SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
September 17, 2015
12:30 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: Kader Frendi, Michael Banish, Wai Mok, Tim Newman, Ramon Cerro, Joseph Taylor, Eric Seemann, Provost Curtis

➢ Faculty Senate President Kader Frendi called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm

➢ Administration Reports
❖ Provost Curtis
   SACSCOC
   Sent out the SACS Reaffirmation report. We are putting it up on myuah website with all of the supporting documents. The public website will have the report without the supporting documents for privacy purposes.

   The next steps: In November, the off-site review team looks at the reaffirmation report. They will say either compliant or non-compliant. If it is non-compliant, they will give a paragraph for why. The report will come back to us and we will write a focus report focused on areas where we are not compliant, and provide documents if any are missing. Peggy Bower scoured for all the documents we needed, so we put in everything that we found, but they may think we need something else. We will send that focus report in in January; therefore, we need it completed by the end of December.

   The QEP Report goes in in January. The QEP consists of a QEP Committee, an Implementation Committee, and a Writing Group. The Writing Group is working diligently. Our QEP is on Collaborative Learning. The QEP Committee is excited about this. We have a speaker coming tomorrow, Claire, on Collaborative Learning. She is from University of Alabama. She will speak first to the leadership group, then to faculty and staff at 1:00 pm, and then to the advisors at 3:00 pm. The on-site group will be here March 15-17. ALL faculty needs to be here. We do not know who they will want to talk with. We will get a list of names that they want to talk to about one week ahead of time. We will brief those individuals. But when they get here, they can ask for anyone. The on-site committee will come back with possible recommendations. Then we have one more chance at answering these. I think we have several months after their review.

   The Institutional Effectiveness issues that were put in place in January weren't done as completely as necessary, so we have been working with the deans in those areas. We asked for the assessments to be in by October 5th. Our consultants strongly encourage us to put together the 5-year summaries. There are some who did not comply, so we are working with them to get these completed. Those are due October 21. We have to have those for our focus reports. For the Fall assessment, we suggested, although it is up to the individual unit, that they use the same Learning Outcomes they did for Spring. Those are due to the deans on 18 January and to us on 25 January. We need those in place ready to show the on-site group in March. Then we go into a year-long cycle, instead of a semester-cycle. We are

asking the deans to decide between either October or February for the annual reports to be due. The deans are talking to their faculty about this.

We appreciate all the work that has been done. The last review was done ten years ago.
- o Ramon Cerro: I have been through several of these reviews, but this one was more difficult. Why?
- o Provost Curtis: They have changed over time. They are a lot more detailed now. Eric Seemann is on the assessment committee and said that the committee had trouble with individual units formatting their report in the way needed. It is a lot more demanding now. He suggested that the administration direct the individual units to do what needs to be done.
- o Provost Curtis: I have asked each unit to provide me with an assessment person. The dean of that unit will evaluate that person. It also becomes part of the dean's evaluation, merit raises. The dean can be the assessment person, but I asked them to choose someone else. The dean holds that person responsible and I hold the deans responsible. We need an assessment culture. We cannot begin the assessment again in five years. We need a consultant, especially to clear up some of the demands. UAB and UA are one year ahead of us. UAB passed with no recommendations. UA had two recommendations after their on-site review. They both set a high standard.
There was a discussion among everyone about various push backs and misunderstandings from departments and possible reasons behind those push backs and/or misunderstandings.

- ➢ Officer and Committee Reports
- ❖ President Kader Frendi
I will be going down to Tuscaloosa after this meeting for the Board of Trustees meeting, which is tomorrow morning. I will ask the chancellor, etc., if they will visit. We might not get the chancellor, though, because word is that he is stepping down. The Faculty Senate President at UA emailed me to talk about some things. I will have lunch with her and the Faculty Senate Chair from UAB.

Some senators emailed me reminding me about the discussions last spring of a possible smoking policy. I emailed the president and asked for a follow up about this. President Altenkirch did do a survey of policies at in-state schools. Last semester, there was not really a strong feeling about this in the Senate. The current trend is a smoke-free campus. Within the area, we have two neighbor institutions who are smoke-free: Calhoun has been since 2010, and A&M is also smoke-free.
- o Tim Newman: Is smoking defined? Does smoking include electronic cigarettes? Do these other places specify that they are e-cig free?
Kader Frendi is not sure.
- o Tim Newman: Are we considering smoke-free or tobacco-free?
- o Eric Seemann: A&M is smoke-free only and that includes electronic cigarettes. They do not regulate chewing tobacco, etc. Troy is all tobacco-free. Athens is smoke-free and they include e-cigs, too.
- o Kader Frendi: We have a policy coming next week for a smoke-free campus. President Altenkirch is drafting a cover letter, and then it will be sent to the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and SGA.

Tim Newman has a fundamental issue with this policy and with the Policy on Policies. He thinks we need to revisit the Policy on Policies. He thinks if we have a policy on

smoking, then the students need to be involved in that, as well as the faculty. There are policies being put out these days that are too administration-generated. He welcomes this policy, but he also thinks that there are a lot of smokers on this campus and we need to think about their concerns and interests before we put forward a policy. Tim Newman wonders what the students at these universities said after the policy was implemented.

