

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

### **October 2, 2014**

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met October 2, 2014 in Room 330 of the University Commons at 3:30 p.m.

President-Elect Franklin called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies:

Michelle Nelson for Senator Lee from Nursing,  
Isaac Sleadd for Senator Hubler from Biology,  
Greg Pitts for Senator Martin from Communication and  
Chong-Yiao Chen for Senator Kirch from Art.

Senator Statom moved the adoption of the agenda with the amendment to include Dr. Vince Brewton, Assistant Vice-President for Enrollment Management after Dr. Calhoun. And that Dr. Andrea Hunt will speak in place of Tammy Jacques. Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Statom moved the approval of the September 4, 2014 minutes. Senator Renfro seconded. The motion passed.

President Thornell spoke concerning the need to market the university due to the change in the funding from the state. Ten to fifteen years ago the state supplied sixty percent of the funding for the university and it has now decreased to approximately thirty percent. This change causes the university to need to rethink how to operate. President Thornell also discussed the important efforts to help students be successfully including the writing center, mathematics center and the university success center. He reported that the university has signed a contract with a firm to audit the current fragmented marketing efforts of the university and then the results will be used to help make decisions concerning where to place our marketing money. He asked for patience since this will be a long-term project.

VPAA Calhoun reported that the Presidential Search Committee was making good progress and that campus visits should begin soon. He stated that due to the down turn in enrollment efforts must be made to reduce the budget without impacting teaching, research and service efforts. He stated that the university is quite healthy and work is ongoing in recruitment of transfer and graduate students.

Assistant Vice-President Brewton asked for thoughts and suggestions concerning recruitment. He stated that no matter how small or how grand the strategies were, they should be shared. He reported that due to the changes in state law and in university policy, we may now offer in-state tuition to students if they receive one thousand or more in scholarship money. He stated that this will make UNA a global university instead of a regional one.

Dr. Andrea Hunt reported from the Title IX Advisory Committee reported that there is a document going through the shared governance process related to confidential reporting, opportunity for faculty service and methods for keeping students safe. There will be a launch of a campus climate survey in order to tailor prevention programs. Faculty were encouraged to issue invites to the committee to speak to a department or a class and encouraged to contact Dr. Hunt, Dr. Williams, or Dr. Paulk.

### **REPORTS:**

- A. Dr. Andrea Hunt of the Faculty Attitude Survey Committee reported the results have already been given to the Board of Trustees and encouraged senators to contact the committee with areas of concern for the coming survey. They hope to launch the survey after the Christmas break and plan on encouraging adjunct faculty to participate in the survey.
- B. Senators Derouen and Maddox are serving as co-chairs of the Faculty Affairs Committee.
- C. Dr. Amber Paulk is the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Senator Peterson moved to table the revision to Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook indefinitely and to send the issue back to the Council of Academic Deans. Senator Statom seconded. The motion passed.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. The revisions to Faculty Handbook 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 and Appendix 2B passed. (See Attachment A)
- B. Senator Peterson moved to refer the issue of the revisions to Faculty Handbook 3.3.3 back to the Academic Affairs Committee in consultation with the administration and the Council of Academic Deans. Senator Statom seconded. The motion passed. (See Attachment B)
- C. Senator Peterson moved the approval of the revision of the Faculty Handbook Appendix 3.D.(See Attachment C) Senator Barrett seconded. The motion passed.

**INFORMATION ITEM:**

President-Elect Franklin reported that the revision to the Faculty Handbook 2.4.3 which was approved by the senate in the September meeting has been posted to the Faculty Handbook and were sent out by email last week.

Senator Roden moved the meeting be adjourned. Senator Statom seconded. The motion passed.

## ATTACHMENT A

### 2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Promotion, Tenure, and Appointment

Faculty ranks of the University, including librarians, educational technologists and supervising teachers at Kilby School, 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. 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, college dean, and Provost/VPAA 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, 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 college deans and Provost/VPAA to monitor equity of expectations across the University.

The following criteria and procedures below do not apply to the Department of Military Science because of the special nature of that department. Faculty from the Department of Military Science will not serve on promotion committees.

#### Minimum Qualifications by Rank

1. Instructor/Visiting (open rank) Professor. 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. Assistant Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank 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.
3. Associate Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as assistant professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the eight years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.

4. Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of 12 years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three 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.

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

### **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 September 1<sup>5</sup>. The department chair will verify, with the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, whether the candidate is eligible for promotion and notify the candidate by September ~~10~~<sup>25</sup>. The candidate submits electronically an application and portfolio by ~~October 10~~November 1 to the department chair.

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.

#### Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Sciences, and Nursing, 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 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 21. 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 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~~November 5. 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~~December 12. 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~~April. 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~~February 15.

#### 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. 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~~April 10, 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~~April 12. Candidates will be notified by the deans by April 15. Promotions will become effective on the first day of the following fall semester. 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~~April 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~~April 12. 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 21. 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~~February 15. 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~~April 10, 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.

