

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 24, 2011

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met February 24, 2011 in Room 100 of Floyd Science Building at 3:30 p.m.

President Richardson called the meeting to order. Senator Statom moved to suspend the rules. Senator Peterson seconded. The motion passed.

President Richardson recognized the following proxies:

Paul Baird for Senator Davidson from Education,
Janice Myhan for Senator Hulsey from Elementary Education, and
David McCullough for Senator Loepky from Music and Theatre.

Senator Statom moved the adoption of the agenda. Senator Figueroa seconded. The motion passed. Senator Statom moved the approval of the December 9, 2010 minutes with the addition of his name as attending. Senator Beckwith seconded. The motion passed.

Vice-President Thornell reported that President Cale had a meeting with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees at 3:30. Vice-President Thornell reported he had presented the accepted edited version of the Faculty Handbook to President Cale who also recommended edit changes. Those changes will be sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review and recommendation.

REPORTS:

- A. President Richardson presented a memo from Paulette Alexander from the Ad hoc Committee for Modification to the Shared Governance Structure. (See Attachment A) He discussed the flow of proposed changes through the flowchart provided. He pointed out the differences with an issue concerning only one constituency and an issue affect multiple constituencies. Senator Carrasco moved to postpone to March 10 meeting for a vote. Senator Lindley seconded. The motion to postpone failed. The motion to accept the recommendation passed with 4 abstentions.
- B. Senator Gaston from the Faculty Affairs Committee presented the recommendation concerning the changes to the Faculty Handbook related to the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee which were recommended by the initial committee. (See Attachment B) The recommendation passed. The committee also

recommended an addition to the section 3.5.3 “It will be the responsibility of the peer promotion committee and the department chair to confirm the eligibility (years of service) of the candidate for promotion to the rank being sought.”

- C. Academic Affairs did not have a report.
- D. Senator Peterson reported that the Faculty Attitude Survey Committee has sent a draft of questions out today. The committee welcomes feedback and pointed out that the document is seven questions shorter. They hope to have the survey ready to begin by March 14 with completion by spring break.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Senator Statom moved acceptance of the changes to the Protocol for External Faculty/Staff Searches. Senator Lee seconded. The motion passed. (See Attachment C)

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Lee moved the approval of the Student Loan Code of Conduct. Senator Statom seconded. The motion passed. (See Attachment D)
- B. Senator Statom moved to postpone the consideration of the extended Thanksgiving proposal. Senator Roden seconded. The motion to postpone passed with two abstentions. Senator Adams moved we request further clarification from the Academic and Student Affairs Committee as to which option they are seriously considering. The motion died for lack of a second. (See Attachment E)
- C. Senator Lee moved the approval of the Distance Learning Policies and Procedures Manual. Senator Carrasco seconded. Senator D. Townsend moved to postpone the vote. Senator Carrasco seconded. The motion to postpone passed.
- D. Senator Adams moved the approval of the Independent Study Compensation proposal with the addition of the word “to” in the third paragraph to read: “To take an independent study, students will develop a proposal and submit it to the faculty member for review.” Senator Statom seconded. The motion passed (See Attachment F)
- E. Senator Statom moved the approval of the proposal to amend the Faculty Handbook section 4.10 concerning Faculty Research and Development. Senator Lindley seconded. The motion passed. (See Attachment G)

Vice-President Thornell announced that the groundbreaking ceremony for the Black Box Theatre will be next week. Also, the George Lindsey festival is going to be held but the reception honoring George Lindsey has been canceled due to his health.

Senator Roden moved the meeting be adjourned. Senator Gaston seconded. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

From: Alexander, Paulette S.
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 6:02 PM
To: Richardson, Terry D.
Cc: Loew, Sandra A.; Adams, Larry W.; Gaston, Greg G.; Carnes, Gregory A.; Darby, Wendy A.; Thornell, John G.; Horn, Christy A.; Humphres, Ethan G.; Hamilton, Cory R.
Subject: Report of Ad Hoc Committee for Modification to Shared Governance Structure
Attachments: SG modification 20110215.pdf; Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance Recommendation to Faculty Senate 2011.doc

Dear Dr. Richardson,

Attached please find the final documents resulting from the work of the Ad Hoc Committee for Modification to Shared Governance Structure. This committee was charged on September 21, 2011 to complete a review of section C of the Shared Governance Document and make recommendations for changing the processes by which policy changes and new policy proposals are considered and approved at UNA. The committee met 7 times for an hour each to work through the various issues experienced through the Shared Governance processes originally enacted and the revisions that have followed. Numerous drafts of revisions were also shared by e-mail between meetings.

