

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 9, 2010

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met September 9, 2010 in Room 100 of Floyd Science Building at 3:30 p.m.

President Richardson called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies:

Dan Burton for Senator Rieff from History and Political Science and
Brenda Webb for Senator Statom from Physics and Earth Science.

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

Senator D. Townsend moved the approval of the April 29, 2010 minutes. Senator Hall seconded. The motion passed.

President Cale welcomed the faculty to another year. He shared that 7279 students were enrolled, 19 more than last year. This came in the year that the university implemented higher admission standards and denied some freshman admission. This means that retention is improving. He reported that the Honors Program has 49 students, a 50% growth. He stated that he is pleased with the credit hour production which has risen 500 hours from last year. President Cale reported that there will be a Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow. Phase 3 of the Green Campus Initiative will result in energy enhancements to Wesleyan Hall Annex. The Board will be presented with recommendations to authorize a bond to fund the new science building, to solicit bids for a new academic center/student commons building, black box theatre, and a resolution to purchase 16 acres and the clubhouse of the Florence Country Club from the City of Florence with a view to move tennis, ROTC activities, and some HPER activities.

President Cale stated that the university had a great summer school. He reported that the university is working with consultants to consider housing and make recommendations for where to build and how to fund such buildings. President Cale also reported that there will be a report concerning the future of athletics at the University of North Alabama.

Vice-President Thornell spoke about what will happen in the next few months concerning SACS Reaccreditation. This will require writing narratives and showing documentation often requiring

the Faculty Handbook. There may be several changes needed including additions, deletions, and rewording. He asked the faculty's indulgence in moving these issues along in a timely manner.

REPORTS:

- A. President Richardson presented the proposed Shared Governance Structure from the Ad hoc committee on Modification to the Shared Governance Structure which appears in the April 29, 2010 minutes. The committee consists of: John Thornell, Terry Richardson, Wendy Darby, Greg Gaston, Sandee Loew, Larry Adams, Paulette Alexander - Chair, Greg Carnes, Chris Horn—by invitation, and Corey Hamilton—by invitation.
- B. Senator McGee gave remarks about the proposed changes to the Faculty Computer Rights to make UNA's policy match the state's standards. These standards however are industry standards and not academic standards. The current policies stated that faculty cannot install software on their office computer. Senator McGee asked whether changes need to be made to this policy. He suggested that we need to look at what we want as a faculty and asked for comments. He will provide a document for consideration next month. President Cale spoke in support of faculty rights in this issue.
- C. Senator Adams reported that the University Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee should have a year-end report prepared for the October or November meeting. He stated that the process has been approximately what was expected.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Lee moved the approval of the proposal to modify the Faculty Handbook 3.5.1 for clarification of the terminal degree policy with the insertion of the term "tenure purposes." This proposal is in Attachment F in the April 29, 2010 minutes. Senator Adams seconded. The motion passed.
- B. The following nominations were made to fill committee vacancies:
 - 1. University Curriculum Committee
 - Nursing – Laura Williams
 - Business – Jana Beaver
 - Business – Sharon Campbell
 - Arts and Sciences (filling position vacated by retiring Ed Joubert) – Pat Roden
 - 2. Graphics Standards and Web Communication Committee
 - Education – Katie Kinney
 - Nursing – Lynn Aquadro
 - 3. Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 - Nursing – Alyce Brown

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Gaston moved the approval of the proposal to modify the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.1 (Clarification of terminal degree policy for Interior Design faculty). (See Attachment A) Senator Lee seconded. The motion passed.
- B. Senator Adams moved the approval of the proposal to modify the Faculty Handbook Appendix 5.A (removal of graduate assistantships as a weighting factor from the Faculty Salary Schedule). (See Attachment B) Senator Austin seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.
- C. Senator Adams moved the approval of the proposal to modify the Faculty Handbook section 4.13 (removal of the 2nd paragraph in order to meet SACS compliance) (See Attachment C) and with the change of the first paragraph to read: “The criteria used for the purpose of Faculty Evaluation Program are to provide uniform and reliable data. These criteria include an assessment of teaching, research and service; and to promote faculty development for the improvement of education. All faculty members are expected to participate fully and in good faith in this process as a part of the terms and conditions of employment at the University.” Senator Sanders seconded. Following discussion, Senator Townsend moved to postpone this vote to the next meeting. Senator Lee seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- A. Questions were raised concerning the shutting down of a parking lot without notice during the academic day.
- B. President Richardson stated that he will attempt to circulate any documents he receives as early as possible so that we can expedite the vote on pressing issues.

