

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 6, 2017

Call to order: A regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama was held in room 330 of the University Commons on April 6, 2017. The meeting convened at 3:31 p.m. with President David Brommer presiding.

Proxies: President Brommer recognized the following proxies: Jason Watson for Shane Banks from Computer Science and Information Systems, Ansley Quiros for George Makowski from History, and Kyle Golenbiewski for Jessica Stovall from Mathematics.

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

Members not in attendance (without proxy): Doug Barrett, Clarissa Hall, Keith Jones, Lisa Kirch, Rachel McKelvey, and Karen Townsend.

Approval of agenda: Sarah Franklin moved approval of the agenda. Lisa Clayton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of minutes: Sarah Franklin moved approval of the minutes of the March 2, 2017 meeting. Felecia Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Remarks from President Kitts: President Kitts was unable to attend the meeting. He had President Brommer convey his regrets.

Remarks from Vice-President Thornell: Dr. Thornell encouraged the Senate to consider rethinking the criteria for promotion. He specifically mentioned the criteria for promotion to Professor which state that an applicant shall have a record of “excellence” in all three areas – teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service. He cautioned that requiring excellence in all three areas might keep some faculty from attaining this rank.

Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee: No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee: No report.

Faculty Attitude Survey Committee: Craig Robertson reported that data collection was completed before spring break. All tables have been constructed and the committee is writing the report. The committee has decided to shorten the narrative this year.

Unfinished Business:

Section 3.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook – Faculty with Administrative/Directorial Responsibilities: Sarah Franklin moved to table. Leah Graham seconded the motion. The motion was then amended to a motion to approve the policy. The motion to approve failed unanimously. (See Attachment A)

Section 3.15.1 and Appendix D of the Faculty Handbook – Course Evaluation: Sarah Franklin moved to approve the proposed evaluation as revised by Academic Affairs. Amanda Coffman seconded the motion. The motion was withdrawn. Richard Statom moved to postpone to the September meeting. Patricia Roden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (See Attachment B)

New Business:

Reconciliation of Deadline Dates between Former and New Promotion Policies: Scott Infanger moved for the 2017 class, extend the portfolio submission deadline for tenure to June 1, move the peer review and department chair review deadlines to July 1, and keep all other deadlines the same. After this year, all deadlines will move to those in the new policy. For tenure, there would be a terminal year after the notification, if denied tenure. Jason Watson seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention. (See Attachment C)

Nominating Committee: Lee Renfroe, Mark Greer, and Prema Monteiro were selected via acclamation.

Information Items:

Faculty Vacancies on Shared Governance Committees: President Brommer reminded the Senate that the committee vacancies are listed in the April agenda package. Nominees for these positions will be selected at the May meeting. (See Attachment D)

Senate Elections: President Brommer reminded the Senate that the May meeting (May 4) is an elections meeting. There will be no other business before the Senate at this meeting.

Recognizing Dr. Thornell: Scott Infanger moved that the Senate formally recognize Dr. Thornell for his service. Richard Statom seconded. The motion passed by acclamation, and Dr. Thornell received a standing ovation from the Senate.

Adjournment: Richard Statom moved adjournment. Lee Renfroe seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Amy Butler
Secretary
Faculty Senate

Date of Approval: May 4, 2017



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: March 15, 2016

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

rv

Enclosure

pc + enclosure: Dr. John G. Thornell

OFFICE of the VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and PROVOST

UNA Box 5041, Florence, AL 35632-0001

P: 256.765.4258 | F: 256.765.4632 | www.una.edu

Equal Opportunity / Equal Access Institution

Proposal for clarification of faculty responsibilities:

Colleagues,

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: October 18, 2016

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

rv
Enclosure

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

Equal Opportunity / Equal Access Institution



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: October 11, 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3-23 of the Faculty Handbook

