

FACULTY SENATE

MEETING #556 AGENDA

THURSDAY, February 12, 2015

12:45 PM to 2:15 PM

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 114

Call to Order

- 1. Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #555 Minutes from January 29, 2015**
- 2. Accept February 5, 2015 FSEC Report**
- 3. Administration Reports**
- 4. Guest Speaker: Al Wilhite, QEP Committee**
- 5. Committee Reports**
- 6. Any additional business**

Adjourn

Proxies for Senate meetings must be a Senate-eligible individual from the same academic unit. No individual may carry more than one proxy.

PLEASE SEND PROXIES TO KALA BURSON: facsen@uah.edu

FACULTY SENATE MEETING #555

January 29, 2015

12:45 P.M. in BAB 114

Present: *Wai Mok, Charles Hickman, Tim Landry, Eric Fong, Jill Johnson, Pavica Sheldon, Joe Taylor, Linda Maier, Carolyn Sanders, Nick Jones, Anne Marie Choup, Eric Seemann, Michael Banish, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Ellise Adams, Kristen Herrin, Azita Amiri, Monica Beck, Cheryl Emich, Luciano Matzkin, Debra Moriarity, Jeff Weimer, Peter Slater, Grant Zhang, Lingze Duan, Seyed Sadeghi*

Absent with proxy: *Jack Schnell, Richard Fork, Ken Zuo, Marlena Primeau, John Shriver, Letha Etzkorn, Nikolai Pogorelov*

Absent without proxy: *Xiaotong Li, Derrick Smith, Joe Conway, John Kvach, Kyle Knight, Ying-Cheng Lin, Earl Wells, Junpeng Guo, Lenora Smith, Larry Carey, Udaysankar Nair*

Guests: *President Altenkirch and Provost Curtis*

➤ Faculty Senate President Wai Mok called the meeting to order at 12:48 pm.

➤ Kader Frendi **motions to suspend the rules**. Eric Seemann seconds.

➤ Administration Reports

❖ President Altenkirch

Smoking Policy

We recently changed the policy to prohibit e-cigarettes in buildings. We added another detail to prohibit the water pipes, as well. I now have a question for the Senate: should we pursue a tobacco-free campus? Tuscaloosa put theirs in place January 1st. A&M put theirs in place a year ago. Auburn is recently smoke-free. UAB's policy is a bit vague, as it says you can't smoke in buildings, facilities, or spaces—and I'm not sure exactly what "spaces" are.

- Anne Marie Choup: Can we take advantage of these institutions' policies to find out how their experiences have been?
- President Altenkirch: UAB's policy has been in effect for a decade and A&M has been over a year, so there might be information they could share with us. Tuscaloosa's "governing bodies" endorse this.
- Senator from the floor: Because smokers can't smoke on campus, they might be gone longer than usual from their job. That's my past experience with it.
- Kader Frendi: If you go to any building, the entrance area is always full of smoke because the current policy isn't doing what it's supposed to be doing. From that point of view, what we have now isn't functional.
- President Altenkirch: Since our sister institutions are going for it, we will take a look at it.

- Peter Slater: I oppose the prohibitionist mentality of seeking to ban individuals' behavior because we think or know their actions are harmful to them. We should protect non-smokers while leaving the smokers responsible for their own actions.
- Carolyn Sanders: I agree with Kader, what we are attempting to do now is to respect smokers, and at the same time provide a smoke-free environment for non-smokers. We should be role models for these students. I know this is a touchy subject.
- Deb Moriarity: In terms of us having the right to tell people what to do, this is a university campus—so to an extent we can. We say no guns, no drugs, etc. Smoking is damaging to the health of other people, and to their own health. Lots of workplaces have gone smoke-free.
- President Altenkirch: I'll have HR survey these institutions and give it to Wai and the FSEC.
- Nick Jones: I would favor a smoke tolerant campus, with designated gazebos for smoking or something.

ID Badges

We are doing some background work on this.

4-day Workweek in the Summer

Friday won't be a workday. The first Friday this will start would be May 29, the last Friday would be July 31. That's 10 weeks. We would save \$150,000 to \$200,000 in energy costs, not even factoring in maintenance, over those 10 weeks. Four 10-hour days including lunch, comes out to 37 hours of work in one week. Workday moves from 8:15am-5:00pm to 7:15-5:15, with requirement that everyone be here 9-4. Start and stop times would be worked out within the unit. The staff unanimously would like to pursue this. My recommendation is that we try it as a pilot and see what the pitfalls are. If it doesn't work, then we say we tried it and it didn't work.

