

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**February 10, 2009**

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Alabama met February 10, 2009 in the Faculty/Staff Commons of the University Center at 3:30 p.m.

President Bates called the meeting to order and recognized the following proxies:  
Linda Lewis for Senator Davidson from Secondary Education and Vicky Hulseley for Senator Dumas from Elementary Education.

The agenda was adopted and the minutes for the January 15, 2009 meeting were approved.

President Cale shared that the legislature is in session. The governor submitted his budget with a 2.93% reduction of the already prorated budget with

concerning how successfully those entering with 14 or 15 ACT score have been. There is a concern with the economic impact of raising the standard as well as the branding of the university as perceived by better students as not being a first choice academic institution due to the current low admission standards. Another issue is remediation of these at-risk students which might be better handled on the junior college level. The committee recommended the proposed change in the admission standards for 2010 be endorsed. The senate will vote on the issue next month.

2. Faculty Affairs – Jeremy Stafford reported the committee had numerous meetings with several groups resulting in the work presented to address Charge 3 (See Attachment B). The senate was asked to take this document to their colleagues and give feedback at the next meeting or contact [jostafford@una.edu](mailto:jostafford@una.edu).

3. Faculty Attitude Survey – Craig Robertson presented the Faculty Attitude Survey questions and asked for revisions which are as follows:

- #37 Change Information Technologies to Educational Technology and Library.
- II Change II to read as I by removing Garry Warren’s name.
- Add for all administrators in I, II and III, “His commitment to identify strategic opportunities for moving the university forward to meet the needs of a changing world.”
- #49 Rick Lester
- #41-43 His/Her
- Add after #41 “and the tenure process”
- Remove #60-69
- #71-72 remove the parentheses item
- Add #75a to read as #75 concerning larger class size
- Remove the budgetary questions 77, 78, 79
- Omit #98
- Change #91 to say enforce parking regulations

Senator Richardson moved to suspend the rules to vote on the issue. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion to suspend the rules to vote passed. Senator Flowers moved the approval of the revisions. Senator Ferry seconded. The motion passed. The committee recommended the use of survey monkey for implementing the survey. Senator Flowers moved the approval of the recommendation. Senator Robinson seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Richardson moved the adjournment of the meeting. Senator Roden seconded. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee Report**

#### **Proposed Change in the UNA Freshman Admissions Requirements for 2009-2010**

#### **Committee Charge**

In late November of 2008, the Academic Affairs Committee was charged with evaluating a recommendation from the Office of Enrollment Management to raise the University standards for conditional admission. Currently, a student must meet two of the following three requirements for conditional admission:

- 1) ACT composite score of 14 or above (SAT of 680 or above);
- 2) At least 11 units on the high school academic core requirements;
- 3) GPA on the high school core requirements of at least 1.5.

The recommendation for conditional admission beginning with the freshman class of 2009 is as follows:

High school graduates who do not meet university standards for unconditional admission may be granted conditional admission provided they meet all the following:

- 1)

**Table 1: Student Retention by Semester and Freshman Class for Students with ACT Composite Scores of 14 or 15\***

	<b>Retention by Freshman Class</b>		
<b>Semester</b>	<b>Fall of 2005</b>	<b>Fall of 2006</b>	<b>Fall of 2007</b>

## **ATTACHMENT B**

---

This document details the activities and considerations of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) during the development of the FSEW. The FAC recommends that the FSEW be adopted as an additional faculty evaluation instrument (proposed Form 4D) beginning in the Fall semester of 2009.

---

Section 1a: Purpose & Considerations

Section 1b: FSEW FAQ's

Section 2: Intended Use

Section 3: Structural Requirements

Section 4a: Teaching Evaluation

Section 4b: Operational Definitions for "Teaching" evaluation

Section 5a: Professional Development Evaluation

Section 5b: Operational Definitions for "Professional Development" evaluation

Section 6a: Service Evaluation

Appendix A: Complete Worksheet

---

As stated in the Faculty Handbook ((Section 4.13, page 4 23),

“The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Program is to provide uniform, reliable data to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service and promote faculty development for the improvement of education. All faculty members are expected to participate fully and in good faith in this process as part of terms and conditions of employment at the University.”

“All faculty members are expected to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching; research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service. “

Currently the only method of faculty evaluation used at UNA is the student Instructor/ Course evaluation (Form 4C). This does not meet the stated requirements of the UNA's Faculty Evaluation Program, and it is deficient compared to UNA's peer institutions which all currently use at least 3 methods of evaluation (i.e., student, peer, and self report evaluations). Moreover, faculty members currently have little input and limited participation in their own performance evaluations, and critical faculty performance activities that should be recognized for both faculty development and promotion/tenure consideration (i.e., professional development and service) are all but ignored.

