

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 7, 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 September 7, 2017. The meeting convened at 3:30pm. with President Dan Hallock presiding.

Proxies: President Hallock recognized the following proxies: Anthony Crisaful for Suzanne Duvall-Zurinsky (Department of Art) and Ansley Quiros for George Makowski (Department of History)

Members in attendance: Rae Atencio, David Brommer, Lisa Clayton, Amanda Coffman, Katherine Crisler, Wes Davenport, Nikita Duke, Sarah Franklin, Leah Graham, Mark Greer, Dan Hallock, Felecia Harris, Scott Infanger, Keith Jones, Ian Loeppky, Glenn Marvin, John McGee, Rachel McKelvey, Janet McMullen, Prema Monteiro, Michelle Nelson, Katie Owens-Murphy, Jeffrey Ray, Alaina Reid, Lee Renfroe, Craig Robertson, Patricia Roden, David Ruebhausen, Leigh Stanfield, Richard Statom, Daniel Stevens, Jessica Stovall, Alexander Takeuchi, Jason Watson, Pete Williams, Tammy Winner, Rachel Winston, and Ryan Zayac. President Kitts and Vice President Alexander were also in attendance.

Members not in attendance (without proxy): Karen Townsend

Approval of agenda: Senator Renfroe moved approval of the agenda. Senator Statom seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Approval of minutes: Senator Zayac moved approval of the minutes of the May 4, 2017 meeting. Senator Renfroe seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Remarks from President Kitts: President Kitts first remarked on fall semester enrollment trends noting that the official census date is September 15th. From his review of the most recent data, UNA should be within 100 students of fall 2016 semester enrollment. Speaking next to the circulated statement regarding children/family in the workplace environment, this issue came to the attention of the Executive Council in June, 2017 at the request of a supervisor. Human Resources determined that UNA did not have clear policy addressing this issue. The Executive Council drafted a statement and after it was released concerns were raised that the statement lacked “common-sense” provisions and exemptions and appeared to have been presented as official policy. President Kitts made clear that the statement was not institutional policy and in July he requested that the statement be moved through Shared Governance. He stressed that Shared Governance work with Amber Fite-Morgan so she may help the assigned committee with legal liabilities related to any future policy. President Kitts then addressed the two recent Title IX cases involving UNA. He reiterated that his remarks at the August 22nd joint faculty/staff meeting related to the “Jane Doe” lawsuit are posted to <https://www.una.edu/administration/docs/PresidentialCommunique.082217.pdf> and reflect accurately on UNA’s response to that case. Regarding the more recent case involving a former UNA Athletic Trainer, President Kitts communicated that UNA could not publicly address the case while it was conducting its own investigation and while cooperating with the District Attorney’s investigation. President Kitts noted his openness to meeting with student representatives, faculty

and staff with concerns regarding these two cases. Finally President Kitts reinforced the date and speaker (Mr. Prentice Chandler) for this year's Fall Convocation.

Remarks from Vice-President Alexander: Dr. Alexander remarked that his prior roles in higher education had placed him in contexts with Faculty Senates and Shared Governance systems and that he is committed to working with both bodies here at UNA. He recognized that there are numerous shared interests between administration, faculty and staff and he was committed to addressing those. He specifically mentioned issues of student/course evaluations and evaluations of administrators. Dr. Alexander closed his comments by opening the floor to questions. There were no questions.

Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee: no report was given.

Faculty Affairs Committee: no report was given.

Faculty Attitude Survey Committee: no report was given.

Unfinished Business:

Section 3.15.1 and Appendix 3D of Faculty – Course Evaluation:

Senator Infanger moved to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.15.1. Senator Statom seconded the motion. The motion failed with no opposing votes. (See Attachment A.)

New Business:

Appointment of new member to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee for a one year appointment (replacing Dr. Rob Koch):

Senator Loepky nominated Senator Daniel Stevens. Senator Infanger seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Vote to release, improve, and increase use and feedback for the yearly Faculty Attitude Survey:

President Hallock discussed the need to improve utility of the Faculty Attitude Survey stressing the involvement of Faculty Senate and other parties as well as enhancing the integrity of the actual data collection.

Senator Zayac moved to release the results of the 2016-2017 Faculty Attitude Survey Results. Senator Statom seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Revision to Section 2.5.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Department Chairs Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure.

Senator Statom moved to approve the proposed revision to Section 2.5.3 of the Faculty Handbook involving Department Chairs Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure. Senator Greer seconded the motion. The motion passed. (see Attachment B.)

Revision to Section 2.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook – Renewal or Termination of a Probationary Appointment.

Senator Statom moved to approve the proposed revision to Section 2.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook involving Renewal or Termination of a Probationary Appointment. Senator Infanger seconded the motion. The motion passed with one vote against. (see Attachment C.)

Revision to Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Curriculum Development.

Senator Statom moved to approve the proposed revision to Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook in order to clarify language related to the 15 working day comment period for new degree program proposals. Senator Infanger seconded the motion. The motion passed (see Attachment D.)