Student Rating: Student rating of faculty will be used university-wide (except Kilby School and university libraries/educational technologies) to collect information about students' perceptions of courses and of faculty members' teaching effectiveness. Departments may add items to the campus form (see Appendix 3.D). Student evaluations will be administered every semester in each class section enrolling five or more students. Student comments should be collected and given to the faculty member in a format to ensure anonymity. Departments may use alternatives to the campus form in laboratories, studio courses, and other courses taught in non-lecture format. The faculty member will let announcee to the class know in advance when the rating forms will be available online. The professor will students will read the following statement as they complete the online survey: to the class: "The evaluation you are about to complete is intended for constructive feedback. After your final grades in this course have been submitted, your tabulated responses will be seen by the instructor of the course and the chair of the department or dean. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this evaluation is improvement, if you are going to be critical, try to document your criticism in your responses in such a way that the instructor can benefit and improve his/her teaching of this course. Be as responsible in completing this form as you would be if you were going to sign it. The instructor of this course will not see the results of these forms until the semester is over and the final grades have been submitted. A blank sheet of paper is provided should you wish to make comments." "The purpose of this evaluation is to help the instructor improve his/her teaching performance. Your instructor is cooperating in this evaluation and your participation is requested, but not required. Please be advised that your instructor will only have access to scores from this form in the aggregate and this information will not be reported until after final grades are submitted, so there is no possibility of your comments having an impact on your grade. It is important for you to realize that you have a responsibility to be fair and honest. Since the purpose of this evaluation is improvement, if you are going to be critical, try to document your criticism in your responses in such a way that the instructor can benefit and improve his/her teaching of this course. Be as responsible in completing this form as you would be if you were going to sign it. Please read the following questions and click on the button that corresponds with the letter that best represents your response according to the following rating scale:" The faculty member should give the envelop with the blank forms and instructions to the student proctor, who is to be chosen from the class by the faculty member. The faculty member will leave the classroom. The faculty member will allow students ample time to complete the form. As students finish the questionnaires, they will place their evaluation responses in the envelope so marked. When everyone has put his/her form in the proper envelope, the student proctor will seal the envelope and take it to the office of the department chair. The survey will be completed online and the results will be processed by the The departmental administrative assistant will collect all sealed envelopes and forward them to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (OIRPA) for processing. The OIRPA will process these forms data in a timely fashion and forward results to the department chair. The summary of the ratings shall be retained on file in the college dean's office and shall be shared with the faculty member.

Proposed final version of section 3-23

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

Appendix 3.D

University of North Alabama End of Semester Student Evaluation of Instructor

Administration Instructions:

For online courses. The instructor will notify students of when the survey will be available and students will complete the form online during the designated window of time.

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

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

Instructor _____ Course Number _____ Semester _____

Please read the following instructions carefully:

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

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

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. | a b c d e |
| 2. The instructor presented content in an organized manner. | a b c d e |
| 3. The instructor was accessible for consultations through office hours or alternate means specified in the syllabus. | a b c d e |
| 4. The instructor provided timely feedback on class assignments in this course. | a b c d e |
| 5. The instructor demonstrated effective verbal and written communication skills. | a b c d e |

-
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 6. The instructor incorporated a variety of instructional methods to meet the needs of all learners. | a b c d e |
| 7. The instructor attempted to establish the relevance of the course to my life and/or future career. | a b c d e |
| 8. The instructor made the course interesting and engaging. | a b c d e |
| 9. The instructor challenged me to think critically. | a b c d e |
| 10. The instructor maintained high expectations and standards. | a b c d e |
| 11. The instructor encouraged questions and participation. | a b c d e |

Comments:

(Academic Affairs Proposal)

Appendix 3.D

University of North Alabama End of Semester Student Evaluation of Instructor

Administration Instructions:

For online courses. The instructor will notify students of when the survey will be available and students will complete the form online during the designated window of time.

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

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

Instructor _____ Course Number _____ Semester _____

Please read the following instructions carefully:

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

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

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

Deleted: fonn

Deleted: e

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: Disagree

Deleted: A

Deleted: gree

Deleted: Disagree

Deleted: Agree

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

abcd

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: abcde

1. The instructor presented content in an organized manner.

f

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt

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

abcd

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering

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

f

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

4. The instructor demonstrated effective verbal and written communication skills.

abcd

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

f

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

abcdf

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering

5. The

instructi

onal

methods

and

assignme

nts used

by the

instructo

r were

appropri

ate for

this

course

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

Deleted: abcde

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

Deleted: abcde

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: Font color: Custom Color(17,17,17)

Deleted: abcde

Formatted

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Section Break (Next Page)

Deleted: The instructor incorporated a variety of instruction

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Deleted: 10

Deleted: .

6. The

instructor

attempted

to

established

the

relevance

of the

course

content to

my life

and/or

future

career.

7. The

instructor

made the

course

interesting

and

engaging.

8. The

instructor

challenge

d me to

think

critically.

9. The

instructor

maintaine

d high expectations and standards.

10. The instructor encouraged questions and participation.

Comments:

What was the best part of the course?

