UAM Assembly Meeting
March 1, 2006
MCB Auditorium

President Stewart called the meeting to order at 3:24 P.M.

New Business:

Bobby Hoyle, Executive Chairman of Information from the Office of IT addressed some faculty concerns triggered by the new security banner on office computers, explaining the legislation the banner reflects and the state agencies excluded and included by the law. Mr. Hoyle distributed a handout of the IT standards that the banner incorporates, encouraged members to read the document and fielded a variety of questions regarding same. Chancellor Lassiter discussed the State policy and Dr. Davis clarified university issues to allay faculty concerns about academic freedom and faculty research regarding the wording of the banner.

The President asked for volunteers to participate as the Nominating Committee for Assembly officers.

Assembly Committee Reports

Academic Appeals: The Committee met three times in January to consider 27 appeals: seven were approved, 14 denied and no action was taken on six.

Athletic Committee: The Committee held two meetings in January. Alvyn Early conferred as Chair, reported on various teams’ achievements, on the Drug Policy and various ways to meet the needs of student-athletes, among other committee meeting results.

Curriculum & Standards Committee: The Committee met four times since the beginning of the Spring semester. Of the eight proposals presented, the Committee approved six course, major or admission modifications (one in CIS, one in EDU, four in NUR) and two course additions in MNS.

Faculty Equity & Grievance: No Report.
Faculty Research: No Report.
Library: No Report
Student Affairs: No Report
Teacher Education: No Report

Special Task Force Reports

Catastrophic Faculty Leave Committee: Chair Ted Hamnett announced the intent of the Committee, as an exploratory committee, to establish a new standing committee to oversee a Catastrophic Faculty Leave Bank The purpose of the bank will be to provide leave time donated by faculty who do not foresee using all of their annual sick time, for use by faculty who have experienced some catastrophic event that has forced them to use up all of their own annual sick time. The Executive Council will have to authorize the policy and procedures of the Committee and the bank. The Chancellor noted that state law prohibits each employee from donating more than 40 hours and that university staff has always . President Stewart pointed out that

Emergency Procedures: Chair John Kidwell announced that he has released the Quick Reference he discussed in last Assembly meeting (December 7, 2005) and has incorporated
procedures from Crossett and McGehee campuses as well as those for individual academic units. The Guide should be out within the next ten days.

**Faculty Evaluation Committee:** Chair Mark Spencer presented its 14-page report (sent via e-mail to Assembly members) as a list of recommendations that were intended to combine both objectivity and flexibility. Dr. Spencer answered questions requiring minimum standards. Discussion ensued regarding establishing criteria for each level of evaluation.

**Hazardous Waste Committee:** Chair Diane Forrest reported significant progress hazardous waste disposal since the December 7th Assembly meeting, citing the removal of chemical wastes, medical wastes, the contracting for removal of surplus transformers and the recycling of used motor oil and rechargeable batteries.

**Information Technology:** No written report.

**Salary Study:** Chair John Annulis reported that the committee's attempt to access data from peer institutions has proved to be more difficult than originally anticipated. Dr. Annulis pointed out that the committee sees its mission as figuring out an appropriate approach to studying the faculty salary issues -- not how to specifically resolve it. Thus, the committee will produce some recommendations as the outcome of their work. Sharon Cantrell reported on a similar process at the Colleges of Technology.

**Strategic Planning Committee:** Dr. Bryant distributed a handout describing the progress of the Strategic Planning. The results of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee work was presented at the January meeting of the entire Strategic Planning Committee, namely that three main areas emerged that subsumed all of the items developed at the earlier November 9 retreat. The whole committee then discussed each of the areas, made suggestions and revisions. The individual academic units were tasked with the responsibility of developing their own strategic plans specific to their units. Those reports would be delivered to the Steering Committee by April 15, 2006. The Steering Committee would then collate these plans and present the results to the next Assembly meeting.

