

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
September 13, 2012

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met September 13, 2012 in Room 102 of Floyd Science Building at 3:30 p.m.

President Lee called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies:
Brenda Webb for Senator Statom from Physics and Earth Science,
Dan Hallock for Senator Beaver from Management and Marketing, and
Randy Shadburn for Senator Blount from Secondary Education.

Senator Barrett moved the adoption of the agenda. Senator McIntosh seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Hulsey moved the approval of the minutes from the May 1, 2012 meeting. Senator Loeppky seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Barry Morris, Director of Planned Giving, presented the Isbell Scholar Program which was created approximately fifteen years ago by Raymond Isbell. Faculty members planning on retiring may continue to teach after retirement with the money saved placed in an endowed scholarship for their department. So far, ten professors have retired and established scholarships and two more are planning to begin after this fall. He stated it is an easy way to ease into retirement and encouraged senators to discuss this concept with their colleagues and consider a formal endorsement of it.

President Cale presented two handouts: fall enrollment and comparison of tuition rates. He encouraged the faculty to connect with the students in an effort to increase retention. In 2014 freshmen will be required to live on campus in another effort to engage the students to improve retention. On the issue of tuition increase, President Cale asked that we consider ways to cope with the increases in tuition. These include better retention of students and creation of niche programs.

President Cale also reported that the Board of Trustees adopted a new resolution on Monday concerning Division 1 athletics. With a 9-0 vote, the Trustees supported the preservation of the integrity of the Academic mission with the policy that no more than four percent of the budget (the percentage currently being given to athletics) will be spent on athletics and that athletic advancement will come from within the athletic department, thereby separating it from the academic advancement.

Dr. Thornell, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, was unable to attend due to an ACHE meeting.

REPORTS:

- A. Standing Committees
 - 1. Matt Green, Tenure and Promotion Portfolio Review Committee Chair, presented the year-end process/procedures review report. (See Attachment A). Senator Peterson moved to send the report to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
 - 2. Senator Peterson, Faculty Attitude Survey Committee Chair, reported that the 2012 Faculty Attitude Survey results have been sent out by email to senators. She also reported that the Senate Executive Committee decided that the Faculty Attitude Survey Committee will do its own data gathering which is a change in procedure. She moved that the senate accept the report and release it to the faculty by email. The motion passed unanimously.
 - 3. Brenda Webb, chair of the Shared Governance Committee, discussed the problem with tracking the status of proposals. She also offered the committee's assistance if needed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Barrett moved the dissolution of the Committee on Equity and Standards. Senator Loepky seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. President Lee reported that the Ad hoc Committee to Review the Senate Constitution is being reformulated. She asked for nominations after consultation with colleagues.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Carrasco moved approval of the proposed revision to the Faculty Handbook 2.4.2. (See Attachment B) Senator Fitzsimmons seconded. After discussion, Senator Barrett moved to postpone the vote until the October meeting. Senator Austin seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. Nominees for the Grievance Committee and the Due Process Committee are: Leigh Thompson, Doris McDaniel, Lee Hurren, Mark Foster, Ian Loepky, Doug Barrett, Matt Fitzsimmons, Pat Roden, Darlene Townsend, and Dan Hallock. Additional nominees will be sought by President Lee to meet the necessary 15 nominations.
- C. Senator Carrasco moved the approval of the Guidelines for Centers and Institutes. (See Attachment C) Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- D. Senator Barrett moved the forming of a working group considering the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Senator Beckwith seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Senators Beckwith, Barrett, Infanger and Carrasco volunteered to serve.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

- A. President Lee reported that the Senate Executive Committee discussed the fact that the faculty has lost their commons area. She was charged to send a proposal requesting the return of a faculty area within the plans for the use of the GUC.
- B. President Lee reported that Scott Infanger had volunteered to represent the College of Arts and Sciences and that Keith Jones will be taking Natasha Lindsey's place representing the College of Business on the Distance Learning Advisory Committee. Peggy Bergeron will fill the faculty at large position on the Food Service Committee.
- C. President Lee informed the senate that Randy Shadburn will be replacing Linda Blount as the senator for Secondary Education.

Senator Roden moved the meeting be adjourned. Senator Gaston seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

Report Re: Year End Process and Procedures Review

To: Darlene Townsend (cc: John Thornell, VPAA)

From: University Tenure and Promotion Committee

Submitted: March 22, 2012

The following is a report from the UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee in response to the charge as detailed in the current Faculty Handbook: “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.”

