
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
May 4, 2017
12:30 P.M. in NUR 101A

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.
- **Meeting Review:**
 - Nepotism Policy – discussion was voted to stop.
 - Bill 402 was sent to committee.
 - Bill 403 passes second and third reading.
 - Bill 408 fails.
 - Bill 409 passes second and third reading.
 - SIE Policy voted to be tabled.
 - Signature Approval Policy passed.
 - Second Bachelor Policy passes.
 - Course Forgiveness Policy passes.
- **Administrative Reports**
 - Provost Christine Curtis
 - Commencement is May 7th.
- Carmen Scholz presented Mike Banish with a plaque to recognize his service as Faculty Senate President.
- Mike Banish, President
 - The largest group of policies is the OIT policies. Carmen and I have met with Russ Ward. They have been sent to you for comments. There is a list that has been assigned to committees that may not have gotten done, most are not controversial.
 - Nepotism Policy – This is just a rewrite of the current law and well aligns itself with SACSCOC policy.
 - CEU Reporting Policy – We did some with this at the beginning of the year and just forgot about it. It is following SACSCOC.
 - Faculty Credential Policy with Forms A & B – They are aligning under SACSCOC. Those who listen to the Provost would have heard that this is one thing that they dinged us on.
 - Second Bachelor’s Degree – This is something that we have been doing. It is generic across the university.
 - Course Forgiveness policy – This has been out of committee for a while with no issues.
- I am going to ask if we can lump these together for approval.
 - Tim – You need a motion.
 - Ramon Cerro motions to lump policies together. Tim Newman seconds. 1 objection.
 - Roy – Some of these policies I have problems with. I think we would be better to go through them separately. I motion to separate. Debra Moriarity seconds. 7 in favor. 12 opposed. 10 abstain.
 - Mike – We will not separate.
 - Roy – Nepotism, what we do right now is we require disclosure. It is a small institution. The current policy requires disclosure and oversight. As the rewrite is written, it is written with

strict objections through the upper level. I think that it is too much. I don't think the rewrite is good.

- Tim - I want to speak in favor to nepotism. I think this addresses complications that we need to address.
 - Roy – I would agree that the current policy requires management oversight. The rewrite is closer to an outright ban. I am sure the President doesn't want to deal with that. I think departmental oversight would be sufficient.
 - Mike – Having worked with different genres of government that is not an excuse.
 - Debra – A faculty member has a wife that is perfectly qualified to work on this. It would actually enhance the research. A situation arises where the faculty member has the money to hire this person. The current situation is they can't be their direct supervisor and evaluate them. We then work with the Dean to have another person to take on this role. It has worked out fine that way. I have been in that position. Even though they work together in the lab, I have made sure they are meeting requirements.
 - Mike – The policy just says the President has to know about it.
 - Debra – That is fine even if he has to approve it.
 - Ramon – This is defeating the purpose of putting the policies together. I motion to put off discussion. Member seconds. Ayes carry. 3 opposed. 1 abstains.
- Next on the list is Bill 402. It was on the agenda for last meeting. Is there a motion to introduce 402? Roy Magnusson moves. Tim Newman seconds.
- Carmen – Unless the physics dept is here, the physics dept submitted amendments. Can you pull them up?
 - Mike – They weren't submitted by physics representatives.
 - Carmen – The email states that they were given to the representative.
 - Tim – Any member is free to introduce them at this time.
 - Carmen – Reads amendments.
 - Tim – That is a lot.
 - Ramon – That isn't an amendment that is a new bill. I recommend sending it back to committee with amendments.
 - Mike – You get the emails from me asking for people to volunteer. Usually that takes at least two emails before a response comes. Getting five faculty members on a committee is a hoop that faculty doesn't want to go through. The results of the IIDR's shouldn't be reported in our minutes.
 - Roy – I think it's well intentioned but over regulates. This bill takes a simple step in saying you have to have a review process.
 - Carmen – Even though this isn't my amendment, I agree with it. Having it state that it is conducted by a review committee should be more specific as to how many faculty members.
 - Mike – A definition of a committee on campus is the majority is faculty. Task force doesn't have to have majority.
 - Carmen – That obviously hasn't been the case in the past.
 - Christine – What is the intent of this bill?
 - Mike – Agencies will say that you can submit one proposal per campus. We have IIDR and a few other things that come through, like EPSCOR. We have had some instances where the VPR office selects who submit the proposal. Even though the OVPR says we will follow NSF procedure, reviews of the proposals are never sent out. If you didn't get it, in most cases you found out through rumor. The intent is to review the current process. This would allow the faculty member to be ensured they will know why it was accepted or not.

