

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
VOLUME XXV
MINUTES OF MEETING #502, 3 DECEMBER, 2009
APPROVED 7 JANUARY, 2010

Present:

BA: Gupta, Mok, Bao

*LA: Stewart, Rountree, Kovacs, Bollinger, Neff, Goebel, Johnson,
Sanders, Heikes, Reeves, Seemann, Sitaraman*

*ENG: Anderson, Gaede, Joiner, English, Milenkovic, Coe, Cassibry,
Wessling*

LIB: Vaughan

NUR: O'Keefe, Warboys, Showalter, Ferguson

*SCI: Boyd, Edmondson, Zhang, Etzkorn, Newman, Ravindran,
Miller, Slater*

Absent with Proxy:

BA: Evans

LA: Smith

ENG: Banish, Gholston, Lin

SCI: Mecikalski, Bishop, Scholz, Wu, Takahashi

- Dr. Letha Etzkorn called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

- Dr. Williams reported regarding the University Housing Policy—We recognize the Faculty Senate and Communities concern for the Housing Policy. Mr. Ray Pinner has forwarded documents regarding Housing. Mr. John Maxon has placed information on the web regarding the policy and exemptions for policy and committee to look at the request. New dorm, Chick Filet and Papa Johns and Convenience Store. No student has complained about student life and activities being too busy. Need for increase in student life is evident since came here and should be to those been here and will be here. We hope these things will contribute to student life. Not and never was a no exclusion policy. Certain students always exempt: Marriage, hardship, children living with them. May petition for exemption. All have right to petition. New dollars available through financial aid office. All request for waivers reviewed and acted on by committee. The Committee that has student and faculty member. 15 requests. 6 acted on 9 requested more information. As of date no exemptions denied. Following numbers reported yesterday.—total admitted—700 same time last year 707. 1% decrease from last year. 15 applied, 6 granted, 9 under consideration. Personal letters requested. Did not meet deadline—contain personal information and was unwilling to forward those letters to open forum. Consulted with Legal Counsel upon recommendation forwarded letters and emails to head of Faculty Senate.

There for you to review. Primary reason for implementation of policy is freshmen and sophomore retention. IPEDS data received and contain graduation and retention rates. Concern for these numbers. Provost has data if interested. December 8 and 9 Space Policy Workshop. Experts on campus. Outstanding meetings

December 9 Pratt and Whitney open new works on campus
Energy forum.

Graduation in two weeks. Dr. Kristina Johnson will address.

After year of intensive work on HR and Legal, Partner benefits implemented on recommendation from this group. Extraordinary amount of effort in putting policy together.

Sunday 4-6 holiday party.

- Dr. Karbhari reported the progress on the searches for the dean of engineering and dean of business—4 candidates in business, engineering one candidate and three more to bring.
Campus planning—centralized scheduling—trying to get accurate count of classroom space and determine needs and put into database. Classes still scheduled in departments information being gathered and being put in and so can assist in scheduling and meeting needs. In future will come time need rules from departments regarding classrooms. Putting rumor to rest.
- Dr. Severn reported regarding Commencement—long thought time between exams and graduation too long. Do that so can award actual diploma—think has impact on attendance of faculty and students. Looking into having graduation immediately following exams. Downside is that while we can audit and determine if student is qualified but not whether successful. There will be handful of students cross stage and not graduate. Not true for graduate students. If anyone has strong feelings either way drop Dr. Severn a line.
- Question—Implementation of email policy date—no date in place—being studied by committee of Senate and Counsel—will get feedback and move forward Bills studied by Counsel and when receive anything will let you know.
Dean searches cost—do not have numbers now—funded by the University.
Of those admitted how many will come—hard to say because of status of financial issues nation wide.
- Approving Minutes—Minutes accepted
- Executive Committee—Change name Jeet Gupta. Asked if Review Committee had disapproved Housing Policy –President said yes.
3 abstentions for accepting Executive Committee Report
- New Committee Chairs introduced and welcomed.

