

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 10, 2013

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met December 10, 2013 in Room 102 of Floyd Science Building at 3:30 p.m.

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

Ruth Dumas for Senator Kinney from Elementary Education and
Alaina Patterson Shockley for Senator Kingsbury from English.

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

Senator Loeppky moved the approval of the November 14, 2013 minutes. Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed.

President Cale discussed the two commencement ceremonies. Lauren Manning, Sept. 11 survivor and writer will be the speaker at both ceremonies. He also reported that the Campus Security Task Force will meet with him on Thursday. President Cale reported on several accreditation visits including the SACS review of the MBA degree delivered on the Athens State campus, the ABET review of the CS and CIS majors and the NCATE review. He also reported that UNA's Phi Kappa Phi chapter has been named a chapter of excellence.

President Cale also discussed the joint effort with the University of Alabama to issue a dual degree in engineering from their institution along with a degree in physics, mathematics, computer science or chemistry from UNA. The Strategic Plan should be available to everyone on campus. He pointed out that it is not prescriptive but a guiding document. He also reported that the Shared Governance Document has been experienced an extensive review and rewrite. He wished everyone a good end to the semester.

VPAA Thornell spoke about his visit to SACS and vendors for evaluation, assessment and verification. He also discussed a new policy on competency based education.

REPORTS:

A. Standing Committees:

1. Senator McGee reported that the Faculty Attitude Survey Committee met yesterday. The members are in the process of revising questions and hope to have something to present at the February meeting.
2. Senator Loeppky reported that the Academic Affairs Committee is working on a survey to present to the deans.
3. Senator Infanger reported from the Assessment of Teaching Excellence Working Group. The group is considering the fact there is not just one method for measuring teaching excellence, the need for a definition of teaching excellence, and the possibility of a purchased instrument. The department chairs of the College of Arts and Sciences are also looking into this issue.
4. Senator Roden reported that the Constitution Committee is gathering data from peer institutions' constitutions concerning several questions and looking at the tasks assigned to the Faculty Affairs Committee and Academic Affairs Committee during the past several years in an effort to better define their roles. The committee hopes to have something to present in the February or March meeting.
5. Senator Townsend presented a proposal: "Recommended practices for full-time faculty at the Instructor rank to apply for reappointment" from the Faculty Affairs Committee. (See Attachment A) Senator Statom moved to postpone discussion of the proposal until the next meeting. Senator Loeppky seconded. The motion passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Barrett moved to send the Faculty and Staff Computer Rights and Computer Monitoring (Administrative Privileges Policy) back to the originators with the following recommendations: Senators would like to see examples provided to illustrate what does and what does not constitute a violation of the policy, "User will not use University computers for personal gain" (p. 1 of the document); Senators and Dr. Thornell agreed to recommend an edit to the language on page 2 of the document, as shown: "personnel involved will be subject to ~~revocation of privilege~~ disciplinary action." Senator Hubler seconded. The motion passed. (See Attachment B)
- B. Senator Infanger moved the approval of the Faculty Handbook 2.5.3 (notification of intent to apply) proposal with the following changes: "notification of intent to apply by ~~October~~ September 1. The department chair will ~~determine that~~ verify whether the candidate is eligible for promotion and notify the candidate by September 10. If ~~eligible the~~ The candidate submits ... Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed. Senator Infanger moved the revision of Appendix 2B to change the first task to September 1 and add a new task for the Department chair notification by September 10. (See Attachment C) Senator Stovall seconded. The motion passed.
- C. Senator Campbell moved approval of the Faculty Handbook 3.14 and Appendix 3D (revisions to faculty performance review). (See Attachment D) Senator McIntosh

seconded. The motion passed.

- D. Senator Barrett moved the approval of the Faculty Handbook Appendix 4A (Salary Schedule). (See Attachment E) Senator Sanders seconded. The motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Senator Barrett moved the approval of the language edits for Faculty Handbook 2.5.3 and 2.5.4. (See Attachment F) Senator Campbell seconded. The motion passed. An issue was raised about whether guidelines are consistent with the recent change to the promotion and tenure process. Senator Statom moved this issue be sent back to the originator. Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed.
- B. Senator Hubler moved that a request be sent from the Faculty Senate to the Distance Learning Advisory Committee for a review of the distance learning policy and consideration of identity verification. Senator McGee seconded. The motion passed.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

- A. Faculty is encouraged to look at the revisions of the Shared Governance Documents related to the makeup of committees and the voting rights.
- B. A request for considering revisions to the final exam schedule and Early College reporting was sent to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.
- C. Construction of faculty webpages need to work with WebLion.