The committee's understanding was that there existed a need to simplify and streamline the process while assuring the success of the original intent of shared governance to allow those impacted by decisions to have a real voice in the consideration of policy changes. The following critical success factors for Shared Governance at UNA provide context to the recommendations of the committee:

- Committee appointments are the key to successful committees and the appointing bodies must take that responsibility very seriously.
- Membership on Shared Governance committees carries with it an obligation to be engaged and attend to the business of the committee, including attendance at all meetings.
- All participants must listen carefully and respectfully to other points of view.
- All recommendations (especially controversial ones) need to carry a well-articulated and factual rationale.

In short, shared governance is hard work. But it is worth it!

I appreciate the diligence of all of the committee members in support of this effort. I also appreciate the spirit of negotiation and the finding of common ground where opinions differed throughout our deliberations. The members of the Committee from the faculty include

- Dr. Larry Adams
- Dr. Greg Carnes
- Dr. Wendy Darby
- Dr. Greg Gaston
- Dr. Sandra Loew
- Dr. Terry Richardson

Based on your invitation, Dr. John Thornell, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and Mrs. Chris Horn, President of the Staff Senate participated in the deliberations of the committee. Mr. Ethan Humphries represented Mrs. Horn on occasions when her schedule prevented her attendance at meetings. Also based on your invitation, the president of the Student Government Association was also invited to be present at all meetings and was included in all e-mail distributions.

Special recognition goes to Dr. Adams for his exceptional service in editing and maintaining the updated modifications in the electronic version of the modification to the existing document and the resulting revised document attached hereto.

By submitting these documents and recommending their approval, my understanding is that this committee has fully discharged its duties.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the committee,

Paulette Alexander, Chair
Ad Hoc Committee for Modification to Shared Governance Structure

Paulette S. Alexander, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Accreditation & Information Technology, College of Business
Department Chair and Professor, Computer Information Systems Department
University of North Alabama
UNA Box 5076
230 Keller Hall
Florence AL 35632-0001
256.765.4409 (voice)
256.765.4811 (fax)

C. University Policy Change

1. The Role of Shared Governance in University Policy Change

Any individual or group of the University may recommend changes to University policy. A written proposal is submitted to the Chair of the Shared Governance Executive Committee. The role of Shared Governance is to ensure that UNA jointly involves faculty, staff, students, and administration in the development of University policies. Collaboration with all potential stakeholders is expected at every step in the development of change in University policy. The Senates are encouraged to consult one another.

2. Shared Governance Procedure for Policy Change Recommendations

The following procedure ensures that all proposals for policy change at UNA jointly involve the faculty, staff, students, and administration in the development of these policies. Because faculty are on nine month contracts, the procedures and time lines described in this section apply to the nine month academic calendar. Under normal circumstances, policy issues are not to be considered except during the nine month academic year. Appendix A contains a flow chart briefly outlining this policy change procedure.

A. A written proposal is submitted to the Shared Governance Executive Committee. Upon receipt of a proposal, the Shared Governance Executive Committee determines if the issue affects only Faculty or Staff or Students. If so, (Case 1) the Shared Governance Executive Committee sends the proposal to the respective Senate within 15 calendar days of receipt of said proposal, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar, to consider. If the issue affects more than one constituency, (Case 2) the Shared Governance Executive Committee must distribute the written proposal to the appropriate Shared Governance committee within 15 calendar days of receipt of said proposal, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar. If the Shared Governance Executive Committee does not move on the proposal within the specified time limit, the originator has the authority to distribute said proposal to the appropriate Shared Governance committee.

B. CASE 1: If the Shared Governance Executive Committee sends the proposal to the Faculty Senate or the Staff Senate or the Student Government Association, that body in consultation with the appropriate Vice President(s) considers the proposal and sends resulting recommendation(s) to the President, with a copy to the Shared Governance Executive Committee. In the event the appropriate body fails to act within 45 calendar days of receipt of said proposal, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar, the Shared Governance Executive Committee sends the written proposal within 15 calendar days of the expiration of the review period to the President with its recommendation regarding implementation or return the proposal to the originator.