Reports:

- Governance and Operations: Dr. Gupta—no report—have requested meeting of Committee soon so can organize work of Spring. Request to Committee members would like to meet after this meeting briefly.
- Finance and Resources: Dr. Stewart-3 goals-compare budget under Dr. Franz and Dr. Williams and impact on Academic Affairs. Answer to questions to those not answered and to Administer REU Program.
- Curriculum—Dr. Coe reported the Committee approved an internship course.
- Personnel-no report
- Faculty and Student Development---Ina Warboys requested if you are on the Committee meet afterward—examining email policy and looking at OSP
- Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs-Dr. Rountree reported the Committee met to consider Academic Bankruptcies and Readmissions—will meet with Janet on new Scheduling software.
- Senate Bill 331 Censure Bill Dr. Gupta requested to make a statement—He discussed the Role of Faculty Senate—detrimental aspects of this resolution—within University and impact on System and Board—and impact in the Community. Do not believe this bill is in best interest. We must get involved way before decisions made and not after –crying over spilled milk. Asking to change policy would be like asking faculty to change what had already taught. We must be shared governance—to achieve faculty must work with faculty, staff and administration in proactive not reactive manner. Before vote on resolution must become clear on goals and way to achieve shared governance. If have issue with housing policy address that and not propose another motion that would be detrimental to the Senate. We should have acted at beginning and we are at fault. Was committee and is current committee. Perhaps need to work with committee to achieve desired results. Work with administration to develop policy to address what would happen if enrollments do go down. Recommend do not consider. Recommend ask for shared governance.

There was discussion regarding some inaccurate statements in the previous discussion and attempts at shared governance. And when the Senate became aware of the policy.

There was a parent present who stated they had been denied regarding the housing policy exemption.

There was some discussion regarding the requests for information and discussions with Mr. Pinner and Mr. Maxon and information received and when it was requested and when it was received and what was not received.

This policy affects us internally and the community almost as no issue does. We do need a better student life and have put a friendly face on university but this policy will take away that friendly face. Not voting for this would send a message to the community that we do not have compassion or we lack compassion.

There was discussion regarding how this policy would help Calhoun and how they are hiring expected more students.

There was discussion regarding how this goes in opposition to increasing enrollment to 10,000. Also how the Review Team had concerns and there are recruitment concerns. There was concern for how we could lose money next year and how this impacts some Colleges even more than others.

There was discussion regarding how this is the tip of the iceberg and that there is a much larger number out there who have already resigned themselves and will not come.

There was some discussion regarding concern for the statement about improving campus life. We do need more student life but the problem is not with having more dorms. This is a gamble and has the potential for putting forth a negative face. It is his job to make informed decisions on such matters. There was concern that there is no contingency plan and also concern for why the business plan is secret.

There was concern expressed again regarding losing candidates due to this information. It was suggested we need an opt in friendly policy.

There was discussion regarding what we get out of this and that censuring the President does not change the policy. Why did we not know until recently about all this –either there is a problem with the mechanism for informing or something else is amiss.

Perhaps the contingency plan is what is needed and if we censure the President without changing the policy have we achieved the desired result?

There was discussion of the Faculty needing a voice and Shared Governance. There was concern for the corporate logic and the use of corporate logic in operations. We should not measure things like growth and use language of corporate to measure success. If we use this policy we are saying to the public we only want those who can afford to come here and will take loan. You should go to lesser place or affordable place to you.

Ask for contingency plan and has anyone done it and should we come up with it.

Policy decision—process-friendly amendment—Line 81 censure Dave Williams for failure to provide requested information. Slater moved and Gaede seconded, 6 in favor 12 against, 15 abstained.

There was discussion of separate issues--frustration of lack of communication to faculty
Frustration and resentment of housing policy
Make messages separate and clear
Motion expressing displeasure of housing policy—already passed
Separate emotion of frustration with communication and policy-could be acted on in positive manner.
Not sure what censure will do—confuse community.
Could we explain why censuring—go back and make clear.
Comes down to censuring President or not.
Go back to letter—answers not satisfactory go further asking for further responses and more information.
If students gave answers like President gave on test would you accept? No
Censure says we are important and you need to listen.

At minimum pass at second reading
Call the question— Dr. Rountree moved, seconded by Dr. Heikes
Secret Ballot vote—
Read from bylaws—point of information.-Dr. Lynn Boyd and Dr. Jennifer English counted. The votes 26 yes 15 no
Moved to 3rd reading by Dr. Heikes and seconded by Dr. Wessling
22 in favor of 3rd reading, 12 opposed, 2 abstaining, not 2/3 vote, 3rd reading will be in January
Dr. Gupta moved, seconded by Dr. Gaede to adjourn at 2:05