Development of current recommendations and report: Following review of portfolios for tenure (Fall 2011) and promotion (Spring 2012), a request was made of committee members to submit issues or suggestions relative to the process as described in the handbook. Issues were also brought forth from the VPAA. The chair of the committee compiled all issues and formulated an agenda which was distributed electronically to committee members two days prior to a called meeting. Early distribution of the agenda permitted committee members to discuss items on the agenda with colleagues for feedback. The committee met on March 14 to discuss items on the agenda. The Tenure and Promotion Committee forwards the following recommendations as a product of this meeting. Issues are described followed by committee recommendations. All committee members have reviewed this document and it is forwarded with approval from all. Please contact me should clarification be necessary.

Kind Regards,

Matt Green – UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair on behalf of the UNA Tenure and Promotion Committee

Issue 1:

Current guidelines provide little clarification regarding the years which should be considered when evaluating candidates.

Recommendation

- Incorporate wording at appropriate points in guidelines which clarifies that the totality of a candidate’s work is expected to be strong overall with particular emphasis placed on productivity since the candidate’s last promotion.
-

Issue 2 A, B, C

- A) A lack of consistency among applicants regarding portfolio structure at times makes evaluation difficult.
- B) With specific departmental guidelines increasing in importance, attention to these during evaluation becomes critical.
- C) Current cover page (i.e. Application page) includes repetition.

Recommendations

- A) Place on reserve at Collier several 'model' portfolios of past applicants (w/permission of applicants).
 - B) Place on reserve at Collier a copy of all up-to-date departmental guidelines, and/or make accessible through the VPAA webpage.
 - C) Mild editorial changes are recommended on the application for promotion form. A copy of the current form is provided with edits outlined.
 - Related also to this issue, it is recommended by the committee that movement toward submission of portfolios in a fully electronic manner be investigated. It is noted that recent searches for positions on campus have been conducted using electronic submission.
-

Issue 3

Regarding promotion to Full Professor, wording in the Faculty Handbook indicates that “the appointee shall have established a record of excellence in teaching, in service to the university, the community, and the profession, and in scholarly or creative performance.” Current evaluation approach does not differentiate regarding success/productivity in independent categories (teaching, scholarship, service). Consequently there is potential for an area to be lacking, yet overshadowed by exceptional performance in alternate areas.

Recommendation

- Candidates applying for promotion to FULL professor should be evaluated independently for EACH of the 3 categories to determine whether 'a record of excellence' has been achieved across the board. Evaluation in the independent categories should occur at all levels beginning with the peer committee in the department.

It is noted that the Faculty Senate recently voted on revisions of this component of the handbook. A review of potential changes would not negate the current recommendation from this committee as the notion of requiring acceptable performance in all of the categories was consistent within the suggested revisions.

Issue 4

The current system (“less,” “moderately,” “highly” qualified) lacks precision in rating candidates making differentiation difficult. A candidate whose portfolio warrants a rating better than “moderately qualified,” but is not at a level considered “highly qualified” MUST be rated incorrectly – either in the candidate’s favor or at a level lower than the actual subjective rating of the individual’s application.

Recommendation

- It is recommended that UNA adopt a system offering greater than three ratings. The Tenure and Promotion Committee is aware of a system discussed recently by Academic Deans (below). The Committee supports this system but would add that there should be consideration of coupling numerical values with each descriptive rating; (Less qualified = 1, Moderately qualified = 2, Highly qualified = 3, Exceptionally qualified = 4). Whole number numerical ratings permit calculation and reporting of an aggregate score of greater precision (compared to a global verbal rating alone).

Ratings system developed at Academic Deans’ meeting:

Less Qualified Moderately Qualified Highly Qualified Exceptionally Qualified

*Issue 5

The VPAA asked the committee to discuss a wording change essentially requesting greater detail from peer promotion committee and department chairs of each candidate. Exact wording of this recommendation is below.

***This issue was voted on (and passed) at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 15, 2012.**

From the Desk of the VPAA:

Current Language

The--- (peer promotion committee, chair, and dean) 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. Proposed Language

Proposed Language

The --- (peer promotion committee, chair, and dean) will review the candidate’s portfolio and will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate for the department chair (or dean) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university and departmental

criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (**highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended.

Rationale

Recommendation

**The proposed language (from above) will require edits should a revised rating system be adopted as discussed in issue 4.

The Committee supports the change but would recommend consideration of additional wording (as a component of the change forward by the VPAA) which specifically requests that evaluation letters composed by the candidate's peer committee and department chair provide information directly addressing the quality of scholarly outlets cited within the candidate's portfolio. That would include, but not be limited to the quality of academic journals in which manuscripts or scholarly works appear as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate). Further, it is recommended that candidates be encouraged to provide as part of the portfolio similar information regarding quality of scholarship.