C. CASE 2: Upon receipt of a proposal, a given Shared Governance committee must, within 45 calendar days of receipt of said proposal, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar,

- 1) accept the proposal as is and send it to the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate and the Student Government Association for action, or

- 2) accept the proposal with amendments. Both the original proposal and the amended version with written comments/ recommendations are sent to the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate and the Student Government Association for action, or
- 3) reject the proposal and return it to the originator with written comments/recommendations and send a copy to the Shared Governance Executive Committee, or
- 4) notify the Shared Governance Executive Committee that a study requiring additional time is necessary before a recommendation can be made and indicate a timeframe for completion of the study and recommendation.

In the event the appropriate Shared Governance committee fails to do any of the above within 45 calendar days of receipt of said proposal, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar, acquiescence is assumed and the Shared Governance Executive Committee distributes the written proposal within 15 calendar days of the expiration of the review period, not counting University holidays and breaks as published in the University calendar, to the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association.

The Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association must provide written comments/recommendations within 45 calendar days of receipt of said proposal. No response constitutes acquiescence to the proposal by the body not responding. The Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, or the Student Government Association may ask the Shared Governance Executive Committee for an extension of up to 30 days if significant issues are addressed in the written proposal and additional time is deemed warranted. After the Shared Governance Executive Committee receives responses through the above processes and reconciles the differences, if there are any, the Shared Governance Executive Committee submits a report with recommendations to the President. If the differences are irreconcilable, the Shared Governance Executive Committee will send the recommendations to the appropriate Shared Governance committee or the originator.

D. Once a proposal has been accepted by the President, he/she may implement it as an interim policy. A new policy/policy change requires the approval of the Board of Trustees prior to becoming an operational policy. The President, or his/her designee on behalf of the President, shall inform the campus community of the new policy/policy change via email.

ATTACHMENT B

From: Gaston, Greg G.

Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2011 10:38 AM

To: Richardson, Terry D.

Cc: Adams, Larry W.; Lindley, Keith W.; Lee, Marilyn B.; Davidson, Lelon O.; Carnes, Gregory A.; Statom, Richard A.; Garfrerick, Beth A.

Subject: RE: Faculty Affairs Committee Report

Attachments: university committee_original.doc; university committee_edited_final.doc; FINAL Report and Recommendation to the Faculty Senate from the UW Promotion-tenure Portfolio Review CommitteedrftFALL10.doc

Dr. Richardson,

As instructed, the faculty affairs committee has reviewed and revised section 3.5.3 of the faculty handbook regarding the formation and function of the University Wide Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. We have incorporated all the information from the recommendations made by the initial committee into a new section that better captures the intent and operations of this committee.

Three documents are attached:

1. The original/unedited section of the hand book that deals with the University Wide Promotion and Tenure review Committee
2. The new language for this section as recommended by the faculty affairs committee
3. The report from the University Wide Promotion and Tenure Review Committee from 2009-2010

We have an additional recommendation: (not sure if this needs to be new business as it is outside the scope of our charge...but because it is related and was part of our discussion, here it is anyway)

We also recommend that the following be added to section 3.5.3 (page 3-9) (In all caps below.) Apparently, this is not being done and people who do not meet the time in service qualification are moving through the system and there is no mechanism anywhere before final rejection for these portfolios to be removed from the system.

“...The peer promotion committee members will review the candidate’s portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean), indicating the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 1. In the event that the peer promotion committee is evaluating more than one candidate, it may choose whether or not to rank the candidates. The peer promotion committee will also provide written feedback to the candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio when the final promotion decisions are announced in March. **IT WILL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PEER PROMOTION COMMITTEE AND THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR TO CONFIRM THE CANDIDATE MEETS THE UNIVERSITY’S ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS (E.G., YEARS OF SERVICE) THE ELIGIBILITY (YEARS OF SERVICE) OF THE CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK BEING SOUGHT.**

CURRENT VERSION:

Responsibility of the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee

A university-wide portfolio review committee, drawn from all five faculty constituencies (four colleges and Library/Educational Technology Services faculty), will serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to, reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content; reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; insuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various colleges, and specific departments are being met in concordance with one another with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; and concurring with, or not, the recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. The committee will have nine (9) members consisting of a minimum of one (1) member (tenured Associate and Full Professors) from each constituency plus at-large faculty to total nine, with the Chair to be selected by the currently-serving committee members. After the inaugural year, the Chair must be a second-year member. A pool of all tenured professors at the Associate and Full ranks will be formed, and the President of the University will annually select members from said pool to serve for two (2) academic years. After the inaugural year and the two subsequent years thereafter, the Faculty Senate should select members from the pool for recommendation to the President to serve on the committee. At the end of the inaugural year, four (4) members will rotate off the committee. Every year thereafter, members finishing a two-year term will rotate off the committee. 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 in cases of extreme exigency and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

Only full professors may review and evaluate applications/portfolios for full professors with respect to tenure and promotion criteria. The inaugural committee will be tasked with consulting with all other parties in the process in developing a timeline for the submission and evaluation of portfolios. The inaugural committee will be tasked with developing a guideline, or guidelines, for procedures regarding review and evaluation of portfolios with respect to tenure and promotion criteria. All members of the committee must participate in an orientation regarding procedures and guidelines with respect to tenure and promotion criteria at the beginning of each submission and evaluation cycle. Departmental criteria with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, unique college criteria and policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, and university policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, will be made available to each member of the committee. The committee will perform a year-end process/procedures review and prepare a report to be distributed at all levels of the process. This report should include what worked well, what did not work, and remediation recommendations. All portfolios submitted, regardless of recommendation(s), will move through the entire process.

PROPOSED VERSION:

Responsibility of the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee

A university-wide portfolio review committee will serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. This committee is to be drawn from all five faculty constituencies (four colleges and Library/Educational Technology Services faculty). The committee will have nine (9) members consisting of a minimum of one (1) member (tenured Associate and Full Professors) from each constituency plus at-large faculty to total nine, with the Chair to be selected by the currently-serving committee members. Annually, the Faculty Senate will identify a pool of **at least 15** eligible members from all tenured professors at the Associate and Full Professor ranks for recommendation to the President to serve on this committee. From this pool of candidates, the President of the University will annually, in October, select members to serve for two (2) academic years. No faculty member **from a faculty constituency** will be appointed for additional terms until the entire pool **from that constituency** has been exhausted. Only then may professors be appointed to serve another term. Exemptions from service should only be granted in extreme circumstances and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to, reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content; reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; ensuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various colleges, and specific departments are being met in concordance with one another with respect to tenure and promotion criteria; and concurring with, or not, the recommendations of candidates for tenure and promotion. The University wide tenure and promotion review committee will focus on the ten-page portfolio (including all forms as described in the Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.3). Supplementary materials will be maintained separately from those portfolios. The location of the supplementary materials will be determined by the VPAA. The language specified in Faculty Handbook 3.5.3 with regard to evaluation of candidates' credentials (indicating the degree (highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended) should be used at all levels and on all evaluation documents. All portfolios that are incomplete or not in compliance with the stated Faculty Handbook guidelines (Section 3.5.3) will be considered as non-responsive and rejected. All portfolios submitted **by eligible candidates**, regardless of recommendation(s), will move through the entire process. The timeline for reviewing promotion materials can be found in Appendix 3C.

The committee will operate on a 'chair-elect' system with a vice-chair serving a year as assistant to the chair before assuming the role of chair. While all members of the committee will review all portfolios; in the event a consensus agreement cannot be reached by the committee, then only full professors will vote in making the final decision on a candidate for full professor.

As soon as the new committee membership is determined and constituted, the Chair will call a meeting for the express purpose of orienting the committee, especially incoming new members, to the established procedures and guidelines for the committee. All members of the committee must participate in this orientation. Departmental criteria with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, unique college criteria and policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, and university policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria, will be made available to each member of the committee. As soon as the portfolios become available, the Chair will notify the committee of the location of the portfolios and the committee will begin the review process. Every member of the

committee will review each portfolio submitted, regardless of recommendation and concurrence at previous stages in the process. After all members have reviewed the portfolios, the committee will meet *en masse* to discuss each portfolio. Upon reaching a decision for each portfolio, the Chair will schedule a meeting of the committee with the VPAA. After discussing the portfolios with the committee, the VPAA will forward the committee's concurrence, or lack thereof, to the President.

