda was adopted and the minutes for the January 15, 2009 meeting were approved.

President Cale shared that the legislature is in session. The governor submitted his budget with a 2.93% reduction of the already prorated budget with will result in an additional \$900,000 cut. There is some possible federal money from the stimulus package or a possible tuition increase by the Board of Trustees in June. He reported that he had interview Friday afternoon and Monday morning for a company to work on the campus master plan. KPS Consulting out of Birmingham, which is working with the city of Florence master plan, has been selected to consider such things as how the university should grow and traffic rearrangement. He will be asking the senate to get involved in the nine month process. He reported that four VPAA candidates have come to campus and the list has been reduced to two names.

President Cale reported that he will be a part of a SACS team visiting the University of Mississippi in the near future. He stated that he appreciated that we sent the questions for the Faculty Attitude Survey to him to be considered. He has concerns with questions 73 and 74 and asked that the senate consider removing them because they are not issues under consideration and the legal issues related to them. He also suggested that the senate might want to rewrite #75 to ask if the faculty member would be willing to increase class size. He also had concern with #79.

Vice-President Warren stated that he has asked the deans to consider if they can hold the jobs open for one year for any job being vacated.

President Bates presented a list of upcoming elections on the bottom of the agenda.

REPORTS:

- A. Standing Senate Committee Reports:
 - 1. Academic Affairs – David Muse presented a report (See Attachment A) concerning the charge of evaluating a recommendation from the Office of Enrollment Management to raise the standards for conditional admission. He presented data

concerning how successfully those entering with 14 or 15 ACT score have been. There is a concern with the economic impact of raising the standard as well as the branding of the university as perceived by better students as not being a first choice academic institution due to the current low admission standards. Another issue is remediation of these at-risk students which might be better handled on the junior college level. The committee recommended the proposed change in the admission standards for 2010 be endorsed. The senate will vote on the issue next month.

2. Faculty Affairs – Jeremy Stafford reported the committee had numerous meetings with several groups resulting in the work presented to address Charge 3 (See Attachment B). The senate was asked to take this document to their colleagues and give feedback at the next meeting or contact jostafford@una.edu.

3. Faculty Attitude Survey – Craig Robertson presented the Faculty Attitude Survey questions and asked for revisions which are as follows:

- #37 Change Information Technologies to Educational Technology and Library.
- II Change II to read as I by removing Garry Warren’s name.
- Add for all administrators in I, II and III, “His commitment to identify strategic opportunities for moving the university forward to meet the needs of a changing world.”
- #49 Rick Lester
- #41-43 His/Her
- Add after #41 “and the tenure process”
- Remove #60-69
- #71-72 remove the parentheses item
- Add #75a to read as #75 concerning larger class size
- Remove the budgetary questions 77, 78, 79
- Omit #98
- Change #91 to say enforce parking regulations

Senator Richardson moved to suspend the rules to vote on the issue. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion to suspend the rules to vote passed. Senator Flowers moved the approval of the revisions. Senator Ferry seconded. The motion passed. The committee recommended the use of survey monkey for implementing the survey. Senator Flowers moved the approval of the recommendation. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Richardson moved the adjournment of the meeting. Senator Roden seconded. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee Report

Proposed Change in the UNA Freshman Admissions Requirements for 2009-2010

Committee Charge

In late November of 2008, the Academic Affairs Committee was charged with evaluating a recommendation from the Office of Enrollment Management to raise the University standards for conditional admission. Currently, a student must meet two of the following three requirements for conditional admission:

- 1) ACT composite score of 14 or above (SAT of 680 or above);
- 2) At least 11 units on the high school academic core requirements;
- 3) GPA on the high school core requirements of at least 1.5.

The recommendation for conditional admission beginning with the freshman class of 2009 is as follows:

High school graduates who do not meet university standards for unconditional admission may be granted conditional admission provided they meet all the following:

- 1) Minimum ACT composite score of 16 or an SAT score of 760-800;
- 2) Minimum of 11 earned units from their high school academic core; and
- 3) High school GPA of 1.75 earned in academic core courses.