The above recommendation is in response to the difficulty experienced by committee members as a result of being unfamiliar with scholarly outlets of candidates in various disciplines.

ATTACHMENT B

2.4.2 Non-Tenure-Track

These appointments are for full-time assignments but only for a limited period of time-- normally one term or one academic year— with the appointment terminating automatically at the end of the period specified. Non-tenure-track faculty are not eligible for promotion or tenure, but do share during the period of employment the general responsibilities, privileges, and benefits accorded regular faculty.

Non-tenure-track faculty who are offered tenure-track appointments as cited in section 2.4.1 may request that their years of non-tenure-track service at UNA be counted toward their years of probationary tenure-track service. Prior to the time that an offer of tenure-track employment is made, his/her department chair and dean will consult with the employee regarding the advantages and disadvantages of counting non-tenure-track years of service at UNA against his/her tenure-track probationary period. The employee will then prepare a memorandum either declining the option to count years of non-tenure-track service or requesting that all or part of the employee's non-tenure-track service be counted. This memorandum will go forward with the hiring recommendation from the department chair to the dean, to the VPAA and Provost, and then to the President for a decision. The tenure-track employment letter will specify the years, if any, of non-tenure-track employment credited toward the employee's tenure-track probationary period(_____-----{

Comment [rpvt]: Insen New Copy below.

Faculty members hired to fill tenure-track appointments in anticipation of being awarded the terminal degree but who have not completed the degree at the time of hire will be employed at the rank of Instructor. Upon receipt of the terminal degree in the teaching field from a properly accredited institution, the faculty member is automatically eligible for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor upon the recommendation of the department chair and dean and final approval by the VPAA and Provost.

Rationale for Change in 2.4.2

On occasion departments hire tenure track faculty who do not have the doctorate or terminal degree required for a tenure track appointment. Current policy is not clear as to the process used to advance the faculty member into the tenure track once they have completed the degree. In the past faculty members have submitted portfolios and in some case, positions were advertised. These actions are unnecessary if an agreement exists with the candidate at the time of hire.

This proposal clarifies that in such cases, completion of the degree will result in a change of status as agreed upon at the time of hire. The initial letter of hire will spell out the conditions and must have the approval of the department chair and college dean. This policy only applies to faculty hired in tenure track positions.

ATTACHMENT C
Policies and Guidelines for Centers and Institutes

University of North Alabama

The University recognizes the contribution that centers and institutes can make in (a) enriching teaching, research, and service within the academic community and/or (b) advancing institutional goals within the service mission of the institution beyond academics. They also often assist the University in leveraging external funding. Proposals for the establishment of such units require a careful review of their need, role within the institution, and relationship to the mission of the university. The guidelines herein are to be followed for the proposal of a center or institute and an ongoing review of its viability to the university.

Proposals

Any administrative unit of the university may submit a proposal for the creation of a center or institute. The terms centers and institutes are used interchangeably but institutes typically reflect a broader institutional scope. Proposals that are academic in nature are submitted to the Council of Academic Deans (COAD) for review and initial approval. Prior to submission to COAD, proposals must have the endorsement of the appropriate department(s) and college(s). Proposals for centers or institutes that are non-academic in nature are submitted by the appropriate vice president to the university executive council for review and initial approval. Subsequent approvals must be obtained by the appropriate constituency bodies as outlined in shared governance and/or university policy. The university president has final authority for the approval of center and institutes. A proposal must include the following items: purpose of the center or institute, relation to mission of the university, organization chart, budget, objectives, external funding and partners (if any), and evaluation procedures.

This policy statement recognizes that units of the institution that provide ongoing administrative and academic support are often referred to as centers. The guidelines described herein are not applicable to those units.

Reporting Procedures

Centers and institutes are considered a part of the organization structure of the university. As such they must compile and submit annual and periodic reports compliant with the guidelines outlined by the university institutional effectiveness committee.

Periodic Review

Centers and institutes will conduct an audit of their activities and contribution to university mission every five years. The report of that audit will be reviewed by the COAD and/or

Executive Council to determine continued viability. Should a center or institute be deemed to be non-viable, it will be afforded the opportunity to provide an improvement plan. A subsequent review after one year will be conducted and a final recommendation will be made to the president by the COAD or Executive Council to either continue the center or institute for an additional four years or discontinue it. The decision of the president in consultation with the Board of Trustees as needed is final.