- Jill Johnson: Are our custodial staff hourly? Will it affect their rate?
- President Altenkirch: No, it won't.
- Senator from the floor: During the summer, on Fridays, will campus be closed? What about the labs?
- President Altenkirch: If you need a lab to be opened on a Friday, you call facilities and ask them to open it on that particular Friday, or if it needs to stay on the whole time for temperature-control, just let them know.
- Peter Slater: There are a good number of faculty members who will be here every Friday, so the offices will need to be on.
- President Altenkirch: Not a problem, as long as you are really here.
- Joseph Taylor: On July 2, there will be no classes, correct? To observe the holiday.
- President Altenkirch: Correct.

Some buildings will need to be left on, like Kramer Hall.

- Charles Hickman: We've been calling students as part of admissions. So far, 6 out of 20 have said to play Lacrosse is why they are coming here.

Peter Slater: Have you checked on handicap spaces?

- President Altenkirch: Yes. We did a survey of how many there are. We are equal to or more than the requirements. The parking folks are watching it and if it becomes a problem, we will add some more.

❖ Provost Curtis

SACSCOC

We have received a number of reports on SACSCOC. We will be getting back to you. We engaged an expert as a reader/editor/coach/guide. He's chaired various committees. Dr. Ed Rugg. He is now retired and serves as a consultant.

BOT Meeting

There is a Board of Trustees meeting in Birmingham next Thursday and Friday. We have put 2 proposals before them.

Master of Arts in Teaching

Master of Arts in Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education—focused on birth to 3rd grade. 121 hours, linked with RISE School and special needs children there.

Bachelor of Arts in Writing—coming out of English and Communication Arts (interdisciplinary degree).

Faculty Awards

Faculty Awards are coming out shortly. There is a University Teaching award and a University Research award and Research award, which are coming out of Research Centers. The Reception and Awards ceremony will be in April instead of at graduation. There is a broader based committee. Wai will ask for suggestions for a name out of Faculty Senate to sit on this committee.

Assessment Committee

Mary Herrington is coming next week for training for the assessment committee. Suzie suggests getting data via surveys.

Departmental Meetings

I will be going out to all departments this spring. I have scheduled two meetings already: one in Biology and one in History for this Friday. One of the issues to address is the retention of our students.

Academic Leadership Workshop

We had an Academic Leadership Workshop earlier this week. The first day was QEP, which Al Willhite chairs. I would like for Faculty Senate to issue an invitation to him to come speak at a Faculty Senate meeting. The Student Success Collaborative presented on the second day. We are working with them and they are working with the advisors and deans and department chairs.

Presentation

Why are student learning and retention important to UAH?

Our Strategic Plan clearly states we are going to recruit and retain an outstanding and diverse student body.

Our goal is to increase enrollment to 10,000 by 2020. That is 75% undergraduate and 25% graduate. There are 2 ways to do this: recruitment and retention.

The growth rate of new high school graduates going to college has been cut by more than half.

The recruitment of new students requires a lot of effort. Out of 8 applications, we get 6 admissions, which turns in to 2 new freshmen who enroll, who end up with a 46% graduation rate. We have to increase retention.

45% of our students came in as first-time full-time students. 34% of them came in as new transfers. Hanover stated that the number of transfer students is predicted to go down. So we are focusing on the transfers in our recruiting efforts. We are putting together articulation agreements, reverse articulation agreements, and pathways. We are working all angles.

We have a moral obligation to retain students. Our core values are integrity and respect. We admitted these students, so by our standards we have told them that they can succeed.

We have to meet our programmatic and faculty needs, but we only have so much revenue. This revenue comes mainly from tuition and fees. We are tuition and fees driven, so we need the students to increase our ability to teach.

There needs to be focus on learning in the classroom (Vincent Tinto). The classroom is where the action occurs. Faculty is responsible for setting high expectations, giving feedback, receiving support, encouraging students to engage, and teaching. But it's a dual responsibility. The student has to respond. The student is responsible for learning, reading the material and preparing for class, expending effort and spending time required to learn, and engaging in learning activities. The maturity level of students varies. This is a very important topic. Hopefully in our department-level discussions, we will be able to come up with ideas and share those ideas so that we can make an impact on our students.