Senator Roden moved that the meeting be adjourned. Senator Loepky seconded. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Terry D. Richardson, Chair
Shared Governance Committee

Dr. Sandra A. Loew, Chair-Elect
Shared Governance Committee

From: Dr. John G. Thornell, Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

Date: July 13, 2010

At its meeting yesterday, the Council of Academic Deans recommended the recognition of the MFA in Interior Design from an appropriate specialized accrediting agency as a terminal degree for promotional, pay, and tenure purposes. Enclosed with this memorandum is the rationale for this recommendation. It is requested that a Shared Governance and/or Faculty Senate committee consider this recommendation and provide feedback so that if approved, it can be approved by the Board of Trustees at its December meeting.

If additional information is needed, please let me know.

rv

Enclosure

pc: Dr. William G. Cale, Jr.
Ms. Regina B. Sherrill

ATTACHMENT B

**To: Dr. Sandra Loew, Chair, Shared Governance Committee
Dr. Terry Richardson, Chair, Faculty Senate**

From: Council of Academic Deans

Date: August 31, 2010

Re: Proposal to Revise the Faculty Salary Schedule

Initial salary determinations for new faculty hires are based on a Faculty Salary Schedule that has been in place at UNA for many years. The Schedule attaches weights to various factors appropriate to an assessment of faculty credentials.

The Council of Academic Deans recommends that one of the weights, graduate assistantships, be considered for removal from the Faculty Salary Schedule. Since the Schedule is part of faculty policy and included in the Faculty Handbook, any revision would have to be approved.

No one seems to know the origin of why graduate assistantships were included in salary calculations for faculty. One source of speculation is that it goes back to UNA's history as a teacher's college. The idea was possibly that the teaching experience often associated with assistantships needed to be acknowledged.

The reasons for proposing this change rest largely on two issues. The first is equity and the second is the inability of the academic affairs office to make proper judgments regarding its applicability.

Comments regarding equity are as follows. For disciplines such as Nursing and Education, and sometimes Business, students often attend part-time while continuing to work full-time. As such they can't engage in a graduate assistantship. These individuals are adversely affected salary-wise in comparison with peers who do full-time doctoral study. Yet they all have the same credential at the time of hire. Also, the more semesters a person holds a graduate assistantship, the more advantageous it is for salary determination. Some doctoral students may take several years, possibly more than is needed due to procrastination, to finish the degree, yet it accrues additional compensation in comparison with the individual who is diligent in finishing in a timely manner

Comments regarding application of the policy by the academic affairs office are as follows. There is great variation in the way in which graduate assistantships are administered in doctoral programs. Some assignments include teaching, many part-time and some full-time. Others may involve non-teaching duties such as working on a grant or serving as an assistant in an administrative office. Others may be research-based. Some universities use the term assistantship but it is actually a form of financial assistance or scholarship that

doesn't require work in return. Our office relies on a resume wherein no such distinction is made. We have no way of knowing the nature or quality of the work performed.

Assistantships are not on transcripts or documented in any way so there is no way to connect the assistantship to the relevance of the position.

To determine the prevalence of this policy at other institutions, the UNA Office of Institutional Research did a survey of other schools on this issue. The results indicated that, of thirteen peer institutions polled, none indicated the use of graduate assistantships as a factor in faculty salary determinations.

Given these issues, the Council of Academic Deans recommends we remove this weight from the salary schedule effective with new hires for 2011 or after. Current faculty would not be affected by the proposed change.