The FAC also recognized that several faculty fall into a broader non teaching category, yet are still subject to the same promotion and tenure criteria as the UNA faculty at large. Section 4.13 of the Faculty Handbook provides certain exemptions from the 'teaching' component of the overall evaluation process through the use of approved alternatives to Form 4C. However, these alternate methods of evaluation (e.g., peer reviews) would still be expected to conform to the criteria outlined in 'teaching' section of the proposed FSEW

Thus, the Faculty Senate Charged the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with developing a standardized self evaluation tool that could be used by the faculty at large with the intent of overcoming many of the qualitative and quantitative deficiencies of Form 4C. After numerous consultations with individual faculty, department chairs, the Council of Academic Deans (COAD), and the university administration, the FAC has developed the following Faculty Self Report Evaluation Worksheet (FSEW). This self report worksheet is intended to serve many purposes. Among those are:

1. To provide individual faculty members with greater input, participation, and flexibility in their annual performance evaluations,

provide

provide

23Ef2or>Tj /TT1 1

performance

performance (Report) /TT1 0.0027.0027.01101500003/02\_51T600

---

Because this instrument is intended to be a self evaluation, thereby enabling all university faculty to evaluate their own performance, there were several considerations that the FAC took into consideration. Specific considerations of the self evaluation instrument were:

- Evaluation criteria had to

Q: Does the FSEW account for all of my teaching, professional development, and service activities and achievements for the entire year?

A: No. Because the FSEW is intended to be a standardized form to be used by the university faculty at large, only those criteria that all faculty have an equal chance of meeting are listed on the FSEW. Eligibility and or achievement of specific awards or activities that are largely influenced or determined by academic discipline, rank, or years of service need to be included as separate documents in your portfolio (e.g. College of Business Teacher of the Year, Top Researcher Award, etc).

Q: Do all faculty need to complete the FSEW?



development, and service) as \_\_\_\_\_, respectively. These weights can be adjusted upwards or downwards in the future as necessary.

---

The overall self evaluation score for the 'teaching' component will consist of a base score (determined by Form 4C) with the possibility for additional points for other factors. Faculty may choose multiple additional evaluation factors; however, the overall teaching score cannot exceed 50 points.

For example, if a new faculty member developed and taught a course for the first time, and whose teaching score (taken from Form 4C) *exceeded*

2. "Concurrent" is suggested to be defined as teaching 1 or more face to face courses while at the same time during the same semester teaching 1 or more non face to face courses.

---

The overall evaluation score for the 'professional development' component will consist of an aggregate of possible points. Faculty may earn points by fulfilling multiple options; however, the overall professional development score cannot exceed 30 points.

For example, in 1 calendar year, a faculty member may achieve an overall maximum point score by publishing in a level 2 journal (1a) OR have their original artwork featured in a syndicated magazine (2b), present 1 paper at a conference (1d), and chair a panel discussion (2c). They would then receive  $15 + 5 + 10 = 30$  points.

---

(accounts for 30% of total evaluation score)

\* Option 1 suggested for research oriented disciplines

\*\* Option 2 suggested for performance/ behavior oriented disciplines.

\*\*\* Points reflect publication and/ or activity rigor only.

Option 1a: Publication of peer reviewed



Option 2c:

- Must perform administrative duties in addition to contributing to a material discussion about a topic related to their specific academic area

Option 2d:

- Must contribute to a material discussion about a topic related to their specific academic area.

*service*

---

The overall evaluation score for the 'service' component will consist of an aggregate of possible points available by satisfying a variety of criteria. Faculty may earn points by choosing multiple service categories; however, the overall professional development score cannot exceed 20 points.

For example, a faculty may serve on 2 committees, be a reviewer for a journal, and volunteer for a civic group. This would

\_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

College & Department: \_\_\_\_\_

For the Calendar Year \_\_\_\_\_ (month/ year) to \_\_\_\_\_ (month/ year)

This self evaluation worksheet is intended as a guide for personal and professional development, as well as an information supplement to be used for promotion and tenure considerations. This worksheet is to be completed at the beginning of each FaTc0.20Tde0003Tj/

\_\_\_\_\_ (accounts for 50% of total evaluation score)

Summary Results (from Form 4C or alternate assessment)

Evaluation Points

-

\_\_\_\_\_ (accounts for 20% of total evaluation score)

- University (shared governance, Senate, student life activities etc) 4
  - College (grant writing, accreditation committee, recruitment, etc.) 4
  - Department (student advising, accreditation and search committees, etc) 4
  - Professional (conference administration, editorial duties, etc) 4
  - Community (non academic or professional volunteerism activities, etc) 4
- 

Total Teaching Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Professional Development Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Service Points: \_\_\_\_\_

2

3

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Dept. Chair Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_