Jill Johnson: The trouble with tracking a student is that they can't declare a major until they have a certain amount of hours in the college. So the most vulnerable student is the freshmen.

- Provost Curtis: So they don't declare their major in Art or in Psychology until after they have their hours?
- Eric Seemann: Right. We have sophomore students come to us planning out their schedule before they've even declared because they can't because they don't have the hours.
- Provost Curtis: Let me check into that.

Deb Moriarity said it is not that way for Science—students can declare whenever they want to in Science. Carolyn Sanders said students can declare when they want to in Music, as well.

Michael Banish: Many times faculty don't have a clear path to solve a problem with a student. People are busy. Either we are the first line or we aren't.

- Provost Curtis: What kind of assistance do you need?
- Michael Banish: Various issues, from having the authority to have printers fixed so students can print off homework to issues with Charger cards; specific things that don't send a good message to our students. We don't seem like a student-friendly campus with some of the problems.

One senator from the floor suggested that a junior faculty training program be established and implemented so that there's some consistency to the teaching in the classroom. He also suggested having mentors for the students to make them feel cared about, to give them a contact point—other than just an advisor to help them choose courses.

- Wai Mok: We had a proposal several years ago on Faculty Excellence. I'll check on that.

➤ Officer Reports
None

➤ Committee Reports

❖ Governance and Operations Chair, James Swain

We stand ready to assist the departments with elections for new senators.

❖ Finance and Resources Chair, Charles Hickman

RCEU student proposals are due on Sunday. Once we have reviewed them, the faculty/researcher will be notified to select the student. The provost gave us enough funding for 2 more students. The Alabama Space Grant gave us enough funding for 2 more students, as well. The RFO for the Distinguished Speaker Series should go out soon, as well.

❖ Undergraduate Student Affairs Chair, Eric Seemann

Going through Readmission Petition reviews.

❖ Undergraduate Curriculum Co-Chair, Deb Moriarity

We are still getting course approvals. We are trying to turn them around quickly to get them into the new catalogue.

➤ Approval of Faculty Senate Meeting #554 minutes.

Charles Hickman **motions to approve Faculty Senate Meeting 554 minutes**. Eric Seemann seconds. Ayes carry the motion

*Motion to approve Faculty Senate Meeting #554 minutes **passes***

➤ Acceptance of the December 18, 2014 and the January 15, 2015 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Reports.

Accepted.

➤ Additional Business

❖ Straw Polls

4-Day Workweek

In favor: 28

Opposed: 2

Abstentions: 2

ID Badges

In favor: 0

Opposed: 15

Abstentions: 13

- Anne Marie Choup suggested that perhaps we compromise with nametags.

➤ Kader Frendi **motions** to adjourn. Michael Banish seconds.

Faculty Senate Meeting #555 adjourned
January 29, 2015 at 1:55 P.M.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 5, 2015
12:45 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: Wai Mok, Kader Frendi, Azita Amiri, Debra Moriarity, Charles Hickman, James Swain, Michael Banish, Linda Maier

Guests: Richard Lieu and Dean Sundar Christopher

Provost Curtis and President Altenkirch were not present.

- Faculty Senate President Wai Mok called the meeting to order at 12:50 pm
- Special Report
Two guest speakers, Richard Lieu and Sundar Christopher, are present to inform FSEC of certain issues related to an incident happening in the Physics Department. Each gets 20 minutes or so to discuss this issue, without the other present in the room. This is not a part of the grievance process. A bill was put forth by the Physics senators. This bill brings out an issue related to the faculty at large.

- ❖ Richard Lieu
Richard Lieu thinks this ought to concern everyone, although he wishes it was under different circumstances. It mainly concerns Physics. On January 21st, he was summoned to a meeting by Dr. Christopher, Dean of Science. Brent Wren was also there. During that meeting he was given a letter of dismissal as chair of the Physics Department on ineffective leadership of the department. Sundar left the meeting, leaving Brent to talk to Lieu. Brent said they were appealing to Chapter 6.1 of the Faculty Handbook, which states "...final authority for the selection and retention of associate deans, assistant deans, and departmental chairs rests with the academic deans, with the concurrence of the provost."