Ramon Cerro said that this is something done in many industries and companies; there are weather-protected, designated places/shelters for smokers, though.
- o Eric Seemann: Smokers are already used to not being able to smoke in most places, so I think they would be able to hold it together until they get to where they can smoke. Shelters were implemented at the arsenal, but people did not use them. It is not effective.
- o Ramon Cerro: At places where I have been, the shelters are useful.
Eric Seemann said it is a discipline issue. Joseph Taylor asked who enforces the rules if we do have shelters. There was a discussion on the discipline issue of a smoke-free policy like this and/or with shelters. Eric Seemann said the students know there is no enforcement. All you can do is ask them to follow the rules. He said he has had issues with people who smoke too close to the building—he asks them to move, but they do not listen to him.

Kader Frendi: Tim's point is that there is a 30-day review. President Altenkirch said we can always ask for an extension.
- o Ramon Cerro: We have 30 days but the administration has all the time in the world. And we have policies to be reviewed by the administration, but they have not been approved yet.
- o Kader Frendi: It is a flexible boundary
- o Wai Mok: The Lecturer Ladder Policy still has not been approved.
- o Michael Banish: We have had responses to it.
- o Joseph Taylor: The policies are currently being sent to SGA, Staff, and Faculty Senate. Do you [Tim Newman] want a town hall type of meeting for them?
- o Tim Newman: Not necessarily. I would like input at the beginning instead of at the end. Our Handbook Chapter 7 lays out titles, so why do we now need a policy to do so? Do we still have shared governance? I see the Policy on Policies as being an end-run around the handbook. I am interested to hear SGA's input.

Ramon Cerro: Who are the councils? They approve everything and are crucial to every policy. But some members of these councils are not even on the university.
- o Michael Banish: A concern of mine is that we have had a lack of proactive faculty, staff, and students for a lot of stuff. So these issues become dependent on us. My understanding between the Faculty Handbook and the policies is this: we can make a change to the handbook, which has to go all the way up to the Board of Trustees, and some will not get approved up there. But with a policy, it only goes to the administration here at the university. "That which is not prohibited is allowed"; we can use this to our advantage.

There was a discussion on the handbook versus policies. There was also discussion on the Parental Leave Policy.
- o Kader Frendi: We need to have a bills website similar to the policy website.

Ramon Cerro: More and more we are employees of the university instead of part of the university. There was not a single signature from an academic person on the signature page of the Policy on Policies.

- o Kader Frendi: There was so much discussion on the Policy on Policies last year that we finally just accepted the August version. We tried very hard to include the Faculty Senate President, or simply someone from the Faculty Senate, on the council, but it did not fly.
- o Wai Mok: President Altenkirch added one more step at the bottom of the policy that included the Faculty Senate with SGA and Staff Senate, and the Faculty Senate was not happy with that.

Kader Frendi emailed Provost Curtis about the climate survey from last year. She said there was not much interest from the committee and the Faculty Senate last year. So, do we want to revisit that?

- o Wai Mok: Some wanted to do it again last year, but I have not heard from them since.
- o Kader Frendi: Provost Curtis is open to it if we want to do it again.
- o Eric Seemann: It is a good idea when there are certain issues. The issues being raised in this meeting can be specifically put into the survey.
- o Ramon Cerro: We are the ones doing the survey.
- o Joseph Taylor: The survey is good for junior faculty, too, because it is not as easy for junior faculty to raise issues within.
- o Kader Frendi: Last year the idea was to go with an outside firm to ensure the quality of the data.

Everyone was in agreement that this is a good idea. Faculty and Student Development Committee and Governance and Operations will work on it.

This year the Vice President of Research cancelled IIDR. If we have a budget problem, why take it to $0 funding directly instead of just lowering it? We had $365,000 last year.

- o Tim Newman: Who is our representative on the research council where this is discussed?
- o Eric Seemann: The cancellation has a real world impact because of this. That funding greatly helped the Psychology Department.

❖ President-Elect Michael Banish

Michael Banish is concerned with the budget issues. He does not understand why we are cutting programs like this when our enrollment is greatly improved and hit a record this year. He would like to know what are our average class sizes really are. He is interested in this issue.

Are there any Committee reports on the **Online Distance Education Policy**?

- o Eric Seemann: Our main concerns are: How this is adjudicated in terms of faculty load? Does it count as a regular class? Do you get paid extra? My suggestion for these questions is that we look at other institutions' policies, such as West Alabama.
- o Tim Newman: One query/concern that I get from a lot of my colleagues is what happens to their materials when the term is over (in regards to intellectual property)?
- o Michael Banish: This policy protects that—it says that the materials belong to the faculty member and the university cannot use it without permission. These policies are more a sense of admission than a sense of intention.

Communicable Diseases Policy
No reports.
- o Tim Newman: Because of our time-limit, it becomes incumbent for the Faculty Senate President to keep a close on the many situations that occur. We can't let any of these policies fall through the cracks.

