

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 5, 2009

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met March 5, 2009 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Bates called the meeting to order and recognized Michael Pretes as proxy for Senator Gaston from Geography.

Senator Adams moved the adoption of the agenda. Senator Flowers seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

first bullet to read: “Insuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various Colleges, and specific Departments are being met with respect to tenure and promotion criteria.” Senator Darby seconded. The motion passed. Senator Adams moved to amend item number two under the first bullet to read: “Reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies with respect to tenure and promotion criteria.” Senator Richardson seconded. The motion passed. Senator Darby moved to remove “only” from the last bullet, fourth sentence to read: “Exemptions from service should be granted in cases of extreme exigency and then only for one (1) term.” Senator Richardson seconded. The motion passed.

2. Ad hoc Committee for Constitution Review report was presented by Senator Roden. A resolution concerning changing the number of faculty members represented by one senator was presented. (See Attachment B) A resolution redefining the definition of faculty and departments to reflect the reorganization of the Collier Library and the Education Technology Services departments was presented. (See Attachment C) The vote on the two resolutions will occur next month.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Ferry moved that the Senate ask t

ATTACHMENT A
Interim Report and Recommendation to the Faculty Senate from the Ad Hoc Promotion Portfolio Review Committee.

The Chair of the committee requested a list of recognized peer institutions from the UNA Office of Research, Planning, and Assessment. We were provided a list that includes: Angelo State University (Texas Tech System), Auburn University at Montgomery, Austin Peay State University (TN), Fayetteville State University (NC), Jacksonville State University, Nicholls State University (LA), Northwestern State University (LA), State University of West Georgia, Tarleton State University (TX), and University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Of the ten (10) universities provided, we were unable to find clear criteria, procedures, and policies for promotion at Jacksonville State University. After reviewing the policies and procedures for the remaining nine (9) universities and initial dialog with selected administrators, the committee recommends the following:

A university-wide portfolio review committee, drawn from all faculty constituencies*, to serve in an advisory/supervisory capacity. Duties of the committee may include, but are not limited to

1. Reviewing tenure and promotion portfolios for content.
2. Reviewing procedures/processes for adherence to stated policies.
3. Insuring the missions, learning objectives, and goals of the University, various Colleges, and specific Departments are being met in concordance with one another.
4. Recommending, or not doing so, candidates for tenure and promotion.

Said committee should be placed between the Deans and the VPAA.

Said committee should have seven (7) to nine (9) members. These members may be selected in one of the following ways:

1. A minimum of one (1) member from each constituency, at-large faculty to finish constituting the committee body, and an appointed Chair who serves only as a facilitator/tie-breaker.

2. A minimum of one (1) member from each constituency and at-large faculty to finish constituting the committee, with the Chair selected by the currently-serving committee members.
3. Members of the committee proportionately selected according to the number of faculty in a given constituency and the Chair selected by one of the previously mentioned methods.

Said committee should be made up of tenured Associate and Full professors.

A pool of **ALL** tenured professors at the Associate and Full ranks should be formed.

The President of the University should annually select members from said pool for said committee to serve for one (1) academic year. No faculty member is to be appointed for subsequent terms until the entire pool has been exhausted. Only then may professors be appointed to serve another term. Exemptions from service should be granted only in cases of extreme exigency and then only for one (1) term. Faculty may not serve on the committee while applying for promotion.

While these recommendations in no way constitute a definitive product, they do give the University community a place to begin dialog, and the committee recommends the Faculty Senate continues to pursue the development of a promotion portfolio review committee similar to those found at our peer universities.

** The constituencies have been identified as the four (4) Colleges and Library and Educational Technology Services faculty for a total of five (5).*

Prepared by Dr. Larry Adams

For the Ad Hoc Promotion Portfolio Review Committee

9 February, 2009

ATTACHMENT B

UNA Faculty Senate Resolution concerning Faculty Senate Constitution Number of Department Representatives

Proposed: 3/05/09

Amended:

Accepted or Rejected:

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, herein referred to as the “Constitution,” has served the Senate well since its creation and adoption in 1971 and its subsequent amendments in 1973, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1985, 1991, and 1999.

And whereas, it has been nearly a decade since the Senate has reviewed and amended the Constitution.

And whereas the during the past decade the university has changed with regard to organization and size.

Be it resolved that we, the Faculty Senate recommend that the Constitution be amended as follows:

Article III Membership A.2.

“Each department offering academic credit shall elect from its members who are fulltime faculty holding the academic rank of instructor or higher in positions that are at least two-thirds non-administrative **one representative for departments having 1-13 members, two representatives for departments having 14 to 22 members or three representatives for departments having 23 or greater number of members thereof eligible to vote**, provided that for the purpose of apportioning representation and voting, Collier Library professional staff, Educational Technology Services professional staff and Kilby School teaching staff shall each be counted as a department. Fractional teaching loads of part-time faculty members shall be considered in determining the number of representatives from a department. In no case shall a department gain or lose a Senator as a result of one of its members being on leave. Each department shall be allowed to have at least one representative.”

