

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 5, 2009

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met March 5, 2009 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Bates called the meeting to order and recognized Michael Pretes as proxy for Senator Gaston from Geography.

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

The February 10, 2009 minutes were approved by consent.

President Cale was absent due to attending Higher Education Day.

Vice-President Warren did not have any comments.

President Bates reported the results of e-business conducted since the February meeting. On February 11, 2009 President Bates opened up nominations for the position of at-large faculty representative on the Student Publications Board via email. Anita Garner, English Department, was nominated by Senator Adams. Voting began via email on February 16th. Thirty-four of forty-two senators voted and the vote was unanimous in favor of the nominee. The vote was called completed at 1:36 p.m. on February 17th due to the clear majority.

REPORTS:

- A. Ad Hoc Committees
 - 1. Ad hoc Committee for Portfolio Review Interim report was presented by Senator Adams (See Attachment A) Senator Ferry moved to suspend the rules to vote. Senator Darby seconded. The motion passed. Senator Richardson moved to amend the proposal to read nine members on the third bullet. Senator Flowers seconded. The motion passed. Senator Loew moved to amend the proposal to strike numbers one and three under the third bullet regarding methods for selecting members. Senator Flowers seconded. The motion passed. Senator Richardson moved to amend number three under the

first bullet to read: “Insuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various Colleges, and specific Departments are being met with respect to tenure and promotion criteria.” Senator Darby seconded. The motion passed. Senator Adams moved to amend item number two under the first bullet to read: “Reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria.” Senator Richardson seconded. The motion passed. Senator Darby moved to remove “only” from the last bullet, fourth sentence to read: “Exemptions from service should be granted in cases of extreme exigency and then only for one (1) term.” Senator Richardson seconded. The motion passed.

2. Ad hoc Committee for Constitution Review report was presented by Senator Roden. A resolution concerning changing the number of faculty members represented by one senator was presented. (See Attachment B) A resolution redefining the definition of faculty and departments to reflect the reorganization of the Collier Library and the Education Technology Services departments was presented. (See Attachment C) The vote on the two resolutions will occur next month.
- B. Senator Richardson reported from the Shared Governance Committee and encouraged everyone to complete the survey from the committee. He thanked those who have already completed it. The Ad hoc Committee on Shared Governance will use the data from the survey.
- C. President Bates reported that the Research Committee had recommended the removal of the language limiting the awards to \$2000.
- D. Senator Stafford reported from the Faculty Affairs Committee with recommended changes to 3.5 Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure and 4.13 Faculty Evaluation. (See Attachment D) He pointed out the change in the number of evaluations of once a year for tenured faculty and every semester for nontenured faculty. The senate will vote at the next meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- A. The Proposed UNA Freshman Admissions Requirements were amended to read 2010-2011. Senator Robinson moved the approval. Senator Ferry seconded. The motion passed.
- B. The Proposed Faculty Self-Assessment Worksheet was discussed. Several concerns were raised. A document giving feedback was presented from Brenda Webb, Physics and Earth Science. Senator Stafford moved to suspend the assessment tool until we see the changed Student Evaluation tool. Senator Flowers seconded. The motion passed. President Bates thanked the committee for their work.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Ferry moved that the Senate ask the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to determine if the university can develop an alternative pathway into the university for students who do not meet UNA's conditional admission standards. Senator Darby seconded.

Senator Stafford moved to suspend the rules and vote today. Senator Richardson seconded. The motion to suspend the rules passed.

The motion concerning determining if the university can develop an alternative pathway failed.

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

ATTACHMENT A
Interim Report and Recommendation to the Faculty Senate from the Ad Hoc Promotion Portfolio Review Committee.

The Chair of the committee requested a list of recognized peer institutions from the UNA Office of Research, Planning, and Assessment. We were provided a list that includes: Angelo State University (Texas Tech System), Auburn University at Montgomery, Austin Peay State University (TN), Fayetteville State University (NC), Jacksonville State University, Nicholls State University (LA), Northwestern State University (LA), State University of West Georgia, Tarleton State University (TX), and University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Of the ten (10) universities provided, we were unable to find clear criteria, procedures, and policies for promotion at Jacksonville State University. After reviewing the policies and procedures for the remaining nine (9) universities and initial dialog with selected administrators, the committee recommends the following:

- A university-wide portfolio review committee, drawn from all faculty constituencies*, to serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to
 1. Reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content.
 2. Reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies.
 3. Insuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various Colleges, and specific Departments are being met in concordance with one another.
 4. Recommending, or not doing so, candidates for tenure and promotion.
- Said committee should be placed between the Deans and the VPAA.
- Said committee should have seven (7) to nine (9) members. These members may be selected in one of the following ways:
 1. A minimum of one (1) member from each constituency, at-large faculty to finish constituting the committee body, and an appointed Chair who serves only as a facilitator/tie-breaker.