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

ATTACHMENT A

Recommended practices for full-time faculty at the Instructor rank to apply for reappointment (for the Faculty Handbook)

A successful non-tenure track Instructor must present evidence of capable instructional performance or professional effectiveness to be eligible for reappointment. Minimum documentation should include the following activities:

(1a) Class Performance or Professional Effectiveness – For teaching faculty the department Chair or a designated tenured faculty member must observe one traditional class per year taught by the applicant and complete an evaluation form. This form is initially utilized for constructive feedback regarding the Instructor's teaching methodology with any recommendations from the Chair or tenured faculty member. Upon application for reappointment, the form is to be included with any necessary follow-up or initiated changes if applicable. For non-teaching faculty the most recent faculty performance report should be submitted with the reappointment application.

(1b) Course Evaluation – Teaching faculty should also submit course evaluations with reappointment application.

(2) Evidence of Service – This may include improving the quality of instructional programs in his/her academic area, mentoring/advising, completing and/or presenting continuing educational activities/programs, professional development, creative effort, leadership, and grants. This also includes any documentation of activities appropriate to the applicant's area and expertise and activities which has brought credit or advancement to the university (UNA) and/or community.

(3) Goals – Submitted goals for the Instructor may reflect any of the above activities and relate to the following year(s). Goals must be clear, concise, and reflect positively on the Instructor, his/her respective department, and coordinate with the overall institutional goals at UNA.

This evidence must be submitted annually (in March) to the department Chair during the first three years of employment as a non-tenure track Instructor. After three consecutive years of reappointment, the Chair of the department may elect to continue this process annually, bi-annually, or tri-annually. (However, an updated C.V. must be submitted annually.)

ATTACHMENT B

Local Administrative Privileges and Network Computer Monitoring Policy

The following document applies to all University employees and computers, including Information Technology Services (ITS) employees and computers.

Running a computer system with administrative privileges represents a significant risk to the confidentiality, integrity, security, and availability of the University's information assets. However, without administrative privileges, a user cannot immediately install or update some software and/or hardware and must wait for ITS support, which causes an inconvenience for the user and increases the expense of maintaining the University's computer assets. Therefore, under the direction of the University administration, ITS enables local administrative privileges for each employee on their assigned computer.

All University owned computers must:

- Be joined to the University's Active Directory domain;
- Have management software installed that facilitates hardware or software inventory for asset tracking, license compliance, software installation/upgrading, remote assistance, or troubleshooting;
- Have active, properly configured security (anti-virus, malware, etc.) software; Have service packs and/or patches deemed necessary by ITS.

NOTE: Exceptions to the above can be made by the ITS Director. Local

Administrative Privileges Agreement

Every University employee initially has local administrative privileges on their University assigned computer and is required to abide by the following:

- User will not alter the computer's firewall, antivirus, or any other security software; User will not create any new user accounts or modify any existing accounts;
- The ITS department will continue to provide operating system patches, application software patches, antivirus/malware updates through the system wide client management platform to all University owned computers. User will not block or in any manner disable or revise any services on the computer that may prevent these or other routine maintenance procedures including scheduled antivirus/malware scans;
- User will maintain software licensing information for any software personally installed on their assigned computer;
- User will not share their username or password with others (Information Technology Services can provide assistance in establishing options for securely sharing items between users);
- User will not install or use software that is considered insecure. If there are questions concerning the validity of any software, the user should contact ITS prior to installing;
- User agrees that ITS has the right to temporarily block the computer from the University network at any time if the computer is suspected to be a security or support risk;
- User will be responsible for backing up their data. ITS will not be able to restore a configuration customized by the user. In the event of a computer failure, ITS will restore the original base image on the computer. The base image includes an operating system and any software maintained by the ITS department;
- User will not use University computers for personal gain
([http://ethics.alabama.gov/docs/Unofficial_Restated_Ethics_Act\(Draft_7-18-2012\).pdf](http://ethics.alabama.gov/docs/Unofficial_Restated_Ethics_Act(Draft_7-18-2012).pdf)Page 24);
- User agrees that, in the event their local administrative privileges result in a security compromise, they may be held responsible for any damages that may result to the full extent allowed by University policy, Local, State, and/or Federal law.