ATTACHMENT C

**UNA Faculty Senate Resolution
concerning Faculty Senate Constitution
Description of Faculty**

Proposed: 3/05/09

Amended:

Accepted or Rejected:

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, herein referred to as the

ATTACHED:

- 03.000 - **General Order** (FEBRUARY 1994)
- 03.001 - **General Order**

General Order for Social Management Association and
 General Order for Social Management Association and

is judged upon the knowledge of subject
 be conducted for the student's academic
 performance and academic progress.

Checklist as a Director. This includes
 matter, including student development, and
 progress, and other factors related to the

1) **Proficiency in Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activities:** The
 individual is judged upon the quality of scholarly activities, the capacity for
 independent thought, originality and quality of published and unpublished
 contributions to knowledge, and evidence of initiative to new problems.

2) **Ability to Teach:** The individual is judged upon
 the quality of instruction, the ability to
 communicate, and the ability to
 evaluate student performance.

3) **Professionalism and Leadership:** The individual is
 judged upon the quality of professional
 conduct, the ability to lead, and the
 ability to contribute to the profession.

4) **Service:**
 a) The individual is judged upon the quality of
 service to the community and the
 profession.

5) **Communication:**
 a) The individual is judged upon the quality of
 communication skills, including writing
 and speaking.

4.13 FACULTY EVALUATION

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to reliably provide uniform

evaluation of the performance of full-time faculty members in order to provide a fair and equitable process for the advancement of the faculty.

All full-time faculty members are expected to demonstrate general competence

in the following areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and leadership. Evaluation of these areas

is based on the following criteria: teaching, scholarship, service, and leadership.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the performance of full-time faculty members:

1. Teaching: The faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom, including the quality of instruction, the

clarity of presentation, and the effectiveness of the learning environment.

2. Scholarship: The faculty member's contribution to the field of study, including the quality of research, the

originality of the work, and the impact of the work on the field.

3. Service: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of service, the

effectiveness of the service, and the impact of the service on the university.

4. Leadership: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of leadership, the

effectiveness of the leadership, and the impact of the leadership on the university.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the performance of full-time faculty members:

1. Teaching: The faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom, including the quality of instruction, the

clarity of presentation, and the effectiveness of the learning environment.

2. Scholarship: The faculty member's contribution to the field of study, including the quality of research, the

originality of the work, and the impact of the work on the field.

3. Service: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of service, the

effectiveness of the service, and the impact of the service on the university.

4. Leadership: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of leadership, the

effectiveness of the leadership, and the impact of the leadership on the university.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the performance of full-time faculty members:

1. Teaching: The faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom, including the quality of instruction, the

clarity of presentation, and the effectiveness of the learning environment.

2. Scholarship: The faculty member's contribution to the field of study, including the quality of research, the

originality of the work, and the impact of the work on the field.

3. Service: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of service, the

effectiveness of the service, and the impact of the service on the university.

4. Leadership: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of leadership, the

effectiveness of the leadership, and the impact of the leadership on the university.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the performance of full-time faculty members:

1. Teaching: The faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom, including the quality of instruction, the

clarity of presentation, and the effectiveness of the learning environment.

2. Scholarship: The faculty member's contribution to the field of study, including the quality of research, the

originality of the work, and the impact of the work on the field.

3. Service: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of service, the

effectiveness of the service, and the impact of the service on the university.

4. Leadership: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of leadership, the

effectiveness of the leadership, and the impact of the leadership on the university.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the performance of full-time faculty members:

1. Teaching: The faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom, including the quality of instruction, the

clarity of presentation, and the effectiveness of the learning environment.

2. Scholarship: The faculty member's contribution to the field of study, including the quality of research, the

originality of the work, and the impact of the work on the field.

3. Service: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of service, the

effectiveness of the service, and the impact of the service on the university.

4. Leadership: The faculty member's contribution to the university, including the quality of leadership, the

effectiveness of the leadership, and the impact of the leadership on the university.

Performance Evaluation Schedule. Using the faculty member's updated annual statement of goals and accomplishments, student teaching or citizenship assessment ratings, and other appropriate information, a committee shall determine the appropriate action for a faculty member in the following categories:

Annual Performance
curriculum vitae, annual other equivalent effective

Category	Action
1. Outstanding	Merit Increase
2. Satisfactory	Merit Increase
3. Needs Improvement	Merit Increase
4. Unsatisfactory	Merit Increase
5. Inadequate	Merit Increase
6. Inadequate	Merit Increase

Special award criteria shall be established and awarded annually by the Board of Trustees. The award shall be given to a faculty member who has demonstrated exceptional achievement in the field of teaching or research. The award shall be given to a faculty member who has demonstrated exceptional achievement in the field of teaching or research.

4.3.2 Use of

Category	Action
1. Outstanding	Merit Increase
2. Satisfactory	Merit Increase
3. Needs Improvement	Merit Increase
4. Unsatisfactory	Merit Increase
5. Inadequate	Merit Increase
6. Inadequate	Merit Increase