
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**April 21, 2016
12:30 P.M. in SKH 369**

Present: Kader Frendi, Mike Banish, Wai Mok, Tim Newman, Carolyn Sanders, Ramon Cerro, Eric Seeman, Eric Fong, Joseph Taylor, James Swain, Andrea Word-Allbritton

Guests: Provost Christine Curtis, President Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President- Kader Frendi called the meeting to order at 12:34 pm.
- **Administration Reports**
- ❖ President Altenkirch
 - Every bed on campus is going to be full in the fall. In June, we are going to go to the board for a new residence hall. It has been designed and will be a mirror of Charger Union. At that time, we are going to talk with two private developers who have worked with other universities. This would be to discuss if it would be to our financial advantage to do it ourselves or contract out to these sources.
 - We have developed a financial plan to build fraternity/sorority houses. We would lend the funds to build the house. The fraternity/sorority would pay us back over years with interest. We made a presentation to all the Greek organizations. We gave sixty days to sign the deal. We have had three agree. We have four building sites in the horse shoe.
 - Kader – Can they borrow from somewhere else besides us? Maybe a bank?
 - President – The amount is too small. The ten bed house is \$1.2. It's too small to go out for a loan. We will actually make money.
 - Kader – I am thinking about saving the money for a classroom building.
 - President – We wouldn't build that with cash.
 - Cerro – Will this be like a bond? Would the money come from the board?
 - President - It would be a bond. We will actually make a little money from this. Residence halls are self sufficient; they don't cost us anything. The money will not be coming from the board.
 - Joseph – How many beds?
 - President – 300.
 - Wai – Would they start and complete?
 - President – It would open fall 2018. So we will have to come up with a solution until that date.
 - Tim – Could you put up an apartment building?
 - President – Why do you say that?
 - Tim – Not much to an apartment, more to dorms.

- President – You are seeing stick and board construction. We do concrete and steel.
- Tim – I see that going up in six months too.
- President – It will take six months to go through the board process. You can't break ground until next spring. Then eighteen months to build. We aren't losing time. The private developer would be to see what deal we will be getting.
- Fong – At the current rate of growth, what are the plans after this building?
- President – We haven't planned beyond building four Greek houses and one residence hall. Right now, we require freshman and sophomores to live on campus. We could do away with sophomore requirement over time. There is a good chance of housing being built across from the Beville Center. About a year ago, the owner of executive plaza came with a developer to tear it down and build a residential complex. The owner decided against it and defaulted. The bank has the property. Another developer came to talk only once. Investors from New York and a local shopping center developer came to talk. So it will be developed soon.
- Cerro – Are their zoning restrictions around the university?
- President – Only in Research Park. It would be in this complex. The zoning would have to change.
- Andrea – Would our growth of students be outside the 30 mile range?
- President – Yes. 26% this fall is out of state.
- Eric Fong – Is it financially feasible to build across from the Beville Center?
- President – No.

❖ Provost Christine Curtis

- Everyone is up to date on SACSCOC. We have created a task force to create a policy for 3.7.1. This has to be done over the summer. Two names were given to me by the senate. I included all the deans that had names on the list. They need to offer resolutions. It's clear what we have to do. We have to follow the rules and be careful within the graduate courses that they have terminal degrees.
- Graduation is May 1st. The speaker is Jeff Sessions. Parking will be difficult due to Panoply. We do have some parking passes, but getting there could still be an issue. Jeff Sessions will be here on campus rather than the President's home.

➤ Officer Reports

❖ President, Kader Frendi

- This is my meeting before last, and then Mike will take over.
- We had a really good meeting the BOT. We had a two hour discussion. Hopefully this will continue. I did contact both presidents about the Ombuds issue in the handbook. UA has three Ombuds for faculty. UAB is recruiting one for 50% first year, and 100% second year. I passed this on to the Provost. I think that collaborating is helping us make decisions.