- Ramon – I put together a proposal that was rejected. When I asked for the reason, I went to the OVPR’s office and was given an oral justification. This was done behind closed doors and nothing in writing.
- Jeff – I see the amendment from physics is strengthening the review committee. The point I do not see addressed by physics is this report should be returned in a timely manner. I think the second one is a major oversight if the intent is to increase transparency. I propose this go back to committee and the language be adjusted. Tim Newman seconds. Ayes carry.

➤ Bill 403

- Roy – I am not sure we want to give away free remedial education.
- Mike – It isn’t free. It’s not meant to be good intention. This is basically for our local students who are struggling and would choose between a community college because the price is lower. My objective with this was that in five years you get a class of students that doesn’t take advantage of it.
- Tim – I almost had a heart attack when I first read this. We have had a problem for a long time with our graduation rate and retention rate. This is a creative approach to this problem and worth the try. I would like to see it passed and have the President think about it. Maybe this helps us get closer to these targets.
- Debra – When we are talking about the courses they would be placed into. Would these be math courses prior to calculus? We don’t have the English remedial, but only a section that can count. CHEM 101, if they have had no chemistry?
- Mike – This is probably more an engineering problem than any other. If you don’t take CAL A your first semester, then you can’t take physics and then you can’t take stats or fluids.
- Debra – Additionally, you are talking about their semester after their freshman year? Doing the courses in the summer to catch up would require taking those offered. Some part of this would have to be tied into making sure the departments offer make up courses. Do you have any idea of how many students this would include?
- Mike – You would have to consider it has to be local students. I would guess 30 – 60 students.
- Roy – The way the bill is written, would it be possible to do this before freshman year?
- Mike – That bill was tabled.
- Debra – The summer has to pay for itself. You have to look at cost versus tuition income. You don’t get to use the full tuition. Low enrollment courses get cancelled. If those start to include a large number of students who aren’t paying, the budget has to be altered to pay those who are teaching.
- Jeff – The scope on this with regards to how long students make invoke this policy? Realizing the intent and applauding, could a student come up in the fourth year saying they are behind? Do you want to place limitations on it?
- Mike – It only involves a catch up for courses required for your degree. It also says that you only get two summers.
- Jeff – You are fine if they propose in their senior year to utilize this to catch up?
- Mike – If it increases our graduation rate, yes, I am good.
- Ramon – Why is the magical number three?
- Mike – Chemical Engineering is the worst. You can get behind three courses the easiest in our field.
- Mike – All in favor of bill. 5 opposed. Ayes carry.
- Tim – Moves to third reading. Carmen seconds.
- Mike – All in favor of third reading. 5 opposed.
- Tim – Motion to approve.