Network and Computer Monitoring

Electronic information on University computing resources is subject to examination if it is necessary to maintain or improve the functioning of University computing resources. Therefore, it is understood that there is a need to periodically inspect computers and network usage in order to ensure the continued correct operation of the University network and computing resources. University network and computing resources.

the University does not condone censorship, nor does it endorse the routine inspection of electronic files or monitoring of network activities related to individual use. At times, however, legitimate reasons exist for persons other than the account holder to access computers, electronic files, or data related to use of the University network. Such monitoring is limited to the backup, caching of data, logging of general activity, and usage patterns as are necessary for maintaining network availability or performance.

The University may monitor individual usage in the following instances: The user has voluntarily made access available to the public;

To protect the security, functionality, and liability of the University's Information Technology Resources; Where probable cause exists to believe that the user has violated this policy.

Any such monitoring of individual activity, with the exception of when a user voluntarily grants access, must be approved in advance by the Vice President of Academic Affairs / Provost (VPAA) in consultation with the President. The University may also monitor individual usage upon receipt of a legally served directive of appropriate law enforcement agencies. In these instances, the user will not be notified, so as to not impede on investigations by proper authorities. The VPAA must be notified prior to initiation of monitoring.

Any violation of these procedures or unauthorized monitoring by the University will be considered "misuse" and personnel involved will be subject to revocation of privilege.

Privileges Revocation

A user's local administrative privileges may be revoked for any of the following reasons:

User is involved in a data breach that is related directly to their having administrative privileges; User is downloading or installing software that is illegal or malicious to the University's Information Technology Resources;

User is downloading or distributing copyrighted material without permission and can't demonstrate "fair use" (<http://www.copyright.gov/fls/fl102.html>);

User requires excessive support from ITS staff. Excessive support is defined as frequent incidents requiring ITS staff to spend time returning a computer's operating system or software to a properly functioning state.

Decisions to revoke a user's local administrative privileges will be made collaboratively by the ITS Director and the immediate supervisor of the assigned user based on documentation of any of the above conditions. Revocation of privileges will be communicated in writing to the user upon execution. If the Director of ITS and the user's immediate supervisor are unable reach a mutually acceptable agreement, either may appeal to the Technologies Advisory Committee (TAC) for a decision. The committee may be reached by sending a written request to the TAC Chair. The Chair will respond to appeal requests in writing to the requester within 15 business days. In the meantime, prior to the TAC's official decision, revocation of local administrative privileges is at the discretion of the ITS Director.

A user's previously revoked administrative privileges will not be restored without a written request from the user. After a period of 90 days, a user may request the reinstatement of their previously granted local administrative privileges by sending a written request to the ITS Director and their immediate supervisor. The decision process will consider the documentation and/or decision that led to the revocation and the user's computer use record during the prior 90 days. If the decision is made to continue without local administrative privileges, the user may continue to request reinstatement every 90 days. Any reinstatement request that is less than 90 days from the initial revocation or from a previous reinstatement request will not be accepted.

A user whose administrative privileges are revoked and not restored may appeal the decision with the TAC. The committee may be reached by sending a written request to the ITS Director and the TAC Chair. The committee will respond to appeal requests in writing to the requester within 15 business days.

respond to appeal requests in writing to the requester within 15 business days.

