FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 2, 2017

Call to order: A regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama was held in room 330 of the University Commons on March 2, 2017. The meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. with President David Brommer presiding.

Proxies: President Brommer recognized the following proxies: Linda Armstrong for Lisa Clayton from Elementary Education and Ansley Quiros for George Makowski from History.

Members in attendance: Rae Atencio, Shane Banks, Doug Barrett, David Brommer, Daryl Brown, Amy Butler, Amanda Coffman, Katherine Crisler, Sarah Franklin, Leah Graham, Mark Greer, Clarissa Hall, Dan Hallock, Felecia Harris, Scott Infanger, Keith Jones, Lisa Kirch, Ian Loeppky, Glenn Marvin, John McGee, Rachel McKelvey, Janet McMullen, Prema Monteiro, Michelle Nelson, Katie Owens-Murphy, Jeffrey Ray, Alaina Reid, Lee Renfroe, Craig Robertson, Patricia Roden, David Ruebhausen, Richard Statom, Daniel Stevens, Jessica Stovall, Alexander Takeuchi, Karen Townsend, Rachel Winston, and Ryan Zayac. President Kitts and Vice President Thornell were also in attendance.

Members not in attendance (without proxy): Lisa Kirch.

Approval of agenda: Richard Statom moved approval of the agenda. Sarah Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Approval of minutes: Richard Statom moved approval of the minutes of the February 2, 2017 meeting with a minor editorial change. Lee Renfroe seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Remarks from President Kitts: President Kitts gave an update on the ongoing administrative searches, enrollment, and the Florence Middle School issue. He reported that he has received the list of candidates recommended for on-campus interviews for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost position. He has accepted the recommendation list without modification. On-campus interviews should begin in approximately mid-March. The search for the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs is also underway. President Kitts reported that interviews for that position may take place in April. In discussing enrollment, President Kitts said that we "are sitting on two years of success." He stated that the indicators are pointing to a third successful year. He briefly discussed the situation with the new middle school. He addressed concerns that the situation is just a bid for the administration to justify building a new stadium. He said that this was not true. He said that he does not want to build a new stadium, but that he wants to make sure that Braly remains viable for the university. He conveyed concerns about the impact of the proposed location of the new middle school on the already poor parking situation at the stadium. He said that it would make a problematic situation unworkable.

Remarks from Vice-President Thornell: Dr. Thornell informed the Senate that an email will be sent to faculty explaining the changes in tenure and promotion and the steps that will need to be taken to opt-in to the new policy. He said that there would be a form and instructions. He specifically addressed a question regarding faculty eligible to apply for tenure this year. He stated that they can chose to opt-in to the new policy and delay their tenure application until they are eligible to apply for tenure and promotion under the new policy, or they can continue under the old policy.

Remarks from Mr. Bryan Rachal – University Marketing/Branding: Mr. Rachal updated the Senate on university marketing and branding. The university contracted with GrahamSpencer to evaluate existing marketing/branding. One result is that the existing secondary logo will become the primary logo. Also, there is a move away from taglines. According to Mr. Rachal, taglines are clichéd. The university is going to start expanding marketing efforts in Nashville, Memphis, Huntsville, Birmingham, Montgomery, and Tuscaloosa. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation can be found in Attachment A.

Reports:

> **Academic Affairs Committee:** The Committee's report is covered under unfinished business.

> **Faculty Affairs Committee:** The Committee's report is covered under new business.

> **Faculty Attitude Survey Committee:** The committee reports that the survey will continue for two weeks. President Brommer asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to take the survey.

