

FACULTY SENATE

MEETING #572 AGENDA

NUR 205A

THURSDAY, October 20, 2016

12:30 PM to 2:00 PM

Call to Order

- 1. Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #571 Minutes from September 29, 2016**
- 2. Accept FSEC Report from October 13, 2016**
- 3. Administration Reports**
 - **Ron Gray, Board of Trustees**
 - **Britt Sexton, Board of Trustees**
- 4. Officer and Committee Reports**
 - **Lecturer Policy**
 - **Librarian Policy**
 - **Bill 396, Proposed Bill Proposing New Process for Small Grants Applications through the Office of Sponsored Programs**
 - **Hoverboard Policy**
- 5. Miscellaneous/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 LAUREN BAKER: facsen@uah.edu

FACULTY SENATE SPECIAL MEETING
September 29, 2016
12:30 P.M. in NUR 204A

Present: David Stewart, Ryan Weber, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Carolyn Sanders, Anne Marie Choup, Eric Seeman, Kyle Knight, Ramon Cerro, Ting-Ting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Fat Duen Ho, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Ann Bianchi, Maria Steele, Mary Bonilla, Roy Magnuson, Debra Moriarity, Michael George, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathi, Sophia Marinova, Michael Banish

Absent With Proxy: Irena Buksa, Dianhan Zheng, Christina Carmen, Casey Norris, Marlana Primeau, Amy Hunter,

Absent Without Proxy: Xuejing Xing, John Schnell, Laird Burns, Yongchuan Bao, David Harwell, Jeremy Fischer, Earl Wells, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Tracy Durm, Qingyuan Han, Shanhu Lee, Carmen Scholz, Ming Sun

Ex-Officio : Provost Christine Curtis

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- This meeting has been called to discuss the faculty senate ad-hoc scheduling committee. Before we begin, I realize this is out of order, Dr. Slater passed away earlier this week. I would like to take a few minutes of silence to reflect upon this.
- Approve faculty senate meeting minutes from #570, September 15, 2016. All in favor. Debra Moriarity motions to approve. Eric Seeman seconds. Ayes carry.
- Accept FSEC report from last Tuesday. We did make some changes to verbiage. Debra Moriarity motions to approve. Member seconds. Ayes carry.
- Before the scheduling report, you have in front of you the UAH graduation retention data. Let me point out something to you for your explanation. If you look at the colleges, for example ENG, the first set of numbers is at the university and second set is within the college. These are not cumulative totals. The graduation rate goes with 2012. The 39% rate goes with 2011, and the six year rate goes with 2010.
 - Harry – The second group is the number of students that graduated in their original college?
 - Mike – Yes, in their original college.
 - Provost – The only thing I am wondering is if we are shifted back one year.
 - Mike – They do go with years.
- Scheduling Report, Dr. Roy Magnuson
 - Mike – Before we begin, I want to thank Dr. Magnuson and the committee for taking on this task.

- We have been working on this for less than two weeks. The committee represented someone from each college. We did end up with a report that was endorsed by everyone. The problem is too much distance too little time. I surveyed students to see what the rate of the problem is. I gathered that 25% of the students are saying they have a tight transition. That is in biology and that is a central location. If you want to walk from Tech to Morton that takes a long time. First problem, too much distance too little time. We don't know who has a problem, where, or how many. The survey was a preliminary attempt to get a feel. We feel that Tech and Morton are places involved. Freshman composition may cause a problem. Courses located in Tech may cause issues. We should be able to obtain data. One solution is to go faster. The second is take more time and change schedule. Clever scheduling doesn't involve changing the scheduling. You could do something from each category at once to help alleviate the problem.
- The first solution is to go faster. One source to be able to do that is bicycles. You can use them and get across campus quickly. There is no reason to give additional support to charger cycle. This allows students to check out a bicycle per semester at no charge. Within that there are related problems not enough bike racks, safety issue, etc. One problem would be we don't know how many bikes we need additionally. A related idea is priority parking. Maybe the computer would notice the tight transit and give priority spots. We have parking reform on the way and maybe this could be integrated.
- Another solution is more time. This would require us altering the schedule. Here I give you a solution that could create several more problems. Option A subtracts five minutes from classes and adds five minutes between class and preserve start times. That is a minimal change to the schedule. You have a cumulative loss over the semester. If this is doable, that can be done tomorrow. If not, you have to add days. That will take much more time.
 - Sophia – This is more doable with MWF classes.
 - Roy – Yes, the loss time depends on the number of meeting times. My suggestion isn't go down this road. If you do, you have to accept loss of meeting time.
- We could add five minutes and shift start time. This is the President's proposal to shift everything out. It starts out beautiful. As you get to the end of the day, everything gets awkward. You could double schedule classes. You have a reform and there are issues at the beginning. It isn't an attractive option. Starting at 8 in the morning and ending at 9 at night is just too much.
- Align short and long classes. We did have this and started to incorporate longer days. Already in the afternoon we have shifted the start times of short classes, you have 40 minute gaps between classes. In the morning, you are still stacked incompatibly. There are several clashes with this. There is room in the schedule to take out a class and spread them out over the afternoon. You can have 40 minutes intervals, and 15 minutes between others. It would cause rearranging.
 - Ramon – The fact that we have long classes on MW is not a good reason. There are two big reasons, students ask for two classes so they can work. Many have to commute and don't want to do this five days a week. Second, we teach at least four classes a year. If you are doing research, you are allowed one day a week to devote to research.
 - Roy – Sorry for categorizing it. I was criticizing the current schedule set up. Putting a couple of these ideas together you can alter short and long classes. That is pretty and it does anticipate problems that could arise with MW classes. This would keep the day from getting out of control. It is a vision for the future, but no clear way to

get there easily. If you are ready to do something tomorrow, the first solution is the only option.

- Clever scheduling: Provost task force suggested cluster scheduling. This is combining advising and scheduling together. Allowing taking classes together and making sure that the internal and location makes sense. We can direct people into that. An idea we came up with is registration clarity or warning. It is allowing the computer to warn you if you scheduled classes back to back with a hard transit. This would let them know they need a bike or reconsider their schedule. When they sign up for classes, freshman for example, may not be familiar with the campus set up. If we start having that ability, we could collect data. We can do micro scale tinkering to fix problems. For example, if we find that tech students need to take a freshman class in Morton, move one into the general science building. This is speculation; we don't have data to know where the problem is.
- Those are our three general solutions. We probably should do all of them. We need to work on the schedule. Reform will need to be necessary at some point. Our recommendation is better access the problem. If you add five minutes, subtract five minutes would that work? If you don't know the true problem, would five additional minutes work? We need to better characterize the problem. We don't need to be hasty in making a decision.
- Mike – Before Roy ends, I want to thank him again. I want to read a section directly from the report and then we will open this for discussion.
 - James – You talked about the improvements to scheduling that may help. One point I want to make is I suggested investing into more bikes. The President has said it would be too expensive to pay for a bus long-term. Bikes wouldn't be that much. One of the scheduling ideas is shortening contact time that should be addressed directly. Since it is very difficult to undo things, if we adopt a schedule that cuts off fifty minutes of contact time that would probably not be undone. The faculty and administration need to talk about this.
 - Roy – I concur. I love bikes, and do understand they aren't suitable for everyone. Since they are suitable for some, they are wonderful.
 - Sophia - Do we lend helmets as well?
 - Roy – We do not.
 - Sophia -Is that a safety issue since we have so many biking across campus?
 - Roy – I actually know an interesting fact on helmets. It was suspected that they would be helpful. When the stats came out, they realized that when you put the helmet on you feel invulnerable. That then makes you do things that you shouldn't do. They didn't help much as they thought they would.
 - Sophia – Yes, but it is still a liability issue.
 - Carolyn – I was a proponent to maintaining 55 minutes. I oversee classes that time is critical. I have been here a long time; the issue of breaks between class times has been ongoing. I feel strongly that students need twenty minutes between classes. From there we have created more complex issues. Sometimes students need the mental break. I want to see the students come into my class ready to go. Maybe the student needs the additional time for a mental break rather than transit time. I was on the first task force last year, what are other universities doing? Why reinvent the wheel and create something complicated? Most other universities have twenty minute class breaks, 50/75 minutes class time. Then add another day or two. This seems a lot simpler than a complicated set of solutions that could stall the decision.

- Harry – Twenty minutes between classes isn't just for students but for me as well. Students talk with me after class and hold me up. Fifteen minutes might be enough. We don't treat the students like human beings. I do echo her thought on 55 minutes. I think if we cut contact time, we lose quality. I know my commuter students would be willing to stay longer than adding additional days.
- Roy – I have come a long way on this issue. I want to step down as my role of chair to this committee and return to the body.
- Kader – I am going to add to the argument of the bikes. If you have bikes on campus, the number one danger is for pedestrians. You have to have bike lanes. You could cause danger for pedestrians.
- Roy – I did a beta test for bikes on our loop. It worked. It wasn't unsafe. I can still get anywhere on campus in a comfortable period of time.
- Sophia – One of the options we discussed is leaving the sections as is and just cut five minutes down on 80 minutes sections. In the spring, we cancel classes due to weather, by having that extra session we could also be hindered due to weather.
- Tim – We have talked about changing schedules at UAH before. Something has always been a constraint on us. The constraint is 40.5%. That is the maximum amount of time the faculty can charge during the summer. The problem is if we look at this chart. Here is the summer calendar for last summer. What has happened every other time here, the 40.5% has always been the going number? I don't know if faculty has been charging that much or it is a recruiting tool. I don't think no one in our department does that. In June and July, there is 20 and 22 working days time. We always have days off for holiday. Here the schedule for the summer. We had 20 days in June, 22 days in July, and 10 days in August. To get to 75, here it is. We start on May 2 and the last day is August 15. Finals ended April 29th, and fall classes started the 17th. To get 40.5%, we have to have 75 working days in the summer. That is the constraint to our schedule. If we want to add classes, we can start sooner or end later. What can we do? On this year, we have a slack. If you go longer in the spring, you have to go longer in December. If you go longer in spring, you have to go longer in fall. Here is the cost of keeping contact time. To add days, we would have to end as late as December 23. We aren't willing to do this and that is why we have this issue. That is why we are where we are.
 - Mike – I have asked OSP to give me a regular faculty member that charges 40.5%, they have never done that.
 - Provost – They count the 75 days by pay periods. They go from Tuesday to Wednesdays.
 - Sophia – That doesn't apply to 80 minute class times.
 - Ramon – I think that I am impressed and we are coming up with clever solutions. The problem with the solutions is no one knows the issue that needs to be solved. We really are working in the dark. One of the problems of solving a problem not well defined is the solutions could be counterproductive. Let's define the problem first.
- Debra – I want to address the issue of the warning at registration and smart advising. When I first came, we had people in the advising center, which is what we worked with students on. At this time, there were fewer buildings. We cautioned students on not backing certain classes. That can alleviate a big problem with classes that have multiple sections. But when you talk with students, they may only want classes on MW. The voluntarily put themselves in this situation.

- Mike – As we have gotten better computer systems, the problem has only gotten worse.
- Roy – I love the idea of defining the problem better and going slow. I would like to talk as a personal faculty member about my view point. Some things I thought were unacceptable, I have changed my thoughts. I went in and thought losing contact time was undoable. The scientist and ENG have a gut reaction of not wanting to lose contact time. I thought that wasn't an option. When I talked with the committee I found out that across the university more people were open to the idea. I have had more days to mull over this and think about it. I have come around to this idea. I am cutting five minutes off the back side. If I imagine cutting five off the middle, it seems much less traumatic. When I end my class early, as Dr. Delugach said, we get questions. Then once it's over, some students come up after to ask questions. If they aren't in too much rush to get out they are having peer contact time. I think about the beginning of my class, if I can get in a few minutes earlier to set up everything that is desirable. I haven't met a faculty member who wouldn't take the extra time to set up. If the students are ready to go at start time, that is a positive thing too. This idea for making it a little shorter, I think about it this way, it isn't as traumatic. If I think about making my teaching better, I make my lecture better. I rarely ever thought my class needs more sections. I have never had students ask for more lectures. There is a proposal to maintain contact hours. My first instinct is to do nothing. If you feel obligated to do something, trimming a little time off a class and add it to the interval isn't the worse thing. If you are willing to take the loss of contact time it's doable. If you want to add days back, I don't want to do that.
- Mike – There has been an override. One thing I want to say that has been misquoted and I think the President did something bad. There was a scheduling task force that considered two proposals. The President sensed push back and created another proposal. I think the President made a tactical error by pushing it out too far. I have a column for current and another column based on the President's proposal. We have fifteen minutes between. You scroll down and they come up pretty close, just a little stretch out. When you get to class period five, it starts stretching out. The committee said let's try to rematch the 55/80 minute class schedule. You then have a break that is half of a class period on the old schedule. This is just for MWF. If you go to the President's new schedule and not go until 9:00 pm. The class periods 6-8 end earlier than they did before and some by a significant amount of time. If you were stuck with class period 8 before, you went to 6:00; you now get out at 5:40. With the new schedule, long block 6 and short block 8, end at the same time. I think he set people off on the wrong track because he said lets go until 9:00 at night. We actually get more class time in the shorter part of the day.
 - Sophia – That doesn't speak to the issue of night classes.
 - Mike – No, but we do whatever we want at night.
 - Roy – The President's proposal isn't unworkable. When we were criticizing the MWF aspects were never a problem. What is the problem is TTH and stacking MW short classes on long classes. The TTH long stack starts to get into issues and shift later into the day. The President put in shorter classes than necessary.

- Ramon – What is going to happen when we change the schedule that we have been taking years to fix?
- Mary – I don't want to go through the bunny trail, I would like to call for a vote.
- Tim – There isn't anything to vote on. Someone needs to bring forward the two bills.
- Mike – I am sorry I lied; I thought it would be shorter. I would like to have a motion to bring bill 393 for a vote. Tim Newman motions to accept bill 393. Kader Frendi seconds.
- Roy – Is this the current version?
- Joseph – I thought it was made known that the President is going to do something no matter what.
- Mike – No, there is the assumption that he will do something.
- Provost – No, you asked what he would like to do. He would like to have twenty minutes between classes.
- Tim – I think we have a timing issue. We have a very short time to get it done.
- Harry – Tomorrow?
- Tim – I think the President said next week.
- Provost – He said the 7th.
- Roy – I would like to make a motion to adjourn.
- Mike – You can't.
- Roy – I believe I can make a motion to adjourn and suggest we do nothing at this point. No one has asked for our advice we are just running around worried about it.
- Mike – The President gave us time to create the task force and consider this.
- Roy – Motion to adjourn.
- Mike – All in favor. Motion fails.
- Mike – The President said I would like your opinion on this matter. The executive committee could have just said this is our opinion. Our choice was to take it to the full senate.
- Roy – Motion to introduce an emergency solution.
- Tim – That is out of order. There is a bill on the table.
- Mike – 393 follows the end of the recommendations from the ad-hoc committee also with an amendment from Dr. Cerro. Dr. Dillihunt has a recommendation that whatever is done is a pilot study.
- James – I don't know if this is in order. I feel cheated. We have 365 days in the year and we have two semesters. Is 40.5% in the same category?
- Mike – That is such an unknown. I can't find anyone that does that. Here is bill 393, black was the original text. The blue and red are changes.
- Roy – Motion to amend to strike new changes and revert back to old changes. Sophia Marinova seconds.
- Roy – The nature of the discussion is to say what the ad-hoc says. It is a nasty problem and needs to be better understood before making changes. The senate recommends that no changes be made at this time. Go back to the original text.
- Harry – I read the bill and the report last night. There is so much we don't know. There are several people on campus that could be working on researching the problem. I don't like having only 24 hours to make a drastic decision that will affect all faculty and students. I am in favor of the amendment.
- Vladimir – What is the definition of this time?
- Mike – Today.

- Roy – We are saying study it, create a solution, then implement the change.
 - Mike – All in favor of the amendment. 27 in favor. 1 opposed. 3 abstain. Amendment passes.
 - Tim – The bill has been amended and is now in order for anymore amendments.
 - Sophia – It seems like that faculty senate recommends finding a cross section. I am not saying it's a bad suggestion.
 - Roy – It complicates it. I motion to strike the bottom section out about funding students to research.
 - Sophia – I second the amendment.
 - Ramon – What the last line says is we need to do a serious study. You don't think we need to do a study?
 - Sophia – No, we do but not this way.
 - Roy – It's not a bad idea, it just complicates the bill. It needs to be separate.
 - Ramon – There isn't anything in the top lines that says what the red does.
 - Harry – I don't want anything in the bill that states how it should be studied at this point.
 - Mike – All in favor of striking the second red portion from bill. 18 in favor. 8 opposed. 2 abstain.
 - Debra – I propose an amendment in place of that. I would like for it to say that, "The faculty senate recommends further study of this problem by methods determined by experts available on campus."
 - Joseph – Can I suggest just putting that in the first paragraph?
 - Mike – Ok, we change believes to recommends.
 - Debra – No. That's ok but also says, by using experts in the area.
 - Debra – The senate believes that this is an important problem recommends that further study be done to determine the problem by using experts in the area.
 - Ramon – Who will decide who does the research?
 - Tim – I would like to piggy back to that. There is a parking study done and I wouldn't want administration to say that the parking study studied what needs to be done and this is the solution. I think it needs to be more specified.
 - Sophia – We want to first analyze what kind of experts.
 - Mike – We will make a friendly amendment to say overseen by the faculty senate.
 - Ramon – Can we task the President of the faculty senate to oversee this?
 - Mike – Sure.
 - Mike – There is an amendment. All in favor. The bill is back to its original format. 26 in favor.
 - Roy – Can you call the bill?
 - Mike – Final vote on bill 393 as amended. Ayes carry.
- Roy Magnuson motions to adjourn. Debra Moriarity seconds. All in favor. 3 opposed. Meeting adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

**Faculty Senate Executive Meeting
October 13, 2016
12:30 P.M. in CTC 103**

Present: Monica Dillihunt, Kader Freni, Carmen Scholz, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Mike Banish, Tim Newman, Earl Wells, James Swain

Absent: Ramon Cerro, Eric Seeman

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guests: President Bob Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- Meeting summary:
 - Proposed Bill Proposing New Process for Small Grants Applications through the Office of Sponsored Programs passed first reading and will be sent to the full faculty senate.
 - Librarian Policy passed with amendments and will be sent to the full faculty senate.
 - Lecturer Policy is added to agenda.
 - Hoverboard Policy is added to agenda to be un-tabled.
- **Administrative Reports**
 - Provost Christine Curtis
 - I brought the preliminary enrollment data that includes pell data. We are at 27.6 ACT and Auburn is at 27.4. I will give you this to look at and if you have questions, let me know.
 - On Tuesday the 25th and Wednesday the 26th, we have an agenda for Title IX training. This is for faculty, staff, department chairs, associate deans, directors, faculty senators, everyone needs to come. We don't know which person a student may come to and say I have a problem. We need to be aware of what to do and the appropriate actions. The training will run an hour and fifteen minutes for each. There are two sessions for faculty. There are two for staff. The students also have two sessions in the evening. This is for us to be totally informed if the students need our help if they have a complaint or are being complained about.
 - Mike – Could you give me a very brief description of what the procedures to be are if a student came to me and said a student groped her or a faculty member groped her?
 - Provost – You go to TJ Brecciaroli for students. For faculty, you go to Delois Smith.
 - Mike – You don't go to police?
 - Provost – These are the contacts for Title IX. TJ handles 40 – 50 complaints a year. They aren't all at a high level, but they all have to be handled. They

have both had extensive training. The key is to keep the student calm and get them to the right person.

- Carmen – How is the point of contact determined?
- Provost – If it is student on student, it stays with TJ. If it is student with faculty, it goes to Delois. If it is amongst faculty, that goes to Delois.
- Mike – Is this posted on the website?
- Provost – Yes, there is a Title IX location on the website. At the very bottom of the website, there is a Title IX link.
- Kader – Does Title IX cover hiring processes too?
- Provost – Yes, but the Title IX we are talking about here is specific to sexual harassment. This area is in the public spotlight. There are lists of universities that are being watched. The board has asked us not to get on that list. That is why we are having this training. In the Chronicle yesterday, there was a university listed that was in Delaware. It stated that they didn't treat the accused properly. We have to treat both parties properly with due processes.
- Mike – I know that you have sent this out, but I will send it out to my senators. I will also remind my committee chairs to remind their members.
- Provost - If you could encourage your department chairs to encourage their staff assistants to go. Students will go to those they are most comfortable with.

○ President Bob Altenkirch

- The board is requiring that we hire a Title IX coordinator. I have written the job description. We finalized that and filled out the paperwork. The title is Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator. They will make sure that we are compliant and up to date. The focal point will be Title IX compliance. They will coordinate the activities. We will start off with a one person office and they will report to me. The Title IX coordinators should report to the highest levels, and there isn't one higher. I held off on it, because I didn't know if it would be a full time job. It was in legal, but had to be pulled out for compliance issues.
- ACT scores are in; we beat Auburn for the first time. I received the resolution for class scheduling and reviewed all the reports. My conclusion is that what we are going to do for the fall is have twenty minutes between classes. I have written a memo that pulls all the areas we are going to pursue. We will consider bicycles and walking maps. We will shift the start times to have twenty minutes between classes. We won't change any contact time.
 - Provost – On MWF, it will no longer match the MW schedule. There will be nine full class times from 8 – 6.
- It's the same table except we won't go until 9:00 and you can start whenever you want. There was an error in the table. It ends at 8:40 not 9:00. Basically accepting all recommendations like bicycles, but change the start times. I will attach a walking map that shows how long it would take to get to each place. There are points to points that are 25 minutes.
 - Kader – One recommendation was to incorporate an alert system in banner when students are enrolling in classes.
 - Provost – I will be talking with the registrar to see if there is a way we can do that. That is an excellent idea. The walking time map will be on the

website. I will talk with them to see what we can do through banner. It will be interesting. We are going to Banner XE. Maybe if it can't be done immediately, it can be done in that transition.

- Carmen – Does the consensus still remain that we can start earlier if students agree?
- Provost – Yes, but you have to stick with the final exam times.
- Kader – This is also contingent on the parking study. It may change with the resolution.
- President – I can't tell you what will come from that. We are supposed to hear from them by Christmas break. I am thinking that anything we hear from the study would improve the situation.
- Carmen – On a different note, is the Title IX coordinator a new position?
 - President – No, this is fresh.
 - Provost – This is coming from the board. They basically said don't get on the list and get a compliance officer.

➤ **Officer/Committee Reports**

- Mike Banish, President
 - Most of you know that Joseph put forth a bill. Overhead is now waived on grants less than \$5K. That is great news and we thank you, President.
 - I got a list from Joy of committees that need faculty senate representation. Some are problematic to begin with because they are called committees and don't have half faculty members on them.
 - Provost – Can we change the name?
 - Mike – Yes, we are going to make that recommendation.
 - One is the Charger Green Recycling Committee; I think we are good on this one after reviewing this. The Students Advisory Board, we are good. The ADA Advisory Committee, we seem to be missing someone from the faculty senate. It really doesn't need to be called a committee.
 - Monica – We looked at that and it didn't say 50%.
 - Mike – Yes, for a committee it does.
 - Monica, I hate to say it, but it will either be nursing or education. We will press someone from nursing. Employee Benefits Committee, we are covered. Mary Bonilla is serving.
 - Provost- What about someone from business?
 - Mike – Ok, I will work to get someone.
- Carmen Scholz, President – Elect
 - I received a bill from Joseph. Then I realized it was agreed upon before anything started.
 - Provost – What did you receive?
 - Joseph – I sent forward a bill.
 - Provost – How did you get the word about the \$5K?
 - Mike – I got it from my Dean.
 - Provost – Today? What time? I was wondering what the chain of events were.
 - Joseph – I emailed Ray Vaughn and received a verbal agreement. We felt like we needed something definitive. That is why we went ahead with the bill to have something down years from now.

- Monica – It came yesterday at 8:33 am from Gloria.
- Mike – We received it at 9:27 this morning. My suggestion is that we go through and pass the bill. That is up to you though.
- Kader – The amount is double.
- Mike – My amendment would be change the amount.
- Joseph – It isn't we don't trust Ray; we just want something for years to come.
- Provost – If you read the last sentence. Since this has been resolved and the amount has been defined, do we really need this statement?
- Tim – Was the thinking of adding that statement was it would make it more enforced?
- Mike- I think the last two things are out because it can't include salaries. We can make an amendment to change it and send it forward.
- Provost – I would say to take it out to not slap the research center.
- Tim – Are we going to go forward with this one?
- Mike – Yes.
- Tim – I will go ahead with a motion to adopt this bill with an amendment.
- Mike – Do we need to go through committee reports first?
- Tim – Yes, I withdraw my motion.
- Carmen – I would like to finish this one.
- Mike – We are going to change the \$2500 to \$5000 and strike the last two “further be resolved”. All those in favor. Ayes carry. This will be on the agenda for Thursday.
- Tim – What is the bill number?
- Mike – It should be 396.
- Carmen – I don't know if this belongs here, but we discussed the issue with the RCEU program on how to get the funds to the students. I have received a complaint along with this in regards to C&G that the PI's paperwork is ridiculous. Is this the time to handle this?
 - Tim – You can make this part of your report. The other option is at the tail of our agenda, there is miscellaneous business that you could discuss it then.
 - Provost – Outside of the senate, you can send this to me and I will start working it. Maybe it needs to go two routes.
 - Carmen – You can't have them handling it this way and then next year they handle it the same way and get in trouble. There is an issue when the students receive the money, if there is an outstanding bill, it gets paid. If the parent paid with card, the money goes onto their card and they will not relinquish the funds to the student.
 - Joseph – The RCEU stipend goes into their account and they may not get it?
 - Carmen – I will send this and we need to get something resolved.
 - Mike – A few of us have talked and rather than do bills and resolutions, let's summarize this in a letter that we agree upon.

One of the issues in this is C&G seems to operate in their own power world. I just had a contract that finally got started. The POP was 21 September. It started up and I asked Angela to get the POP changed. I was told C&G didn't have it set up, so I can't. They will let me know when it's ready. C&G runs their own organization with no reporting to you in essence; that is a problem. We ask them a question, how much will be taken out for fringe benefits? That is difficult to get an answer and it is usually wrong. Other departments asked the question how much fringe will be taken out over the summer. They received an answer and it was wrong. The contract was overcharged and the PI's used their three accounts to cover it.

- Provost – I think we need to get this in a letter with basic description. The President has to have examples in order to push the person in charge.
- Mike – I agree with you. Faculty members receive a lot of accountability. There is no accountability to these wrong answers.
- Provost – That is what needs to be addressed. I understand the issue. I have got to have the examples.
- Carmen – I think that the problem comes from the fact that C&G is set up for contracts. They have very little knowledge about awards from funding agencies. They understand themselves as the final gate keeper to keep faculty in check. This mindset of treating the faculty as potential crooks is wrong. Our faculty does not have the mindset to use the funds for personal gain. The mindset needs to change.
- Kader Frendi, Past – President
 - I was assigned the Committee for Graduate Education. I have a list of members: Ramon, Monica, Wai Mok, Rob Preece, Alaina, Lenora, and John. I would like to have another person from science.
 - Provost - The President was talking with the deans yesterday. He was talking about the PhD production. Due to the way they have changed it, we have to have a broader range of PhD's. Is there any other area, that we would have a strong case, outside of science and engineering that we could consider creating a PhD program? If that committee would think about that it would help the university. It has to be well thought idea.
 - Mike – One of the reasons that we have been slow to develop this is because it was getting people from business and liberal arts to buy into it. Dr. Frendi did a lot of work to get this started. We do agree with you highly.
 - Kader – In addition to that, our ranking was high without the new areas.
 - Provost – They made it broad based. That is hurting us. We have to change when we bring in GTA's, we pay 125 a year, to PhD. We don't make that transition.
 - Carmen – Why doesn't the GTA to Master's count?
 - Mike – That doesn't count in Carnegie. It is PhD only.

- Provost – That is important. In regards to Carnegie, PhD is what matters.
- Monica – What further support is available? For example, psychology, there is a strong need for that. Our psychology department doesn't have certain areas. If that would be an area we found to support this need, what would the support be?
- Provost – Then you have to look at the cost. In order to sell it, I would go with programs that would be closest to move to PhD's. We can't be in an ivory tower. We know where the funds come from – the state.
- Carmen- I think we are skewed to a certain area. If you look at the kind of money that comes in, there is a chunk that is entirely research.
- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
 - No Report.
- Monica Dillihunt, Governance and Operations Chair
 - I counted the numbers for the Faculty Appeals Committee. I guess Joy will send those out.
- Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
 - We looked at a couple of bills. The plus/minus grading, the committee is concerned that it was piece milled. The proposal was that the professor would put on the syllabus what they would do, it was decided that was not a good decision.
 - SIE's - there needs to be some standardization across the university. We felt since there was a SIE committee, they need to do their work. We approved several classes. We are keeping on with new classes and programs.
- Joseph Taylor, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
 - Our committee met with the President for the budget presentation.
 - We did select speakers for spring 2017. There were five speakers. They will be on the website soon.
 - The RCEU proposals for faculty are due the 28th of this month. We do have sponsorship for stipends from business, science, and nursing. We are up to 35. Honors are now creating their own RCEU program. The consideration of the two honors will now be considered within that program.
 - Provost – I sell this when I go on the road. The parents always seem interested.
 - Mike – Can I suggest that you take a faculty member with you on recruiting trips?
 - Provost - That isn't my decision. This year we are streamlining it more than last. There are two going this time. I was told we would drive separately. But I did ask if we could drive together. Before we had a senior level go. It is grueling that you are away for that whole period of time. It can be hard. One thing we could possibly do, I have Florence to do in a week, and I have Decatur. I would love to have faculty go with me.
 - Mike – I would like to see business and liberal arts faculty go with you.

- Provost - One thing we are doing is we are setting up collaboration with a fine arts school in Birmingham. It turns out they have a math and science program. I am stopping by the Governor's School in South Carolina. We are trying to make specific efforts. When I went through Alabama, I only heard out of 81 students that 4 were aerospace, 10 computer science. There was a wide range. When we go outside, we tend to get more academic common market which is aerospace and engineering.
 - James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
 - We didn't come to a consensus on the IRB. I think things on course forgiveness will be solved soon. Will there be a bill for plus/minus bill?
 - Mike – Yes, it was a student bill. I need to get with them.
 - Earl Wells, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
 - No report.
- Mike – I am going to slip an item into the agenda. For the three policies we declared non-governance and released to committees for voting, it was the speech area policy, parking in front of SSB, and SSB room's use. Was there votes? Today is the deadline to announce. Did anyone say they want to discuss in front of full senate. Then they will go through and we will respond back the President.
- Mike – The policy on the leave pool. For accounting reasons, they are going to have a leave pool for people that are primarily on research contracts. I had a nice long discussion with Theresa in the VPR office. We went through the procedure and why they are doing it. It doesn't affect regular faculty in any form. If you have a research associate under you, it will affect them.
 - Provost – It deals with people who have leave.
 - Mike – For the policy of leave pool, can we have a vote that it is non-governance and send it out to the committees? All in favor? 2 abstain. We will release the policy and discuss it next time.
- Approval of faculty senate agenda for October 20th.
 - We will have bill 396 with amendment. I made some edits to the librarian policy to the representation part. I took off the procedures for non-tenured track faculty. I couldn't find that in 7-14.
 - Provost – On the last paragraph, change racked to rank.
 - Tim – On page 2, I think the way it reads is the librarian determines the college from which the external member comes from, not the actual member. I can't remember what is in the faculty handbook on non-tenured. For tenure-tracked, it's possible for the chair and the candidate to pick a specific person. Do you want it to parallel that? Is that in the handbook that someone chooses the college, not the person?
 - Mike – I tried to blend them.
 - Tim – If it isn't the handbook that someone picks the college not the person, maybe you don't want that in this policy.
 - Mike – I ask that we move this forward to the senate next week. Tim Newman moves. Mike Banish seconds. Ayes carry.
 - Kader - Do you have guests coming to this meeting?
 - Mike – Yes.
 - Kader – They need to be on the agenda.
 - We will add lecturer policy, librarian policy, proposed bill, and un-table the Hoverboard policy to Thursday's agenda. All in favor. Ayes carry.

- Kader Frendi moves to adjourn. Mike Banish seconds. Meeting adjourns at 2:00 pm.

The University of Alabama in Huntsville
Policy on Lecturer Titles and Positions

Draft

Number:

Division: Academic Affairs

Date: May 2016

Purpose: This policy defines lecturer faculty titles and positions at The University of Alabama in Huntsville.

To sustain academic excellence, the University of Alabama in Huntsville is committed to growth in areas that align with its core mission. The success of UAH as institution is based on a climate that supports academic freedom, tenure, shared governance, and economic stability of the faculty. If success is to be retained, UAH is committed to maintain an academic labor force that can commit to excellence in instruction and research innovation through the appointment of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Lecturers are not hired as part of long-term expansion but to satisfy departmental circumstantial needs. **Teaching at all levels should be done by tenure-track faculty thus if circumstantial needs arise they should respond in particular, to the teaching of General Education Requirements courses.** It is recognized these needs differ among different colleges and departments. Thus, the request of a position for appointment of lecturers must be approved by the tenured faculty of a department.

Policy:

The lecturer academic titles and credentials defined below are required for the appointment and promotion of lecturers who are classified as non-tenure-track faculty. Recruitment and hiring of lecturers shall conform to the University's Affirmative Action Plan and comply with the Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Policy 02.01.06. Additionally, like all other faculty employed at the University, lecturers involved in instruction must meet the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) credential requirements for teaching at the appropriate level.

Procedures:

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments/Promotions of Lecturers

Lecturer appointments are non-tenure track faculty appointments. Non-tenure-track faculty are given either (1) a one year appointment, or (2) an appointment that may continue for a stated period of time up to six years, renewable annually for one year within that period, contingent upon the faculty member's satisfactory performance, the availability of funds, and the instructional needs of the department. After a Lecturer has been appointed for 6 consecutive years, he/she cannot be dismissed without due

process. The causes for dismissal are proven financial distress of the University, gross misconduct or continued non-satisfactory performance. In all cases a review committee will evaluate the dismissal process.

The review of a non-tenure-track faculty member follows the review process outlined in Chapter 7 of the UAH Faculty Handbook. Recommendations for reappointment of a lecturer are the responsibility of a unit's reappointment committee consisting of at least three faculty members appointed by the unit chair or head. The committee writes an evaluation of the individual's performance and a statement of the need for his or her continued services. Recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment are submitted by the unit chair or head to the dean early in the semester prior to the end of the lecturer's current appointment. The dean, with the approval of the provost, issues a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment.

The annual renewal of an appointment that is potentially multi-year is based on the committee's and unit chair's or head's recommendation to the dean. The dean reviews the recommendation and with the approval of the provost may either renew or not renew the lecturer or librarian. If the dean does not agree with the recommendation of the committee he/she has 30 days to notify the committee in writing of the reasons for the decision not to appoint.

If the lecturer is seeking promotion, the reappointment committee will review the promotion request and provide a written review of the candidate's promotion file to the unit chair or head, stating whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion. The unit chair or head then reviews the promotion file and writes a letter of recommendation to the dean or director. For those colleges organized into departments, the promotion file is then reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC), which then votes on the candidate's promotion file and submits the promotion file to the dean. After reviewing the promotion file, the dean provides a recommendation and submits the promotion file to the provost, who makes the promotion file available to the University Review Board (URB) for its review and vote. The provost receives the URB's recommendation and conducts an independent review prior to making a final decision. In conducting the review, the provost evaluates all information submitted and may utilize professional assessments from appropriate faculty and academic administrators, as well as the promotion file and all previous recommendations. The provost, with the concurrence of the president, makes the final decision on the promotion of a lecturer.

Service in a non-tenure-track appointment is not considered part of a probationary period for tenure consideration, and tenure cannot be earned in the position. **Lecturers receiving a negative review have access to the same appeal procedures outlined for tenure-track faculty in section 7.10.12 of the Faculty Handbook.**

Lecturer Series

Lecturer: To be eligible for appointment at the rank of lecturer, an individual must have completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at

least a master's degree, or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the discipline in which the lecturer teaches. The primary responsibilities of an individual appointed as a lecturer are instruction, student learning, and retention, with an emphasis on student success, and curriculum development. Contributions such as highly effective and consistent dedication to student learning, retention, and success; scholarly and/or creative activities or publications; grantsmanship usually related to instruction and student activities; consistent and conspicuous involvement in institutional and professional service responsibilities; and professional development activities are expected and required for promotion. Other duties may be assigned.

The teaching load for lecturers is normally eight 3 or 4 credit hour courses equaling either 24 or 32 semester hours in the academic year. Those who teach 24 semester hours typically have additional expectations for service in student advising, participation in departmental programs concerned with student activities, additional responsibilities in instructional matters required by their courses, or other responsibilities as assigned by the chair of the department. Those who teach 32 semester hours normally do not have any additional responsibilities. Teaching requirements may be adjusted for involvement in important projects, special activities of value to the department and the college, or special needs/requirements of the courses taught. Lecturers do not participate in departmental processes concerning appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure, nor are they eligible to the Faculty Senate.

Senior Lecturer: Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer includes all of the requirements of a lecturer and is intended to recognize efforts and performance that combine instructional effectiveness with additional significant contributions to the mission of the university. These contributions may include instructional and curriculum development; dedication to student learning, retention, and success; scholarly and/or creative activities or publications; grantsmanship usually related to instruction or student activities; consistent and conspicuous involvement in institutional and professional service responsibilities; professional development activities; and continuing education. An individual promoted to the rank of senior lecturer will normally have held a regular, full-time appointment as a lecturer at The University of Alabama in Huntsville for a minimum of six, preferably consecutive, years. **Senior lecturers do not participate in departmental processes concerning appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure, nor are they eligible to the Faculty Senate.**

Review: Academic Affairs will review the policy every five years or soon as needed.

Approval

The University of Alabama in Huntsville
Policy on Librarian Titles and Positions

Draft

Number:

Division: Academic Affairs

Date: May 2016

Purpose: This policy defines librarian faculty titles and positions at The University of Alabama in Huntsville.

Policy: The librarian academic titles and credentials defined below are required for the appointment and promotion of librarians who are classified as non-tenure-track faculty. Recruitment and hiring of librarians shall conform to the University's Affirmative Action Plan and comply with the Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Policy 02.01.06. Additionally, like all other faculty employed at the University, librarians involved in instruction must meet the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) credential requirements for teaching at the appropriate level as stated in the Faculty Credential Policy 02.01.57.

Description of Librarian:

Each librarian's professional responsibilities include activities that contribute directly and indirectly to student learning. Librarians contribute directly to students' acquisition of knowledge, skills, and dispositions by teaching in the library's information literacy program and working with students individually during reference transactions. Normally, members of the library faculty are expected to teach and to provide reference services to students, faculty, and other library patrons. Among the indirect contributions are development of the library's print and electronic collections and the creation of print and online resources that aid students in finding the information they need. Each librarian carries additional responsibilities that contribute to the smooth operation and administration of the library. These include supervision of student and/or support staff and management of some aspect of the library's operations (reference, interlibrary loan, technical services, electronic resources, archives, systems, user services).

Effective library service is characterized by (1) teaching and public service that embodies the constructs set for all University faculty (organization and preparation, engagement, delivery, fairness, and accessibility); (2) engagement with the departmental faculty in the development of the library's collections and services. This includes, but is not limited to, monitoring the department's use of its library allocation, informing faculty of new publications and resources in the field, development of research guides and finding aids in the field, and promoting library use among the

faculty; (3) identifying and implementing innovative information technologies that improve library services; and (4) effective management of the operational unit, including effective supervision of staff, responsible use of library resources, participation in library planning, and project management.

Research/creative endeavor includes scholarly, scientific, or artistic endeavors. Librarians are expected to do research to improve individual effectiveness and overall quality of library service. Some examples of research/creativity are publications, conference presentations, development of innovative techniques or programs, and substantial redesign or development of programs.

Service/professional obligation includes on-campus and off-campus activities. On-campus service includes activities whose principal purpose is the efficient and effective functioning of the University. Committee responsibilities are the most obvious examples of such activities, but all activities potentially beneficial to the UAH community, including student advising, also will be considered service. Off-campus service refers to those activities in which a librarian, officially or unofficially, serves as liaison between UAH and some external organization, or shares his or her expertise with those outside the University. Such activities will aim to affirm UAH's commitment to the larger communities of which it is a part. Such activities include participation in scholarly and professional organizations, professional consulting, delivering lectures and workshops to off-campus groups, and representing UAH at professional activities involving groups outside the University.

Procedures:

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments/Promotions: Librarians

Librarian appointments are non-tenure track faculty appointments. Non-tenure-track faculty are given either (1) a one-year appointment, or (2) an appointment that may continue for a stated period of time up to three years, renewable annually for one year within that period, contingent upon the faculty member's satisfactory performance, the availability of funds, and the instructional needs of the department. After a Librarian has been appointed for 8 consecutive years, dismissal requires due process and follows the process given in Chapter 7, Section 7.14 of the Faculty Handbook

The review of a non-tenure-track faculty member follows the review process outlined in Chapter 7 of the UAH Faculty Handbook. Recommendations for reappointment of a librarian are the responsibility of the Library reappointment committee consisting of at least three Librarian members appointed by the library director. The external committee member will be from a College agreed to by the faculty under review and the Library Director and the Provost. The committee writes an evaluation of the individual's performance and a statement of the need for his or her continued services. Recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment are submitted by the Director of the Library in accordance with the procedures given in Chapter 7, Section

7.8 in the Faculty Handbook. The director, with the approval of the provost, issues a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment.

The annual renewal of an appointment that is potentially multi-year is based on the committee's recommendation to the director. The director reviews the recommendation and with the approval of the provost may either renew or not renew the lecturer librarian. If the director does not agree with the committees' recommendation, he/she has 30 days to notify the committee in writing of the reasons for the decision not to appoint. The appeal process for non-reappointment of a librarian follows the same process as given in Chapter 7, Section 7.14, of the Faculty Handbook.

If the librarian is seeking promotion, the reappointment committee will review the promotion request and provide a written review of the candidate's promotion file to the unit head, stating whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion. The unit head then reviews the promotion file and writes a letter of recommendation to the director. The promotion file is reviewed by the director without a PTAC review. After reviewing the promotion file, the director provides a recommendation and submits the promotion file to the provost, who makes the promotion file available to the University Review Board (URB) for its review and vote. The provost receives the URB's recommendation and conducts an independent review prior to making a final decision. In conducting the review, the provost evaluates all information submitted and may utilize professional assessments from appropriate faculty and academic administrators, as well as the promotion file and all previous recommendations. The provost, with the concurrence of the president, makes the final decision on the promotion of a librarian.

Librarians receiving a negative promotion decision may appeal by following guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook, 7.10.12.

Service in a non-tenure-track appointment is not considered part of a probationary period for tenure consideration, and tenure cannot be earned in the position.

Librarian Series

Librarian I. Appointment to Librarian I requires a master's degree from a library school accredited by the American Library Association or a master's degree relevant to the individual's subject specialty. A librarian of this rank demonstrates potential to carry out instructional, scholarly, and creative duties required to perform the informational needs of the position and shows evidence of professional growth in the field.

Librarian II. Appointment or promotion to the rank of Librarian II includes all of the requirements of Librarian I. In addition, appointment/promotion to this rank requires a minimum of two years of relevant professional library experience. The following additional criteria apply to Librarian II. A librarian of this rank demonstrates ability to handle information needs as assigned by specific job duties in accordance with

Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) defined guidelines¹ (instructional, scholarly, creative, assessment, technical, and service duties) and shows evidence of scholarly activity, which may include but is not limited to publications in library or discipline-specific journals, presentations and exhibits at the local and regional level, development of programs and operating procedures for pertinent departments, participation in continuing education efforts, etc. A librarian of this rank also demonstrates service to the library or university by serving on committees and by membership in professional library or library-related associations.

Librarian III: Appointment or promotion to the rank of Librarian III normally requires at least six years of relevant professional library experience. Appointment/promotion to this rank also normally requires a minimum of four year's full-time appointment at the rank of Librarian II. In addition, a librarian of this rank demonstrates outstanding performance of primary job responsibilities in accordance with ACRL-defined guidelines and demonstrates leadership and planning skills for library and/or university projects. A librarian of this rank shows evidence of scholarly activity that may include but is not limited to publications in library journals or discipline-specific journals; presentations at the local or state level, development of exhibits, and participation in or leading continuing education efforts; working collaboratively with university faculty to develop subject-specific library-related curricular content; etc. In addition, a librarian of this rank demonstrates service to the library and the university by serving in a leadership capacity on library or university committees and by participating in professional library or library-related associations.

Librarian IV: Appointment or promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires demonstration of nationally-recognized excellence in the library field, normally involving a minimum of twelve year's relevant professional experience. Appointment/promotion to this rank also normally requires a minimum of four year's full-time appointment at the rank of Librarian III. In addition, a librarian of this rank demonstrates overall superior performance in primary job responsibilities in accordance with ACRL-defined guidelines and demonstrates leadership in creative problem-solving and strategic planning skills in the management of library resources. In the position of librarian, the individual meets or exceeds a high level of understanding of the library's mission and the relationship of the library to the mission of the university. A librarian of this rank is recognized nationally as a proven scholar with a record of publications, presentations, exhibits and other scholarly activities. The individual further demonstrates service to the library and to the university by serving in a leadership capacity on university committees and by participating in professional library or library-related associations, assuming leadership responsibilities in these associations.

Faculty Senate Representation

The Library may send a Librarian of any rank to act as a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate until such time as the Library has sufficient Clinical, Tenured, or Tenure track faculty for a regular member.

¹ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/promotiontenure#promorank>

Review: Academic Affairs will review the policy every five years or soon as needed.

Approval

Chief University Counsel

Date

Vice President for Diversity

Senior Vice President for Business
and Finance

Vice President for Research and
Economic Development

Provost and Executive Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Date

APPROVED:

President

Proposed Bill Proposing New Process for Small Grant Applications through the Office of Sponsored Programs

WHEREAS, funds from many sources that support scholarly research, including private foundations, are relatively small in dollar value; and

WHEREAS, these small funding awards are typically used solely to support research travel to, and/or per diem at, external locations; and

WHEREAS, the University should encourage scholarly activity of all levels and across all disciplines; and

WHEREAS, enhanced scholarly activities benefit the University by raising its academic profile and reputation; and

WHEREAS, the scholarly activities of many faculty are neither enabled nor supported by existing University Research Centers; and

WHEREAS, the University's existing internal proposal preparation and approval process (the "process") is oriented toward large extramural grants that, in part, include faculty and/or staff salary support; and

WHEREAS, the application of Facilities and Administrative fees ("F&A") on small grants substantially reduces their value, scholarly impact, and usefulness; and

WHEREAS, the (a) process and (b) application of F&A can be onerous and therefore discourage faculty from seeking "small" funding awards to support scholarly activity,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Office of Vice President for Research and Economic Development and the Office of Sponsored Programs, in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs, develop a simplified proposal review and approval process (the "new process") for any funding proposal less than or equal to \$5000 that is limited to travel, per diem, or other costs directly related to scholarly activities.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the new process be developed in conjunction with representatives from the Faculty Senate and each College.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the new process be operational no later than the start of the Fall 2016 semester.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That F&A be automatically waived for any proposal less than or equal to a total of \$2500 that is limited to travel, per diem, or other costs directly related to scholarly activities.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
USE OF HOVERBOARDS AND SIMILAR DEVICES POLICY
-INTERIM-**

Number 03.01.03

Division Student Affairs

March 15, 2016

Purpose The University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH) is committed to the safety and welfare of our employees and students. Due to reported fire hazards and other problematic safety concerns associated with Hoverboards and similar, hands-free, self-balancing devices, UAH has imposed prohibitions and restrictions that will remain in effect until the risks are eliminated. The University realizes that an emerging issue that will be reconsidered when information and better safety standards for all models of these devices are in place. In the meantime, the prohibitions and restrictions specified in this policy will remain in effect until further notice.

Policy Hoverboards, and other similar self-balancing boards and scooters are prohibited from being used inside all University-owned buildings. This includes residence halls and apartments, academic buildings, university owned homes, leased facilities, and other campus properties controlled by the University. These devices are also restricted from being stored and/or having their batteries charged inside the aforementioned facilities.

Individuals who use Hoverboards and other similar self-balancing, hands-free, two-wheeled devices on the grounds, streets, and sidewalks of UAH, must familiarize themselves and comply with state and campus motor vehicle regulations.

This policy does not apply to any assisted device required by a person with documented limitation.

Review The Vice President for Student Affairs is responsible for the review of this policy every five years (or whenever circumstances require.)

Approval

Chief University Counsel

Date

Vice President for Student Affairs

Date

Approved

President

Date