ATTACHMENT C

2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion

A. Faculty Members Who Are Not Department Chairs

The promotion process will be initiated when the faculty member submits by e-mail to the department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost a notification of intent to apply by October 1. The department chair will determine that the candidate is eligible for promotion and notify the candidate of the outcome. If eligible, the candidate submits electronically an application and portfolio by October 10 to the department chair. ~~It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit documentation to confirm that he/she meets the minimum criteria for promotion to the next rank.~~

The electronic portfolio will contain the following and will be housed on a UNA server accessible only by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion review process:

UNA PROMOTION PROCESS	
TASK	TARGET DATE*
Candidate submits by e-mail to Department Chair, Dean, and VPAA/Provost notification of intent to apply for promotion.	October 1
**Candidate presents application and portfolio to Department Chair.	October 10
Department Chair forms Peer Promotion Committee and informs College Dean of candidates.	October 20
Peer Promotion Committee reviews portfolios, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to department chair.	November 1
Department Chair reviews portfolio, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to dean.	November 15
College Dean reviews recommendations of peer committee and department chair and portfolios, completes evaluations for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to VPAA/Provost.	January 10
University Tenure/Promotion Committee reviews portfolios, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to VPAA/Provost.	March 1
VPAA/Provost reviews portfolios, completes evaluations for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to the President.	March 8
President or his/her designee makes final decision and informs VPAA /Provost.	March 15
VPAA/Provost informs deans of final decisions. Candidates are notified by deans.	March 15 (Promotions become effective as of March 1)
Written feedback from department chair and/or dean is provided to candidates. Portfolios are picked up from dean.	March 30

*If target date falls on a university non-workday, the next workday applies.

**Departmental and/or college promotion guidelines and a cover letter (optional) must be contained within the promotion portfolio.

ATTACHMENT D

3.14 FACULTY EVALUATION

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to provide for a valid and reliable assessment of faculty performance based on designated areas of engagement approved by the University. Toward that end, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate continuous involvement and effectiveness in the areas of: (1) teaching/professional effectiveness; (2) research, scholarship, and/or creative activities related to the faculty member's discipline and/or professional responsibilities; and (3) service performed on behalf of and/or in affiliation with the University, professional association, or as a civic or social service in the local community.

3.14.1 Components of the Program

Updated Curriculum Vitae. The vitae shall contain detailed background and professional achievement data – educational background, degrees, teaching and other professional experience, scholarly and creative activities, service to the department, university, and community – and any information deemed relevant to the department or faculty member. The vitae shall be updated yearly **by May 15** and retained on file in the college dean's office.

Faculty ~~Evaluation~~ Performance Report. Each full-time faculty member will establish professional goals for the upcoming year. The faculty member will contact the department chair to establish a meeting date **prior to May 15** in order to discuss professional goals for the coming year. (See Appendix 3.D) During the conference, the faculty member and department chair shall come to a consensus on the following year's goals. If the faculty member was employed the previous year, he/she will also complete and submit electronically on this form (Appendix 3.D) a statement of accomplishments relating to the prior year's goals. The faculty member and the department chair will, during the meeting, discuss the specific goals and the improvements made which the faculty member has documented. This form will be transmitted electronically to the appropriate academic dean for review. A signed copy of the Faculty ~~Evaluation~~ Performance Report shall be retained in the college dean's office.

Student Rating. Student rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and ~~U~~niversity libraries/educational technologies) to collect information about students' perceptions of courses and faculty. 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 announce to the class in advance that the rating forms will be administered. The professor will read the following statement to the class: "The evaluation you are about to complete is intended for constructive feedback. After your final grades in this course have been submitted, your tabulated responses will be seen by the instructor of the course and the chair of the department or dean. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of the evaluation is improvement, if you are going to be critical, try to document your criticism in your responses in such a way that the instructor can benefit and improve his/her teaching of this course. Be as responsible in

completing this form as you would be if you were going to sign it. The instructor of this course will not see the results of these forms until the semester is over and the final grades have been submitted. A blank sheet of paper is provided should you wish to make comments." The faculty member should give the envelope 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 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 the forms 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.

Performance Evaluations. Using the faculty member's updated curriculum vitae, Faculty Evaluation Performance Report, student ratings, and other appropriate information, department chairs will provide each faculty member a written performance evaluation on the following schedule: by **September 15** every year for nontenured faculty and every two years for tenured faculty. Performance evaluations may be provided more frequently at the discretion of the department chair or upon request by the faculty member or the dean of the college. The evaluation will be signed by ~~both~~ the department chair, dean, and the faculty member. The faculty member has the option of submitting a written response to the department chair by **September 30**. Copies of the evaluation and any response shall be retained in the college dean's office.