Unfinished Business:

> **Section 3.15.1 and Appendix 3D of Faculty Handbook – Course Evaluation:** The Academic Affairs Committee presented their recommendation. Richard Statom moved to postpone until April to allow Senators to take the issue back to their departments and come back with comments and thoughts; Doug Barrett seconded the motion. The motion passed. (See Attachment B)

New Business:

> **Section 2.5.2 of Faculty Handbook – Exceptions Clause:** The Faculty Affairs Committee presented the change requested by Vice President Thornell. Sarah Franklin moved to change "tenure-track" to "tenured and tenure-track" and approve. Richard Statom seconded the motion. The motion passed. (See Attachment C)

> **Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Curriculum Development** (as it relates to course fees)**:** Richard Statom moved approval. Ryan Zayac seconded the motion. The motion passed with one vote against. (See Attachment D)

> **Section 3.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook – Faculty with Administrative/Directorial Responsibilities:** Lee Renfroe moved to postpone and take this back to the departments to review. Richard Statom seconded the motion. The motion passed. (See Attachment E)

> **Personal Leave Policy (University Employee Policy Manual and Handbook):** Richard Statom moved approval. Lee Renfroe seconded the motion. The motion failed (12-19). Leah Graham moved to approve with a change of "Personal leave should be approved in advance by the immediate supervisor" to "When possible, immediate supervisors should be

notified in advance." Doug Barrett seconded the motion. The motion passed. (See Attachment F)

Information Items:

Next Meeting: The next Faculty Senate meeting will be April 6 at 3:30 p.m. in Commons Room 330.

Adjournment: Sarah Franklin moved adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Amy Butler
Secretary
Faculty Senate

Date of Approval: April 6, 2017

UNA Branding: What's Next?

LOGO

The Office of Communications and Marketing will change UNA's current logo from the primary "Lion" to the secondary "Circle Lion."

Current Primary   Current Secondary (Proposed Primary)

Since this is already a secondary logo and is used quite often in admission pieces, it won't be hard to transition to this as the primary.

Additionally, current signage and building décor could remain the same under this proposed logo change. This will also provide us with visual recognition with prospective students.

College Specific Logos

Here are examples of our current college specific logos:

Tag Line

The Office of Communications and Marketing will not create a new tag line.

The reasoning behind this is that taglines are becoming dated and many schools (not all) are moving away from them. Additionally, a tagline will have to be changed at least every two years in order to remain fresh.

Over the past 2 years UNA has used two taglines:
"A Premier Southern University," & "Our tradition is leading the way"

Excerpt from GrahamSpencer Report:
When discussing current tag lines, students preferred "A Premiere Southern University" over "Our Tradition is Leading the Way" unanimously, but still thought the Premiere tagline felt "old" and "common.

Project Scope

UNA will need to determine where our focus will be in terms of approach.

GrahamSpencer recommended we target Memphis and Nashville, in addition to the cities we currently target in Alabama.

Memphis, TN

- High number of Average HS diplomas (4,288.68-9,321.67)
- 145 miles from UNA
- Shelby County population: 940,000
- Memphis-Forrest City CSA estimated population: 1,369,548
- Based on Google analytics of UNA.edu, Tennessee visitors account for 5% of total new visitors; of TN visitors, Memphis accounts for 12% of those visitors)
- 10 students from the Fall 2015 Freshman Class were from Shelby County, the only county in TN more than 100 miles from campus that has 2+ students attending UNA.

Nashville, TN

- Nashville MSA consists of 14 counties and is the 29th largest DMA in the country.
- High number of Average HS diplomas (2,603.68-4,288.67)
- 130 miles from UNA
- Davidson County population: 658,602
- Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Columbia CSA estimated population: 1,553,406
- Based on Google analytics of UNA.edu, Tennessee visitors account for 5% of total new visitors; of TN visitors, Nashville accounts for 26% of those visitors.
- Nashville students could be viewed as more likely to be interested in a music degree due to living in "Music City." UNA can be positioned as an alternative to Belmont and MTSU music programs.

Project Scope

The Office of Communications and Marketing will target the cities of Memphis and Nashville which we think will result in increased enrollment.

Additional focus cities: HSV, Shoals, Tuscaloosa, B'Ham and Montgomery.

Communications Plan/Strategy

With the scope of the project determined, we've looked into our best options to attack those areas.

We'll have a mix of digital and traditional marketing taking place in each designated area.

Strategy

The Office of Communications and Marketing has announced a 6 month – 12 month long campaign in each designated city:

Nashville
Memphis
Huntsville
Florence
Tuscaloosa
Birmingham
Montgomery

Recommendations

Using our **$200,000 annual budget** as a base, the marketing would break down accordingly:

$50,000 for Billboards   **12 Months**

These are located on the I65 corridor from B'Ham to Nashville. Additionally, we have to in close proximity to HSV.