The committee will perform a year-end process/procedures review and prepare a report to be distributed at all levels of the process. This report should include what worked well, what did not work, and remediation recommendations.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA
Protocol for External Faculty/Staff Searches

New 1st paragraph: See end of document

This proposed protocol is intended to ensure that diversity and equity are achieved in all external faculty and staff searches. The Director of Diversity and Institutional Equity (DDIE) will provide assistance and guidance in achieving this goal for the university. Search committee chairs and members of the search committees are expected to maintain communication with the DDIE throughout the search and screening processes. In the event that a search committee chair and the DDIE do not concur on any step in this protocol requiring their agreement, this matter should be resolved by the respective Executive Council member or the President.

1. As a part of the Request to Fill/Advertise electronic form, the department chair/supervisor will include a listing of proposed search committee members (in the appropriate field in the Online Employment System, OES). Search committees should typically be made up of no more than 9 and no less than 5 members, ~~two~~ of whom reflect diversity. Departments lacking diversity may select additional committee members from the campus and/or community at large. In order for an individual to serve on a search committee, he/she must have evidence of participation in diversity training and search committee training, once available. Once the Request to Fill/Advertise is completed, it should be forwarded to the DDIE for approval via the OES.
2. Upon review of the Request to Fill/Advertise which includes the job announcement, the proposed advertising sources, and the search committee composition, the DDIE will advise as to his/her approval via the OES. If not approved, the Request to Fill/Advertise will be returned by the DDIE to the originator of the request for needed information.
3. Once a search is authorized, the search committee chair will schedule a brief meeting of the committee with the DDIE and Director, Human Resources and Affirmative Action (DHRAA) to explore ways of attracting a diverse pool of qualified candidates.
4. All applications and supporting materials will be received and initially processed by the Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action. Applications and supporting materials are immediately available to the DDIE via the OES.
5. Applications and supporting materials are then presented to the appropriate committee chair via the OES.
6. The committee will review applications and supporting materials and develop an initial ranking of candidates with a realistic chance of receiving an offer. With the concurrence of the DDIE (via the OES), telephone screens may be conducted with a wide range of qualified applicants to gain initial information with respect to the candidates' qualifications. Following these telephone interviews, the search committee chair will invite the top candidates (typically 2 or 3 in a faculty or staff search) for an on-campus interview. Additional candidates may be invited with approval from the DDIE, DHRAA, and the hiring unit's senior administrator. Fewer top candidates may

"s"

at least one

be invited for this purpose if the DDIE and chair concur that none of the other candidates have a realistic chance of receiving an offer.

7. At the conclusion of campus interviews, the department chair/supervisor will consult with the DDIE to confirm that all diversity candidates have been given full consideration prior to a final recommendation to and selection by the President. The department chair/supervisor will assign the recommended candidate the status of "Recommend for Hire" and all candidates not selected the appropriate statuses in the OES. Upon these status changes, the OES will prompt the department chair/supervisor to complete the Hiring Proposal form and forward to the appropriate Dean/Director via the OES. Once all approvals are obtained, the Hiring Proposal will be forwarded to the Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action via the OES. The Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action will perform the appropriate background checks and will prepare a contract of employment for the President's approval.
8. Before the contract is offered to the candidate, the department chair/supervisor will complete the Search Summary Form. Once this form is received via the OES, the candidate will be offered the contract of employment.

Deviation from this policy may be necessary if unique circumstances exist. Exceptions to the policy must be approved DDIE and the DHRAA.

New 1st paragraph: The University defines diversity broadly as differences related to age, culture, ethnicity, gender, nationality, national origin, political affiliation, physical disability, physical attributes, race, religion, sexual orientation, and/or socioeconomic status. UNA administrative personnel, staff, and faculty wish to create an environment that promotes and celebrates this diversity. Respect of diversity is promoted by encouraging a discipline of mutual open discourse and expression of cultural viewpoints, values, and belief systems that create a global community on campus. To aid in accomplishing this goal the University wishes to recruit and retain a diverse and highly qualified faculty who —without regard to age, culture, disability, national origin, race, creed, gender, sexual orientation, or religion— demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly activities, and public service. Similarly, UNA wants to recruit and retain equally diverse and highly qualified staff.