❖ Past President, Wai Mok

- No Report.
- ❖ Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
 - No Report.
- ❖ Finance and Resources Committee Co-Chair, Joseph Taylor
 - My committee met last week to discuss the bills/policies on today's agenda.
- ❖ Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Co-Chair, Eric Fong
 - My committee voted and passed Professional Studies so that has now left our table. It was passed with six courses and three concentrations.
- ❖ Governance and Operations Committee Co-Chair, James Swain
 - I am still working to get senators elected.
- ❖ Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, Eric Seeman
 - Class Size Bill 382 – The main concern with proposing this bill is it takes the concern away the type of class it is. It may not need to be filled to max capacity due to the class content. The department chair and dean should determine the size not the professor. The driving force is to keep good instruction at the forefront. ENG 101 has regulations by a governing body on the class size. If you double the size, you are out of regulation and limit the effectiveness of the course. An authority outside of the instructor may tell the professor what the class will be. Each class needs to be evaluated separately.
- ❖ Parliamentarian, Tim Newman
 - Our committee had eleven meetings this year and did a lot of work on the handbook. We have included Chapters 4, 5, 6 and Appendices A & B. We learned a lot on how to not revise a handbook.
 - Kader – I would like to call a special meeting to discuss the handbook items separately before Thursday's Full Senate meeting. Would Monday, 1:30 pm work?
 - It was decided to hold the special meeting at 1:30 pm on Monday, April 25, 2016.
- ❖ Ombudsperson, Carolyn Sanders
 - No Report.
- ❖ Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair, Lenora Smith
 - No Report.
- ❖ President – Elect, Michael Banish
 - Hoverboard Policy – If liability came out, we can move forward?
 - It was agreed to move forward with that friendly amendment.
 - Communicable Disease – This policy has been moved to go before the full senate.
 - SGA Grading (Bill 388) –
 - Plus/minus grading - SGA is concerned that inconsistency with the plus/minus grading may hurt students applying to professional schools. They have asked us to endorse a policy that allows plus/minus grading on campus. We took this to the committee. The context of this bill is answering their concern of a consistent policy. The committee is uncomfortable telling the professors how to grade. The professor should decide and state on their syllabus which grading system they will use.

- Mike – The Provost will set the numbers for this policy.
- Eric – The highlights of my committee’s discussion is it addresses SGA’s concern to not take away from the professor. When the policy goes into effect, any plus/minus grades that already exist are grandfathered in. So their grades are not retro’d.
- Tim – I think the faculty’s understanding and reception to this is going to be influenced by what the GPA is for plus/minus. I think it would be better if we had a bill to establish that. If an A plus is more than a 4.0, that could affect faculty.
- Eric – Anything we do will positively or negatively impact faculty.
- Tim – The concern I have is the C minus. Personally, I am opposed because of the C minus. Certain students have to maintain certain grade point average. A C minus is a big impact to some students. I don’t know that they have considered the other end. We have more students affected by the C minus end. I think we really need to carefully think about a C minus being less than a 2.0.
- Ramon – Are there any examples of universities that go higher than 4.0?
- Eric – Yes.
- Mike – I think there is a positive influence in this. It may push students to work harder. There is equal plus/minus.
- Eric Fong – Can we do something more on the plus side?
- Joseph – You may have a student sitting at a 69 that doesn’t deserve a C you leave them at a D. The pluses can balance the minuses.
- Tim – Some places convert a D between 1.0 to 2.0. They don’t divide into a 4.3.
- Joseph – For faculty choosing to stay in the current grading, how will that work?
- Eric – Whatever we do has to be uniform. A plus is usually scaled to a 4.0.
- Ramon – This is something that is initiated by those concerned with medical school? What about the others?
- Mike – We did encourage this to get done because faculty from physics and economics came to me and said that they would like to see this passed
- Ramon – Wouldn’t it be funny if it passes and there is an uprising?
- Mike – You don’t have to invoke it.
- Eric – It is supposed to leave academic freedom.
- Carolyn – This opens up a new series of issues. This could be viewed by some students as unfair. I would rather see us not do rather than it be optional. Did the committee explore that?
- Eric – We can set our grading scales anyway. So the biased already exists. It really doesn’t change a whole lot.
- Carolyn – I think medaling with A’s and B’s is an issue.
- Eric – Some students are aware that it exists. I think it would be restricting if they could give A plus based on the university policy.
- Tim – Eric cited can we just give pluses? There isn’t an A plus but other grades are a plus. Personally, I favor that more. I think it would be great to reflect that. I am leery to the minus. If I have someone who scrapes by their teeth, I give a C

minus. If this goes into effect, I will never assign a C minus and make them drop below 2.0 that could cause them to lose their scholarship. We need to be careful.