$100,000 for Digital Advertising   **12 Months**

We have allotted $1,200 a month for each of the 7 locations. This would be used on social media and digital impressions.

Recommendations

Using our **$200,000 annual budget** as a base, the marketing would break down accordingly:

$50,000 for Television, Print and Radio   **12 Months**
This will be divided up amongst TV, Radio and print ads.

Generally we spend around $2,500 for 100 TV spots during a marketing push. These run in different months depending on what we're trying to promote.

Additionally, we will run ads in publications like Business Alabama or TimesDaily depending on the issue. We also like the ability to run radio Spots for our graduate programs.

We will also work with athletics to saturate these areas with DI marketing as well, this will allow for more impact. We'd also like to work to increase faculty visits to these areas and encourage more alumni meetings that we can publicize.

Step 4: Rollout

Once approved by the EC, we will provide Graphics Standards with the new logo for approval.

We would like to meet with the COAD, as well as the Faculty senate and Staff senate to discuss the changes.

I would like to send a mass email out to staff/faculty in the email digest to discuss the process and the outcome.

Since all print pieces come through our office, we will initially begin the transition to the new logo. However, departments will need to change their stationary, only after they run out of the old.

Our web designers can make the logo change instantly to all web pages.

Questions?

MEMORANDUM

To: Ms. Kenda Rusevlyan, Chair
            Academic and Student Affairs Committee

From: Dr. Scott R. Infanger, Chair
            Shared Governance Executive Committee

Date: October 18, 2016

At its meeting yesterday, the Shared Governance Executive Committee considered a proposal for revisions to section 3.15.1 and Appendix 3D of the Faculty Handbook – Course Evaluation. The SGEC determined this to be an item to be reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Therefore, please inform me of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure

OFFICE *of the* VICE PRESIDENT *for* ACADEMIC AFFAIRS *and* PROVOST
UNA Box 5041, Florence, AL 35632-0001
P: 256.765.4258 | F: 256.765.4632 | www.una.edu

Equal Opportunity / Equal Access Institution

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Ken Kitts, President
    University of North Alabama

From: Dr. Lamont E. Maddox, Chair
      Course Evaluation Committee

Date: October 11, 2016

Enclosed with this memorandum you will find proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook section 3.15.1 (Student Rating) and a new *End of Course Student Evaluation of Instructor* instrument to replace the survey found in Appendix 3.D. In May 2014, President Cale organized the Course Evaluation Committee to "carry on the work of the Faculty Senate Work Group" and revise the instructor evaluation process. Pursuant to this charge, the committee met several times over the past two years and did the following:

- Clarified the specifics of our charge through conversations with Dean Burkhalter and VPAA Thornell
- Debated the purpose of course evaluations, how they should fit within the tenure/promotion process, processes for establishing validity, and changes to the instrument currently in use (Appendix 3.D)
- Examined processes and instruments used by other institutions
- Sought input from the faculty through a Faculty Course Evaluations Survey (Spring 2015)
- Further defined the elements that might be included in a tiered system to evaluate teaching effectiveness
- Developed a new *End of Course Student Evaluation of Instructor* instrument

The committee concluded that it was not necessary or feasible to purchase a validated, commercially developed instrument for eliciting student feedback on the instruction they received in a course. The current course evaluation survey is used as one piece of evidence, among several in a portfolio, to document teaching effectiveness. As such, it has a minimal impact on tenure/promotion decisions. The attached instrument should be used in a similar fashion. It is intended to:

- Provide insight regarding how students perceive the effectiveness of the instruction they received from a particular instructor
- Focus feedback specifically on instruction, rather than issues pertaining to a course
- Allow instructors to address trends in the survey and document improvement relative to specific criteria (i.e. timely feedback to students)

The committee recommends the new instrument for several reasons. It removes questions that deal with course items beyond the control of the instructor. As a result, it is more focused than the current instrument. It remains short and allows students to provide comments for qualitative feedback. The online delivery format will facilitate timely processing and feedback to instructors. While a commercially produced survey will likely be more elegant and technically precise, this instrument has the benefit of being organic and aligned with areas that interest the faculty at UNA.