ATTACHMENT D

University of North Alabama Student Loan Code of Conduct

The University of North Alabama (UNA) participates in the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program which includes the Direct Subsidized and Direct Unsubsidized Student Loans, the Direct Graduate PLUS Loans, and the Direct Parent PLUS Loans. In some cases, private student loans are needed to supplement the cost of education. UNA recommends that students exhaust all other methods of financing their education before applying for private loans. To comply with the 2008 Higher Education Opportunity Act (enacted August 14, 2008) UNA adopts the following Student Loan Code of Conduct to serve as the formal guiding principles to ensure the integrity of the student aid process and ethical conduct of UNA employees in regard to student loan practices.

1. Revenue Sharing

The term “revenue-sharing arrangement” means an arrangement between an institution and a lender which – (i) a lender provides or issues a loan that is made, insured, or guaranteed to students under the Higher Education Act attending the institution or to the families of such students; and (ii) the institution recommends the lender or the loan products of the lender and in exchange, the lender pays a fee or provides other material benefits, including revenue or profit sharing, to the institution, an officer or employee of the institution. UNA and its employees will not enter into any type of revenue-sharing arrangement with any lender, guarantor or servicer. UNA does not provide students a preferred lender list from which to select a lender for a private student loan. All loans are processed without regard to lender or mode of transmission (i.e., electronic or paper). UNA will neither recommend a private loan lender nor accept material benefits including revenue or profit sharing to the institution, an officer, or an employee of the institution or an agent.

2. Gifts

Employees of the Office of Student Financial Services (SFS) are prohibited from soliciting or accepting any gift from a lender, guarantor, or servicer of education loans.

- a. Gifts include any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan or other item. This includes a gift of services, transportation, lodging, or meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has incurred.
- b. Gifts to family members of a UNA employee are considered to be a gift to the employee if the gift is given with the knowledge and consent of the employee and there is reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of that employee.

3. Contracting Arrangements

Employees of the Office of Student Financial Services shall not accept from any lender or affiliate of any lender any fee, payment, or other financial benefit (including opportunity to purchase stock) as compensation for any consulting arrangement or other contract to provide services to a lender or on behalf of a lender relating to education loans.

4. Preferred Lender Status

UNA participates in the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program which provides student and parent loans through the U.S. Department of Education. Lenders in the private student loan industry will not be given a preferred status. UNA will not produce a preferred lender list that gives any lender an advantage in securing business from UNA students.

5. Private Loan Certification

UNA will not assign a borrower's private student loan to a particular lender; all decisions will be made by the borrower in his/her independent review of borrower benefits and lender services. UNA will not refuse to certify, or delay certification of, any loan based on the borrower's selection of a particular lender or guaranty agency.

6. Opportunity Pool Loan

UNA will not request or accept from any lender any offer of funds to be used for private education loans (defined in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act) including funds for an opportunity pool loan in exchange for UNA providing concessions or promises regarding providing the lender with a specified number of loans made, insured or guaranteed; a specified loan volume of such loans; or a preferred lender arrangement for such loans.

7. Staffing Assistance

UNA will not request or accept from any lender, guarantor, or servicer of student loans any assistance with call center staffing or financial aid office staffing.

8. Advisory Board Compensation

Employees of the Office of Student Financial Services who serve on an advisory board, commission, or group established by a lender, guarantor, or group of lenders or guarantors, are prohibited from receiving anything of value from the lender, guarantor, or group of lenders or guarantors, except that the employee may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in serving on such advisory board, commission, or group.

ATTACHMENT E

From: Chambers, Jill M.
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 11:11 AM
To: Richardson, Terry D.; Horn, Christy A.; Hamilton, Cory R. **Cc:** Ford, Kelly M.; Thornell, John G.; Loew, Sandra A.
Subject: Thanksgiving Break Proposal

Good morning everyone!

I am forwarding a proposal that was brought before the Academic and Student Affairs Committee at our last meeting on January 25, 2011. Our committee has not taken any action on it and would like your feedback. I am attaching the proposal from SGA. They are proposing that the Thanksgiving Holiday break be extended for the entire week. We are asking each of your committees to discuss whether you support or oppose this measure. You will also need to consider where we would make-up the two days that we would use that week. The ASA committee came up with a few options for you to consider:

- 1) No Fall Break day. Study day on Wednesday. Start exams on Thursday and end on Tuesday.
- 2) New Student Orientation on Thursday and Friday. Start classes on Monday.
- 3) Start classes on Tuesday. No Fall Break.
- 4) No Study Day. Start classes on Tuesday.
- 5) No Study Day. No Fall Break.