- Carolyn – Tim may apply his well thought idea in regards to finances, but we have to realize many won't have thought about the financial side.
- Kader - That could hurt prerequisite classes that require a C.
- Eric – This came from the SGA. They want the Provost to institute this and make it mandatory. I am not going to take the freedom away from the professor. If we don't like it, we shoot it down. Then we respond to SGA that it will cause a disadvantage.
- Ramon – Do we have any indication that SGA made a survey?
- Eric – The only information we have is contained in their bill.
- Eric Fong - I am confused by the logic of this bill. Professors don't have to use it? Our GPA is meaningless to other universities.
- Eric – They want us to be mandated to give B pluses.
- Eric Fong – My point is to only come up with a new numbering system for grading. The students are going to hand their grades to another university and they will recalculate to fit their scale.
- Andrea – No, they want it to be consistent across faculty.
- Joseph – Right, because banner allows a plus and minus to be entered. I would rather banner just be straight.
- Andrea – I find it disturbing that faculty could count so far out. To the students point, they are assuming coming from a K-12 system the grading system is what it is.
- Mike – I think the issue comes down to students may get a plus. It is confusing with banner that it just started allowing plus and minus that doesn't mean anything. I use it as a record for myself. They are asking for consistency. I think we should give them that. We could vote to get rid of it.
- Kader – This is still open.
- Mike – Take it to faculty senate? All in favor? 2 opposed. Ayes carry.
- Provost – Has anyone done a study on plus/minus across the nation?
- Andrea – No.
- Provost – I agree with Tim. We need to see what we are imposing on the students.
- Andrea – Could we just put in front of the full senate three major models for discussion?
- Eric – I don't think we need to waste the senate's time.
- Kader - I move to table the bill for next year.
- Mike– Do you want to make a friendly amendment to make it at a 1/3?
- Eric – If you want to make a friendly amendment to remove the minus.
- Wai – Tim, if we let the senate discuss, then it passed first reading?
- Tim – Yes. It either passes first reading or send it to a committee.

- Eric – No friendly amendment? Motion to reconsider? Banish seconds.
- Eric Fong – We are ok with the statement that we require professors to use this?
- Eric – That is what they said, but it isn't in the "be it resolved section".
- Tim – It's debatable. The motion is to strike the next to last paragraph and replace with "is 0.33".
- Kader – All in favor to reconsider? Aye carry. Motion to the amendment? One opposed. Aye carries. All in favor of the bill as amended. One opposed. Aye Carry. Bill passes first reading.
- Bill 385 Developmental Giving
 - Joe's committee was nice enough to rework this. I am going to ask if there isn't any extensive discussion to table it at this time. I would like to discuss the lecturer bill. Motion to accept? Newman seconds. All in favor of bill? Ayes carry.
- Librarian and Lecturer Policy
 - Joseph – We looked at it and there is a lot of discussion. We discussed the role of clinical faculty and lecturer. The committee was in favor of the good outweighing the bad. We would want to make sure that the discussion on reappointment matched the handbook. It should just reference to the handbook. Also, the titling, the librarian associate makes sense. The senior lecturer and distinguished lecturer is confusing since we have senior professor here. Change to senior and master – distinguished change.
 - First paragraph is reflecting the handbook 7.8.2.1.
 - Provost – The problem is librarians aren't in the handbook.
 - Joseph – Are the librarians considered term?
 - Provost – Lecturers are. Librarians are lecturers.
 - Joseph – Lecturer's are considered term.
 - Mike – Let's introduce an amendment.
 - Joseph – Motion to introduce the policy with the language amended to senior lecturer and master lecturer? All in favor? Mike seconds.
 - Ramon – My concern is more than the name. I think it is a two – tier system for the university. The danger is that we have more than 50% working here in a teaching position that is non-tenured. I know some departments need the help. Why is the university going this way? This is damaging to the basic fiber of the university. Why don't we just have more tenured people?
 - Frendi – Last time I said this policy is not encouraging hiring lecturers. This policy recognizes what we have on campus now. We have lecturers and continue to hire them. They have no visibility, pack up, and leave. We use them and they help the tenure-track. In a sense, I agree with you on balance. I am all for hiring tenure-track. I made that point with the BOT. This gives a balance for what we have.
 - Ramon – How many times did you go to your dean for a position and they say hire lecturer?