The issue of validity is always a concern with this type of survey. Validity deals with the inferences that can be made from a particular instrument based on its intended purpose. The proposed instrument is not intended for use as a stand-alone measure of teaching effectiveness in making high-stakes employment decisions. A valid inference cannot be made regarding a teacher's effectiveness from this instrument because it focuses entirely on student perceptions, which may or may not be accurate. An evaluation of teaching effectiveness must include more forms of evidence (i.e. direct observations of instruction by a trained expert) and tight protocols to reduce subjectivity. The proposed instrument is more appropriately used as part of a broader system to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

While the committee recognizes student evaluations of instruction are inherently subjective, this information is still of critical importance to instructors seeking ways to improve their craft. The proposed instrument should provide data to support targeted professional development, which might result in increased student satisfaction with instruction and greater learning outcomes. Steps can be taken to increase the validity and reliability of the instrument for this purpose – as a tool for professional development and a way for instructors to document dispositions related to effective teaching (i.e. a willingness to be reflective and act on constructive criticism). When seeking tenure/promotion, an instructor could present these data (i.e. improved mean scores in a particular area across semesters) as part of a broader argument, with more pieces of evidence, to show overall teaching effectiveness.

If a decision is made to validate the proposed instrument, a panel will need to be formed to document how the instrument meets standards of content, construct, criterion, and other forms of validity. This process is time consuming and intensive, but can be accomplished. The panel would need to consist of faculty, students, those with test design expertise, and perhaps additional stakeholders. Even when this process is complete, departments should not use this instrument as a primary means of documenting teaching effectiveness.

The Course Evaluation Committee believes that the task of devising a comprehensive teaching evaluation process best fits under the responsibility of the proposed Center for Teaching and Learning, presently under review by the administration. The committee has reached the limits of what it can do at this time and is putting aside its remaining tasks until they can be taken up by a Center that has faculty development and support as its primary focus.

Section 3-23 of the Faculty Handbook

Student Rating: Student rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and university libraries/educational technologies) to collect information about students' perceptions ~~of courses and~~ of faculty members' teaching effectiveness. Departments may add items to the campus form (see Appendix 3.D). 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 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 let ~~announce to~~ the class know in advance when the rating forms will be available online. The ~~professor will~~ students will read the following statement as they complete the online survey: ~~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 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 this 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."~~ "The purpose of this evaluation is to help the instructor improve his/her teaching performance. Your instructor is cooperating in this evaluation and your participation is requested, but not required. Please be advised that your instructor will only have access to scores from this form in the aggregate and this information will not be reported until after final grades are submitted, so there is no possibility of your comments having an impact on your grade. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this 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. Please read the following questions and click on the button that corresponds with the letter that best represents your response according to the following rating scale:" ~~The faculty member should give the envelop with the blank forms and instructions to the 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 survey will be completed online and the results will be processed by the ~~The departmental administrative assistant will collect all sealed envelopes and forward them to the~~ Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (OIRPA) ~~for processing~~.   The OIRPA will process these ~~forms~~ data in a timely fashion and forward results to the department chair. The summary of the ratings shall be retained on file in the college dean's office and shall be shared with the faculty member.

Proposed final version of section 3-23

Student Rating: Student rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and university libraries/educational technologies) to collect information about students' perceptions of faculty members' teaching effectiveness. Departments may add items to the campus form (see Appendix 3.D). 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 format to ensure anonymity. The faculty member will let the class know in advance when the rating forms will be available online. The students will read the following statement as they complete the online survey: "The purpose of this evaluation is to help the instructor improve his/her teaching performance. Your instructor is cooperating in this evaluation and your participation is requested, but not required. Please be advised that your instructor will only have access to scores from this form in the aggregate and this information will not be reported until after final grades are submitted, so there is no possibility of your comments having an impact on your grade. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this 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. Please read the following questions and click on the button that corresponds with the letter that best represents your response according to the following rating scale:…" The survey will be completed online and the results will be processed by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (OIRPA). The OIRPA will process these data in a timely fashion and forward results to the department chair. The summary of the ratings shall be retained on file in the college dean's office and shall be shared with the faculty member.