What was the least appealing part of the course?

abcdf

Deleted: abcde

abcdf

Deleted: 11

Deleted: abcde

abcdf

Deleted: abcde

abcdf

Deleted: abcde

abcdf

Deleted: abcde


abcdf

Deleted: abcde



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: March 7, 2017

Based on your conversations with VPAA and Provost Dr. John Thornell whereby it was determined that having different promotion policy deadline dates between the former and new promotion policies will prove difficult for implementation, at its meeting yesterday the SGEC determined this as a faculty only issue to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. The enclosed chart depicting the issue may be useful in the Faculty Senate deliberations. Please inform me of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosure

OFFICE of the VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and PROVOST

UNA Box 5041, Florence, AL 35632-0001

P: 256.765.4258 | F: 256.765.4632 | www.una.edu

PROMOTION/TENURE POLICY DEADLINE DATE SUMMARY

| | Old Promotion Policy | Old Tenure Policy | New Promotion/Tenure Policy |
|--|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Deadline for Intent of Notification to Apply | September 15 | Candidate is notified from VPAA by October 1 of academic year prior to final probationary year | May 1 |
| Dean Confirm Eligibility | September 25 | N/A | May 15 |
| Portfolio Deadline | November 1 | May 1 | October 1 |
| Peer Committee Deadline | November 21 | June 1 | November 15 |
| Department Chair Deadline | December 12 | June 1 | December 1 |
| Dean Deadline | February 15 | August 1 | February 1 |
| UPT Deadline | April 1 | September 15 | March 15 |
| VPAA Deadline | April 10 | October 1 | April 15 |
| President Deadline | April 12 | October 1 | April 22 |
| Letter Notice Deadline | April 15 | October 1 | May 1 |

Faculty Vacancies on Shared Governance Committees Beginning in Fall 2017

A red asterisk (*) next to a name indicates the person has served the maximum of two consecutive 3-year terms as allowed by the shared governance document and therefore, is not eligible for reappointment.

| Committee | Incumbent Faculty Member w/Term Expiring Aug. 2017 | Representation per Shared Governance Document | Person Selected (or Re-elected) for Vacancy for Service Term 2017-2020 |
|---|--|---|--|
| Academic and Student Affairs | Dan Hallock* | Business | |
| Academic and Student Affairs | Lynne Rieff | Faculty at large | |
| Animal Care and Use | Jean Ann Allen | Primary concerns in nonscientific area | |
| Animal Care and Use | Helen Coronel | Faculty at large | |
| Athletic | Lisa Clayton* | Faculty at large | |
| Facilities & Infrastructure Dev. | Leah Graham | Faculty at large | |
| Faculty/Staff Welfare | Eric O'Neal | Faculty at large | |
| Faculty/Staff Welfare | Patricia Roden | Faculty at large | |
| Faculty/Staff Welfare | Gary Padgett | Faculty at large | |
| Food Services | Ulrich Groetsch | Faculty at large | |
| Food Services | Jenny Dawson | Faculty at large | |
| Graphics Standards and Web Communications | Pete Williams | Business | |
| Graphics Standards and Web Communications | Jonathan Simms | Library | |
| Institutional Review Board (pka Human Research Participants) | Leah Whitten | Education at large | |
| Institutional Review Board | Lynn Underwood | Nursing | |
| Institutional Effectiveness | Eric O'Neal | Faculty at large, but with inst. effectiveness reporting requirements | |
| International Programs/Offerings | Lesley Peterson | Arts and Sciences | |
| Multicultural Advisory | Tera Kirkman* | Nursing | |
| Multicultural Advisory | Peggy Bergeron | Nursing | |
| Online Learning Advisory | Alejandra Alvarado-Brizuela | Arts and Sciences | |
| Online Learning Advisory | Jill Simpson | Business | |
| Parking and Traffic | Ulrich Groetsch | Faculty at large | |
| Parking and Traffic | Lisa Clayton* | Faculty at large | |
| Research | Matt Green | Faculty at large | |
| Safety and Emergency | Suzanne | Art | |

| Committee | Incumbent Faculty Member w/Term Expiring Aug. 2017 | Representation per Shared Governance Document | Person Selected (or Re-elected) for Vacancy for Service Term 2017-2020 |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Preparedness | Duvall-Zurinsky* | | |
| Safety and Emergency Preparedness | Isaac Sleadd | Faculty at large | |
| Shared Governance Executive | Katie Kinney | Tenured faculty at large | |
| Shared Governance Executive | Kristy Oden | Tenured faculty at large | |
| Strategic Planning & Bdgt Study | Brian Thompson* | Faculty at large | |
| Student Financial Services | Felecia Harris | Faculty at large | |
| Technologies Advisory | Jonathan Simms | Library | |
| Technologies Advisory | Richard Hudiburg* | Arts and Sciences | |
| Undergraduate Readmissions | Jerome Gafford* | Business | |
| Undergraduate Readmissions | Michelle Nelson | Nursing | |

These nominations require Shared Governance Executive Committee approval.