Two parts of the Handbook are not in harmony. Appendix B says something else, under the *Reassignment of a Department Chair* section: "In unusual circumstances a dean may, on his or her own initiative or at the request of the majority of the eligible departmental faculty, initiate an early review of a chair...a dean may remove a chair with the concurrence of a majority of the eligible departmental faculty and the provost." Our senators are seeking clarification.

Richard Lieu: I wasn't hired by this dean, but by the previous dean, Jack Fix. I served one full academic year under him. I came to office under a time of transition during which half of our department members went off to start a new department, Space Science, under Gary Zank. The department I chaired leads a diverse role. A lot of progress was made under Jack Fix. Positions were approved by President Altenkirch at the time. When the new dean, Christopher, came to office, it happened at the same time that I had some arguments with the administration over some courses in the department of Space Science/Physics. Jack Fix was able to smooth things over well. I think certain things here are due to personality issues.

By mid-September I was told to resign or face removal. I consulted my department, and a good majority of them wanted me to stay.

I informed the dean in mid-September of last year that I didn't want to resign. A memo dated September 19th from the dean states that he would initiate an early review to remove me. He made it clear that he would follow a process that is in exact alignment with Appendix B of the Handbook. He would conduct a survey of faculty members, etc. There was no mention of Chapter 6.1. This was the dean's own admission of the process. The department fulfilled the first half of this—they completed the survey and met the deadline of October 1.

Richard Lieu showed an example of the survey form. At the end, there is an Overall Evaluation, which states, "I want the chair to be removed" with a "Yes" or "No" answer.

Richard Lieu: The dean was asked in multiple meetings for the vote count. The dean, however, never disclosed anything. We still don't know anything. Although in one meeting, he finally stated that he did not have enough votes.

- Charles Hickman: He was asked if he had enough votes, and he said he did not.
- Richard Lieu: Correct. He said he didn't, after the 5th time he was asked.

On January 21st I received a letter of removal. There is no mention of concurrence with the majority. It cited ineffectiveness of leading the faculty, but the survey form had a huge section on leadership. However, since the survey results were never released, I don't know where this is coming from.

Between September 15th and January 21st, I went through a painful period, in which 3 positions that President Altenkirch approved were frozen for no robust reason. There were plenty of reasons given to me, though. We already made an offer on the Junior Lectureship position, which Dean Christopher had signed, but for some reason he terminated the position because she didn't get her visa on time. The university petitioned her visa very late, 2 weeks before the start of her job, which is unreasonable. So all of a sudden we were not allowed to hire 3 positions, and for no reason. It seems they make life sufficiently impossible for me, so that I would resign. But since I didn't, I was removed.

There appears to be disharmony between Chapter 6.1 of the Handbook and Appendices A and B. In the specific instance of the recent removal of the Chair of Physics by Dean of Science, a memo was written by the dean, who committed himself to follow Appendix B, with no mention of other parts. The failure of the College of Science Dean to follow the process resulted in the wrongful removal of the Physics Chair. Results of the survey should be published. The Physics Chair should be reinstated and compensated for defamation.

Richard Lieu states the Physics Department has achieved many things while he has been chair, among them: donations have doubled and a Distinguished Professor was awarded.

- Charles Hickman: Have you initiated a grievance?
- Richard Lieu: No.

- Charles Hickman: There is a grievance procedure. If Dr. Wren was there, we have to assume that the provost and president signed off on this. They will need to accept

any bill that we pass. So what do you expect us to accomplish if this is rejected? We don't have any power after that.

- Richard Lieu: I don't expect you to do any more than that. I would just ask you to be pragmatic. I would like your support on this. I would like the administration to know that even if they turn us down, the faculty has sounded and reported the Senate's thoughts.

- Michael Banish: For the bill you've put forth, what was the vote in Physics?
- Richard Lieu: A majority vote. 5 and possibly 6 supported it. One did not attend the meeting, but emailed that he would support the decision of the majority. This bill has the majority.
- Michael Banish: How many faculty members are there in Physics?
- Richard Lieu: Including me, there are 9 eligible voters.
- Wai Mok: I suggest that is on the bill.