Appendix 3.D

University of North Alabama
End of Semester Student Evaluation of Instructor

Administration Instructions:
For online courses. The instructor will notify students of when the survey will be available and students will complete the form online during the designated window of time.
Traditional or hybrid courses. The instructor should allocate class time for students to complete the evaluation, even though it will also be available and active outside of normal class hours during a specified period each semester. In order to complete the evaluation, students will need to bring a personal mobile device (laptop, tablet, phone, etc.) with internet capability to class or the instructor can reserve a computer lab. As necessary, students may share devices to complete the evaluation using their unique login access. The evaluation should be completed during one of the final class meetings of the semester. Instructors are encouraged to promote maximum participation by adding the date of the evaluation to their course schedule/syllabus. When administering the assessment in class, instructors should provide students with any administrative information not already provided (i.e. course #, department specific questions if applicable) and then leave the room until the evaluation is complete. Please send a follow-up email to the class to encourage anyone who was absent to complete the evaluation form while it is still available (as needed).

Sample of Online Survey: **For use with traditional, hybrid, and online courses.**

Instructor_____**Course Number**_____**Semester**_____

Please read the following instructions carefully:

The purpose of this evaluation is to help the instructor improve his/her teaching performance. Your instructor is cooperating in this evaluation and your participation is requested, but not required. Please be advised that your instructor will only have access to scores from this form in the aggregate and this information will not be reported until after final grades are submitted, so there is no possibility of your comments having an impact on your grade. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this 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. Please read the following questions and click on the button that corresponds with the letter that best represents your response according to the following rating scale:

a	b	c	d	e
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral or No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

1. The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. a b c d e

2. The instructor presented content in an organized manner. a b c d e

3. The instructor was accessible for consultations through office hours or alternate means specified in the syllabus. a b c d e

4. The instructor provided timely feedback on class assignments in this course. a b c d e

5. The instructor demonstrated effective verbal and written communication skills. a b c d e

6. The instructor incorporated a variety of instructional methods to meet the needs of all learners.   a b c d e

7. The instructor attempted to establish the relevance of the course to my life and/or future career.   a b c d e

8. The instructor made the course interesting and engaging.   a b c d e

9. The instructor challenged me to think critically.   a b c d e

10. The instructor maintained high expectations and standards.   a b c d e

11. The instructor encouraged questions and participation.   a b c d e

Comments:

Appendix 3.D

University of North Alabama
End of Semester Student Evaluation of Instructor

Administration Instructions:
For online courses. The instructor will notify students of when the survey will be available and students will complete the form online during the designated window of time.
Traditional or hybrid courses. The instructor should allocate class time for students to complete the evaluation, even though it will also be available and active outside of normal class hours during a specified period each semester. In order to complete the evaluation, students will need to bring a personal mobile device (laptop, tablet, phone, etc.) with internet capability to class or the instructor can reserve a computer lab. As necessary, students may share devices to complete the evaluation using their unique login access. The evaluation should be completed during one of the final class meetings of the semester. Instructors are encouraged to promote maximum participation by adding the date of the evaluation to their course schedule/syllabus. When administering the assessment in class, instructors should provide students with any administrative information not already provided (i.e. course#, department specific questions if applicable) and then leave the room until the evaluation is complete. Please send a follow-up email to the class to encourage anyone who was absent to complete the evaluation form while it is still available (as needed).

