Dr. Bridges,

Since the last recommendations were sent to the Cabinet, the Faculty Senate has discussed a wide variety of topics. I have divided this memo into two sections – the first containing general updates and information regarding the topics discussed, the second containing any relevant recommendations.

**Updates**

1. **Senate Bill 101**: After discussion, it was decided that ABAC’s Faculty Senate will not align itself with any particular organization either for or against the passing of SB101.
2. **Ceremonies Committee**: A memo will be sent out this week which formally charges the committee.
3. **Bookstore Issues**: There were significantly fewer issues regarding a lack of texts in the bookstore this semester. The only complaint regarded a shortage of lab manuals, which have been written by our faculty but are printed offsite.
4. **Grants Improvement Group (GIG)**: Ms. Betty McCorvey has recruited three faculty members to work with the Office of Sponsored Programs on brainstorming and devising ways to increase faculty participation in sponsored programs.

**Recommendations**

1. **Promotion & Tenure Guidelines**: The text has been divided amongst the Senate members for review. We were able to discuss some of the suggested revisions at the February meeting; the remainder will be discussed at the March meeting. Here are the revisions proposed so far:
   
   I. **Procedures for Faculty Recruitment, Employment, and Appointment**
   
   - p. 4, third full paragraph, first sentence: Screening committees will be appointed by the department head/dean and will consist of at least three faculty members, **none of whom may serve in any administrative capacity.**
   - p. 4, third full paragraph, fourth sentence: “Once the deadline for application has passed, the screening committee (whose chair, a member of the regular
teaching faculty, will have been appointed by the department head/dean) will screen the applicants as to the suitability of their qualifications as measured against the minimum qualifications set forth in the position announcement.”

- p. 4, first bulleted item: “Candidates should be able to choose from a variety of topics transmitted to them well in advance. The subject matter of the colloquium/seminar shall be left to the discretion of the search committee.”

II. Requirements for Ranks
- Section E: The positions of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer are mentioned here but not defined previously. It is recommended that a description of the requirements for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer be added. A Lecturer can be described as “a non-tenured faculty member teaching a full load without attending duties of a tenure-track faculty member.” It is unknown what would define a Senior Lecturer.

III. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
- Discussion tabled to next meeting.

IV. Promotion and Tenure Unit
- p. 16-17, paragraph carried between these pages: The wording here should make clear that faculty evaluations by dean are only in place if there is no department head.
- p. 17, second full paragraph, second sentence : “Deans/department heads shall also be evaluated by their subordinates (one level down) faculty.” If evaluation of a dean only occurs one level down, the department heads are placed in a somewhat precarious position since there are so few of them to provide feedback.

V. Procedures for Promotion
- No changes noted.

VI. Procedures for Tenure
- Discussion tabled to next meeting.

VII. Appeals
- Discussion tabled to next meeting.

VIII. Appendices
- p. 35, title: Change “IX” to “VIII”
- p. 44: Add a signature line for the school dean. Since both the dean and department head compile the annual faculty evaluate report, as noted in #3 on p. 42, the dean should also sign the final report.

2. Roster Verification: Currently, Roster Verification begins approximately one week after the first day of class each semester. The students who are removed are those who have not attended the class at all that semester. These students take up valuable seats that could be filled by dedicated, paying, students. It is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that Roster Verification begin on the first day of class. This would allow no-show students to be removed from the roll so that the students waiting for a seat can enroll in the class. This could prove quite profitable for the institution since we would be providing more opportunities for students to take the classes they need.
3. **Summer Scheduling**: An email was received by several faculty in one school that caused some worry amongst the faculty. The email contained various scenarios for altering the length of the summer session. After some discussion with the faculty across the campus, it is recommended by the faculty senate that the summer session last no less than eight weeks. To shorten the duration of the summer semester, thereby increasing the length of time spent in the classroom per day, would be detrimental to student performance.

4. **Student Evaluation Tools**: To organize the search for an effective Student Evaluation tool, the Level II and Level III institutions belonging to the USG were divided amongst the senators. Details were gathered regarding the evaluation tool used at each institution. Not surprisingly, other institutions are having the same difficulties that we are with regard to student response rates. In fact, we had requests to share our findings with other institutions.

From the information reported, only one student evaluation tool was praised and recommended for use – Gravic Remark Office OMR (http://www.gravic.com/remark/Office-OMR-Scanning-Software/). This software would allow us to create our own questionnaire and scan the completed forms using any standard scanner. The software compiles the data, reports any number of statistics, and displays any written comments in one report. Of course, there would be a cost associated with printing the customized forms. If necessary, we could require students to purchase the form from the bookstore just as they are required to purchase regular scantron forms for various classes and exams. It is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that we return to a more traditional “paper and pencil” method of collecting student evaluation results and look into some form of data processing for the results, i.e. Gravic Remark Office OMR. This motion carried unanimously.

The Senate is aware that three evaluation tools were requested by the Cabinet. However, due to the substantial difficulties encountered by other institutions, the only plausible tool was the Gravic Remark Office OMR system. Other useful tools may be “out there,” but they have yet to be discovered or used by any of the institutions contacted during this search.

5. **Dead Day(s)**: With the shifting of the beginning and end dates of each semester (from Monday to Wednesday), the start of final exams now begins the day immediately following the last day of class. This provides very little time for student preparation and for faculty to complete any unfinished grading. It is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that, should the last day of classes continue to fall mid-week, the Academic Calendar should reflect a minimum of one day (24 hours) between the end of regular classes and the start of final exams. This so-called “Dead Day” would apply to both students and faculty, i.e. no office hours would be required of faculty members. Admittedly, students may choose not to use the break to its full potential, but we are certain that faculty would appreciate the time greatly, especially being used to a full weekend between the end of class and the start of final exams.
The Cabinet has my sincerest apologies for the delay in submission of this report. Much of the information contained here has been compiled over several meetings of the Faculty Senate.

I look forward to any response you provide. Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have questions regarding these recommendations.

Respectfully,

Amanda Urquhart

President of the Faculty Senate
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
School of Science and Mathematics
(229) 391-5124
aurquhart@abac.edu