**Administrative Reports**

**Vice Chancellors**

*College of Technology at Crossett:* reported

*College of Technology at McGehee:*

*Finance & Administration:*

*Student Affairs:*

**Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

- appreciation to Dr. Bryant and Eubanks for their work in Academic Affairs
- acknowledgment of the work of the Promotion and Tenure Committees that has been completed and their recommendation made to the Chancellor
- acknowledgment of the work of the Program Review committee, who have completed their review of Natural Science, Biology and Chemistry and whose recommendations will be forwarded to the Chancellor this week
- Early College High School fall enrollment was 184, spring enrollment is 387
- Act 1014 8-semester and programs of study work is nearing completion
  - mandatory training in advising will take place the week of April 17
  - first test will be Scholar’s Day April 24
- faculty advisors will be responsible for notifying the registrar’s office when their
advisee does not follow the program of study

- Faculty and units need to have syllabi available in electronic form in case ADHE needs it

Chancellor
- Salary study is taking longer than originally predicted
  - the intent was to use this info for the FY 2007 Budget process -- may not be possible...may take more than one year -- the results will be used once the study is complete and a recommendation made to the Executive Council

- first charge is to address campus parity then parity with peer institutions
- issue is complicated by multiple factors: rank, discipline, experience, merit

UAM logos
- member participation in selection of logos is appreciated
- logos will be copyrighted as official logos of the university
- adopt the new logos as your supplies/inventories of letterheads, et. al. are exhausted (see Mr. Brewer for assistance with orders)

- New Improved Website
  - recognition of the work of Ms. Freeman and Mr. Hoyle for their work on the new look

- Announcements of upcoming campus events

The motion to adjourn the meeting was approved at 4:51.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy E. Everts
Assembly Secretary
REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

Membership of the committee:
Lisa Branch, Robert Graber, Terri Hopkins, Myeong Kim, Matthew Pelkki, Robert Pryor, Lisa Sharp, Mark Spencer (chair), Linda Webster.

Philosophy statement:
The committee assumes that both administrators and faculty will benefit from a process that is clear, appropriately flexible, and as objective as possible: a process that acknowledges the needs of individual faculty members, as well as the needs of individual academic units and the university as a whole; a process that clarifies expectations for individual faculty; a process that clarifies the standards by which an individual faculty member is evaluated; a process that enhances continuous professional growth on the part of every faculty member; a process that is efficient.

Goals of the committee:
In response to the initial charge given by the Assembly Chair and in response to feedback from a number of university faculty, the committee has determined that its goals are to recommend to The Assembly Chair revisions that might make annual faculty evaluation clearer, more flexible, more objective, and less burdensome.

Recommendations:
The following recommendations were approved by a majority vote of the committee (the chair did not vote) and are hereby offered to Assembly Chair Kate Stewart:

1. That each faculty member--in consultation with the unit head--be allowed to set a percentage weight for each area in which the faculty member is evaluated: teaching, service, scholarship, professional renewal.

For example, an Instructor of English with a fifteen-hour teaching load may wish his evaluation to be based on the following weights: 80% teaching, 10% service, 0% scholarship, 10% professional renewal/planning. The rationale is to acknowledge and accommodate the different expectations for different ranks, different teaching loads, needs of individual units, and interests and needs of individual faculty.

2. That point values be assigned to the ratings: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Satisfactory = 3, Needs Improvement = 2, Unsatisfactory = 1.

3. That class evaluation forms be revised so that there is a consistency between the ratings students give instructors and the ratings peer evaluators and unit heads assign to instructors; that is, Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Satisfactory = 3, Needs Improvement = 2, Unsatisfactory = 1.
4. That each unit develop criteria that define the various ratings for faculty members of each rank.

5. That, in lieu of the currently required annual narrative, the following form be used. (Note that the form asks a faculty member to assign ratings to himself in each area. Peer evaluators and unit heads confirm that the achievements and activities listed warrant the ratings).

**ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FORM**

**Directions:** Give yourself a rating in each of the four categories and an overall rating, concisely listing achievements/activities that warrant each rating.

Name:_______________________________

Rank:_________________

Period of Evaluation:__________

Years of Service completed:___

**TEACHING**
Percentage weight:_______

Self Rating:___________________________

Achievements that warrant rating:___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

**SCHOLARSHIP:**
Percentage weight:_________

Self Rating:_____________________________

Achievements that warrant rating:__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
SERVICE
Percentage weight:___________

Self Rating:_____________________________

Achievements that warrant rating:__________________________________________

PROFESSIONAL RENEWAL/PLANNING
Percentage weight:___________

Self Rating:_____________________________

Plans for upcoming year:

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

Percentage weights for upcoming year: ____%Teaching, ____%Scholarship, ____%Service, ____%Professional Renewal (Percentages must be approved by Unit Head)

OVERALL NUMERICAL SELF RATING:___________

4.5-5.0 = Excellent
3.5-4.49 = Good
2.5-3.49 = Satisfactory
1.5-2.49 = Needs Improvement
1.0-1.49 = Unsatisfactory

FACULTY MEMBER’S NARRATIVE/COMMENTS (optional):
6. That the following very broad and general criteria be used as the initial basis for the self rating in junction with any other guidelines or criteria developed within a faculty member’s academic unit.

