Call to Order

1. Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #574 Minutes from December 15, 2016

2. Accept FSEC Report from January 12, 2017

3. Administrative Reports
   - Vice Chancellor Dr. Nash

4. Officer and Committee Reports

5. Miscellaneous/Additional business

Adjourn
FACULTY SENATE Executive Meeting  
January 12, 2017  
12:30 P.M. in CTC 103

Present: Monica Dillihunt, Kader Frendi, Carmen Scholz, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Ramon Cerro, Mike Banish, Tim Newman, James Swain

Absent: Earl Wells, Eric Seeman

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guests: President Bob Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:42 pm.
- Administrative Reports
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - We signed off on the class scheduling policy. We would like to get the second’s bachelor policy in place as soon as possible. Advisors are confused. This would make it much simpler. We are in a recruiting season.
    - We have a draft of the parking study. There are a few minor editorial changes that need to be made. It says that we have adequate parking. With enrollment at 10,000, we will still have adequate parking. Our problem is not spots, but utilization of spots. They recommend zone parking and a transit system. The bad news is it costs $400,000 a year to operate a transit system.
      - Joseph – What is involved in the $400K?
      - President – They recommend contracting it out.
    - The zoning and transit are pointed toward having people park one time. The problem isn’t adequate spots; it is people moving their vehicle throughout the day. I think the parking consultants are going to give an overview to the Vice President’s and police officers in a week or two.
      - Joseph – Could we partner with Huntsville? Their buses come through campus.
      - President – The problem will be timing.
      - Mike – Why can’t we have a shelter where the bus stops across from the police station? I think it would be nice to revisit that.
      - President – They are recommending implement the transit system and operate it for a year, based on that place shelters based on your patterns within that year.
      - Monica – What is the suggestion to zone parking?
      - President – They are recommending nine different decals.
      - Carmen – What happens if I have to change zones due to a meeting?
• President – Get on the bus.
• Joseph – Will it be zoned for faculty/staff, students, or zone 1, 2?
• Christine – Some campuses have gold decals that cost extra, but allows you to park anywhere.
• President – I had a sticker for my building, and also another sticker that would allow me to park in a couple lots colored the same for extra.
• Provost – There are other places that faculty can park in any faculty/staff lot.
• President – They are saying we have parking but not using it efficiently and utilize the transit system.
• Kader – Are we going to push residents to outside lots?
• President – Their recommendation is they will park near their residence hall and not move the vehicle.
• Kader – The problem with that is the parking garage will be full all the time.
• President – They are proposing that the parking garage be charger village parking. I think they colored SSB lot to no student parking.
• Monica – Is one proposed to start in the fall?
• President – They are proposing starting both at the same time.
• Carmen – I think you have to have both start at the same time.
• Monica – What are you saying, President?
• President – I am saying I have just read the report. I haven’t talked with them yet. Another suggestion was a gate, which is expensive. Another suggestion was parking meters, those cost money. Top level recommendations seem to be correct.
  o Provost Christine Curtis
    ▪ We have searches out for tenured faculty. We have one offer out as of this morning and we have been turned down by one. If you are involved in searches, push your people. Secondly, I met with Kader, Mike, Tim, and Carmen, last Thursday, to discuss the plan for the handbook. We have returned the lecturer and librarian policy to you for review. We have asked for a task force for online. Hopefully we will find people that are available at 8:00 in the morning. There are faculty amongst the campus that are involved with online learning that agreed to come. The overall summary of DFW, we anticipate an evaluation on our performance. If we don’t address these issues to make students successful and then come up with means to assist them, we won’t be able to show performance. We are trying to pinpoint what you need to do. Everyone will be involved not one course or instructor. How do we go about addressing it? How do we help them grasp the material? The faculty involved in those courses will be key in helping us address them. I think we have come a long way.
    • Christine – I wish we could collect data on who gets the DFW.
    • Provost – That is an issue that I have thought of. My daughter had a student that received an F thinking she had a W.
    • Monica – We have students say they don’t know they need to go in and withdraw.
    • Christine – Some do it for money.
    • Monica – They are starting now to make them pay it back.
Carmen – Some students are enrolled in classes and pay but flunks out. I had students that were paid through the Army. So they enroll due to that.

Provost – There are many things that we need to look at.