❖ Sundar Christopher

The rationale for Appendix B and the decision was made by the provost. I started as the Dean of College of Science in June of last year. There were several instances where Dr. Lieu mentioned extreme pressures of the job. At one point he sent an email stating his intention to resign. So there was confusion about his job and what he intends to do. I initiated a review of the chair at that time. The review was done in a blindfolded manner. The Office of Institutional Research handled the survey. A survey instrument was constructed and provided to faculty members. The provost and I received the comments and the results of the survey. The comments were not consistent with the individual markings. There were comments concerning ineffectiveness. The results were inconsistent, though, so I talked individually with the faculty members. The removal of Dr. Lieu, while it is connected to the survey, is also an administrative decision. On January 21, 2015, in concurrence with Dr. Curtis, I sent a letter to Dr. Lieu informing him of his removal from chair. This decision was not made lightly. There were performance issues—not with just his leadership in the department but also in his management of the department.

- Charles Hickman: Do you believe that you have the concurrence of the majority of the eligible faculty?
- Sundar Christopher: When the survey was done, the majority of faculty indicated that they wanted to retain the current chair, with a vote 5 to 2.
- Charles Hickman: You thought the comments were inconsistent, though.
- Sundar Christopher: Yes.

- Charles Hickman: There is an inconsistency in Appendix B and Chapter 6.1.
- Sundar Christopher: There is concurrence in Chapter 6.1 and faculty participation; it is a decision of the dean and the provost. It is an administrative affair.
- Charles Hickman: The question that I have is that if there is this inconsistency, do you feel you've complied with both? Do you feel you have the compliance of the faculty to remove Dr. Lieu?
- Sundar Christopher: We are recognizing that Chapter 6.1's language is different than Appendix B. Chapter 6.1 provides the dean and the provost with the authority to remove a chair. I don't understand your question.
- Deb Moriarity: Do you feel like the faculty supports your decision to remove Dr. Lieu?

- Sundar Christopher: I'll go back to the survey. 5 out of 7 wanted to retain Dr. Lieu. When the comments came, though, they came in bulk, so I had no way of knowing who provided which comments.
- Charles Hickman: In talking with the faculty, do you have their support?
- Sundar Christopher: No. They wanted to retain him.
- Kader Frendi: After talking with the faculty, did it seem that the comments you read on paper were mainly attributable to the 2 who wanted him to be removed? Since after you talked to the faculty members, the majority was still supportive? So is it fair to say that the comments that you read were all from the 2 who wanted him removed?
- Sundar Christopher: I had to be very careful when I talked one-on-one because I couldn't bring up what was said in the form because I didn't know who said what—it's a violation of confidentiality.

- Deb Moriarity: When you started the process with the survey, it looks like you were following the process outlined in Appendix B. Between Chapter 6.1 and Appendix B there is the weirdness of final authority rests with the dean and the provost, but the discrepancy is what action rests. There is a process we've outlined here. You did start to follow that, and there's some concern about the timing, and about you not informing them of the results when the memo says that they would find out.
- Sundar Christopher: There was the assumption that this would be a clear-cut case. But since there were inconsistencies, I had to think about what to do next. Since it was towards the end of the semester, there were more pressing matters, and also not every faculty member wanted to come and speak. In my one-on-one meeting with the chair, I was told that a faculty member who previously told me they didn't want to talk was now willing and I got an email days or weeks later stating they now wanted to talk.

- Deb Moriarity: In your discussion with Christine about this, do you think her interpretation is that Chapter 6.1 simply says: you're the dean so you make the final decision since the final authority lies with you? The decision can be made separately from Appendix B.
- Sundar Christopher: There was a lot of discussion between Christine and me, and the Office of Counsel. This is very important, but it was a decision made by me as a dean based on Chapter 6.1. There's only so much you can say in a letter. There were a lot of discussions that happened behind this. Performance is a major issue. Chairs are the heart of a department. When it begins to affect the productivity of students and the morale of faculty, when the proper chain of command isn't followed, it creates conflicting pieces of information and voices on an issue. Situations just don't work out if you don't go through simple processes.

- Michael Banish: As far as the survey, could you tie binary answers in?
- Sundar Christopher: The surveys were inconsistent with binary, as well. They would mark "I don't want to answer this" but at the end they would mark "I want to keep the chair."