We are open to hearing any other recommendations you may have. I hope everyone is having a great semester so far! Please let me know if you have any questions and I will be happy to help!

Jill Chambers, Chair
Academic and Student Affairs Committee

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

January 13, 2011

TITLE: EXTENDED THANKSGIVING BREAK

AUTHOR: STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION – SENATE

RESOLUTION: 11 – 01

RESOLUTION

Whereas; The University currently closes from Wednesday through Sunday on the last full week in November of each year for Thanksgiving break, and

Whereas; Non-traditional students who are parents of school-age children have to find an alternative such as missing classes or finding a babysitter for their children who receive the entire week for break, and

Whereas; Many students who have permanent residence farther from the University are unable to travel home for the short Thanksgiving break, and

Whereas; Most of the break is spent traveling and many students are prevented from studying for important exams, and

Therefore; it is the goal of the Student Government Association to extend the Thanksgiving holiday break to include the Monday and Tuesday before the currently allotted break, and

Therefore; the extended two days will allow students to begin studying for exams and focusing on final projects, and

Therefore; the extended two days will allow for non-traditional students who are parents to stay at home with school-age children who receive the entire week, as opposed to finding a babysitter or missing class to stay with them; and

Therefore; the extended two days will allow for students whose permanent homes are farther from the University to have the previous weekend to spend traveling home, allowing for more time to be spent with family; and

Therefore; The Student Government Association realizes that the University would be losing two days out of its calendar and proposes that the two day be made up elsewhere, and

Therefore; The Student Government Association proposes that the two days be made up by beginning one day earlier in the fall and spring semesters, and

Therefore; be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Dr. William G. Cale Jr., President; Dr. John Thornell, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Mr. David Shields, Vice President for Student Affairs; Dr. Sandra Loew, President of Shared Governance Committee and Mrs. Tammy Jacques, Director of Student Engagement.

Passed and Approved by the Student Government Association this _____ day of _____, 2010

Signed: _____

(Student Government President)

ATTACHMENT F

Independent Study Compensation Proposal

Current

The faculty or department chair workload will exclude independent study courses or other special arrangement courses with enrollments of fewer than 10 students. Full-time or adjunct faculty or department chairs with advanced approval may be compensated for such special courses for credit on an overload basis at the rate of \$20 per credit hour generated in such courses. (Page 4-8 of FH)

Proposed

Faculty teaching independent studies or other special arrangement courses will be compensated at the rate of \$100 per course credit hour **per student** . Faculty members are limited to a maximum of five independent study or special arrangement courses, totaling no more than 15 credit hours **or \$1,500.00**, at any given time.

To take an independent study, students will develop a proposal and submit it the faculty member for review. After finalizing the proposal, the independent study must be approved by the Department Chair and a copy filed with the college dean.

Rationale for the Change

The new programs in interdisciplinary studies will identify coursework that aligns specific career goals of the student with faculty expertise across campus. In some cases the coursework would need to be offered through independent study instead of regular classes because of small numbers. These efforts will require considerable time on the part of the faculty member. Also, more emphasis is being placed on undergraduate research wherein faculty members and students collaborate on a project. Again, the time commitment on the part of the faculty member is significant. The current rate of pay for such efforts is not adequate. Give the number of contact hours expected of faculty to engage in such efforts, a compensation increase is needed. Concurrent with the increase in compensation is an increase in expectations for the outcomes of courses. Prior approvals by the department chair will ensure that the proper rigor is in place.

ATTACHMENT G

From Faculty Handbook **4.10 FACULTY RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT**

...

Faculty research and development monies ~~for purposes other than the completion of terminal degrees~~ are disbursed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost who will distribute to the college deans ~~and Dean of Information Technologies,~~ **Director of Library Services, and Associate Vice President for Academic Support** percentages of those monies based on FTE faculty **full-time faculty**. ~~The deans will distribute the money~~ will be distributed ~~between research and development~~ according to the following procedure.