The recommendation memo also indicated that “Approximately 50 students from the 2008 freshman class would have been impacted by these proposed changes.”

Committee Evaluation

This report is directed toward assessing the impact of raising the minimum ACT composite score from 14 to 16. To this end, trends were examined both with regard to student retention and with regard to the academic success of students who were retained. More specifically, data was obtained from the Office of Research for high school graduates with ACT composite scores of 14 or 15 who entered UNA during the fall terms of 2005, 2006, and 2007. Conditional admissions for this category of ACT composite scores included 54 - fall of 2005, 48 - fall of 2006, and 44 - fall of 2007, respectively. The associated retention information by semester is presented in Table 1. Table 2 displays GPA scores for the students who were still enrolled at the start of the fall semester of 2008.

Table 1: Student Retention by Semester and Freshman Class for Students with ACT Composite Scores of 14 or 15*

Semester	Retention by Freshman Class					
	Fall of 2005		Fall of 2006		Fall of 2007	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Fa 05	54	100.0	-	-	-	-
Sp 06	38	70.4	-	-	-	-
Fa 06	23	42.6	48	100.0	-	-
Sp 07	20	37.0	40	83.3	-	-
Fa 07	16	29.6	30	62.5	44	100.0
Sp 08	12	22.2	27	56.3	38	86.4
Fa 08	6	11.1	14	29.2	20	45.5

* This retention data is based on initial enrollments each semester. Withdrawals during a semester are included in the initial enrollment for the following semester.

Table 2: Cumulative GPA's of Students with ACT Composite Scores of 14 or 15 by Freshman Class for Those Still Enrolled as of Fall 2008

Freshman Class				
Fall 05	Fall 06		Fall 07	
3.48	3.00	1.94	2.94	1.95
2.52	2.80	1.76	2.84	1.80
2.39	2.69	1.61	2.59	1.68
2.28	2.66	1.58	2.54	1.67
2.22	2.48	1.42	2.45	1.66
2.06	2.36	1.00	2.32	1.64
	2.18		2.28	1.56
	2.15		2.03	1.36
			2.00	0.96
			2.00	0.76

With regard to Table 1, note that the 3-year retention rate for the fall of 05 freshman class is 11.1%; the 2-year retention rates for the fall of 05 and fall of 06 classes are quite consistent at 29.6% and 29.2%; and the 1-year retention rates for the three groups are more variable with reasonably close agreement between the fall of 05 (42.6%) and fall of 07 groups (45.5%).

Table 2 shows that only a small percentage of each group has achieved the level of academic success (based on a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0) that is required for graduation: 22.7% - fall of 07; 16.7% - fall of 06; and 11.1% - fall of 05.

Given the above information, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee would like to recommend acceptance of the recommendation from the Office of Enrollment Management to raise the University standards for conditional admission.

ATTACHMENT B

Charge 3: UNA Faculty Self-Report Evaluation Worksheet (FSEW)

This document details the activities and considerations of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) during the development of the FSEW. The FAC recommends that the FSEW be adopted as an additional faculty evaluation instrument (proposed Form 4D) beginning in the Fall semester of 2009.

Index

Section 1a: Purpose & Considerations

Section 1b: FSEW FAQ's

Section 2: Intended Use

Section 3: Structural Requirements

Section 4a: Teaching Evaluation

Section 4b: Operational Definitions for "Teaching" evaluation

Section 5a: Professional Development Evaluation

Section 5b: Operational Definitions for "Professional Development" evaluation

Section 6a: Service Evaluation

Appendix A: Complete Worksheet

Section 1a: Purpose of FSEW

As stated in the Faculty Handbook ((Section 4.13, page 4-23),

“The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to provide uniform, reliable data to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service and promote faculty development for the improvement of education. 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.”

“All faculty members are expected to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching; research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service. “

Currently the only method of faculty evaluation used at UNA is the student Instructor/ Course evaluation (Form 4C). This does not meet the stated requirements of the UNA’s Faculty Evaluation Program, and it is deficient compared to UNA’s peer institutions which all currently use at least 3 methods of evaluation (i.e., student, peer, and self-report evaluations). Moreover, faculty members currently have little input and limited participation in their own performance evaluations, and critical faculty performance activities that should be recognized for both faculty development and promotion/tenure consideration (i.e., professional development and service) are all but ignored.

The FAC also recognized that several faculty fall into a broader non-teaching category, yet are still subject to the same promotion and tenure criteria as the UNA faculty at large. Section 4.13 of the Faculty Handbook provides certain exemptions from the ‘teaching’ component of the overall evaluation process through the use of approved alternatives to Form 4C. However, these alternate methods of evaluation (e.g., peer reviews) would still be expected to conform to the criteria outlined in ‘teaching’ section of the proposed FSEW

Thus, the Faculty Senate Charged the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with developing a standardized self-evaluation tool that could be used by the faculty at large with the intent of overcoming many of the qualitative and quantitative deficiencies of Form 4C. After numerous consultations with individual faculty, department chairs, the Council of Academic Deans (COAD), and the university administration, the FAC has developed the following Faculty Self-Report Evaluation Worksheet (FSEW). This self-report worksheet is intended to serve many purposes. Among those are:

1. To provide individual faculty members with greater input, participation, and flexibility in their annual performance evaluations,
2. To make individual faculty more competitive for promotion and tenure (once they become eligible) by adding critical performance data to their portfolios, and
3. To recognize many of the valuable contributions faculty make to the University each year that all too often do not receive recognition.
4. To aid faculty in meeting the University’s annual summary evaluation and goal planning requirements.

FSEW Considerations

Because this instrument is intended to be a self-evaluation, thereby enabling all university faculty to evaluate their own performance, there were several considerations that the FAC took into consideration. Specific considerations of the self-evaluation instrument were:

- Evaluation criteria had to be standardized and measured quantitatively.
- Worksheet had be useful for assessing candidates for promotion and tenure considerations, as well as being useful for internal personal and professional development at the department & college level (e.g., end of year goal planning), as well as for accreditation compliance needs.
- Worksheet had to focus on specific aspects of all 3 “general criteria” outlined in Section 3.5 (i.e., teaching, professional development, and service) and that are not currently assessed by the Student Instructor/ Course Evaluation form (4C).
- Must allow faculty the opportunity for maximum input and flexibility in the recognition and account of their overall academic activities and professional contributions.
- Must provide all faculty with an equal chance of meeting the specified criteria (e.g., not including awards or opportunities that are only available to a specific discipline)

Section 1b: FAQ's

Q: Does the FSEW include all of the scholarly and service activities from my entire career?

A: No. The FSEW only accounts for those teaching, professional development, and service activities that occur during 1 calendar year starting with each Fall semester. This will allow for professional development and service activities to be completed during the summer even though teaching may not occur. Your promotion and tenure portfolios should include all annual FSEW worksheets.

Q: What do the FSEW scores mean?

A: The FSEW only provides a means of obtaining an objective and measurable account of faculty activity and performance. How the scores are interpreted, applied, and for what purpose will be determined by individual departments, colleges, COAD, Portfolio Review Committee, and/ or the university administration.

Q: Who determines my FSEW score?

A: You do! Each faculty member will complete the FSEW on their own. However, review of the completed FSEW may take place during the goal planning meetings with your department chair, and all activities claimed on the FSEW should be documented and verifiable.

Q: Will the FSEW replace the Student Instructor/ Course Evaluation (Form 4C)?

A: No. The FSEW is intended to be an evaluation supplement to Form 4C. The FAC proposes that the FSEW be listed in the Faculty Handbook as “Form 4D”.

Q: What is the minimum score I need to be considered for a promotion or tenure?

A: There is no minimum score needed. The FSEW scores do NOT determine promotion or tenure eligibility and will NOT be used as the exclusive determining factor for promotion and tenure decisions. The FSEW is intended only to provide additional information to be considered along with all the other information in a faculty member's promotion or tenure portfolio.

Q: Does the FSEW account for all of my teaching, professional development, and service activities and achievements for the entire year?

A: No. Because the FSEW is intended to be a standardized form to be used by the university faculty at large, only those criteria that all faculty have an equal chance of meeting are listed on the FSEW. Eligibility and or achievement of specific awards or activities that are largely influenced or determined by academic discipline, rank, or years of service need to be included as separate documents in your portfolio (e.g. College of Business Teacher of the Year, Top Researcher Award, etc).

Q: Do all faculty need to complete the FSEW?

A: Yes. All tenured and non-tenured faculty are expected to complete the FSEW at the beginning of each Fall semester.

Q: In terms of points, is there a limit to the number of authors or principles for publications, performances, or panel discussions under the 'professional development' section?

A: No. Point values are based only on the activity performed.

Q: Does serving as the head editor for a journal count as having a publication?

A: No.

Section 2: Intended Use

The FAC recommends that the FSEW be incorporated only as an added informational supplement (i.e., not a "gate-keeping" assessment) to the overall evaluation process in order to provide substantially more evaluative information above and beyond what is currently obtained by Form 4C alone. Specifically, the FSEW is intended to be used in conjunction with Form 4C, and will not be the only evaluation data source used to make promotion and/ or tenure decisions. In addition, the FAC recommends that the FSEW be completed annually at the beginning of each Fall semester at which time student evaluation scores will be available to faculty and to include professional development and service activities performed or achieved over the summer. It is also recommended that all faculty goal-planning meetings be scheduled at this time in order to integrate the FSEW into the goal planning session.

Section 3: Structural Requirements

- Must be user friendly and clearly defined (operational definitions should be included as an Appendix to Section 4.13).
- Must incur minimal administrative effort/ cost to complete and process.
- Must reflect performance characteristics inherent to all academic disciplines.
- Evaluation criteria scores must be on a quantitative scale.
- Criteria must have *prima fascia* content, construct, criterion, and concurrent validity.
- Framework must be flexible enough such that additional or alternate evaluation criteria could be included in the future.
- In keeping with the stated mission of university, and after consultation with the administration, the Council of Academic Deans (COAD), department chairs, and faculty, the FAC chose to weight the total relative value of each of the 3 evaluation areas (i.e., teaching, professional

development, and service) as **50%, 30%, and 20%**, respectively. These weights can be adjusted upwards or downwards in the future as necessary.

Section 4a: FSEW Teaching Evaluation Component

The overall self-evaluation score for the ‘teaching’ component will consist of a base score (determined by Form 4C) with the possibility for additional points for other factors. Faculty may choose multiple additional evaluation factors; however, the overall teaching score cannot exceed 50 points.

For example, if a new faculty member developed and taught a course for the first time, and whose teaching score (taken from Form 4C) *exceeded* their college average, then they would receive 45 points as their base score, and would then add an additional 2.5 points for the new course prep. This would give them a total score of 47.5 points out of a possible 50. If they happened to also *exceed* the average score for their department, they would be eligible to receive an additional 5 points. However, since the maximum score for the teaching evaluation are 50 points, they would need to choose which additional factor they wanted to apply to their overall score (obviously it would be the greater of the two!). On the other hand, if their scores from Form 4C had only *met* the college average, then they would receive a base score of 30, and could then apply both additional factors (i.e. exceeded department average and new course prep) for a total score of 37.5 (i.e., 30 + 5 + 2.5).

TEACHING (accounts for 50% of total evaluation score)

Summary Results (from Form 4C or alternate assessment)	<u>Evaluation Points</u>
• Exceeded College Average (more than +1.5 standard deviations)	45
• Met College Average (within +/- 1.5 standard deviations)	30
• Did not meet College Average (more than - 1.5 standard deviations)	15
 <u>Additional Evaluation Factors</u>	
- Exceeds department average (more than +1.5 standard deviations)	5
- At least 1 new course preparation ¹	2.5
- Concurrent face to face & online/ distance courses (to include hybrid courses). ²	2.5

Section 4b: Operational Definitions for Teaching evaluation

1. A “*new course preparation*” is suggested by the FAC to be defined as:

- a. Any substantial change in content and/ or pedagogy for an existing course that the incumbent instructor had previously taught, or
- b. Preparation of a course that had not been previously offered under the University course catalog, or
- c. Preparation by a non-incumbent instructor for an existing course that had been previously offered.

2. "Concurrent" is suggested to be defined as teaching 1 or more face-to-face courses while at the same time during the same semester teaching 1 or more non face-to-face courses.

Section 5a: FSEW Professional Development Evaluation Component

The overall evaluation score for the 'professional development' component will consist of an aggregate of possible points. Faculty may earn points by fulfilling multiple options; however, the overall professional development score cannot exceed 30 points.

For example, in 1 calendar year, a faculty member may achieve an overall maximum point score by publishing in a level 2 journal (1a) OR have their original artwork featured in a syndicated magazine (2b), present 1 paper at a conference (1d), and chair a panel discussion (2c). They would then receive 15 + 5 + 10 = 30 points.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (accounts for 30% of total evaluation score)

* Option 1 **suggested** for research oriented disciplines

** Option 2 **suggested** for performance/ behavior oriented disciplines.

*** Points reflect publication and/ or activity rigor only.

Option 1a: Publication of peer reviewed & indexed journal article or book authorship.

- | | |
|---|----|
| - Level 1 journal (less than 10% acceptance rate) | 20 |
| - Level 2 journal (less than 20% acceptance rate) | 15 |
| - Level 3 journal (less than 35% acceptance rate) | 10 |
| - Level 4 journal (less than 50% acceptance rate) | 5 |

Option 1b: Published chapter in an indexed academic text or professional reference. 15

Option 1c: Publication in a trade journal, white paper, or conference proceeding. 10

Option 1d: Paper or poster presentation and/ or recognition in conference proceeding. 5

Option 2a: Demonstration, delivery, or display of original work/ material, or physical performance related directly to your academic area. 20

Option 2b: Material or physical work related directly to your academic area, featured or displayed in any form of print, film, video, or photographic medium for the intended purpose of reference, display, or public dissemination. 15

Option 2c: Organize, chair, and/ or facilitate a panel session or workshop at an academic conference or symposium. 10

Option 2d: Serve as an invited discussant in a panel session at an academic conference or symposium. 5

NOTE: In order to ensure that each faculty member at UNA has an equal opportunity for point attainment, no distinctions are made between the composition levels of journals and conferences because the professional association of several disciplines may not have national or international journals or professional meetings. Such a constraint would preclude certain faculty from being able to earn the maximum points.

Section 5b: Operational Definitions for Professional Development Evaluation

Option 1a:

- *Peer reviewed* is suggested to be defined as being works that is critiqued by reviewers anonymous to the author(s) and who were selected by the publisher.
- *Indexed* is suggested to be defined as a journal or book that is listed in an academic database.

* Individual departments will be responsible for maintaining a list of acceptable journal and book titles / publishers.

Option 1b:

- *Professional reference* is suggested to be defined as a glossary or technical manual limited to material that is related to the faculty member's specific academic area.

Option 1c:

- Publication source must be related to the faculty member's specific academic area (e.g., a white paper posted on www.SHRM.org for a faculty member whose primary instruction is in human resource management).

Option 1d:

- Paper and/ or poster presentations are suggested to apply only to complete papers (i.e., no abstracts) unless abstracts are the common practice of the specific academic association or conference.

Option 2a:

- Examples include performance of original music compositions, demonstrations of newly developed technology or procedures, display of original creative artwork, theatrical and vocal performances, readings of original literary work, etc.

Option 2b:

- Examples include artwork feature in a syndicated magazine, original music score featured in a commercial or movie soundtrack, research cited in a syndicated or national news report, etc.

Option 2c:

- Must perform administrative duties in addition to contributing to a material discussion about a topic related to their specific academic area

Option 2d:

- Must contribute to a material discussion about a topic related to their specific academic area.

NOTE: Individual departments will interpret faculty members' professional development activities and decide which of the options listed are most applicable for each. Activities that fall outside of the professional or academic scope (i.e., not required for accreditation, certification etc) are to be considered a *service*.

Section 6a: FSEW Service Evaluation Component

The overall evaluation score for the 'service' component will consist of an aggregate of possible points available by satisfying a variety of criteria. Faculty may earn points by choosing multiple service categories; however, the overall professional development score cannot exceed 20 points.

For example, a faculty may serve on 2 committees, be a reviewer for a journal, and volunteer for a civic group. This would result in a total score of $4(x2) + 4 + 4 = 16$ points. Another example would be if a faculty member served on a new faculty search committee, was a student group advisor, and went on recruiting trips for the college, served on a board for a community group, and helped organize a local charity fundraising event, their total score would be $4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 = 20$.

SERVICE (accounts for 20% of total evaluation score)

- University (shared governance, Senate, student life activities etc) 4
- College (grant writing, accreditation committee, recruitment, etc.) 4
- Department (student advising, accreditation and search committees, etc) 4
- Professional (conference administration, editorial duties, etc) 4
- Community (non academic or professional volunteerism activities, etc) 4

Appendix A

University of North Alabama
Faculty Self-Report Evaluation Worksheet

Completed by: _____

College & Department: _____

For the Calendar Year _____ (month/ year) to _____ (month/ year)

This self-evaluation worksheet is intended as a guide for personal and professional development, as well as an information supplement to be used for promotion and tenure considerations. This worksheet is to be completed at the beginning of each Fall semester; however, because some faculty members are classified as non-teaching (e.g., library science, ET, department chairs, etc), certain exemptions to this worksheet are permissible.

TEACHING¹ (accounts for 50% of total evaluation score)

Summary Results (from Form 4C or alternate assessment)	<u>Evaluation Points</u>
• Exceeded College Average (more than +1.5 standard deviations)	45
• Met College Average (within +/- 1.5 standard deviations)	30
• Did not meet College Average (more than - 1.5 standard deviations)	15
<u>Weighting Factors</u>	
- Exceeds department average	5
- At least 1 new course preparation	2.5
- Concurrent face to face & online/ distance courses (to include hybrid courses).	2.5

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT² (accounts for 30% of total evaluation score)

* Option 1 **suggested** for research oriented disciplines

** Option 2 **suggested** for performance/ behavior oriented disciplines.

Option 1a: Publication of peer reviewed & indexed journal article or book authorship.

- Level 1 journal (less than 10% acceptance rate)	20
- Level 2 journal (less than 20% acceptance rate)	10
- Level 3 journal (less than 35% acceptance rate)	15
- Level 4 journal (less than 50% acceptance rate)	5

Option 1b: Published chapter in an academic text or professional reference. 15

Option 1c: Publication in trade journal, white paper, or conference proceeding. 10

Option 1d: Paper or poster presentation and/ or recognition in conference proceeding. 5

Option 2a: Demonstration, delivery, or display of original work/ material, or physical performance related directly to your academic area. 20

Option 2b: Material or physical work related directly to your academic area, featured or displayed in any form of print, film, video, or photographic medium for the intended purpose of reference, display, or public dissemination. 15

Option 2c: Organize, chair, and/ or facilitate a panel session or workshop at an academic conference or symposium. 10

Option 2d: Serve as an invited discussant in a panel session at an academic conference or symposium. 5

SERVICE³ (accounts for 20% of total evaluation score)

- University (shared governance, Senate, student life activities etc) 4
 - College (grant writing, accreditation committee, recruitment, etc.) 4
 - Department (student advising, accreditation and search committees, etc) 4
 - Professional (conference administration, editorial duties, etc) 4
 - Community (non academic or professional volunteerism activities, etc) 4
-

Total Teaching Points: _____

Total Professional Development Points: _____

Total Service Points: _____

TOTAL EVALUATION POINTS: _____

¹ Faculty may choose multiple weighting factors. Teaching score cannot exceed 50 points.

² Faculty may choose multiple options. Professional development score cannot exceed 30 points.

³ Faculty may choose more than 1 service category. Service score cannot exceed 20 points.

Faculty Signature: _____

Date: _____

Dept. Chair Signature: _____

Date: _____