- Deb Moriarity: We are trying to look at the Handbook issues of Chapter 6.1 and Appendix B. The way they're interpreted or written. So this isn't a grievance process

or anything, but we are trying to figure out if they're really at odds or inconsistency. So we need to know the process by which these were used.

➤ Discussion of Special Report and bill submitted by Physics Department

Wai Mok: I was called to the provost's office yesterday. I went through the procedures with her about the bill. No matter what, I think anything we do will be rejected. I think the process will be this for this situation: a bill through Senate, a personal grievance, hearing, which will possibly lead to the hiring of an outside lawyer. I think she understood that.

Deb Moriarity: As a chair in the College of Science, I will say that Richard tried very hard to be chair and he really wanted to do a good job, but I think some of the issue between Space Science and Physics kept getting in the way. When Sundar came in as dean, he inherited that mess. He tried to find an honorable solution. He tried to do what was best for the department and Richard. Richard was willing to step down, but some of the faculty members talked him out of it, so Sundar was forced to go another route. He didn't know if some faculty were being intimidated to vote to retain Lieu; that's why he met with them individually. There was a student matter that went all the way to the president, and some other issues. That's why this happened.

Michael Banish: One of the things about Chapter 6.1, reading it as a separate paragraph, the reappointment or removal, is systematically obtained and considered. We might want to read into there that the majority rules or something, but it doesn't say that. If they talked to people and did a survey, okay. But it doesn't say that majority matters.

Charles Hickman: I talked to Tim Newman. It would be clearer if the appendices were incorporated into the Handbook in some specific way, and I looked at the rules of the BOT. Tim told me that it depends on the Chancellor and BOT if the appendices are incorporated into the Handbook. However, there is a way of reading them both together, consistently. Faculty decides how to do that.

Kader Frendi: Most of the votes in general are non-binding because the dean can overturn them. Christine called us into her office back in the fall and asked us about Chapter 6.1, and we (Wai and me) told her that the chair works at the discretion of the dean, who works at the discretion of the provost.

Deb Moriarity: The word here that causes issue is "may."

Charles Hickman: I looked at this and the rules of the BOT this morning, and the Handbook isn't a contract, they're just guidelines, but if someone proposes a bill then I think we need to follow our own process, but this is something I think we don't want to get involved in. I think he needs to go through the grievance process.

Wai Mok: The Handbook is currently on her desk. She told me that she recognizes there is an issue between Chapter 6.1 and Appendix B, so sooner or later this will come back to us. So whether or not we should address it now or later is up to y'all.

Charles Hickman: Should the Senate be involved in personnel issues, and only if there is some overriding principle of importance?

Deb Moriarity: The real question is if we think Appendix B should be interpreted a certain way which mandates Chapter 6.1. I don't see an Appendix mandating the body. I don't think it should be taken up right now. I don't see that it's someone in total violation. In the College of Science, we've never operated under the faculty members voting in a chair—you vote in your preference, which the dean takes into consideration.

Charles Hickman: The administration has taken a position, so the question is whether it's worth the Faculty Senate trying to convince them to change that position—that position being them following Chapter 6.1 and not Appendix B.

- Deb Moriarity: I find it acceptable; it's not an uncommon situation. Many times, the provost comes in and changes all the deans, who changes all the chairs. It's their job to manage how they see it working best.
- Kader Frendi: I think the administration was trying to work it out between September and January.
- Charles Hickman: It was made clear in our College that it's the dean's decision who is chair. Is it worth it for the Faculty Senate trying to convince the administration to change their position?
- Michael Banish: Chapter 6.1 says, "the advice of the faculty be actively and systematically sought." It doesn't say by majority. We are being asked to follow Appendix A and B and not Chapter 6.1. We are fighting over "may" in Appendix B, but what does this really mean.
- Charles Hickman: I take a more pragmatic view that we won't accomplish anything substantive since it's already been decided by the administration. We need to take a look at what fights are worth fighting. Is this one? There's an ambiguity, and we can hang our hats on it, which isn't exactly an honest way to handle.
- James Swain: Was this a bill to direct administration to follow their own rules? It struck me as not a very useful thing.
- Deb Moriarity: The general expectation is to be replaced when a new dean comes in.
- Kader Frendi: I don't think this is worth it.