# 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.	September <del>1</del> <u>5</u>
Department Chair verifies <u>with the Office of the VPAA/Provost</u> , whether the candidate is eligible for promotion and notifies the candidate.	September <del>10</del> <u>25</u>
Candidate presents application and portfolio to Department Chair.	<del>October 10</del> <u>November 1</u>
Department Chair forms Peer Promotion Committee and informs College Dean of candidates.	<del>October 20</del> <u>November 5</u>
Peer Promotion Committee reviews portfolios, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to department chair.	November <del>2</del> <u>21</u>
Department Chair reviews portfolio, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to dean.	<del>November 15</del> <u>December 12</u>
College Dean reviews recommendations of peer committee and department chair and portfolios, completes evaluations for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to VPAA/Provost.	<del>January 10</del> <u>February 15</u>
University Tenure/Promotion Committee reviews portfolios, completes evaluation for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to VPAA/Provost.	<del>March 1</del> <u>April 1</u>
VPAA/Provost reviews portfolios, completes evaluations for candidates, and provides evaluation letter to the President.	<del>March 8</del> <u>April 10</u>
President or his/her designee makes final decision and informs VPAA /Provost.	<del>March 15</del> <u>April 12</u>
VPAA/Provost informs deans of final decisions. Candidates are notified by deans.	<del>March 15 (Promotions become effective as of March 1)</del> <u>April 15 (promotions become effective on the first day of the following fall semester)</u>
Written feedback from department chair and/or dean is provided to candidates. Portfolios are picked up from dean.	<del>March 30</del> <u>April 30</u>

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

# MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Larry W. Adams, Chair  
Shared Governance Executive Committee

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

Date: April 8, 2014

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans to revise section 2.5.3 and add a Promotion Recommendation Form to Appendix 2B of the Faculty Handbook. This form is proposed to provide uniformity in faculty promotion recommendations. Perhaps the Shared Governance Executive Committee will view this proposal as a faculty-only issue for review by the Faculty Senate. Your consideration of these revisions is appreciated.

rv  
Enclosure



### 2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion

#### Responsibility of the Peer Promotion Committee

The dean 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 [and be recorded on the Promotion Recommendation Form](#) 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).

#### 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 [and be recorded on the Promotion Recommendation Form](#). 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 [and be recorded on the Promotion Recommendation Form](#). 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

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 [and be recorded on the Promotion Recommendation Form](#). 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.

## PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION FORM

Promotion Candidate Name: John Doe

Recommending Body: Peer Promotion Committee

Level of Recommendation: Assistant to Associate

Overall Promotion Ranking: Exceptionally Qualified

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Teaching/Professional Effectiveness: Exceptionally Qualified

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities: Exceptionally Qualified

Comments: Click here to enter text.

University, Community, and Professional Service: Exceptionally Qualified

Comments: Click here to enter text.

### 2.5.1 General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in support of this mission as reflected in accomplishments specific to the criteria below.

1. Effectiveness in Teaching. (see page 2-7 of Faculty Handbook)
2. Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities. (see page 2-7 of Faculty Handbook)
3. Effectiveness in Rendering Service. (see page 2-8 of Faculty Handbook)

### 2.5.2 Special Criteria by Ranks for Promotion, Tenure, and Appointment

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, tenure, and year to year success (Departmental and College Performance Guidelines should be consulted as a part of the review process).

1. Associate Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or a terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of eight years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three of which must be in rank as assistant professor. Effective for new hires beginning fall 2012, promotion to this rank requires that three of the eight years of cumulative experience shall be earned at UNA. In addition, the applicant shall have had successful experience in teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service.
2. Professor. Appointment and/or promotion to this rank requires possession of a doctoral degree or terminal degree appropriate in the field of assignment as determined by university policy. A minimum of 12 years' appropriate cumulative experience specific to the discipline is also required, at least three 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.
3. Department Chairs Applying for Promotion. The administrative effectiveness of the department chair will be evaluated within the category of university and community service.

**Comment [rpv1]:** This is a drop-down box that forces one to choose from one of the review groups

**Comment [rpv2]:** This is a drop-down box that forces one to choose from one of the recommended levels

**Comment [rpv3]:** This is a drop-down box that forces one to choose from one of the four scoring categories

### 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, it is forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This 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 or proposals by units outside the academic departments 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 to the President for final approval. If they involve new curriculum programs, they must also be approved by the 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. Such change recommendations are subject to the same approval procedures outlined above.

Consideration of curricular change normally involves informal discussion, not only within academic departments, but also within and between the several levels of academic



**University of North Alabama**  
**FACULTY 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 Effectiveness:**

**Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:**

**University, Community, and Professional Service:**

- II.        **What was accomplished relative to these goals?**

**Teaching 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.**

**Teaching Effectiveness:**

**Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:**

**University, Community, and Professional Service:**

- IV.        **Evaluation by Department Chair related to departmental and/or college performance guidelines (to be completed annually by September 15 for non-tenured faculty and every two years for tenured faculty).**

**Teaching Effectiveness:**

**Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities:**

**University, Community, and Professional Service:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**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 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 performance guidelines (to be completed annually by September 15 for non-tenured faculty and every two years for tenured faculty).**

**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**



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 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 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.