Forward these first two pages only to:

Dr. Scott Infanger
2016-2017 Chair, Shared Governance Executive Committee
UNA Box 5180 (srinfanger@una.edu)

w/copy to:

Regina Sherrill
Senior Assistant to the President
for Administration
UNA Box 5004 (rbsherrill@una.edu)

--and--

Renee Vandiver
Assistant to the Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost
UNA Box 5041 (rpvandiver@una.edu)
(handles administrative support for ShGovExecComm)

The following lists do not require Shared Governance Executive Committee review.
Please forward these last two pages directly to:

Regina Sherrill, Senior Asst. to the President for Administration
UNA Box 5004 (rbsherrill@una.edu)

Faculty Vacancies on Committees that Function Outside of Shared Governance Structure

| Committee | Membership Service Term | Incumbent Faculty Member w/Term Expiring Aug. 2017 | Representation per Committee Description | Person Selected (or Re-elected) for Vacancy |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Undergraduate Curriculum | Three years: 2017-2020 | Lee Raney | Arts and Sciences | |
| Undergraduate Curriculum | Three years: 2017-2020 | Isaac Sleadd | Arts and Sciences | |
| Undergraduate Curriculum | Three years: 2017-2020 | Cameron Gren | Arts and Sciences | |
| Undergraduate Curriculum | Three years: 2017-2020 | Patricia Roden | Business | |
| Non-Traditional and Interdisciplinary Curriculum | Two years: 2017-2019 | Jean Ann Allen | Faculty at large | |
| Non-Traditional and Interdisciplinary Curriculum | Two years: 2017-2019 | Miranda Parries | Faculty at large | |

Faculty Pool for Grievance Committees
(if such a case arises during the coming year)

| Submit the Names of 15 Faculty Members Willing to Serve | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 1. | 5. | 9. |
| 2. | 6. | 10. |
| 3. | 7. | 11. |
| 4. | 8. | 12. |
| 13. | 14. | 15. |

Faculty Pool for Due Process Committees
*(if such a case arises during the coming year;
 may include duplicates from Grievance Committee pool above)*

| Submit the Names of 15 Faculty Members Willing to Serve | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 1. | 5. | 9. |
| 2. | 6. | 10. |
| 3. | 7. | 11. |
| 4. | 8. | 12. |
| 13. | 14. | 15. |

Faculty Pool for University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee

Note: Please be sure to include in your pool at least one faculty member from Education and from Library/Education Technology Services, as the terms of the current representatives from those areas (Lisa Clayton and Amy Butler) expire this fall.

From Section 2.5.3 of the Faculty Handbook:

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.

| | | |
|----|-----|-----|
| 1. | 6. | 11. |
| 2. | 7. | 12. |
| 3. | 8. | 13. |
| 4. | 9. | 14. |
| 5. | 10. | 15. |

Those who have already served on this committee:

Linda Armstrong (At large, 2014-2016)
Dennis Balch (Business, 2014-2016)
Larry Bates (At large, 2015-2017)
Santanu Borah (Business, 2012-2013)
Daryl Brown (A&S, 2009-2010)
Amy Butler (Lib/EducTech, 2015-2017)
Greg Carnes (At large, 2009-2011)
Chiong-Yiao Chen (At large, 2009-2011)
Lisa Clayton (Education, 2015-2017)
John Crabtree (At large, 2013-2015)
Valeriy Dolmatov (A&S, 2011-2013)
Wendy Darby (Nursing, 2009-2010)
Sarah Franklin (At large, 2016-2018)
Matt Green (Education, 2011-2013)
Charlton James (A&S, 2016-2017)

Keith Jones (At large, 2014-2016)
Brett King (Business, 2016-2018)
Tera Kirkman (Nursing, 2014-2016)
Lisa Kirch (A&S, 2015-2017)
Sandra Loew (At large, 2012-2014)
Keith Malone (At large, 2011-2013)
David McCullough (At large, 2011-2013)
Michelle Nelson (Nursing, 2016-2018)
Brent Olive (At large, 2013-2015)
Quinn Pearson (Education, 2009-2011)
Martha Rock (Nursing, 2012-2014)
Claudia Vance (At large, 2012-2014)
Kristy Van Rensselaer (Business, 2013-2014)
Brenda Webb (At large, 2015-2017)
Ryan Zayac (At large, 2016-2018)