Deb Moriarity: I don't think it's such an egregious breach of faith. If he wants to file an individual grievance, he has the right to do that.

Linda Maier: My feeling is that the dean tried to follow procedures to consult with the faculty. So he did make that good faith effort. I think there's ambiguity between the two sections, but the deans have the authority.

Azita Amiri: It seems to be progressing naturally, based on this discussion.

Deb Moriarity **motions to reject the bill**. Charles Hickman seconds.

Michael Banish called the question.

Ayes carry the motion.

Motion to reject the bill submitted by the Physics Department is **unanimously rejected** at the first reading.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20pm



MEMORANDUM

TO: All tenured, tenure track and research faculty in the Physics department

FROM: Sundar A. Christopher
Dean, College of Science

DATE: September 19, 2014

SUBJECT: ♣ Review process for reassigning chair

As we discussed in our meeting on 8 September, 2014 and based on faculty hand book guidelines, I am initiating an early review for the chair of the Physics department, Dr. Richard Lieu. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) will serve as the independent unit to receive the survey, process and tabulate the results for final review by the Dean and Provost.

The following process will be followed:

1. Faculty will be emailed a survey on September 24, 2014.
2. The survey must be completed on or before October 1, 2014. Do not write your name or other identifying information on the survey.
3. Please print the survey and submit to Jason Smith at Office of Institutional Research, 363, Shelbie King Hall.
4. OIR will provide the results of the survey to the Dean of the College of Science no later than October 13, 2014.
5. The Dean will inform the faculty and chair of the survey results on or before October 17, 2014.
6. Reassignment will require an affirmative "vote" of a minimum of five faculty members and the concurrence of the Provost, as noted in current University's governing policy.

If you have any questions about the process, please contact me on or before September 23, 2014.

EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Date:

Administrator's Name: Dr. Richard Lieu

Department: Physics

The major goal of this survey is to assess the chair's performance as part of an early review process for possible reassignment. This survey will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Please mark a response to each item and enter comments where appropriate. This is an anonymous survey and therefore please do not include any identifying information. Please print this form and submit to Jason Smith at the Office of Institutional Research at Shelby King Hall, Room 363.

LEADERSHIP	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No basis to judge
Is an effective advocate for department					
Communicates effectively with faculty, staff and students					
Ensures appropriate balance of teaching, research and service					
Works with faculty to plan, review and implement the curriculum					
Displays integrity in decision making					
Upholds dept. bylaws and faculty handbook principles					
Remains active in teaching, service and research					
Is active in student recruitment					
Please enter comments on leadership:					

RESOURCE ALLOCATION and MANAGEMENT	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No basis to judge
Allocates resources consistently in a balanced manner across department					
Involves faculty in setting budget priorities					
Supports and mentors faculty in generating external funding					
Is effective in managing facilities and equipment					

Please enter comments on resource allocation and management:

PERSONNEL ISSUES	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No basis to judge
Conducts timely and focused review of faculty					
Fosters positive morale in the department					
Is active in promoting professional development of faculty					
Addresses conflicts fairly and professionally					
Treats others with fairness and respect					
Provides proper guidance to staff to effectively manage department					
Please enter comments on personnel issues:					

What are the department chair's strengths?

What are the department chair's weaknesses?

Is your department functioning efficiently?

OVERALL EVALUATION	Yes	No
I want the chair to be removed.		

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Richard Lieu, Chair, Department of Physics

FROM: Dr. Sundar Christopher, Dean, College of Science *Sundar. A. C.*

CC: Dr. Christine Curtis, Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs

DATE: January 21, 2015

SUBJECT: Removal from the Chair of Physics Position and Reassignment to your Faculty Position, Distinguished Professor of Physics

Effective today, January 21, 2015, with the concurrence of Provost Curtis, I am removing you from your position as chair of the Department of Physics. This action is taken because of your ineffectiveness in leading the faculty, staff, and students of the department and your inability to effectively manage departmental affairs.

As of today, you are reassigned to your position as Distinguished Professor of Physics with the normal duties and responsibilities that include teaching, research, and service in accordance with the guidelines set by the department and the College of Science. Also, effective today, you will be paid on a nine-month basis.