Sample of Online Survey: **For use with traditional, hybrid, and online courses.**

Instructor_____**Course Number**_____**Semester**_____

Please read the following instructions carefully:

The purpose of this evaluation is to help the instructor improve his/her teaching performance. Your instructor is cooperating in this evaluation and your participation is requested, but not required. Please be advised that your instructor will only have access to scores from this form in the aggregate and this information will not be reported until after final grades are submitted, so there is no possibility of your comments having an impact on your grade. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this 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 ~~fonn~~ form as you would be if you were going to sig n it. Please read the following questions and click on the button that corresponds with the letter that best represents your response according to the following rating scale:

a	b	c	d	e f
Strongly ~~Disagree~~ Agree	~~Disagree~~ Agree	~~Neutral or~~ No Opinion	A~~Disagree~~ gree	Strongly ~~Agree~~ Disagree

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

1. ~~The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.~~ ~~abcde~~

2. 1. The instructor presented content in an organized manner. abcdf

3. 2. The instructor was accessible for consultations through office hours or alternate means specified in the syllabus. ~~abcde~~

abcdf

4. 3. The instructor provided timely feedback on class assignments in this course. ~~abcde~~

5. 4. The instructor demonstrated effective ~~verbal and written~~ communication skills. abcdf

~~abcde~~

abcdf

Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17)), Strikethrough
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Font color: Custom Color(RGB(17,17,17))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering

~~6.~~ 5. ~~The instructor incorporated a variety of instructional methods to meet the needs of all learners~~ The instructional methods and assignments used by the instructor were appropriate for this course.

abcde
abcdf

~~7.~~ 6. The instructor ~~attempted to~~ establish ed the relevance of the course content to my life and/or future career.

abcde
abcdf

~~8.~~ 7. The instructor made the course interesting and engaging.

abcde

~~9.~~ 8. The instructor challenged me to think critically.

abcdf

~~10~~ 9. The instructor maintained high expectations and standards.

abcde

~~11~~ 10. The instructor encouraged questions and participation.

abcdf

Comments:

What was the best part of the course?

abcde

What was the least appealing part of the course?

abcdf

abcde

abcdf

2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Appointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure

Faculty ranks of the University, including librarians, and educational technologists, are instructor, visiting (open rank) professor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Only positions at the assistant professor level or higher are considered tenure-track. All others are based on renewable appointment, not including visiting (open rank) professor appointments. Appointment, continued employment and consideration for tenure of supervising teachers at Kilby Laboratory School are subject to all relevant Alabama laws and Alabama State Board of Education policies governing P-12 public school teachers. Determination of rank is established at the time of initial appointment. The years of appropriate experience are calculated at the end of the academic year prior to appointment. The academic year in which a promotion portfolio is submitted will count toward appropriate cumulative experience for that rank. Compensation for visiting (open rank) professors is determined by joint agreement of the department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost based on duties, needs of the University, and available funds.

The University understands that the interests and areas of emphasis for faculty members change as their career develops. It is the responsibility of departments, in cooperation with their respective deans, to develop guidelines for faculty professional growth that (1) adequately define for each faculty member what his/her departmental expectations are for promotion and/or tenure, and year-to-year success, and (2) are implemented through guidance provided by the department chair to the faculty member during the annual evaluation and at other appropriate times. It is the responsibility of the deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost to monitor equity of expectations across the University.

For non-teaching faculty, effectiveness in role as library or educational technology faculty is evaluated instead of teaching effectiveness. The following criteria and procedures below do not apply to Kilby School and the Department of Military Science because of the special nature of those departments. Faculty from the Department of Military Science will not serve on promotion committees.

Minimum Qualifications by Rank (Also see Appendix 2.D/2.D1, Timeline for Promotion and/or Tenure)

1. <u>Instructor/Visiting (Open Rank) Professor</u>. Appointment to this rank typically requires possession of a master's or higher degree in the field of assignment. For appointments without the master's or higher degree in the field of assignment, there must be evidence of related work experience in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes.

2. <u>Assistant Professor</u>. Appointment, promotion to this rank, and/or tenure requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. There shall also be evidence of potential for effective teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service; as well as for a successful career. As per the terms of the letter of employment, 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 Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

3. <u>Associate Professor</u>. Appointment, promotion to this rank, and/or tenure requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.