Revision to Appendix 2F of the Faculty Handbook – Application for Promotion and/or Tenure.

Senator Zayac moved to approve the proposed revision to Appendix 2F of the Faculty Handbook – Application for Promotion and/or Tenure to align the application form to the policy under which a faculty member applies for promotion and/or tenure. Senator Graham seconded the motion. The motion passed. (see Attachment E.)

Revision to Appendix 2G of the Faculty Handbook – streamlining of forms used for the Promotion and/or Tenure process.

Senator Stovall moved to postpone consideration of the newly developed Appendix 2G form for evaluation of faculty applications for promotion and tenure. Senator Statom seconded the motion. The motion to postpone passed. (see Attachment F.)

Information Items:


No information items were introduced.

Adjournment: Senator Statom moved adjournment. Senator Roden seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:00p.m.



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



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: October 11, 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3-23 of the Faculty Handbook

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

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-f
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral or No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Agree
	Agree		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 f
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 f

a b c d e

a b c d e f

a b c d e

a b c d e f

a b c d e

a b c d e f

a b c d e

a b c d e f

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

6-1. The instructor attempted to provide a variety of instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners. The instructional methods and assignments used by the instructor were appropriate for this course.

7-1. The instructor attempted to establish the relevance of the course content to my life and/or future career.

8-1. The instructor made the course interesting and engaging.

9-1. The instructor challenged me to think critically.

10-1. The instructor maintained high expectations and standards.

11-1. The instructor encouraged questions and participation.

Comments:

What was the best part of the course?


What was the least appealing part of the course?

Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.12", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22)), Strikethrough
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))
Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.08", No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font: 9.5 pt, Font color: Custom Color(22,22,22))



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Daniel E. Hallock, President
2017-18 Faculty Senate

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

Date: April 25, 2017

At its meeting yesterday, the Shared Governance Executive Committee considered the enclosed proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for revisions to Section 2.5.3 of Faculty Handbook – Department Chairs Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure. The SGEC determined this as a faculty only issue to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate at one of its early 2017 fall semester meetings. Therefore, please inform incoming SGEC Chair Lee Renfroe of the outcome of this review with a copy to Renee' Vandiver. Thank you.

rv
Enclosures

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

16



MEMORANDUM

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

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

Date: April 18, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for revisions to section 2.5.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Department Chairs Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure. This proposal is made to add a layer of review that is currently missing with department chair applications for promotion/tenure. It is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee.

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

2.5.3 Procedure for Promotion and/or Tenure

B. Department Chairs Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure

Department chairs who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated using the same process as that described for other faculty members, except that the department chair review ~~is omitted~~ will be conducted by the associate dean of that college. No committee shall consist of less than five tenured faculty. When that number is not possible at the departmental level, the dean will complete the committee membership from among all tenured faculty not applying for promotion from other departments in the college or in a related discipline. In the case of department chairs, however, the evaluation completed by the peer promotion and/or tenure committee, and the evaluation by the associate dean, will be sent directly to the dean no later than November 15. The dean will evaluate the candidate's portfolio and will forward his or her evaluation and the peer promotion and/or tenure committee's evaluation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost by February 1. By April 15, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will review each candidate, and the recommendations from the peer promotion and/or tenure committee, the dean, and the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Review Committee, and will recommend for or against the granting of promotion and/or tenure to the President.



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Lee G. Renfroe, Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

From: Dr. Ross C. Alexander, Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

Date: August 22, 2017

A handwritten signature in dark ink, likely belonging to Dr. Ross C. Alexander, is written over the "From:" line and extends slightly into the "Date:" line.

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for a revision to section 2.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook – Renewal or Termination of a Probationary Appointment. In working through the logistics of the new promotion/tenure policy, it appears that equalizing the renewal date of all non-tenure-track employment letters would better streamline the process. This proposal is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee in an early fall meeting.

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

2.5.4 Renewal or Termination of a Probationary Appointment

Written notice of renewal or termination of a probationary appointment will be March 1 ~~for the second year and October 1 for third and subsequent years.~~ Written notice delivered via official university communication methods, including e-mail, before the specified dates shall be deemed sufficient notice. Otherwise, offers of reemployment will be made by an offer of appointment as specified in Section 2.3.2 above. Acceptance of an offer of reemployment must be made in writing and received by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost not later than thirty (30) calendar days following the offer.

The recommendation to renew or not to renew a probationary appointment normally will originate with the department chair or other immediate supervisor. Tenured members of the department also will be consulted. After review of the recommendation by the appropriate college dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost makes the final decision to renew or not to renew the appointment. The person affected will be advised of that decision in writing by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Probationary faculty who receive non-renewal notices as a result of tenure and promotion review will be retained for one academic year of employment prior to separation from the institution.



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Lee G. Renfroe, Incoming Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

From: Dr. Joy S. Borah, Acting Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost *JBorah*

Date: June 13, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for revisions to Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Curriculum Development. This revision is proposed to clarify the 15 working day comment period for new degree program proposals. It is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee in an early fall meeting.