- Mike – Motion of third reading. 35 in favor. 2 opposed. Passes.
- Bill 408 – This was submitted to faculty senate.
 - Carmen – This bill was delivered unanimously.
 - Mike – Motion to move to floor. Ramon moves. Roy seconds.
 - Roy – I appreciate the intent. I think this bill makes worth a process of hiring much more challenging. There is nothing to keep internal candidates from applying.
 - Mike – We are told whether we are going to have an internal or external search.
 - Provost – The faculty handbook says the President or Provost can decide if the search is internal due to financial issues. My read of this is all searches are external with internal, only on special circumstances is it made external.
 - Roy motions to vote. Jeff seconds.
 - Mike – All in favor of voting. Ayes carry. All in favor of bill 408. 3 in favor. Fails.
- Bill 409 – This was given to the FSEC and passed out. Let me give you the history of this bill. The BOT specifies the tuition that each campus can charge and they are equal to one another. The BOT has been hesitant to fee increases outside of the tuition increase matrix. The online systems the campuses have are something that the BOT have not equalized tuition on. Now UAH is behind the power curve of what we get to charge versus what the other campuses charge.
 - Provost – That statement is incorrect. Alabama is the lowest. UAB is the highest. We set ours two years ago and it has risen some due to our tuition increase. We have a graduated tuition schedule in terms of the colleges.
 - Mike – Having said that and been corrected, I would encourage you to read it that we are asking the President to have a discussion with the board to equalize this.
 - Jeff – I am still not sure what problem this is trying to solve.
 - Mike – We are trying to start up an online system. We don't have an infrastructure for this. We cannot try to recoup any fees that would be associated with this.
 - Joseph – The University had an online task force. The task force generated a report and found an organizational structure that would support this. We figured in order to support this financially we need designated online course fees. We figured a \$250 online course fee, but the BOT has denied fee charges. The bill is intended to register the faculty's desire be treated equally.
 - Mike – I want to remind everyone if a bill passes unanimously on the second reading, there is no need for third reading. I would like to call for a vote on bill 409. 3 opposed. Ayes carry. Motion to third reading. Carmen moves. Debra seconds. All in favor. 1 opposed. Ayes carry. All in favor of bill for third reading. 3 opposed. 2 abstain. Bill passes third reading.
- SIE – The issue last time was when the evaluations would take place.
 - Debra – I thought some issue was too with them being done in class. That implies going back to paper.
 - Tim – There was an amendment to change tenth to twelfth or thirteenth. I had some discussions with others and would like to amend it again. I would like for it to read after the midpoint of the term, but not later than the next to last class. Ramon seconds amendment.
 - Carmen – I would amend to strike 2/3 of the semester.
 - Debra – There is an SIE committee that has senate representative. All of the issues are being discussed along with OIRA. We have been looking at best practices. This may be counter to what our own committee is doing. We were discussing the time point in the committee.
 - Member – It should read fall 2017.
 - Mike – All in favor of amendment. 26 in favor. 7 opposed. 5 abstain. Amendment passes.