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

3.14.2 Use of the Results of the Program

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

University of North Alabama
FACULTY ~~EVALUATION PERFORMANCE~~ REPORT
 Academic Period

NAME: Rank #Years Full-Time
 List Courses/Clinicals/Labs Currently Teaching
 Additional Assignments (professorship, grant, release-time, etc.)

DEPARTMENT:

I. _____ What were your professional goals this year as related to departmental and/or college performance guidelines??

Teaching/~~Library~~ Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities (~~Scholarly or Creative Performance~~):

University, ~~and~~ Community, and Professional Service:

II. _____ What was accomplished relative to these goals?

Teaching/~~Library~~ Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities (~~Scholarly or Creative Performance~~):

University, ~~and~~ Community, and Professional Service:

III. _____ After evaluating your goals/accomplishments for the current year, indicate your measurable goals/objectives for the upcoming year ~~relative to teaching/library effectiveness; research, scholarship, and other creative activities (scholarly or creative performance); and university and community service.~~

Teaching/~~Library~~ Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities (~~Scholarly or Creative Performance~~):

University, ~~and~~ Community, and Professional Service:

 Faculty Member _____ Date

IV. Evaluation by Department Chair related to departmental and/or college performance guidelines.

Teaching Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:

University, Community, and Professional Service:

Reviewed By: _____ **Date:** _____

☐ Department Chair _____

☐ Dean _____

Faculty Member Signature **Date**

Department Chair Signature **Date**

Dean Signature **Date**

Optional Comments by Dean:

***Attach updated vita per Faculty Handbook**

University of North Alabama
FACULTY PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES FACULTY
 Academic Period

NAME: **Rank** **#Years Full-Time**
List Current Duties/Assignments
Additional Assignments (professorship, grant, release-time, etc.)

DEPARTMENT:

I. What were your professional goals this year as related to departmental ~~and/or college~~ performance guidelines?

Professional Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:

University, Community, and Professional Service:

II. What was accomplished relative to these goals?

Professional Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:

University, Community, and Professional Service:

III. After evaluating your goals/accomplishments for the current year, indicate your measurable goals/objectives for the upcoming year.

Professional Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:

University, Community, and Professional Service:

IV. Evaluation by supervisor related to departmental ~~and/or college~~ performance guidelines.

Professional Effectiveness:

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:

University, Community, and Professional Service:

Faculty Member Signature

Date

Supervisor Signature

Date

Dean Signature

Date

Optional Comments by Dean:

***Attach updated vita per Faculty Handbook**

FACULTY SALARY SCHEDULE**A. Salary Category Weights****1. Degree Level:**

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

The degree level master's plus one year is based on a minimum 30 semester hours of advanced graduate study beyond the master's; master's plus two years on completion of all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation—ABD.

2. Rank:

Instructor	0.50
Assistant Professor	0.80
Associate Professor	1.55
Professor	2.60

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

Experience is based on the academic year, with prior experience for initial appointment rated at 100% for teaching and up to 75% for related work. Only experience following completion of the master's degree in a field related to the teaching discipline is considered.

4. Merit or Market Value: 0.5

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

~~The degree-level master's plus one year is based on a minimum 30 semester hours of advanced graduate study beyond the master's; master's plus two years on completion of all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation—ABD. Experience is based on~~

~~the academic year, with prior experience for initial appointment rated at 100% for teaching and up to 75% for related work. Only experience following completion of the master's degree is considered.~~

B. Salary Factor

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

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

C. Department Chairs and Other Administration

Supplement according to responsibilities.

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

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

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

2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion

A. Faculty Members Who Are Not Department Chairs

The promotion process will be initiated when the faculty member submits electronically an application and portfolio by October 10 to the department chair. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit documentation to confirm that he/she meets the minimum criteria for promotion to the next rank.