**TEACHING**

**Excellent (5)**

Professor: Receipt of teaching award; or overall student evaluation ratings in highest range and rating of exemplary by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.

Associate Professor: Receipt of teaching award; or overall student evaluation ratings in highest range and rating of exemplary by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.

Assistant Professor: Receipt of teaching award; or overall student evaluation ratings in highest range and rating of exemplary by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Instructor: Receipt of teaching award; or overall student evaluation ratings in highest range and rating of exemplary by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Workforce Education Instructor: Receipt of teaching award; or overall student evaluation ratings in highest range and rating of exemplary by colleague(s) on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible to students, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluator(s) regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Adjunct: Overall student evaluation ratings in highest range; dedication and excellence demonstrated by syllabi, exams, assignments, etc—or equivalent achievement.

**Good (4)**

Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range and rating of outstanding by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.
Associate Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range and rating of outstanding by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.

Assistant Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range and rating of outstanding by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range and rating of outstanding by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Workforce Education Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range and rating of outstanding colleague(s) on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible to students, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluator(s) regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Adjunct: Overall student evaluation ratings in next-to-highest range; dedication and high level of competence demonstrated by syllabi, exams, assignments, etc—or equivalent achievement.

Satisfactory (3)

Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range and rating of satisfactory by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.

Associate Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range and rating of satisfactory by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor—or equivalent achievement.

Assistant Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range and rating of satisfactory by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.
Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range and rating of satisfactory by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible, meticulous advisor, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Workforce Education Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range and rating of satisfactory colleague(s) on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head recognition of individual as accessible to students, as well as unit head agreement with peer evaluator(s) regarding classroom performance—or equivalent achievement.

Adjunct: Overall student evaluation ratings in satisfactory range; dedication and competence demonstrated by syllabi, exams, assignments, etc—or equivalent achievement.

Needs Improvement (2)

Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of marginal by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

Associate Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of marginal by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

Assistant Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of marginal by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of marginal by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Workforce Education Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of marginal by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Adjunct: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and marginal competence demonstrated by syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

Unsatisfactory (1)
Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of unsatisfactory by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

Associate Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of unsatisfactory by peer evaluator based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

Assistant Professor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of unsatisfactory by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of unsatisfactory by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Workforce Education Instructor: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and rating of unsatisfactory by two of three colleagues on peer evaluations based on examination of syllabi, exams, assignments, etc, and unit head agreement with peer evaluators regarding classroom performance.

Adjunct: Overall student evaluation ratings in “below satisfactory” range and lack of competence demonstrated by syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.

SCHOLARSHIP

Excellent (5)

Professor: Significant national recognition, as in the receipt of a national prize or award, the publication of a book with a reputable national press, or multiple publications, presentations, performances at the national level, or equivalent achievement.

Associate Professor: National recognition in the form of publication, presentation, or performance at the national level, or equivalent achievement.

Assistant Professor: Multiple publications, presentations, or performances at the regional level, or equivalent achievement.

Instructor: Publication, presentation, or performance at the regional level, or equivalent achievement.
**Good (4)**

*Professor*: National recognition in the form of publication, presentation, or performance at the national level, or equivalent achievement.

*Associate Professor*: Multiple publications, presentations, or performances at the regional level, or equivalent achievement.

*Assistant Professor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the regional level, or equivalent achievement.

*Instructor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the state level, or equivalent achievement.

*Workforce Education Instructor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the state level, or equivalent achievement.

*Adjunct*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the community level, or equivalent achievement.

**Satisfactory (3)**

*Professor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the state level or preparation to publish, present, or perform at the state level or higher, or equivalent achievement.

*Associate Professor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the state level or preparation to publish, present, or perform at the state level or higher, or equivalent achievement.