- Sophia – I see two separate issues. One has to do with teaching reviews. They have to be based on more than the SIE scores. In terms of taking this back to class, there are ways to increase online participation. I see it as a multifaceted bill.
 - Anne Marie – We went over teaching style to say teaching effectiveness.
 - Ramon – The idea of the bill was to fix the problem that exists with SIE evaluation with poor participation from the students. One says let's go back to the old way, not specifying paper. The only way to ensure that the students will participate is doing it in class. The only ones that go back and do this outside of class are the complainers. One size doesn't fit all. The questions should be tailored to the courses. The third part, there is a tendency that we only have an evaluation done through SIE. That is wrong. There are many facets of what teaching is. What do students really know about teaching? This turns into a popularity contest. Suggest departments use other way to evaluate our teaching effectiveness.
 - Debra – I am concerned with the third point.
 - Christine – Given we can have different questions and not being able to avoid biased opinions. I would like to move that get rid of the second.
 - Mike – Is there a second to that. Debra seconds.
 - Member – Can ask for clarification on the second? Does this mean each question is catered or additional measures done?
 - Christine – My understanding is that we can add to what the college puts out.
 - Ramon – You think that what you use in English or other departments is what you should do in Engineering?
 - Debra – There is a core. Nursing has 19 questions. The core is to be fairly generic then let people add.
 - Roy – Motion to table the bill. 5 opposed. Bill is tabled.
 - Debra – Can I suggest at the first of the fall we have the chair of SIE committee come to discuss this?
- Signature Approval Policy: Motion to bring forward. Debra motions. Mary seconds. A memo was put out last year saying you had to have two signatures on anything over \$2K. Someone wasn't clear on the primary account holder that would be the person that had to initiate the transaction. The Provost rewrote the policy to make it clear that the PI or account holder is the one who has to initiate the funding request. State law and general accounting principles state that there should be two signatures.
- Tim – This disturbed me a bit because ledger 2 is being treated the same way as 3 and 6. I understand if there are state funds there. Ledger 3 is residual funds from a grant. Ledger 6 is a gift. Why is there a low threshold on these accounts? This doesn't apply to ledger 5 accounts.
 - Mike- Ledger 5 has more rules than this. We don't have rules for this account. I have always had to get two signatures on a 5 account, at any amount.
 - Provost – Any money that comes into the university is all university money, state funds. That is how we the public see it. We as employees/public officials are required to follow accounting safe guards. Mike added a sentence to this bill. If there is a dispute, if anyone who is in the position to sign refuses to sign, the dispute will follow administrative sequel.
 - Roy – I would like to propose an amendment to change \$1K to \$5K.
 - Mike – Who is familiar with state law? I am not sure that doesn't make the bill illegal in the state eyes. We will go with \$5K and see what happens.
 - Roy- Then strike the following sentence. Tim seconds. All in favor. 25 in favor. 4 opposed. 11 abstain.
 - Sophia – Can we hear about the logic behind the \$1K? I thought it was good.

- Provost – The figure that came from the Deans was \$1K.
- Sophia – Why change it?
- Ramon – That is the opinion of the senate and the administration.
- Roy – At some point the definition of equipment is something costing more than \$5K. In regards to residuals that would go away. We have an inability to acquire computers on federal grants and inability to get departments to pay. Having signed off on routine things seems more harm than benefit. Some level is appropriate and I think \$5K is appropriate.
- Mike – I would like to call for a vote on this policy as amended. 27 in favor. 3 opposed. 7 abstain.
- Mike – I motion to split the five policies. Roy moves. All in favor. 4 opposed.
- Mike – I would like to introduce the CEU Reporting Policy. This one has been out since August. All in favor of policy. Ayes carry.
- Faculty Credentials Policy: This specifies who can teach classes. It is a mirror of the SACSCOC requirements. We did get in a little trouble over this.
 - Roy- I have looked at other institutions and SACS. One thing that happens is reinvent the wheel. There are occasions where you want to hire someone who doesn't have a degree or that specific credential.
 - Provost – On the fifth page of the policy, number three, experience is listed. That is where we deal with the experience of those who don't have a degree. If you don't have the degree, you are then evaluated on experience.
 - Member – Does this have an impact on part time? Appendix B, required documentation, is these required?
 - Provost – Yes, they are required. They have to be in the Dean's office for part time. When they come to the onsite, we have files they go through to double check credentials. We have to fill out the faculty credential table. When they came a year ago, they can look at any individual at any time.
 - Member – For example, we hire a lot of part time. If someone has a terminal PhD in mechanical, he also has to provide three letters of accommodation to teach for us. I think that is a lot.
 - Mike – I am going to say we are a university that belongs to SACSCOC. We could ask the Provost and President to fight the rules to relieve it, but they are what they are.
 - Member – I don't see it referring to part time.
 - Provost – Let me double check. We have to have the resume and the transcripts. It doesn't come to the Provost office, it goes to the Dean. All new full time faculty have to do this.
 - Mike – All those in favor of the faculty credential policy. 4 opposed. 5 abstain. 21 in favor.
- Tim – I would like to move second bachelor policy. Jim seconds. 14 in favor. 1 oppose. 8 abstain. Passes.
- Tim – I move adoption of course forgiveness. Jim seconds. 10 abstain. 13 in favor. 11 oppose. Passes.
- Jim Swain motions to adjourn. Ayes carry.