The electronic portfolio will contain the following and will be housed on a UNA server accessible only by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion review process:

1. Application for Promotion (See Appendix 2.B)
2. Current Resume or Vita (maximum length five pages)
 - a. Education (Institution, major, minor, degrees awarded, and when)
 - b. College/university teaching or library experience as appropriate to field (include position and dates)
 - c. Other teaching or library experience (describe and include dates)
 - d. Other related experience (describe and include dates)
3. Supporting information for the following items, limited to a 10-page maximum**
 - a. Teaching/Library Effectiveness
 - b. Scholarly or creative performance
 - c. University and community service
 - d. Any other relevant information

**The candidate is provided the flexibility to use his or her own discretion as to how best to demonstrate effectiveness in the categories listed in item 3. In addition to addressing the essential portfolio components in the limits given above, the candidate may place material or objects referenced in the portfolio in a designated review area as established by the college dean. The additional referenced work may be reviewed by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion process.

4. A cover letter (optional) in which the faculty member indicates degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of work specific to his/her area, in order to demonstrate quality of scholarship for university-wide committee members who may be unfamiliar with the field, as well as indicating which of the areas in item 3 should be weighed more heavily or less heavily than others.
5. Departmental and/or college ~~promotion~~performance guidelines.

Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health, this committee will consist of all tenured members in a candidate's department who are not applying for promotion. The department chair will not serve on the committee; however, the department chair will convene the first meeting and supervise the election by secret ballot of a chairperson, from among the members of the committee. In Collier Library and Educational Technology Services, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's area who are not applying for promotion.

The dean/director will then perform the functions of the department chair as outlined above. 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) that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified), to which promotion is recommended or not recommended no later than November 1. This written evaluation, composed by the candidate's peer committee, should provide information directly addressing the degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of scholarly outlets cited within the candidate's portfolio. These should include, but not be limited to, the quality of academic journals in which scholarly works appear, as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate).

For departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing and Allied Health where two or fewer tenured faculty are eligible for the peer promotion committee, the department faculty will complete a committee of three, adding to that department's tenured faculty (not applying for promotion), other tenured faculty from the college.

Responsibility of the Department Chair

When a faculty member applies for promotion, it is the responsibility of the department chair (or dean) to form a peer promotion committee by October 20. The department chair will evaluate the portfolios of the candidates in his or her department and prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The department chair will forward the peer promotion committee's recommendation, and his or her own recommendation for each candidate to the college or area dean no later than November 15. This written evaluation, composed by the candidate's department chair, should provide information directly addressing the degree of merit or level of prestige or quality of scholarly outlets cited within the candidate's portfolio. These should include, but not be limited to, the quality of academic journals in which scholarly works appear, as well as the prestige/quality of presentations/performances (musical, theatrical, other as categorically appropriate). The

department chair will also provide written feedback to each candidate regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's portfolio when the final promotion decisions are announced in March. It will be the responsibility of the department chair to confirm the candidate meets the university's eligibility requirements (e.g., years of service) for promotion to the rank being sought.

Responsibility of the College Dean

It is the responsibility of the college or area dean to review and evaluate the individuals' portfolios as well as the recommendations of the peer promotion committees and department chairs. The dean will prepare a written evaluation of each candidate that addresses strengths and weaknesses in relation to the university, college, and departmental criteria established for advancement in rank. The evaluation, based on those strengths and weaknesses, will indicate the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended. The dean's recommendations as well as all previous recommendations and actions on the promotion shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by January 10.

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. The committee will select a vice chair to serve as assistant to the chair during the first year of a two-year term and to assume the role of chair during the second year. 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 Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee will focus on the 10-page portfolio (including all forms as described in section 2.5.3). Supplementary materials will be maintained separately from those portfolios. The location of the supplementary

materials will be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The language specified in section 2.5.3 with regard to evaluation of candidates' credentials [indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, 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. The candidate should also include departmental and/or college ~~promotion and tenure performance~~ guidelines with the portfolio. All portfolios that are incomplete or not in compliance with the stated guidelines (section 2.5.3) 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 2.B.

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. After orientation, the new committee will begin its work with review of promotion portfolios, followed by review of tenure portfolios. As soon as the portfolios become available, the chair will notify the committee of the location of the portfolios on the UNA server 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. 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. Upon reaching a decision for each portfolio, the chair will schedule a meeting of the committee with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. After discussing the portfolios with the committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost 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.

Responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review the candidate's portfolio and the recommendations from each peer promotion committee, department chair, and dean. By March 8, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will evaluate each candidate, indicating the degree (exceptionally qualified, highly qualified, moderately qualified, or less qualified) to which promotion is recommended or not recommended.

Following the decisions made by the President as outlined below, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will inform the college or area dean of the success or

failure of the candidates as soon as possible, but not later than March 15. Candidates will be notified by the deans. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will remove all portfolios from the UNA server and maintain all evaluations for safe keeping. Portfolios will be available for candidates to pick up no later than March 30.

Responsibility of the President

The President will review the individual portfolios and all recommendations. Based upon these, and in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the President will establish a tentative promotion list, which will be shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the academic deans for their final input. Informed by this process, the President will make the final decision on promotion for each candidate by March 15. The President will give due consideration in these decisions to any extraordinary circumstances, budgetary constraints, and fiduciary obligations to the University. In addition, the President shall try to ensure that the number of promotions (including department chairs) each academic college and Collier Library/Educational Technology Services receives is fair and equitable.

B. Department Chairs Applying for Promotion

Department chairs who are applying for promotion will be evaluated using a process similar to that described for other faculty members. In the case of department chairs, however, the evaluation completed by the peer promotion committee will be sent directly to the dean of the college no later than November 1. The administrative effectiveness of the department chair will be evaluated within the category of university and community service. The college dean will evaluate the department chair's portfolio and will forward his or her evaluation and the peer promotion committee's evaluation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by January 10. The college dean and the peer promotion committee will provide written feedback to the department chair regarding strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio. By March 8, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review the department chair's portfolio, recommendations from the peer committee and college dean. These recommendations will be forwarded to the President and reviewed as outlined in part A.

2.5.4 Tenure

An award of tenure is not a right but a privilege which must be earned by a faculty member on the basis of his or her performance during a probationary period. The granting of tenure is never automatic. Normally, tenure is granted after a faculty member has been evaluated by the tenured faculty members in a department, the department chair, the college dean, the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and the President. However, the President may, after appropriate consultation, grant tenure at any time if good and sufficient reasons exist for doing so.

Policy on tenure, or continuing contract status, as adopted by the Board of Trustees of the University of North Alabama, provides that a person appointed to the faculty rank of assistant professor will serve a probationary period of five successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the sixth consecutive academic year. A person appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of associate professor will serve a probationary period of four successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the fifth consecutive academic year. A person appointed to the faculty in the academic rank of (full) professor will serve a probationary period of three successive academic years at this University and will be granted tenure upon acceptance of an offer of appointment from the President for the fourth consecutive academic year. A faculty member holding the academic rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor may, at the discretion of the university administration, be granted leave without breaking the successive years of employment for tenure purposes, but years of leave will not count as years of service toward tenure unless specifically granted in writing at the time leave is granted.

Except as otherwise stated herein, the following process will be followed in determining whether a faculty member will be awarded tenure:

1. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall notify a probationary faculty member by October 1 of the academic year prior to the final academic year of probationary status that failure to apply for tenure by the appropriate deadline could result in an offer of a non-renewable or “terminal” academic year contract. This notice shall be made in writing and placed in the faculty member’s campus mailbox. Failure to notify by this deadline does not automatically constitute a grant of tenure or extension of the employment contract. In such situations, appropriate adjustment of deadlines for notification and portfolio submission will be made.
2. By May 1 of the academic year prior to the final academic year of probationary status, the faculty member will present to the department chair electronically an updated tenure review portfolio which provides evidence of accomplishments specific to the criteria as outlined in section 2.5.1 as well as departmental and college criteria for promotion and tenure.

Applicants for tenure will limit their portfolios to a maximum of 15 pages, including a current vita not to exceed five pages and supporting narrative not to exceed 10 pages. Supplemental materials may be provided but should be separate from the portfolio. Departmental and/or college tenureperformance guidelines should also be included with the application.

3. If a member of the teaching faculty has not presented a student evaluation composite or overview as part of teaching effectiveness, it will be the responsibility of the department chair to forward such materials to the department tenure committee and to the college dean.