UNA is committed to maintaining faculty salaries competitive with regional averages. To ensure that this change doesn't adversely affect that effort, the experience factor in the salary schedule shall be adjusted slightly to offset the removal of the graduate assistantship factor. This will keep faculty salaries for new hires at the same levels as under the old system.

**John Thornell, Provost
August, 2010**

FACULTY SALARY SCHEDULE

A. Salary Category Weights

1. Degree Level:

Bachelor's	0.40
Master's	0.50
Master's + 1	0.70
Master's + 2	0.80
Doctorate	1.45

2. Rank:

Instructor	0.50
Assistant Professor	0.80
Associate Professor	1.55
Professor	2.60

3. Experience (including experience as a UNA non-tenure-track faculty member): 0.10 each 2 years (0.50 maximum)

4. Merit or Market Value: 0.5

In the late 1970's, merit values for faculty were frozen. Since that time, merit values of less than 0.5 have been elevated to 0.5 for all faculty as funds permitted, and this process was completed on October 1, 1998. The salaries for all newly hired faculty members are calculated to include a merit value of 0.5. A few faculty members possessing merit values of greater than 0.5 when the merit values were frozen have retained those values to the present and receive a fixed frozen merit supplement each year.

(The degree level master's plus one year is based on a minimum 30 semester hours of advanced graduate study beyond the master's; master's plus two years on completion of all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation--ABD. Experience is based on the academic year, with prior experience for initial appointment rated at 100% for teaching, and up to 75% for related work, and at 50% for total time in graduate fellowship or assistantship teaching).

B. Salary Factor

The sum of weights derived from salary categories is converted to a salary factor at the rate of a factor of .01 for each .05 of weights, as per the following abridged conversion table:

<u>Wgt</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Wgt</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Wgt</u>	<u>Factor</u>
0.90	0.98	2.50	1.30	4.25	1.65
1.00	1.00	2.75	1.35	4.50	1.70
1.25	1.05	3.00	1.40	4.75	1.75
1.50	1.10	3.25	1.45	5.00	1.80
1.75	1.15	3.50	1.50	5.25	1.85
2.00	1.20	3.75	1.55	5.50	1.90
2.25	1.25	4.00	1.60	5.75	1.95

C. Department Chairs and Other Administration

Supplement according to responsibilities.

D. Determination of Salary for the Academic Year (Nine Months)

The schedule includes a base salary figure for the academic year. An individual salary is then determined by (1) totaling the weights earned in each salary category, (2) finding in the conversion table the factor for this sum, and (3) multiplying the base salary figure by the factor. Example (using a hypothetical base figure of \$10,000): an associate professor (1.55) with a doctorate (1.45) and 10 years of experience (0.50) and judged at a merit level of (0.50) earns a total of 4.00 in category weights, the factor for which is 1.60, and 1.60 times the base figure of \$10,000 produces a salary figure of \$16,000.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost may be consulted for details on salary determinations and for the current base salary figure.

ATTACHMENT C

To: Terry Richardson, Chair of Faculty Senate
From: John Thornell, Provost
Re: Faculty Evaluation
Date: August 31, 2010

Section 4.13 of the Faculty Handbook details the components of our faculty evaluation system at UNA. The SACS Committee responsible for that narrative has cited compliance concerns relative to paragraph two of that section. The specific language in question is as follows:

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching: research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service. 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. Department statements will be reviewed at least once in each five-year period.

The SACS Committee correctly pointed out that the policy outline above has not been implemented nor are there plans to do so. Thus, from a SACS perspective, we have a written policy we do not follow which constitutes a violation.

Accordingly, the recommendation is to delete paragraph two from Section 4.13 of the Faculty Handbook. Such action will negate non-compliance with SACS policy. The rest of section 4.13 would remain and suffice to explain our faculty evaluation system as part of the SACS narrative.

4.13 FACULTY EVALUATION

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. 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 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 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.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 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 rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and University libraries) 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 every semester in each class section enrolling five or more students. Student comments should be collected and given to the faculty member in a typed format to ensure anonymity. Departments may use alternatives to the campus form in laboratories, studio courses, and other courses taught in non-lecture format. 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 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