*Assistant Professor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the community level or preparation to publish, present, or perform at the community level or higher, or equivalent achievement.

*Instructor*: N/A

*Workforce Education Instructor*: Publication, presentation, or performance at the community level, or equivalent achievement.

*Adjunct*: N/A
**Needs Improvement (2)**

*Professor:* Little effort demonstrated in the area of scholarly endeavor.

*Associate Professor:* Little effort demonstrated in the area of scholarly endeavor.

*Assistant Professor:* Little effort demonstrated in the area of scholarly endeavor.

*Instructor:* N/A

*Workforce Education Instructor:* Little effort demonstrated in the area of scholarly endeavor.

*Adjunct:* N/A

**Unsatisfactory (1)**

*Professor:* No evidence of scholarly effort.

*Associate Professor:* No evidence of scholarly effort.

*Assistant Professor:* No evidence of scholarly effort.

*Instructor:* N/A

*Workforce Education Instructor:* No evidence of scholarly effort.

*Adjunct:* N/A

**SERVICE**

**Excellent (5)**

*Professor:* Leadership position on campus or multiple leadership positions within unit, including sponsorship of student organizations, or equivalent activity.

*Associate Professor:* Leadership position within unit, such as chairmanship of active committee, or equivalent activity.

*Assistant Professor:* Multiple committee memberships, including university committees, or equivalent activity.

*Instructor:* Multiple committee memberships in unit or equivalent activity.
Workforce Education Instructor: Multiple unit committee memberships or university committee membership, or equivalent activity.

Adjunct: Multiple committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

**Good (4)**

Professor: Leadership position in unit or equivalent activity.

Associate Professor: Multiple committee memberships, including university committees, or equivalent activity.

Assistant Professor: Multiple committee memberships in unit, or equivalent activity.

Instructor: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

Workforce Education Instructor: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

Adjunct: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

**Satisfactory (3)**

Professor: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

Associate Professor: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

Assistant Professor: Committee membership in unit or equivalent activity.

Instructor: N/A

Workforce Education Instructor: Advisory Committee membership (departmental) or equivalent activity.

Adjunct: N/A

**Needs Improvement (2)**

Professor: Willingness to serve but no activity.

Associate Professor: Willingness to serve but no activity.

Assistant Professor: Willingness to serve but no activity.

Instructor: N/A

Workforce Education Instructor: Willingness to serve but no activity.
Adjunct: N/A

**Unsatisfactory (1)**

*Professor:* Unwilling to serve.

*Associate Professor:* Unwilling to serve.

*Assistant Professor:* Unwilling to serve.

*Instructor:* N/A

*Workforce Education Instructor:* Unwilling to serve.

*Adjunct:* N/A

**PROFESSIONAL RENEWAL/PLANNING**

**Excellent (5)**

*Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

*Associate Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

*Assistant Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

*Instructor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

*Workforce Education Instructor:* Accomplishes CEU’s or appropriate work experience required to keep teaching certifications/qualifications, and planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

*Adjunct:* Planning is specific, realistic, and highly ambitious.

**Good (4)**

*Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriately ambitious.

*Associate Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriately ambitious.

*Assistant Professor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriately ambitious.

*Instructor:* Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriately ambitious.
Workforce Education Instructor: Accomplishes CEU’s or appropriate work experience required to keep teaching certifications/qualifications, and planning is specific, realistic, and ambitious.

Adjunct: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriately ambitious.

**Satisfactory (3)**

Professor: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriate.

Associate Professor: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriate.

Assistant Professor: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriate.

Instructor: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriate.

Workforce Education Instructor: Accomplishes CEU’s or appropriate work experience required to keep teaching certifications/qualifications.

Adjunct: Planning is specific, realistic, and appropriate.

**Needs Improvement (2)**

Professor: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

Associate Professor: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

Assistant Professor: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

Instructor: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

Workforce Education Instructor: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

Adjunct: Planning is vague or lacks appropriate goals.

**Unsatisfactory (1)**

Professor: No evidence of appropriate planning.

Associate Professor: No evidence of appropriate planning.

Assistant Professor: No evidence of appropriate planning.

Instructor: No evidence of appropriate planning.

Workforce Education Instructor: No evidence of appropriate planning.
Adjunct: No evidence of appropriate planning.