   Promotion to Associate Professor: Faculty will be required to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure no later than the sixth year of service as an Assistant Professor at UNA. Faculty employment contracts may, upon approval by the dean and VPAA, include credit for up to three years of service at the assistant professor level or higher at other institutions toward the six years of service. The credit given must be determined at the time of hiring and included in the employment letter. The relevant documentation of years of probationary service will be maintained by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and may be used in lieu of offer letters written prior to the 2017-18 academic year that do not include this information. An Assistant Professor must serve a minimum of two years at UNA prior to the review of the promotion and/or tenure application in the third academic year of employment at UNA.

4. <u>Professor</u>. Appointment, promotion to this rank, and/or tenure, requires possession of a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. In addition, a minimum of 12 years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least six of which must be in rank as associate professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the twelve years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have established a sustained and consistent record of excellence in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.

   Promotion to Professor: Faculty will be eligible to be evaluated for promotion no earlier than the sixth year of service as an Associate Professor at UNA. Faculty employment contracts may, upon approval by the dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost, include credit for up to three years of service at the associate professor level or higher at other institutions toward the six years of service. The credit given must be determined at the time of hiring and included in the employment letter. The relevant documentation of years of probationary service will be maintained by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and may be used in lieu of offer letters written prior to the 2017-18 academic year that do not include this information. An Associate Professor must serve a minimum of two years at UNA prior to the review of the promotion application in the third academic year of employment at UNA.

Tenure for Full Professors: Faculty appointed as full professors will apply for tenure after completing at least two years of service at UNA.

Exceptions: In rare and unique circumstances, a petition by the department chair (approved by a majority of the full-time ~~tenure~~ tenure-track departmental faculty) and by the dean for a waiver of the aforementioned credential and experience requirements for tenure and/or any rank may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

University of
NORTH
ALABAMA
1830

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. David M. Brommer, President
        UNA Faculty Senate

From: Dr. Scott R. Infanger, Chair
        Shared Governance Executive Committee

Date: February 21, 2017

At its meeting yesterday, the Shared Governance Executive Committee considered a proposal for revisions to section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Curriculum Development (as it relates to course fees). The SGEC determined this to be a faculty only issue to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Therefore, please inform me of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Scott R. Infanger, Chair
         Shared Governance Executive Committee

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

Date: February 14, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans to revise Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Curriculum Development. This proposal is designed to address the review of proposed course fees prior to submission to the Board of Trustees. It is presented for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee.

rv
Enclosure

3.3.3 Curriculum Development

Curriculum development leading to new majors, programs or courses, or the revision of existing programs or courses, normally originates in the academic department. Typically, faculty members with expertise in a particular area develop proposals for departmental review. Proposals are developed outlining the changes and a rationale and are submitted with recommendations to the department chair. The chair reviews the proposal, signs the appropriate approval documents, and forwards the proposal to the college dean. The college dean convenes the college-wide curriculum committee to review the proposal. Once approved and endorsed by the college dean, it is forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for initial review. If approved, Tthis office submits the proposal to the appropriate university-wide faculty curriculum committee. For undergraduate changes, the proposal is submitted to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. For graduate changes, the proposal is submitted to the Graduate Council and to the university Director of Graduate Studies/ACHE Liaison. In addition, proposals for new degree programs will be posted by campus e-mail for review by the faculty. Comments are to be submitted to the Curriculum Committee Chair for undergraduate proposals and Graduate Council Chair for graduate proposals. The comment period will be 15 working days, excluding holidays. Once the comment period has been completed, the Curriculum Committee and/or Graduate Council will review the proposal, any faculty comments, and any comments from the department and/or college submitting the proposal and take action on the proposal. Different forms are used to transmit curriculum changes to the appropriate faculty committee. At the undergraduate level, the UCC (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee) form is used. At the graduate level, the Graduate Council New Course and Course/Curriculum Change Proposal Form is used. If the curriculum changes are approved by these campus-wide faculty committees, they are transmitted back to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for final approval and addition to the university catalogs. If they involve new curriculum programs (majors) or course fees, they must also be approved by the President and University Board of Trustees. Significant changes in existing programs and/or new programs must also be submitted to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education for review (departments should refer to the ACHE website for procedures). If curriculum changes represent a substantive change in program mission for the University, they must be reviewed and/or approved by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (departments should refer to the SACSCOC website for procedures). Significant changes in teacher education programs leading to certification must be further reviewed by the Alabama State Department of Education and significant changes in nursing must be further reviewed by the Alabama Board of Nursing and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education.

