



SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

March 21, 2013

12:45 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: Richard Miller, David Neff, Wai Mok, Phillip Bitzer, Deborah Heikes, Ramon Cerro, Timothy Newman, Mitch Berbrier, Vistasp Karbhari

Absent: Ina Warboys

Guests: Brent Wren, Joel Lonergan

President Altenkirch was not present. He was in Montgomery.

- Provost Karbhari Report: We will have the Board meeting here in April. We will have 3 items, the Doctor of Business Administration NISP, this is Joint UAH and Grenoble, this is the first with the University and a University in Europe—it requires a little bit of explaining—have to explain to ACHE as well. Grenoble approached us and looked for technological background university and this happened at the same time as talking about a DBA here. Hope to get through NISP easily and go to a proposal. There is a proposal for the Science, Technology and Society cognate, this will probably be an administrative item—ACHE has option of putting it as an action item but we spoke to Ellen Haulman and it will probably go as information. Emphasis in music—information item. To ACHE as an information item. Hope to be on the ACHE agenda at the June meeting of ACHE.
- Seeking the help of Senate in trying to review and see what to do about SIEs—Dr. Karbhari distributed a package of information—the way we use SIEs and questions on SIEs. We have had these forms a long time—there have been discussions these may not have been giving us information we need and for faculty to know how to change things. I would like the Senate to help suggest modifications to the forms—modifications in the process—a combination of the two or anything else that allows us to get the appropriate input from students and helps us do the assessment.
- Dr. Richard Miller—how are they used in evaluations—are they taken seriously—how are they factored in? What happens with the information? There are a variety of things done across the country—there is a book published and students can buy or download it. Others edit comments—general perception of thought--% thought good instructor, etc. Others provide rating but not comments. Here some make scores available and some do not. When scores are published they are taken seriously—faculty have gotten phone calls or meeting request, etc. Degree of seriousness depends on the department or college. Would be good to consider what to do on a uniform basis.

Dr. Ramon Cerro stated in Tulsa the scores are in the Library. Individual comments are very personal. They are a way to get back at the teacher. Why so much emphasis on SIE scores? Some other institutions do peer review—a senior faculty sits in a class—provides feedback. Is that something faculty are comfortable with? Don't think it is a bad idea to have various ways to assess teaching instead of just one way. There is some bias in rating. Some classes are weeder classes and so the instructor gets low scores. Consider alternative ways to assess. Would welcome ideas from Senate in terms of how to go forward. Go down to department level. Feedback by the end of the semester.

- Dr. Mitch Berbrier—Center for Teaching Excellence—how is hiring a director going—would this be in their purview?

Dr. Karbhari responded that we have only one application and we are not comfortable with moving forward with just one application. This is broader than a director—we need Senate input.

Dr. Richard Miller stated we will talk with people we know and suggest they apply. We will mention this in Senate.

Dr. Timothy Newman brought up the “No bound thesis and dissertations to advisors and departments”—CS does not like it and faculty do not like it either. Dr. Karbhari indicated this is the first feedback he has received on this.

The Honors College will be brought up at the June meeting of the Board because of discussions. There is some concern for creating positions. In our case we are just changing the name but had to walk through and because of that the proposal was not submitted by the deadline. In June it will go forward.

- **Associate Provost Wren**—Honors Day is coming two weeks from today. It will take place at 9:00 a.m. in the UC Exhibit Hall. This is the university wide event and colleges will hold their events in the afternoon. We will check on wearing hats and get back to you.

Drops—Dr. Wren will draft a memo to clarify.

Beta Policy—where?

Dr. Richard Miller—Background Check Policy—will give feedback.

- **Joel Lonergan: Logo**—We have taken the Logo back to the SGA, staff, alumni and now back to you. Keith Jones had a lot to say and made suggestions—We made adjustments and Joel showed the group the results of the changes. We will maintain the UAHuntsville for signage and wording for letterhead. SGA really likes the UAHuntsville. Dr. Witt has seen this and is excited about the changes. There will be many options. This will go in the 2014 recruitment material.

- **Dr. Richard Miller**—no significant report—some things brought to my attention—smoking policy on campus—smokeless tobacco problems—no policy—something to address or not? Think we should let Regina know and put it in the Student Handbook. There is already a policy against disruptive behavior. Sanctity of the Promotion and Tenure process. Concerns regarding some of the violations of the policy in the process. Addition of material by a Chair. Deadlines in place for dealing with incomplete information. Don't want faculty to lose faith in the process. What do you think the Senate should do about it? Don't have all the details but it might be something for Dr. Mitch Berbrier and Dr. Rich Miller to talk to the President about. Willing to look at other alternatives. Statement strengthening what is in the Handbook. What would you like Mitch and me to do, if anything?

Dr. Mitch Berbrier—procedure or policy. We will investigate and see what happens.

- **Governance and Operations**—Phillip Bitzer reported nominations coming in. One or 2 for President and none for Ombudsperson. When can we let people know who is nominated? Nothing in bylaws so it is the call of the Governance and Operations Chair. Committee restructuring—not sure we will finish.
- **Personnel**—Ramon Cerro invited counsel to a meeting—they did not come—there are some written comments included in my report—Legal did not get it finished—they will respond in the future. There was discussion regarding where the Background Check Information should be housed and scope and use of the reports—need for reports.
- **Finance**—Dr. Wai Mok Reported the RCEU proposals are in—Met with Dean Smith—we would like the money at the beginning of the year instead of having to ask for the money every time. Academic Affairs budgets for it and the VPR contributes—this year it was not clear if the VPR was going to contribute –talked and Dr. Tom Koshut wanted a commitment to open it up to non- faculty—talked about and not fans. The Finance Committee decides. There was an easy resolution—we want faculty to be the primary mentors—faculty are mentors but non-faculty personnel could be secondary mentors. Dr. Kader Frendi made that suggestion. The Committee decides.
- Send SIE information to Faculty and Student Development for a first pass.
- Update on searches.
- Expertise list—Jim Steele—no university level list—try to help put together list. Raise profile of faculty here and community.
- Strategic planning—hear from President soon. Like Senate and faculty to be involved.