President – There was publications that came out that showed the general education courses and were rated. Our four year graduation rate for 2009 cohort rate was 18%.

Tim – It is low, but it’s more than twice than what it used to be. We are getting better.

Mike – I have heard in engineering, the big question is taking internships. We say you can’t take an internship and graduate in four years. We are told it is because we don’t have a written Co-Op plan and people say that is used against.

President – I am not sure about that. I can tell you that architecture is a five year program. That isn’t taking in to count they are folded in the six year graduation rate. There is a difference in having a four year plan laid out but fall in a six year graduation rate.

Provost – Upper division of nursing won’t be counted in the four year rate.

Monica – Same for education. Have you looked to see where most of the DFW’s are?

Provost – It is broken down by department.

Monica – Our students struggle with math across the board.

Provost – We have made significant strides in the math department in the last years. It isn’t where it needs to be but it is much improved.

Monica – In Alabama, you don’t need past algebra to graduate. If our elementary math teaches above that, they don’t have the skill level.

President – We have the highest ACT score in the state.

Monica – What are other colleges doing to help their students pass?

Tim – I think one factor is we have a larger mix of students than other universities. If a student is insufficient in math, it may not affect them as much as here.

President – GA Tech’s graduation rate is 40%. What you say is true? You have to be careful comparing, but regardless, we are too low.

Provost – We know Auburn and Alabama have engineering school.

Kader – Another thing is we get transfer students from Calhoun that is hit because they aren’t prepared. No matter what I do to help, the students fall.

President – They show up in DFW rate not graduation.

Provost – How do we help students coming as freshman versus transfers?

Kader – How do we help transfers?

Provost – We can do this. We need to break down enrollment in classes from transfers to freshman.

Mike – In chemical engineering, we have a three year program. We get a lot of push back that they need to graduate in two years. So they double up between their sophomore/junior years. We see a drastic DFW rate. We said they couldn’t take the class, but your office approved them to. You aren’t stopping them from taking certain classes at the same time. That is coming out of your office.
• Provost – That happens every year?
• Mike – Yes. It hasn’t been said verbally, but when there are overrides.
• Ramon – The problem is compounded at upper level division. If you put someone in the upper division class, if one student fails the whole team suffers. Last semester a student came to my 446 class, but didn’t have fluid mechanics. They had approval from the Provost Office to take it.
• Carmen – If one department says you need to have this prerequisite, another department doesn’t need to override it. It is not good practice to advise weak students to go to Calhoun. The advice to take organic at Calhoun is not good.
• Provost – We are trying to stop that practice. It also has to stop at the college level.
• Tim – We have the same issue. One of my colleagues came to me and said that another college overrode our prerequisite and the student wasn’t ready.
• Mike – I will do it for you but if you look up my class and see the grades, you will see where the override occurred.
• Kader – Our classes have become very large. How can I help the DFW rate when I am dealing with such a large section with no help? I am forced to not grade the homework because I don’t have a TA. I am not against the growth rate, but we need the resources.
• President – The growth has to happen first.
• Mike – It has happened. When I came, Dr. Cerro had twenty students in 244, now he has 56. The growth has happened, and we still hear when it happens.
• President – It is also a growth in revenue.
• Mike – The growth with students has happened. I can’t answer why the revenue hasn’t.
• President – There were years when tuition rates increased. It’s hard to keep pace with a 2-3% increase. You can look at health insurance increases. The overall increase has to be taken into consideration.
• Kader – We haven’t stopped growing. If my DFW rate is high, it’s because I don’t have the help.
• Monica – All the research on effective teaching says you can’t teach that many effectively.
• Kader – The other thing I have heard is we have adequate facilities. I am not so sure about that. I think they are getting pushed to the limits.
• President – If you look at the utilization of space. We have adequate space, it is the utilization. There are some spaces that the quality is poor and needs updating.
• Kader – I invite you to come see S105 in Tech Hall.
• Carmen – It’s great for a symposium. I don’t agree with you on utilization. There is an opinion of an architect, and then there is reality. Some rooms have 66 straight seats, but some can see little and some none. We are forced to fill that class though.
• President – I am looking at the time some classrooms are vacant. You can tell from the parking study that the peak parking is at 11:00 am. There are underutilized classroom spaces.

• Ramon – There is a lot of space that isn't adequate. If you look at the largest class in engineering, it holds 56. To put 56 students where 58 fits is really tight. There is no space for anything. I don’t know what is going to happen when midterms and finals happen. It looks like UAH has always been the poor relative in this system.

• President – It is a perception. It is based on revenue. If you look at Alabama, their tuition structure is higher than ours. When you count the number of students paying at the higher rate that increases the tuition.

• Mike – How much higher is Alabama than ours?

• Monica – A lot.

• President – We have a straight line from 1-12, now it’s flat. They have a flat area too but they have a bubble between 1-12. They have students trapped in the bubble, and they aren’t getting scholarships. To get there for us, we have to raise tuition and that would be questionable. We have raised part time tuition around 4%. We didn’t put block tuition in at once, because we would have to raise part time tuition 12%. We eased it in at 4%, and we took a hit. We have it in place and this coming year we are going for a 4% increase. There is a push at the board level to keep tuition and fees down.

• Christine – I am glad that you are looking at rooms based on utilization. As you look at things and improve, that will help.

• President – The announcement for Ray Pinner came out. We will start that process. I am debating on using a search. Second thing is the gift agreement for the incubator has been signed and set. The resolution will be before the board to name the building.

• Kader – I am sure you saw the petition sent to you. The minorities on campus are nervous. What has been said to me about the upcoming administration has made me nervous. Being a minority, we sense the nervousness.

• President – We put a statement out in regards to the TV station coming out when there was a rally. Our statement was that our public policies provide all the rights and protections they are entitled to. We can’t say any more. You are correct; we can’t violate federal law and Alabama law. All we can do is by our actions and we demonstrate there aren’t any issues. We have to be careful with our statements.

• Mike – We did meet with the Provost last Thursday. Immediately afterwards, I walked over to RI. Russ was there and Malcolm was not. Russ agreed that this was on them, and he would get back with me. I went back another day and neither was there. I will keep walking over to them. A request I have out to the Provost and the President, it seems to me in the discussion with parking, the reports I have heard is we have people going every direction with no sense of where classes are. We have someone who is teaching chemical engineering in Tech Hall. It seems that administrative assistants just grabbed classrooms without thinking about location. I think a
map needs to be generated to show classrooms relative to home offices and departments.

- Provost – We have a space inventory completed now. We have walked through the buildings and found other spaces. We will then put all classroom space and potential classroom space into ASTRA. It will be assigned as centrally scheduled by a given unit. We finished the walk through at the end of January. We will have a better feel for what classrooms are used and not used. There are some that are not being used that can be used. The priority is size of class; the proximity of faculty to the class is in there.

- Mike – When you hear that Dr. Scholz is going to Tech Hall to find a chemistry class that is doubling transit.

- Carmen – Computer took our class. I think what has happened is a wild frenzy has started. We always teach 101 in our lecture hall. We are told to get out. It is now just empty.

- Provost – At any time you have a larger class it goes to a larger classroom.

- Ramon – The problem with scheduling is we forget other classes that are taught at the same time.

- Provost – There are a few departments that have this issue. Chemical is probably the worst.

- Kader – Now you see the dimension of the problem. We are so close to the 10K number. I am looking at next fall being a disaster. We are struggling right now with the facilities we have. I don’t believe in the study.

- Tim – Another issue is in my building, we have classes back to back. The classroom is a disaster by the end of the day. We have a lot of broken chairs. There may be 50 there but only 40 are usable. That inventory of what is actually good isn’t done. Our building needs a face lift.

- Ramon – The question I ask is we schedule our classes and determine how many will be in the class. Why don’t we work the other way around? I have to teach here so I will only take this many students. Can we reduce the number of students based on the number of faculty?

- Provost – You run into a financial problem.

- Ramon – We either have a financial problem or have fewer students.

- Provost – We are hiring 20 tenured track faculty. If we can get them hired, that will help.

- Monica – The new furniture we have is awesome. It can be moved easily, it’s great for collaborative learning/teaching.

### Officer/Committee Reports

- Michael Banish, President
  - You all know next Thursday is the annual meeting. We will have Vice Chancellor Dr. Nash as the speaker. I have one more question to submit to him. I am going to ask the FSEC to announce to the full senate we will start renegotiations on Chapters 4-6, and Appendix A. Going back to the lecturer and librarian policy, Joseph got the task to rewrite the lecturer policy.

- Past President, Kader Frendi
  - Kader – I met with Dr. Berkowitz regarding graduate education. I was pleased to learn that he is going to embark on investigating the fundraising that was presented
to the senate. He also has a matrix for tuition for graduate students. I did complain about the number. We talked about several other issues.
- Ramon – Did you remind him that he should be leading this effort?
- Kader – Yes, and he was onboard with it.
- Provost – One issue on the matrix is we have to pay for students that are coming from out of the country. If we give to high of a fellowship we have to pay the revenue.
- President-Elect, Carmen Scholz
  - Carmen – I want to inform you all with policies; Monday I will compile these policies. We have quite a few that are out there. I am trying to understand what is what and where they are. Please expect in the next couple of weeks these policies to be pushed out.
  - Mike – Nepotism is important. Course forgiveness is also important.
  - James – I have already reported that course forgiveness is ready to go forth.
  - Mike – Since we haven’t seen emotion. I am going to call forward Bill 393.
  - Carmen – That went to finance and UCC.
  - Mike – That was student evaluations during the term. Will you pull them forward?
  - Joseph – I have feedback on that.
- Parliamentarian, Tim Newman
  - We will be having a vacancy for our ombudsperson. He needs to notify Carmen, and then she will be interim until we get a campus wide election. It will be now until the end of August.
  - Monica – There will be an election for a new one in two months?
  - Tim – We need both.
  - Also, the faculty reporting database committee is moving forward. We are getting demos of three promising packages. I have had some great discussions. I called one company and talked with a person there that was a faculty member. I think there is hope.
  - On the handbook committee, I have talked to some about things that have come back. There is a lot of faculty feedback on the issues that came back. A comment that we don’t need a statement about shared governance is a big problem. There is a problem from counsel. I am disappointed in that.
  - Provost – There was no change to that.
  - Tim – It is just troubling that they brought forward an issue with that. I also have an issue with faculty work belonging to the university. I think that is a violation of the 14th Amendment. If someone writes a song, that is not work in regards to the university and they shouldn’t claim ownership. I am surprised this issue comes forward. This is not what we want to present this as who we are.
  - Provost – Have you gone back to the board rule?
  - Tim – Yes, it is overly broad; more so than the board rule. The board rule is in regards to things related to your work. It appears that the university is trying to set up a new faculty contract. I think this is a regressive step. I am concerned we are not the progressive light we need to be.
  - Provost – Have you looked at the copyright policy?
  - Tim – I haven’t compared the two side by side.
- Provost – We need to go back to the board rule and the copyright policy.
- Mike – I think the problem Tim is experiencing as well as many of us, is the counsel seems to think they can always make whatever the board rule is less generous. It seems they want to see how much we will scream.
- Kader motions to extend meeting. James seconds. Ayes carry.
- Kader – In chapter 5 of the handbook the removal of terminal degree of the center director goes against the Carnegie ranking. They should be tenured in some department. I really think they should have more synergy between center directors and centers. Not requiring a degree, doesn’t help us.
- Mike – I have an issue with having a center director that isn’t capable of generating a PhD. I think when most of the research centers were started; all the center directors had PhD’s and were tenured faculty members. This is a step back on our standards.
- Provost – I don’t think that was in the handbook prior?
- Mike – Yes it was. All the center directors were tenured.
- Kader – The other point I saw was the removal of severance pay of someone who is terminated with tenured status. That is a breach of contract.
- Provost – You keep them on a year. The President is saying we can’t pay severance; we have to pay for work.
- Tim – Our chancellor got paid to not work for a year. I have a problem with those policies applying to higher paid individuals and not the rest within the institutions. I always thought a university wouldn’t be like that, but I see us adopting that.
- Provost – You know for a fact that Presidents and Chancellors at other universities have received severance pay?
- Tim – It has been quoted that it is standard board procedure that a departing President was paid a year’s salary with no duties.
- Kader – They use fancy language, but it is the same as golden parachute.
- Provost – Isn’t that the same as if a department is dissolved and they can’t be reassigned?
- Finance and Resource Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
  - We are finishing RCEU evaluations. With funding coming from all different directions, we have to meet. I hope we can fund a lot more than last year. Everyone will be notified by 30 January.
- Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, James Swain
  - I reported last time that we have given the thumbs up on course forgiveness. We can now add second bachelors. I understand that I am sitting on IRB and CEU.
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair, Christine Sears
  - No report.
- Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
  - Ramon – When a bill comes back, can it go back to committee, Tim?
    - Tim – Yes, it can.
    - Ramon – I would like for our committee to look at the lecturer/librarian policy.
- Approval of faculty senate meeting agenda. Monica Dillihunt seconds. Ayes carry.
- Kader Frendi motions to adjourn meeting at 2:15 pm. Monica Dillihunt seconds. Ayes carry.
FACULTY SENATE Meeting
December 15, 2016
12:30 P.M. in NUR 205A

Present:  Xuejing Xing, Laird Burns, David Stewart, Ryan Weber, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Carolyn Sanders, Anne Marie Choup, Kyle Knight, Ramon Cerro, Fat Duen Ho, Earl Wells, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Ann Bianchi, Tracy Durm, Marlena Primeau, Maria Steele, Mary Bonilla, Shanhu Lee, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Michael George, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Shannon Mathis, Michael Banish

Absent with Proxy: John Schnell, Sophia Marinova, Yongchuan Bao, Jeremy Fischer, Christina Carmen, Qingyuan Han, Debra Moriarity, Harry Delugach, Ming Sun, Vladimir Florinski

Absent without Proxy: David Harwell, Irena Buksa, Eric Seeman, Dianhan Zheng, Tingting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Casey Norris, Amy Hunter, Monica Dillihunt

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guests:  President Bob Altenkirch
         Dr. Chittur

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- Approval of faculty senate meeting minutes #573, November 17. Carmen Scholz motions to approve. Ramon Cerro seconds. Ayes carry.
- Bill 398 did not pass second reading unanimously.
- Administrative Reports
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - In regards to construction, a message was sent out with a map in regards to the residence hall. This will start shortly. Around June, the incubator will start. We will build one Greek house at this time. This will start in the spring as well. The incubator building is funded from the state, economic development, UAH foundation, and a private gift. The private gift is sufficient according to the board to name the facility after the donor. This will be the first building named after someone that has given a gift.
    - Director of Compliance and Title IX has formed a selection committee. We will start shortly after the first of the year. Currently there are 46 applicants.
  - Provost Christine Curtis
    - The good news is we received our accreditation. They had two recommendations, QEP and faculty credential. The faculty credential policy was developed and being implemented as we speak. They accepted that in response to the recommendation. They had eight individuals. We accepted seven that they were correct on. One individual we said was the most qualified and stood our ground on that. We are in
good shape. We have a number of things we have to do. We have to follow through with our assessments. We don’t want to fall behind. If we do this in a routine manner, it won’t be difficult to get this done. We have to follow our policies. I need to thank everyone for all the hard work in preparation of the visit. It was a team effort. Congratulations to us all. It is a positive thing for the university. Baylor and Louisville did not satisfy the requirements.

- I need to ask help with one thing – grade reports. The grades were late coming in. There are a couple of exams on Friday. On Monday we had 341 classes without grades. In some, it was only a few grades. We sent out an email that day to the Deans. By Monday night, there were still 105 sections missing grades. At that point, I asked an email be sent out to the individual faculty member. By Tuesday morning, we were down to 19 sections. The deadline was 9:00 am and it was extended to 10:00 am, then we had seven. We went ahead and rolled the grades. I would ask the senators to encourage faculty to get their grades in. We did have some grades that weren’t in and exams were on the first day. The students need to know grades to plan for the next semester.
  - Carolyn – One question, Janet is good to send reminders out to Deans, Directors, etc. Is it fair to assume that it only goes to Deans?
  - Provost – The Deans need to send it to Chairs, and then they send it out.
  - Carolyn – Have you considered sending it to the Chairs?
  - Roy – A little automation would be good on this. One thing the system doesn’t do is let you know when you are done. It’s not too difficult to get lost. It occurs to me that an automated email sent to let you know you are complete would be good.
  - Provost – We are transitioning to Banner 8. If you would Roy, send me an email and I will forward that to Malcolm to see if it is in Banner XE, and if not, see if it can be added.
  - Roy – It may not be the biggest problem, but it would help to get the notification.
  - Provost – If something is missing, it would notify you.
  - Member – Some know the grades aren’t going to be rolled and they push the deadlines.
  - Provost – We need to know what a reasonable deadline is. If it is impossible to grade and get it in by Monday morning, we need to set an absolute time.

- Honor’s Day is April 11th. We are dispensing with the University Honor’s Day. We will start with the Honor’s College early in the morning. Then the colleges have a time frame that doesn’t overlap. We had some overlapping last year. If you don’t go over your time slot everything will be good.

- The IRS and the Federal Government have changed the interpretation of the insurance for graduate students. We complied with the ruling that wouldn’t allow us to provide the insurance to students that we were, it was illegal. We stopped doing that and supplemented them with the funds we used for insurance. We asked the PI’s do the same with GRA’s. As of fall, we are going back to offering insurance, unless new administration changes something else. We will go back to regular insurance and pay graduate student insurance. We will be requiring that of all including GRA’s.
- On the lecturer and librarian policy we are consulting with John Cates and will get back with you at the first of the year.
  - Tim – First, I want to encourage the administration to move ahead with chapters 7-9 on the handbook. It has been four years since that has been sent. If they would like to reject those, just let us know. Second, we sent forward 16-17-01 resolution. I think it fell short in three areas. I don’t think it is satisfactory. We asked for ninety days, sixty came back. We asked for an interim policy and only a statement came back that administration would provide an informal response. I think there is a big difference in the two. If we think about the motivation for the system of policies, we want to get away from memos. I think the response was disappointing in this area. I think the biggest one is we asked that an analysis of risk for deanship be done and there was no response to that. I think that one thing that drove the bill to come from the senate is there are a number of deanship creations. The final straw was deanship of continuing studies. I don’t run across any faculty that was aware of why that happened. I don’t think we want a deanship created and no one understand why it was created. That was some feedback. My third point is on the deadline for proposals. It seems that the deadlines are always very short. I checked with another colleague at another institute, there deadline was two weeks beyond ours. That is a disadvantage. Some know those are coming down but most don’t. Most people on campus don’t know. When it comes in on a Tuesday, with a Friday deadline, I know I can’t do that. It seems that they are wired for the faculty member that knew about it. I think we should open it up to have the most diverse ideas. It is my understanding that this has happened recently.
    - Provost – Do you have a recommended time for a deadline?
    - Tim – I would be hesitant to throw out a time. I think ten days would be nice. I just think we don’t want a situation where faculty find something out and have to have a response in 72 hours.
    - Mike – Typically it will be a six page mini proposal. Most of these are EPSCOR and you have to cost share. It has to go through OSP and they have to verify all these and verify the one to one cost share. I have a complaint of we do this following NSF format, but I have never received a proposal back telling me why I didn’t get it. Either we need to follow the NSF format and go through OSP to receive feedback or not.
    - Provost – Your request is?
    - Tim – If the institution response is twenty days, we should be given half that.
    - Provost – You think ten days would be the minimal time?
    - Tim – I think we need a broad umbrella.

- Kader - At first I want to join the senate on the SACSCOC work. You all stepped up to the plate by passing key policies on time. Handbook chapters 4-6, appendix a, we passed that in the summer and it hasn’t gone to the board yet. I would like to see it go forward, or we want an answer.
    - Provost – The President hasn’t had a chance to review these yet. He did ask that I find out what the deadline for submissions is for the Board meeting.
• Ramon – I want to voice a concern from a colleague, he is embarrassed that we have lost Carnegie one status and not seeing much being done by administration to help. There was a proactive meeting with the ad-hoc committee with Dr. Frendi. I still don’t think anything will happen until administration embraces the request.
  o Provost – The key thing that hasn’t happened is PhD productions. We need this in areas outside of the areas we have PhD’s. Our numbers are 20% becomes PhDs, when nationally the number is 40%. It has to be done at the local level.
  o Ramon – There is a lot that needs to be done at the administrative level.
  o Provost – Do you want to write down what you think we should be doing?
  o Ramon – No, there are still meetings in regard to this.
  o Provost – I asked Dr. Berkowitz to meet with the FSEC to discuss various issues.
  o Ramon –The point is that all faculty should be embarrassed that we have lost this status and concerned that administration has not done much to fix this.
  o Carmen – Is the 20% of PhD production held against us?
  o Provost – In regards to PhD production, yes. As far as GTA’s that pursue PhD’s, we are not at the national level. We have to have funding for these students to get through the PhD.
  o Carmen – Master students don’t help?
  o Provost – No, they look at the PhD production.
  o Earl – If you want to increase PhD production and create new, one wouldn’t solve it. We have to increase current production and create new.
  o Provost – The PhD in science is in science. They are looking at the breath. We don’t have those at this time.
  o Earl – Is there a possibility of the rules changing?
  o Provost - I haven’t met this person but the President has. He says this person won’t change his mind unless he wants too. He did give us more information this time than any other as to what it was. It wasn’t research funding, it was PhD production.
  o Christine – In terms of breath, one of the problems for expansion is the lack of librarian resources. We can’t produce PhD candidates without quality resources.
  o Provost – Dr. Moore is working with UAB to get those resources. When Dr. Whitt was working with the three he encouraged them to work together. Dr. Moore is trying to get this going.
  o Mike – When Chancellor Nash is here in January that may be a point to bring up to him since they want all three campuses to be strong.

➤ Officer and Committee Reports
  o Michael Banish, President
    - Thank you all for coming. This will be our last meeting for this year and last meeting in this room. We have two special committees. I have Dr. Chittur coming for charger foundation. I do encourage you to go through the policies that are on
the website. One was brought to my attention yesterday about video surveillance. The Provost and I have been discussing back and forth what I have found on it. It was basically that every video system on campus be tied through the police station. We did work through those.

- Ramon – Are these policies that doesn’t involve faculty?
- Provost – As we were preparing for SACSCOC, we had to have a set of policies that were public. The President started to gather all the policies, they were everywhere. A number of these that haven’t been through the senate were long standing. That was long before the policy on policies. These were just long standing policies.
- Ramon – I understand that. Who decides if a policy involves the faculty or not?
- Provost – This was before the policy on policies. They were just long standing.
- Mike – They are up and made public. We have the right to comment on one if we have a concern.

- Kader Frendi, Past President
  - We finally met on December 1st, we had a lively discussion. Bottom line is the faculty is concerned with the lack of research. If we increase the number of lecturers, we will go further away from the Carnegie ranking. We encouraged hiring tenure-faculty track. We mentioned the need for PhD GTA’s. The expansion of PhD degrees based on the Carnegie ranking is based on the diversity of PhD’s. The focus needs to become on other areas creating PhD’s and are they ready? These are ideas we are throwing out. We mentioned the creation of graduate level matrix. We have heard there is a matrix for undergraduate, is there one for graduates? If we can get GRA’s supported by research money, that is the top priority. We also threw out the idea of fundraising for graduate level. The idea here is for the departments that are not able to generate funding; this would be good seed money to start the program. These are ideas that we have thrown out. We will meet at the New Year.

- Carmen Scholz, President-Elect
  - There is one bill that is coming to the full senate today. The second bachelors have been assigned the scholastic affairs committee. There was a bill in regards to on-call employees and has been assigned to committees.

- Ramon Cerro, Personnel Committee Chair
  - No report.

- Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  - We are working through paper work.

- Earl Wells, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
  - No report.

- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
  - No report.

- James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  - We did approve the course and repeat forgiveness policy. Since 9 am on Tuesday my committee has responded and reached an agreement on readmissions.

- Joseph Taylor, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
  - We are getting ready to start examining faculty proposals. We will have those done by January 30th. In February, we will meet with Bob Lyon to meet with advancement and fundraising.
Dr. Chittur, Charger Foundation Ad-Hoc Committee Chair

- Mike asked me to revive the charger foundation ad-hoc committee. We met about six weeks ago to see what we need to do next. There was no specific charge from the faculty senate president, but to revive the foundation. The task force was never disbanded. Several from the task force didn’t show for the meeting. Information about charger foundation is on the website. There were several objectives; the first question was to make the first two years more relevant and something to give students a foundation. A lot of chemical engineering students take the course because it is on the program of study and don’t see the relevance. I think the importance would be to see how to make the foundation courses relevant to everyone on the campus. We are going to attempt to look at the courses and come up with a recommendation. I have more ideas and was careful to not push it at the first meeting. We will meet again during the spring semester. One of my suggestions is to look at the charger foundations under the perspective of the student. Can we look at it from the student’s perspective? That is my personal objective. To end the meeting, I said if it was up to me they would take a class on programming.

- Mike: Do you have members from every college on the committee?
- Dr. Chittur – We don’t. We don’t’ have someone from science or business. We don’t want rookies on the committee. We want a person who understands how it is to change something that has been done for years. There are a few members that have been here a year or two. If you have names send them to me.
- Ramon – I think it is interesting because going to the university is more than a credential. Literacy is also in chemistry and science. You have to be around the person to be a dedicated person.
- Dr. Chittur – This will be challenging. Concepts and ideas will be hard to change.
- Carmen – I want to report an observation to your committee. You said look at the courses from the student’s perspective. I observe that our interaction with students went away. It is my observation that students go to their classes and you never see them. When you speak with them they refer to central advising. They don’t understand why they should take certain classes, because that would come from faculty.
- Dr. Chittur – One solution in chemical engineering is starting last fall we had one day we invited students to come talk with advisors. I sent email to 200 and 75 came. I don’t know the answer to the question, but you are right.
- Carmen – There are a lot of students who don’t want to be sought out.
- Tim – I want to put a plug in for maintaining the notion that we want our students to have a broad based education. In an effort to sell ourselves to the public, UAH makes the key for higher education for the job. I think we should stand for something more than that. Our interest should be more than. One that creates broad based students that are well rounded. It should be beyond the next professional university.
- Dr. Chittur – That is my objective too. The biggest barrier will be to rethink the idea of education. One thing that everyone should know around the campus is you need to go beyond specific courses. What is the world the student is going to see in four years?
- Member – I was on the original task force. We went through all of this. Are you starting over with this or picking up where we ended?
- Dr. Chittur – We aren’t starting over. Even in the way you ended, there were some ideas that were never pushed forward.
Mike – From my understanding the charger foundations committee, still exist? We want to ensure this was well represented. Also, that many people had the chance to provide their input from the faculty senate side. Dr. Chittur is ready to give room to forty people. I have turned this over to him.

Member – I was confused because it was all about producing good citizens, we also went through that. We did have faculty members there during my time. I wanted to make sure we weren’t spinning our wheels and starting over.

Dr. Chittur – We have to sell the idea that we are going to help them not make this impossible for them.

Carolyn – I was well aware of this task force. I would ask the same question. Did you hear complaints from what came from that committee? I don’t see the point in doing this. Do these young students really know what’s best? I do think it needs to be disciplined specific so it is well rounded. I hate to see a group come from faculty senate come and rethink this. They will all have their own ideas. I am against not having a representative from every college. Were there people of significant number that pointed out problems with the end result of charger foundations?

Provost – I asked for an oversight committee. We received two different requests for new charger foundation courses. There were a number of things that the task force recommended be done to ensure the students were learning the material. I was hoping they could take that forward. That is the reason I made the request. Since it is a curriculum issue, it should sit next to the university’s curriculum committee.

Carolyn – That makes sense to me. It makes more sense to look at this area than the whole charger foundation.

Dr. Chittur – We are going to let the students dictate. We aren’t throwing everything out. The question to ask is has anything changed from what the task force recommended? I think there is still some talk among the campus about the curriculum. I don’t know the answer to the question.

Mike – I am going to cut this off and say Dr. Chittur is looking for members.

Ramon – I think a problem is that people don’t know what was done before. I have some ideas after talking with Dr. Chittur. We need to become more knowledgeable.

- **Miscellaneous**
  - Mike – The last order of business is Bill 398, cover a charger. It passed first reading in FSEC meeting. It says that Purdue University has a student loan program where you pay back a percent of your salary for a certain period of time and the loan is forgiven. Some never pay their loan back. This bill asks for the President to give several reports to see if we could cover a charger.
    - Roy – I looked up information in regards to this. The term is income share agreement; you pay back a percent of your income over a period of time. I want to propose an amendment where it says the President evaluates a pay it back plan. I propose a payback plan with evaluating an income share plan.
    - Roy – This seems like an unobjectionable request that we look into something. I propose to close debate. Laird Burn seconds. Ayes carry.
    - Mike – All in favor of second reading of bill 398. 3 opposed. 3 abstain. Ayes carry. Bill does not pass second reading unanimously.

- Motion to adjourn meeting at 1:56 pm. Ayes carry.