Thank you.

rv
Enclosure

OFFICE of the VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and PROVOST

UNA Box 5041, Florence, AL 35632-0001

2F-1

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

Equal Opportunity / Equal Access Institution

21

3.3.3 Curriculum Development

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



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Lee G. Renfroe, Incoming Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

From: Dr. Joy S. Borah, Acting Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost *JSB*

Date: June 13, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum is a proposal from the Council of Academic Deans for revisions to Appendix 2F of the Faculty Handbook – Application for Promotion and/or Tenure. This revision is proposed so that the application form will match either policy and will also clarify under which policy a faculty member will apply. It is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee in an early fall meeting.

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

23

APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Name of Applicant:

Years at Present Rank:

Present Rank:

Rank Requested:

Year of Initial Appointment at UNA:

Tenure Requested: ☐

Department:

College:

Policy Followed: ☐ P/T Policy adopted for 2017-18 and beyond (new policy)☐ P/T Policy prior to 2017-18 (former policy)

SUMMARY	YEARS AT UNA	YEARS ELSEWHERE
College/university teaching/library experience		
Other teaching/library experience		
Other experience		
Years in present academic rank		

Candidate will prepare a portfolio that contains with the following information outlined in the Promotion and/or Tenure Policy the faculty member follows and present the portfolio to department chair by October 1st.

- I. ~~Application for Promotion and/or Tenure~~
- H. ~~_____~~
- III. ~~Current Resume or Vita (limited to 10 pages)~~
- A. ~~Education (Institution, major, minor, degrees awarded, and dates degrees were awarded)~~
- B. ~~College/university teaching or library/educational technology services experience as appropriate to field (include position and dates)~~
- C. ~~Other teaching or library/educational technology services experience (describe and include dates)~~
- D. ~~Other related experience (describe and include dates)~~

- IV. ~~Supporting Information for the Following Items, as outlined in section 2.5.1 (optional—electronic submission of supporting information is preferred; if submitted in hard copy form, references to these materials must be made within the electronic portfolio)~~
- A. ~~Effectiveness in Teaching/Effectiveness in Role as Library or Educational Technology Faculty~~
 - B. ~~Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities~~
 - C. ~~Effectiveness in Rendering Service~~
 - D. ~~Any other relevant information pertaining to the college or department~~

* ~~Applicants for promotion will limit their portfolios to a 10-page maximum. In addition to addressing the essential portfolio components in the 10-page limit, 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 must be referenced in the electronic portfolio and may be reviewed by the administration and committee members involved in the promotion process.~~



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Lee G. Renfroe, Incoming Chair
Shared Governance Executive Committee

From: Dr. Joy S. Borah, Acting Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

Date: June 13, 2017

Enclosed with this memorandum are two forms currently being used for the evaluation of faculty promotion and tenure based on the utilization of two separate policies. However, the Council of Academic Deans proposes that only one evaluation form be utilized and that Appendix 2G be the version that is selected. The basis for this request is that most departmental promotion and tenure guidelines are set based on the new policy criteria and it should eliminate any confusion over which form is to be used. This proposal is provided for consideration by the Shared Governance Executive Committee in an early fall meeting.

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

26

PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE EVALUATION FORM

Date:

Candidate Name:

Recommending Body: Peer Promotion and/or Tenure Committee

Level of Recommendation: Tenure and Promotion

Overall Ranking For Tenure/Promotion

Effectiveness in Teaching/Effectiveness in Role as Library or Educational Technology Faculty

Comments:

Met Criteria

Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities

Comments:

Did Not Meet Criteria

Effectiveness in Rendering Service

Comments:

Met Criteria

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/Effectiveness in Role as Library or Educational Technology Faculty. (see section 2.5.1 of Faculty Handbook)
2. Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities. (see section 2.5.1 of Faculty Handbook)
3. Effectiveness in Rendering Service. (see section 2.5.1 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 and/or tenure, and year to year success, and (2) are implemented through guidance provided by the department chair to the faculty member during the annual evaluation and at other appropriate times. It is the responsibility of the deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost to monitor equity of expectations across the University.

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

Promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty will be required to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure no later than the sixth year of service as an Assistant Professor at UNA. Faculty employment contracts may, upon approval by the dean and VPAA, include credit for up to three years of service at the assistant professor level or higher at other institutions toward the six years of service. The credit given must be determined at the time of hiring and included in the employment letter. An Assistant Professor must serve a

2G-1

27

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION FORM

Promotion Candidate Name:

Recommending Body: Choose an item.

Level of Recommendation: Choose an item.

Overall Promotion Ranking Exceptionally Qualified
Comments: Click here to enter text.

Teaching/Professional Effectiveness Less Qualified
Comments: Click here to enter text.

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities Moderately Qualified
Comments: Click here to enter text.

University, Community, and Professional Service Highly 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.

4. Effectiveness in Teaching. (see page 2-7 of Faculty Handbook)
5. Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities. (see page 2-7 of Faculty Handbook)
6. 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).

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Department Chairs Applying for Promotion. The administrative effectiveness of the department chair will be evaluated within the category of university and community service.

2E-12

28