2. A minimum of one (1) member from each constituency and at-large faculty to finish constituting the committee, with the Chair selected by the currently-serving committee members.
 3. Members of the committee proportionately selected according to the number of faculty in a given constituency and the Chair selected by one of the previously mentioned methods.
- Said committee should be made up of tenured Associate and Full professors.
 - A pool of **ALL** tenured professors at the Associate and Full ranks should be formed.
 - The President of the University should annually select members from said pool for said committee to serve for one (1) academic year. No faculty member is to be appointed for subsequent terms until the entire pool has been exhausted. Only then may professors be appointed to serve another term. Exemptions from service should be granted only in cases of extreme exigency and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

While these recommendations in no way constitute a definitive product, they do give the University community a place to begin dialog, and the committee recommends the Faculty Senate continues to pursue the development of a promotion portfolio review committee similar to those found at our peer universities.

** The constituencies have been identified as the four (4) Colleges and Library and Educational Technology Services faculty for a total of five (5).*

Prepared by Dr. Larry Adams

For the Ad Hoc Promotion Portfolio Review Committee

9 February, 2009

ATTACHMENT B

UNA Faculty Senate Resolution concerning Faculty Senate Constitution Number of Department Representatives

Proposed: 3/05/09

Amended:

Accepted or Rejected:

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, herein referred to as the “Constitution,” has served the Senate well since its creation and adoption in 1971 and its subsequent amendments in 1973, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1985, 1991, and 1999.

And whereas, it has been nearly a decade since the Senate has reviewed and amended the Constitution.

And whereas the during the past decade the university has changed with regard to organization and size.

Be it resolved that we, the Faculty Senate recommend that the Constitution be amended as follows:

Article III Membership A.2.

“Each department offering academic credit shall elect from its members who are fulltime faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions that are at least two-thirds non-administrative **one representative for departments having 1-13 members, two representatives for departments having 14 to 22 members or three representatives for departments having 23 or greater number of members thereof eligible to vote**, provided that for the purpose of apportioning representation and voting, Collier Library professional staff, Educational Technology Services professional staff and Kilby School teaching staff shall each be counted as a department. Fractional teaching loads of part-time faculty members shall be considered in determining the number of representatives from a department. In no case shall a department gain or lose a Senator as a result of one of its members being on leave. Each department shall be allowed to have at least one representative.”

ATTACHMENT C

UNA Faculty Senate Resolution concerning Faculty Senate Constitution Description of Faculty

Proposed: 3/05/09

Amended:

Accepted or Rejected:

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, herein referred to as the “Constitution,” has served the Senate well since its creation and adoption in 1971 and its subsequent amendments in 1973, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1985, 1991, and 1999.

And whereas, it has been nearly a decade since the Senate has reviewed and amended the Constitution.

And whereas the during the past decade the university has changed with regard to organization and size.

And whereas the current description of faculty excludes the departments of Military Science and Educational Technology Services.

Be it resolved that we, the Faculty Senate recommend that the Constitution be amended as follows:

New Article III D.

“Nominees for election and electors in each department shall be fulltime faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions that are at least two-thirds non-administrative.”

Article III Membership A.2.

“Each department offering academic credit shall elect from its members who are fulltime faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions that are at least two-thirds non-administrative,------(number of representatives to be considered separately)----
-- provided that for the purpose of apportioning representation and voting, Collier Library professional staff, Educational Technology Services professional staff and Kilby School teaching staff shall each be counted as a department. Fractional teaching loads of part-time faculty members shall be considered in determining the number of representatives from a department. In no case shall a department gain or lose a Senator as a result of one of its members being on leave. Each department shall be allowed to have at least one representative.”

ATTACHMENT D

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 judged 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 judged upon 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 judged 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; performance on administrative assignments; 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.~~ It is expected that each individual considered for academic appointment, promotion and/or tenure will demonstrate an acceptable level of effectiveness in each of these general criteria. Assessment of the level of effectiveness in these general criteria for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration will be based on performance standards defined and interpreted by each academic department. These standards should be structured in such a way as to reflect the varying degrees of performance commensurate with each academic rank and allow for value added contributions unique to different academic fields.

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

The Board of Trustees for the University of North Alabama has determined that the degree of Master in Library Science is to be considered as a terminal degree for promotional purposes. The following degrees are to be considered as terminal degrees for promotional, pay, and tenure purposes: MFA in Studio Art, MFA in Creative Writing, MFA in Theatre, and J.D. for Business Law.

Comment [u1]: This new language was specifically structured (as per the request of the Senate) to:
1) communicate a more positive and 'transformational' tone,
2) provide maximum flexibility to departments & colleges, and
3) communicate different performance expectations among academic ranks.