- Joseph – I don't disagree with a system that ensures we hire tenure and tenure-earning. We need lecturers to balance the load. I think more about my lecturers that have been here for 10 years. They need something. I am fighting to get them opportunities now.
- Tim – We use to have a tradition that if a faculty member stayed somewhere between 7 - 10 years, they were tenured. I think it's not in our student's best interest to have instructors that aren't protected with tenure. They don't have the assurance of knowing that are protected. This is taking the university in the wrong direction. If we are going to keep them, they need the benefits. We have a lot of people who have been here but we aren't paying them what they are worth.
- Ramon – I will use the words of an existing lecturer. They said it is degrading to me to wait to know if I have a job.
- Mike – I am going to ask for a rearrangement. A lecturer was 1 year, senior 2 year, master 3 year. One of the problems we have here is we have not been able to build up our liberal arts program. Sixty-five sections of ENG 101, 102, & 105 they are going to be teaching. There is a huge disproportion of what happens at the freshman 101 levels. Fixing that fixes Ramon's issue. Having a tenure-tracked teaching position, I will entertain. We have an immediate problem that we do need to reward those that have served us for so long, this will do that. I'm not afraid to go to the battle later.
- Andrea – I was a lecturer for fourteen years. When I started, it was a three year renewable. We then went to a one year renewable. The notion is that the lecturer comes in with a one year. I went backwards as a lecturer. We suddenly became one year renewable rather than three. Then at least you get the dignity of a 3, 5, 7 period. It isn't tenure. That gives some balance.
- Frendi – Can I have the motion to extend this meeting by ten minutes? Newman seconds. Ayes carry.
- Ramon – If anyone has been a lecturer more than six years they can be denied a contract without a due process. Right now, a dean or chair can decide if they receive a contract. It does damage the university.
- Andrea – The lecturers have expressed this concern. They are worried about what they can say or not say.
- Kader – I received a request from the library. The librarians would like to see this passed because they are in this policy. Some hires are waiting on this.
- Ramon – Why not separate the policy?
- Joseph – I have some lecturers that need to see this passed.
- Carolyn – Ramon connected to this. I could debate on both sides. Making part-time lecturers would be a bump up. We have seen this change over many years here at UAH. Not having a lecturer-ladder hasn't stopped us, but it would allow them to be treated better.
- Ramon – They can wait.

- Joseph – There are people waiting on this.
 - Ramon – What makes them happy about this?
 - Wai – They can get a pay raise.
 - Kader – There is a motion to pass with the amendment and move policy to full senate. All in favor to move? 7 agreed. 2 opposed. 1 abstained. Policy was passed to move to full senate.
- **Approve the Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting #567 April 28, 2016**
- Tim Newman motions to approve agenda with the following changes:
 - Make the Hoverboard Policy the first time. Approve meeting #566 minutes next. Accept FSEC minutes. Then add: Lecturer Policy, Bill 385, and Bill 384.
 - Mike – I motion to approve Bill 384 to send to full senate. Eric Seeman seconds. Ayes carry.
- **The meeting then adjourned at 2:10 pm after a motion from Tim Newman, second by Eric Seeman, committee affirmed.**