In certain situations, proposals for broad-based and/or multidisciplinary changes may originate and be proposed by units outside the academic departments. Examples include the university-wide curriculum committees, the Council of Academic Deans, and/or ad hoc faculty committees appointed as part of the shared governance process. The types of changes these groups might submit include changes in the general education curriculum or graduation requirements, and/or new programs that include multiple disciplines. Multi-disciplinary and other curriculum proposals originating outside of traditional departments are submitted to the Council of Academic Deans to be reviewed by the Non-Traditional and Interdisciplinary

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Gary Padgett, Chair
Faculty/Staff Welfare Committee

From: Dr. Marilyn B. Lee, Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

Date: March 15, 2016

At its meeting yesterday, the Shared Governance Executive Committee considered the enclosed proposal from Dr. Greg Gaston to modify the Faculty Handbook to address the issue of faculty with administrative/directorial responsibilities. The SGEC determined this as an issue to be reviewed by the Faculty/Staff Welfare Committee. Therefore, please inform me of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure
pc + enclosure: Dr. John G. Thornell

OFFICE *of the* VICE PRESIDENT *for* ACADEMIC AFFAIRS *and* PROVOST
UNA Box 5041, Florence, AL 35632-0001
P: 256.765.4258 | F: 256.765.4632 | www.una.edu

Equal Opportunity / Equal Access Institution

Proposal for clarification of faculty responsibilities:

Colleagues,

A number of departments on the UNA campus have faculty whose responsibilities are divided between their traditional faculty responsibilities and some form of management/oversight/administrative responsibilities. These faculty are directors of various centers on campus as well as having some responsibility within their department.

Currently, there is no guidance in the Faculty Handbook or other UNA governing documents. Nor has the administration moved to clarify the rights and responsibilities of the individuals in these positions. This situation should be clarified and resolved as soon as possible for the benefit of the individuals and departments involved in these situations.

The Constitution of the UNA Faculty Senate has addressed this situation insofar as representation to the faculty senate. The Senate Constitution Article III A states:

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

Using this standard as guidance for faculty responsibilities within each department will insure consistency and clarity for all parties across campus.

Be it resolved to modify the faculty handbook to address the issue of faculty with administrative/directorial responsibilities as follows:

In order to be considered a voting member of a department, faculty in any department shall be full-time faculty in positions that are at least two-thirds (66%) non- administration. Questions regarding the role a faculty member with a split appointment may play regarding other responsibilities within the department, such as acting as the major professor on graduate committees, will be decided by a vote of the full time faculty within each department.

This simple change will provide clarity for individuals and departments across campus.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Nathan Pitts, Chair
Faculty/Staff Welfare Committee

Dr. David M. Brommer, President
UNA Faculty Senate

Dr. Kevin L. Jacques, President
UNA Staff Senate

From: Dr. Scott R. Infanger, Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

Date: February 7, 2017

At its meeting yesterday, the Shared Governance Executive Committee considered a proposal for revisions to the university policy on Personal Leave. The SGEC determined this to be an item to be reviewed concurrently by the Faculty/Staff Welfare Committee, Faculty Senate, and Staff Senate. Therefore, please inform me of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Scott R. Infanger, Chair
           Shared Governance Executive Committee

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

Date: January 31, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for revisions to the Personal Leave Policy as contained in the University Employee Policy Manual and Handbook. It is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure
pc: Ms. Catherine D. White

Personal leave : An employee is allowed time away from work to take care of ~~extraordinary~~pressing legal or personal business matters. Personal leave should be approved in advance by the immediate supervisor~~, and work requirements take priority over personal leave~~. ~~Only~~Up to ~~two~~five days per year of personal leave are authorized. (The year starts on January 1 and ends on December 31.) ~~An additional three days of leave may be approved by the appropriate vice president when circumstances warrant such action.~~ Personal leave is charged against the accrued sick leave balance and cannot be carried over from one year to the next.