You will report to the Chair/Interim Chair of the Department of Physics. An interim chair will be named until a permanent chair can be selected.

discuss the preliminary results of the evaluation and to determine whether additional information should be sought. After the evaluation process is complete the dean communicates the results of the review to the departmental chair and to the provost. Normally, no later than one month following the completion of the review the dean will report to the departmental faculty concerning the general results of the evaluation. Personnel actions growing out of the evaluation must have the concurrence of the provost.

Reassignment of a Department Chair

In unusual circumstances a dean may, on his or her own initiative or at the request of the majority of the eligible departmental faculty, initiate an early review of a chair for possible reassignment. Those faculty eligible to participate formally in the request for an early review will be tenured faculty, tenure-earning faculty not under termination notice, clinical faculty, and research faculty, excluding administrators above the level of department chair. In such a case, the chair in question and the departmental faculty will be informed by the dean that the chair's performance is being reviewed for possible reassignment. In so far as possible, this review will follow the procedures set forth in the section on the "Review and Evaluation of a Department Chair." Based on the results of this early review, a dean may remove a chair with the concurrence of a majority of the eligible departmental faculty and the provost.

Appendix

B

Chapter 6

Shared Governance

The Board of Trustees entrusts university administrators, faculty, staff, and students with responsibilities for sharing in the governance of the university. The responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and university administrators are delineated elsewhere in this handbook.

6.1 Faculty Participation in Shared Governance

6.2 Faculty Senate

6.3 The Graduate Council

6.4 Staff Senate

6.5 Student Government Association

6.6 Boards, Councils and Committees

6.6.1 Boards, Councils and Committees Reporting through an Administrative Liaison

6.6.2 Ad Hoc Groups

6.1 Faculty Participation in Shared Governance

Academic excellence is essential to the successful performance of UAH's educational mission. Such excellence is achieved in an environment of mutual confidence, collegial participation, effective leadership, and strong academic programs. To foster this environment, it is university policy that the faculty have the opportunity to participate in the selection of deans and department chairs and that the advice of the faculty be actively and systematically sought.

Final authority over the selection and retention of deans rests with the president, and final authority for the selection and retention of associate deans, assistant deans, and departmental chairs rests with

the academic deans, with the concurrence of the provost.

Prior to the appointment of deans and chairs, the advice of the faculty is systematically obtained and considered.

Program direction, program quality, and the performance of deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and department chairs are evaluated periodically and an important consideration in these evaluations is the views of the faculty.

Faculty review of administrative performance and program effectiveness is accomplished by conducting formal program reviews at least at five-year intervals, with the faculty also participating in the regular, ongoing evaluation of administrative leadership, program direction, and program quality.

6.2 Faculty Senate

The structure of the Faculty Senate of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, as well as its relationship to other university bodies, is set forth in the governance system proposed on March 7, 1973, as adopted with amendments by the president of the university on April 3, 1973.

The authority of the Senate derives from the Office of the President of the university and exists as a feature of the bond of mutual trust that serves as the basis for the general system of governance for the faculty, student body, and administration.

Senators are the voice of the faculty. The Faculty Senate is the permanent body representing the faculty for the formulation of university policy and procedures in matters pertaining to institutional purpose, general academic considerations, curricular matters, university resources, and faculty personnel (appointments, promotion, and tenure). Normally, issues of university governance affecting the faculty at large should go before the full Faculty Senate before implementation. By-laws of the Faculty Senate are included in Appendix L.

6.3 The Graduate Council

The Graduate Council is an elected body representing the graduate faculty. The Council consists of the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (non-voting ex-officio chair), the Registrar (non-voting) and a number of Full members of the graduate faculty. The representation

Title: On the role of Handbook's Appendices A and B in regulating administrative disposition of Deans and Chairs

"WHEREAS Section 6.1 of the Faculty Handbook grants final authority over the selection and retention of Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs to the President, Provost, and Deans respectively,

WHEREAS Appendices A and B of the Faculty Handbook outlined the processes for the selection and retention of Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, and Chairs that involved the active participation and voting power of the faculty in decision making,

WHEREAS Section 6.1 was also written in the spirit of joint governance,

LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT the final authority of the President, Provost, and Deans over the selection and retention of Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs respectively is to be exercised in observance of the processes outlined in Appendices A and B."