4.13 FACULTY EVALUATION

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to ~~reliably provide uniform, reliable valid data necessary to assess teaching performance, and improve the quality of teaching, research, and service~~ and to promote faculty development ~~through research and service~~ 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 continuous involvement and effectiveness in the general areas of~~ 1) teaching; 2) professional development (i.e., research, scholarship, and/or creative activity) ~~specific to the faculty member's academic discipline; and 3) service performed on the behalf of and/ or in affiliation with the university, professional associations, or as a civic or social community.~~ In order to ensure that the performance criteria for each assessment area are met, each department will develop and distribute to its faculty a document setting forth explicit measurable criteria for evaluation of its faculty, procedures for interpretation of faculty data; and standards of performance. Each department's statement of criteria, procedures, and standards is subject to approval by the dean of its college, who will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost to assure consistency with the purpose and goals of the University and equity of criteria, procedures, and performance standards across the University. Departmental statements will be reviewed at least once in each five-year period.

4.13.1 Components of the Program

Updated Curriculum Vitae. The vitae shall contain detailed background and professional achievement data - educational background; degrees; teaching and other professional experience; scholarly and creative 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 no later than 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 Summary Evaluation and Goal Planning Form. Each full-time faculty member will establish yearly goals related to departmental and institutional goals for the upcoming year. These goals shall be measurable and shall reflect departmental standards for areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity. Each goal will clearly describe what is to be accomplished during the upcoming year. 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.C1, 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 statement of accomplishments relating to 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 review. 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 ratings of faculty as recorded on the "Instructor/ Course Evaluation" form (see Appendix 4C2) will be used as the primary university-wide evaluative measure (except Kilby School and University libraries) of all lecture-based courses. ~~to collect information about students' perceptions of courses and faculty. However, because different academic disciplines and departments often structure their courses to reflect and meet their own unique needs and goals,~~ departments may add supplemental items to the current campus form for faculty development purposes, but may not omit original items from the form. Departments may also submit use an alternatives evaluation form to the campus form other than form 4C2 for non teaching faculty where the primary instruction and/ or activity occurs in laboratories, on the internet, in studios courses, and courses where otherwise taught in or in a non-lecture format. Any alternate evaluation form submitted for faculty evaluation purposes at the university level must first be approved by the appropriate dean or University accreditation administrator who will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in order to assure consistency with the purpose and goals of the University and equity of criteria, procedures, and performance standards across the University. Formal review of form 4C2 by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will be limited strictly to the non-supplemental item.

Comment [u1]: Not previously specified

Comment [u2]: Ties into the language in 3.5

Comment [u3]: Maintains the integrity of the VFAAP charge.

Comment [u4]: This sentence was moved from the "Course Evaluation Forms Administration" paragraph in order to give added flexibility to the departments.

Comment [u5]: This section was copied and adapted from the second paragraph under 4.13

Course Evaluation Student Rating Form Administration Schedule. Student evaluations will be administered every semester in each class course section with enrolling five or more enrolled students. Except for when the departmental or college evaluation administration requirements are mandated by an accrediting agency, university-wide evaluations will be required once every academic year for all tenured faculty, and every semester (except summer sessions) for all non-tenured faculty including adjunct instructors. The faculty member will announce to the class in advance that the rating forms will be administered. [NOTE: The order of the following sentences has been revised.] The professor will then read the following statement to the class:

Comment [u6]:

THIS WAS THE PRIMARY CHANGE FOR THE FAC REGARDING SECTION 4.13

"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."

Comment [u7]: This section was lumped into the text body and needed to be separated.

The faculty member should will then give the envelope with the blank forms and instructions to a 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. 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. The departmental secretary will collect all sealed envelopes and forward them to the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (OIRAP) for processing. The OIRAP will process the forms in a timely fashion and forward results to the department chair. The summary of the ratings shall become a part of the faculty member's file and shall be shared with the faculty member.

Annual Performance Evaluations Schedule. Using the faculty member's updated curriculum vitae, annual statement of goals and accomplishments, ~~student teaching or other equivalent effectiveness assessment ratings,~~ and other appropriate information, department chairs will provide each faculty member a written performance evaluation ~~on the following schedule:~~ by September 15 every year for nontenured faculty and every two years for tenured faculty. Performance evaluations may be provided more frequently at the discretion of the department chair or upon request by the faculty member or the dean of the college. Performance evaluations will be based on approved departmental criteria for evaluation, procedures for interpretation of faculty data, and performance standards. The evaluation will be signed by both the department chair and the faculty member. The faculty member has the option of submitting a written response to the department chair by September 30. Copies of the evaluation and any response will be kept in the individual's permanent personnel file in the department chair's office, the appropriate dean's office, and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

For department chairs, performance evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the above process and schedule by the dean of the appropriate college and will include evaluation of administrative performance as well as the elements specified above. Deans are expected to consult department faculty and staff in conducting evaluations of the chair.

4.13.2 Use of the Results of the Program

The Faculty Evaluation Program is an integral component of the University's institutional effectiveness program. Departments will use information collected through the Faculty Evaluation Program in their departmental and academic program reviews with special care to document use of the program to improve teaching, research, and service.