Substantive Change Policy
Ramon Cerro: This looks like a mild policy. It has some problems, such as changing the clock hours to credit hours.
- o Joseph Taylor: That bit is taken directly from the SACSCOC site. It looks like they're just cutting and pasting some things.
- o Ramon Cerro: As long as it is reporting, there is not a problem. The problem is that at the end of this policy, there is a procedure for making substantive changes. That procedure involves closing a department and closing a program. If this is a policy for reporting, then it should be a policy for reporting. We propose two changes: (1) to remove any indication that the faculty, staff, and students will be told, because they were already participating in it; (2) to take out the entire section regarding a procedure for substantive changes. This is not a policy to make changes; it is a policy to report changes to the higher administration.

Michael Banish asked Ramon Cerro to send those changes to him.
- o Joseph Taylor: One of my issues with it is that it is vague. Also, a related question, in the handbook, there was some issue with the removal of the AAUP Guidelines. They have been totally removed from the revised handbook, chapter 4, section 4. Will we talk about this? We did not get to it last year.
- o Michael Banish: The reporting and approval should be separated. There should be two policies here. I will take those comments.

New policies (17):
Extension of the Tenure Clock
Tim Newman: This needs to be in Chapter 7 of the handbook. I want to formally object to this policy. It should not be put forward in this form. If they want this, the procedure for this is a bill coming to the Faculty Senate. Anyone can submit a bill to Faculty Senate.
- o Michael Banish: I will send this policy to our Parliamentarian, then, so that you can submit a response. It also needs to go to the Personnel Committee and to the Faculty and Student Development Committee.

Modified Duties for Faculty
This one is definitely a policy. We need to look at some of this stuff as it needs to be a policy and also included in the handbook. Or the possibility of it passing handbook procedure versus policy procedure. Tim Newman, Personnel Committee, and Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee will receive the Modified Duties for Faculty Policy to review. Wai Mok asked if this was the response from Provost Curtis on the Faculty Senate's Parental Leave Bill that Rich Miller submitted. Joseph Taylor noted that this includes the language from the new handbook.
- o Tim Newman: The administration gives the Faculty Senate an answer on bills—yes or no. They do not formulate a policy from them.

Emeritus Faculty Privileges
This policy will go to the Parliamentarian, Faculty and Student Development Committee, and Personnel Comm. Michael Banish wants this one to include senior faculty that maybe are not emeritus.
- o Joseph Taylor: The handbook says if a faculty member is retiring and served at least ten years, they are automatically granted emeritus status.

Faculty Separation
This policy goes to Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs, Faculty and Student Development Committee, Governance and Operations Committee, and Personnel Committee.
- o Ramon Cerro: If this is a termination policy, then we are in real trouble because we are talking about dismissal of tenure.
- o Michael Banish: This only concerns what happens to your stuff (i.e., emails, etc.)
- o Ramon Cerro: There should not be a policy about how to terminate people.
- o Eric Seemann: I think we need to change the name of this one.

CEU Reporting Policy
Goes to Governance and Operations Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and Finance and Resources Committee.

OIT Policies
Go to the entire Department of Computer Science (Tim Newman will circulate among the faculty), Governance and Operations, and Finance and Resources.

Tim Newman **motions** to suspend the rules and extend the meeting. Eric Seemann seconds. Ayes across the room.
*Motion to extend the meeting **passes***

Any IT policies concerning email privacy goes to the Personnel Committee.
- o Michael Banish: I think students and faculty should keep their UAH email forever, instead of moving to alumni email. It is a financial advantage to us.

➢ Committee Reports
❖ Ad-Hoc Committee (Handbook) Chair, Tim Newman
Our handbook committee has met. We are currently focused mostly on the issue of chair appointment and retention. We hope to have a report on that issue soon. This issue is covered in Appendices A and B.

❖ Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
We met. We will look at these policies in the next meeting. I will also talk to the committee about some information in the Appendices. We are also looking at the budget issues in terms of where it goes and who decides where it goes. The department level does not have any say-so but that is where the real work occurs.

❖ Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
(Report from Eric Fong via Kader Frendi) Received ten course reviews; approved seven of them; currently reviewing the other three.

- ❖ Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
  RCEU proposals for faculty went out. We only have two right now. Those are due October 15. We want to make offers in January (before other community proposals go out) so we can get more undergraduate participation. Our committee asked Ray Pinner to present the new budget in one of our committee meetings. I have not heard back from him yet. We want him to present by the end of October. We usually go through the budget report and review that information.
  - o Kader Frendi: I plan to invite Ray Pinner to a full Senate meeting to present, too.

- ❖ Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, Eric Seemann
  We received one petition for readmission. We are reviewing it. We will probably see a bunch of these in November. We are reviewing policies as well.

  Kader Frendi will ask during the full Senate for a volunteer on the Charger Green Recycling Committee.

- ➢ Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting #560 September 24, 2015
  After administration reports, need to add Senate Officer and Chair reports. Tim Newman **moves** to accept the Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting #560. Michael Banish seconds the motion. Ayes across the room.
  *Motion **passes***

Eric Seemann **motions to adjourn**. Ramon Cerro seconds.
Meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm