FACULTY SENATE
MEETING #573 AGENDA
NUR 205A
THURSDAY, November 17, 2016
12:30 PM to 2:00 PM

Call to Order

1. Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #572 Minutes from October 20, 2016


3. Officer and Committee Reports
   - Mr. Anthony Daniels, State Representative
   - Bill 397, UAH Tuition Capital Campaign

4. 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 Executive Meeting  
November 10, 2016  
12:30 P.M. in CTC 104

Present: Ramon Cerro, Michael Banish, Carmen Scholz, Kader Frendi, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, James Swain, Eric Seeman

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:42 pm.
- **Summary of Meeting**
  - Bill 397, Capital Campaign, passed first reading.
- **Officer/Committee Reports**
  - Michael Banish, President
    - There are no administrative reports today.
  - Carmen Scholz, President-Elect
    - We were called to talk to the Provost about the summer schedule. The problem last year was we started summer school after high school was out. Then we run ten weeks, then a week exam, then fall starts. That really put housing in a tight spot between summer and fall. She sent us four options to fix the summer schedule. Option 1 is the same as last year and that is not recommended. Option 2 is use the last class period they meet for finals and do away with the exam week. Option 3 is to start earlier, but that disadvantages high school students. Option 4 is similar to option 2, instead of teach two hours add minutes to the end. So the solution we came up with is option 2 to get rid of one week and use the open Friday. Does it inconvenience or take from the educational program if the exam is given the last day of class? We figured no. Do we lose significantly if we use the last day? Can we give the exam the last day? We felt this is the best solution. Would we lose anything?
    - Joseph – My concern would be for the classes that have two exams, midterm and final. It doesn’t bother me being online.
    - Mike – One question we asked but didn’t get an answer to is how many hours do students typically take during the summer? We can’t answer it.
    - Christine – When I taught this summer, several students were taking two classes.
    - Mike – It isn’t typical to do that. Typically, they take one ten week class and then two five week classes. What is the limit to students taking summer classes? We heard there isn’t a limit.
    - Carmen – He tried to open the discussion to redoing the entire summer schedule. I don’t want that right now. I want a solution everyone can live with. I don’t want to reduce it or reinvent it.
    - Ramon – The only problem is housing?
    - Mike – Yes, they need time to clean from the old students to new. They need a week.
    - Carmen – They have two days right now and say that isn’t possible.
    - Kader – They finish Wednesday and move in Thursday and Friday.
• Carmen – Fridays we are closed.
• Joseph – I thought we are open five days.
• Kader – That would require a big change to teach on Fridays.
• Ramon – How many high school students do we have?
• Mike – There is a good number.
• Carmen – 100 classes were taken. I don’t know if that was 100 students or classes.
• Mike – That is about 35 for the ten week.
• Joseph – In the summer, I don’t know off the top of my head. We ran ten or so.
• Ramon – What is wrong with having the last class as the exam?
• Mike – You can do that if you want. It causes you to lose a class period.
• Christine – That would give those 12 hours to study to take it on Thursday.
• Kader – If you advertise it ahead of time that would make the students aware of the push for exam time.
• Mike – In engineering and science, at least half of the last class period is review. You could make the argument the review is fresh and they come ready. I told Christine that option 2 seemed like the best one. Use Thursday and Friday as exam days for ten weeks. That would need to be tweaked for the five week. This really isn’t our issue to comment on. We told them we appreciated the opportunity to give input. They have done this by instructor preference. This option leaves the instructor the driver for decision.
• Carmen – They get in the summer the same instructor exposure. I think it was generous she asked. Do we have a significant disadvantage to say so?
• Kader – I move that we adopt option 2. Carmen seconds. All in favor ayes carry.

O Kader Frendi, Past President
  ▪ I was assigned the graduate education program. I sent an email to have a meeting this week. I didn’t have quorum to move forward with that. The difficulty with fall is it’s almost over. I am going to try again.

O Eric Seeman, Ombudsperson
  ▪ No report.

O Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  ▪ We are working through a lot of paperwork.

O Joseph Taylor, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
  ▪ We are in the process of reviewing students RCEU applications.
  ▪ Carmen – Did you scan the proposals that came from faculty?
  ▪ Joseph – We accepted all proposals.
  ▪ Carmen – Right now if you received 30 proposals. Are they up and students can apply?
  ▪ Joseph – We are going to try to give faculty real time access to see if they have applications. We hope to find some system for faculty to be able to go and keep up. We have 33 stipends right now and we may get four more.

O James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  ▪ No report.

O Ramon Cerro, Personnel Committee Chair
• No report.
  o Mike Banish
  • We still have a lot of OIT policies out. I have lost track of the CEU Report Policy.
    • Kader – It is still open.
    • Mike – I think that belongs to Dr. Swain.
    • James – This is a presidential policy?
    • Mike – Yes.
  • Nepotism Policy – It has been assigned out.
  • Course Forgiveness Policy
    • James – I have that one.
    • Mike – Christine, do you?
    • Christine – I don’t think so.
    • Joseph – It was sent out to UCC and USA.
    • James – The main thing here is they went from five to three?
    • Eric – Overall, the students are better with this policy.
    • Mike – Chairs please see where you are on these.
  • Copyright Policy
    • Anyone got comments? I want to finish this one up by the end of the year.
  • Human Research Policy
    • James – I have this one.
  • Mike – The Provost has moved the lecturer policy to the President. She is still working on the librarian.
    • I still don’t have an official note from the SGA President, but he assured me is going to veto the bill and have it withdrawn.
    • The Provost wants to work on chapter 7 of the faculty handbook. She is going to start with the revised version. She is going to email me what she has and what she is working from. I suggested that she start looking at chapter 8.
      o Tim – She has 9, so when she comes back we are ready.
      o Mike – I will turn that over to you, Tim. I am sure some of the wording will need work.
      o Kader – We are hoping that chapter’s 4, 5, & 6 along with Appendix A will be presented to the board in February.
      o Tim – Nothing has come back. We are still waiting on responses to what we sent 4.5 years ago.
  • Mike – I received a request from Bob that we are going to hire a Title IX director. He has asked for two names to serve on the committee to hire the new compliance director. Right now, we have had three system lawyers here. They are going to be a system person, but we get to hire our own.
    • Tim – I thought we were hiring a lawyer.
    • Ramon – Can we suggest that there are enough administrators? I would like to make a motion that there should not be a search committee or new position.
    • Christine – I think we should make that statement with a different position. We need this position.
    • Ramon – I think that there is someone here that could do this job.
    • Mike- It could be an internal hire. But the question is to get two names.
• Tim Newman seconds Ramon motion.
• Ramon – My position has nothing to do with Title IX, maybe this is a bad time to put our foot down. I hear from faculty that there isn’t enough money for faculty positions but administrative positions. I think we should tell them that they should find someone within the current administration.
• Mike – I amend your motion to say that the faculty senate believes that no more administrative positions should be created with the exception of the Title IX coordinator.
• Ramon – I won’t second that one. This is the time to put our foot down.
• Eric - Ramon, this is a bad time to do this. We need this person. There is no room for being creative. We will be evaluated on making sure we have a person compliant.
• Ramon – Do we have someone here?
• Eric – No. They have to have a legal credential.
• Ramon – Get someone from the system.
• Eric – The system will find them and we hire them.
• Mike – I am not for sure on that.
• Joseph – I thought the position had to be tied the campus.
• Eric – If you are going to have a shared one they have to be responsible for one unit.
• Ramon – Can we find out who is going to pay for it?
• Mike – I can ask. I am going to say that Title IX is something we don’t want to mess with. It can cost us a lot of money, more than the salary. The fight won’t be on this.
• Kader – I follow on Mike’s comment. Let’s not have Title IX as collateral damage. Let’s create a bill for administrative positions, to say no more.
• Ramon – What will be afterwards?
• Mike – There aren’t any more reasons than Title IX.
• Tim – I don’t know how many were on the executive board when Bob came in for his interview. He was asked how we reduce the number of administrators. He said we don’t fire, but we hold it constant. Then as people retire some you won’t replace. Also if you grow your enterprise, your administrative overhead is a lower percentage of what you got. That is not what we have seen. It hasn’t set well with me. I am disappointed in that and think it is time to send the message that it needs to stop.
• Mike – I call for vote on motion. 2 in favor. 3 opposed. 1 abstains. I invite you to make a bill.

Mike – Last order of business, I sent senate bill 397, UAH Tuition Capital Campaign. At Stanford if your family makes $125,000 or less, you go for free. If your family makes less than $67,000, you have free housing. Personally, our tuition structure is we give 55% of our freshman class some sort of scholarship. If you go back to the report where collaborative learning came out, number one was financial concerns. I wrote this bill. This states that we start a capital campaign that we have goals within 25 years, we have an endowment they get nine semesters paid for. Within five years, everybody gets one free semester. I added into this is we will change our bylaws and out of faculty senate make another committee, so that faculty has 50% membership to determine who gets the scholarship.
• Ramon – I would put a limit on the number of hours. I would also put a limit on the GPA.
• Mike – I won’t do that at this time. It is up to future faculty senate to decide that.
• Ramon – You say you want to provide it to everybody. We should say that this is for people that are eligible by a committee. I don’t think we should throw money to people who aren’t interested.
• Mike – If you get to this point, you have to get here.
• Ramon – We take everyone that has a pulse.
• Mike – When you say college is free, you have people with higher qualifications apply.
• Ramon – The friendly amendment would be we give a free ride to anyone that is a national merit scholar.
• Mike – Yes, we do.
• Ramon – No.
• Mike – We give you a free ride and housing.
• Tim – The GPA has to be at a certain level.
• Christine – Some students work and they can’t make a high GPA because they focus on support too. I don’t want it to be based on GPA. I don’t want it to be merit based. I think it should be everybody.
• Mike – If they are smart enough to get here, they may be need based, that will be a choice a future faculty senate makes. This is the question of do we want to go in this direction. We have never had a campaign here. I hear send us grad students, but we have too many students that are struggling to make it through financially. Is this the kind of institution we want to be.
• Tim – The point Ramon is making is if Paris Hilton came, she is covered.
• Mike – She is covered. If she meets the standard of the committee, she qualifies. I don’t want to have this discussion now. I want a separate faculty committee that says what we are going to do and the numbers may change.
• Ramon – I would suggest it goes to committees.
• Mike – I suggest it goes to executive and full senate.
• James – If you alter it, the slight change would be the goal would be to provide a way to make these goals. This would say we have the capability to give each student a free semester. Capital campaign is real money instead of discounted tuition. I don’t think you want to mess with who and how many. We need to say we need funds to cover this.
• Ramon – Why waste tuition money on students who do not deserve. Do it according to need and merit, not a blanket.
• Mike – I don’t want to get into a discussion of need. Then I get into a discussion of how many students do I want from surrounding counties that fit the qualifications. I think I can trust the people that will come after us to make that decision.
• Ramon – Then leave it open.
• Christine – It is.
• Tim – The language says everyone.
• Mike – At 10,000, we want them to go for nine semesters. If the committee wants 15,000, that is for the faculty after us.
• Christine – I like it being for everyone. Going to a graduate level where they funded everyone cuts out competition. I think it sets the tone for the university.
• Mike – It is down to who we let in.
• James – I am assuming if we don’t raise the money?
• Mike – Then it doesn’t go.
• Mike – I am asking for a vote of all those in favor this bill, first reading with the friendly amendment of fifteen hours per semester. 5 in favor. 2 opposed. Bill passes first reading.

➢ Motion to adjourn Kader Frendi, seconded by Carmen Scholz. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.
Faculty Senate Meeting
October 20, 2016
12:30 P.M. in NUR 205A

Present: Sophia Marinova, Laird Burns, David Stewart, Ryan Weber, David Harwell, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Jeremy Fischer, Anne Marie Choup, Kyle Knight, Michael Banish, Tingting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Fat Duen Ho, Earl Wells, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Christina Carmen, Tracy Durm, Marlena Primeau, Mary Bonilla, Qingyuan Han, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Ming Sun, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathis, Carolyn Sanders

Absent without Proxy: John Schnell, Kevin Bao, Eric Seeman, Dianhan Zheng, Ramon Cerro, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Casey Norris, Ann Bianchi, Amy Hunter, Michael George

Absent with Proxy: David Harwell, Xuejing Xing, Maria Steele, Shanhui Lee, Debra Moriarity

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guests: President Bob Altenkirch
Mr. Ron Gray
Mr. Britt Sexton

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- Approval of Faculty Senate Meeting #571 Minutes from September 29, 2016. Laird Burns request that his name be changed to absent with proxy. Tim Newman motions to approve Minutes 571 with amendment. Kader Frendi seconds the motion. Ayes carry the motion. No oppositions.
  Motion to approve Faculty Senate Minutes 571 passes.

- FSEC Report from October 13, 2016
  Kader Frendi moves to accept. James Swain seconds the motion. Ayes across the room. No oppositions.
  Motion to accept Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report from October 13, 2016 passes.

- Summary of Meeting
  - Lecturer Policy passed third reading with amendment.
  - Bill 396 passes second and third reading unanimously.
  - Librarian Policy passes second and third reading.
  - Hoverboard Policy passes third reading.

- Presentation by Board of Trustee Members
  - Mr. Ron Gray
Britt and I are the main representatives for this campus. We want to go through the presentation quickly. We want to introduce ourselves individually. I am from Huntsville originally. I worked in Birmingham for a while and moved here in 1995. Over that period of time, I have been involved with three companies. I have been very blessed to be a part of this town and community. It’s a great place to work and raise families. I am married and have two children. We have been on the board since 2009. We have been through a lot with this campus and are invested into this place.

Mr. Britt Sexton

I am from Decatur and have a daughter who just graduated from Randolph. I am familiar with the Huntsville area. My passion is economic development. When I was interviewed I said this campus is a sleeping giant. It is growing and being a trustee we do have a judiciary responsibility. We had a great lunch and are available for one on one time.

Mr. Ron Gray

How many have knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of the board? The system is large. It includes campuses here, UAB, and UA. The UAB campus is responsibility for UAB Health System. We take this seriously. Whatever we can do in this conversation to emphasize to this group that this campus has importance with the board. Capital investments are tangible items that come to the trustees. Academic programs, we have been very energetic to support a comprehensive university. The board consists of fifteen members. We have two members from the seven districts. Britt and I are the two for the fifth district. We serve potentially three six year terms. We have been at it quite a while. You can’t read this; I will make these charts available to you. The board of trustees executes its responsibilities through a committee structure. There are a couple of key points out of this chart. One is that this campus is represented very well by me and Sexton. We are heavily involved in all the committees. Britt was the prior chair of the finance committee and I am the current chair. If you were to summarize the number of committees that are led by these two trustees, the take away is this campus the board looks to us for this campus. They count on us to know. We are very well represented upon the board. One of the things we did when community unrest was an issue. The board of trustees took that concern very seriously. We have a UAH committee led by us that includes half the board. We meet once a year. The board is very interested and supportive of this campus. The trustees that represent you are well positioned to provide positive influence to the board in regards to this campus. One of the things that is important is we won’t solve the state budget problems. One of things the university through the board of trustees, we have initiated a very aggressive campaign to protect the education trust fund. This board is spending money and resources to make sure that the funds are protected.

Carolyn – Are there any UAH grad’s on the board of trustees? Is that something that has been discussed?

Ron – No, there aren’t. Joe Rich was a trustee representing the fifth district in 2010. I think it is a concern but the most important thing is that the trustees that represent you have influence at the board level. Ideally, that would be great if it was a UAH grad. The board receives the same question from Birmingham. They do have grads on the board.
Carolyn – I think many of us are aware of retirement. The impact of the suggestive changes politically, is scary. We hear a lot in the RSA newsletter and are becoming more concerned. Is this a topic that comes up among the board?

Britt – The current chancellor served on the RSA. We made a point to get him involved. It’s on the radar.

Ron – The rules have changed on how we have to account it. I don’t have any solutions.

Britt – If Ray Hayes rolled off, I will make sure that we have representation.

Harry – I was faculty senate president in the mid 90’s. Tuscaloosa was huge at that time and UAB almost as big. I am pleased to hear that we have two trustees on board that are representing us so well. How does the board treat you as representatives of this place?

Ron – That isn’t how it is thought of. They view of us independently. We treat every entity the same. One thing that has changed from the 90’s, the board at that time wasn’t as active. It was more of a board that people wanted to be on for a status point. It was realized that this board has a judiciary responsibility. We operate according to the manual. That perception isn’t how we operate.

Ron – Karen Brooks has had the same question asked. Her response is it is your child you love them all the same. We try to operate that way. I have left business cards here if you need my cell number.

Mike – Let me add to that. I was actually approached at the board meeting by our representatives and asked can I talk with the faculty senate? That shows there has been a change in the engagement. This will be an annual occurrence now.

Tim – Thanks for coming. Five years ago, you reached out to me. I appreciate that so much. Thanks for continuing this. I have been here for 20 years. We have moved forward from that point. It looks so much better than 20 years ago. What is the board’s vision for 20 years from now?

Ron – The vision would be for UAH would be to continue to capitalize on strong leadership. This campus could handle more. I know there are growing pains with growth. If you manage the growth well, you can produce revenue that provides support for the enterprise. We have not had a formal board declaration but I think the board would say let’s keep building.

Carolyn – I am a music professor and been here for a while. As a music professor, if we are going to do our best work with students on the technical sides, we need to feel our discipline to create music majors is highly respected. I question how much the board respects these kinds of majors. We want to have a sense that music is respected as any other major.

Ron – Why would you have that question?

Carolyn – Under previous administration, there was question among the board of trustees that he walked away from a $25M.

Ron – You know that President isn’t here anymore.

Carolyn – I appreciate that. Our music facilities are terrible in comparison to the high school.
o Ron – That is between you and the President. It would be on us if we
turned down something that Dr. Altenkirch came to us with a music facility
proposal. What happened in 2008 is inexcusable.
o Carolyn – You can understand why we feel like the step sister. There is
speculation among the campus of the board of trustees support among all
majors.
o Mike – As we have a continuing discussion, we will get past that.
o Member – The university I was with before experienced a high rate of
growth. Seeing the morale of the professors was low and the personality of
the university was different. How can we maintain the personality of UAH?
o President – The average ACT score of this group is the highest ever and the
highest in the state. If you look at the strategy for enrollment growth, when
the freshman class grew so did the ACT score. We are getting a cluster of
students around 27/29. The discount rate for freshman is 55%. It will hold
steady and the ACT score will grow each year. The discount rate across the
board is 25%.

➤ Officer and Committee Reports
  o Mike Banish, President
    ▪ We have a ballot for faculty members on various committees. One of them is
campus planning. I am going to pass out the ballots and the role to confirm that the
ballots match the attendance.
    ▪ I want to announce that Dr. Frendi has a Research Education committee that he
could have a few more members on. If you are interested in graduate education, it
isn’t just PHD and engineering. Somewhere along the way this campus will have a
PhD in liberal arts or business.
    ▪ I have started the charger foundations ad-hoc committee. Right now we are missing
people from science and business. We don’t have a representative from business or
science. Provost will have her own committee on charger foundations. This is our
own committee. If you want to have some say on this, we need a few more people.
Please volunteer for that committee. The current committee chair may not remain
the full time chair but he is getting it started.
  o Kader Frendi, Past President
    ▪ I do have membership and will call a meeting soon.
  o Carmen Scholz, President-Elect
    ▪ I am looking at problems and complaints from the research area working with C&G.
There is a lot of disconnect and running into problems. The life of PI’s is made very
difficult. If any faculty has examples to give. Something has to happen to resolve
this issue.
  o Joseph Taylor, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
    ▪ The RCEU proposals from faculty are due the 28th. We’ve added six new stipends.
Honors has started their own RCEU and won’t be competing for those stipends.
    • Sophia – We had a discussion in the college of business, who reviews the
proposals?
    • Joseph – The finance and resource committee.
    • Tim – I noticed that the call for last year is on the senate website. Is this
year’s up?
    • Sophia – It’s on the website.
  o Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
• I don’t have a report as Parliamentarian but has chair of the faculty database committee. We have met twice and formed subcommittees. We are starting to look at alternatives to digital measures. If you have any feedback with past digital measures, you can send those to me. If you have any ideas for a new database let me know. The primary ones are Digital Measures and Digital 180. Many universities that adopted those successfully have invested a considerable amount of funds to use them.

  o Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
    • No report.
  o Monica Dillihunt, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
    • No report.
  o James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
    • We are reviewing three policies.
  o Mike Banish
    • By the agenda we have the lecturer policy that is coming up. The lecturer policy, this is the third reading. There were votes against it in the last meeting. I am introducing a motion for the third reading. Joseph Taylor motions to accept the lecturer policy. Christine Sears seconds.

    • Roy – I have a motion to amend. I am proxy for Debra Moriarity. There is some red text letters added. As much as possible, we should be using tenure-tracked. In her experience, the main concern is people we qualify to teach are lecturers and have no problem using them. The concern is that this instruction is restrictive and inappropriate. I amend to strike.

    • Mike – Do I have a second to this amendment? Laird Burns seconds.

    • Tim – Personally, I don’t see the value in striking this. The text does not say that lecturers can’t be used for other things but it talks about their use in particular. As a member of the faculty interest long term, I have been opposed to this policy from the beginning and this can take us in a direction that causes increased reliance on non-tenured faculty. Striking this in fact would enhance that movement. It opens the use of lecturers for anything. I am speaking against the amendment. I am against the bill, but really against removing this text.

    • Member – That is problematic for nursing. I am not sure for other colleges if you have tenure and lecturers. In nursing, we have tenure track and clinical track, they are full time committed. We have part time also. Our structure is different and that statement is problematic to us.

    • Mike – In this case, tenure track includes clinical. This was born out of stopping the administration from hiring part time lecturers to fill in slots. There is a departmental responsibility built into this. Your argument could be I need a part time person to teach long term.

    • Member – It doesn’t say that.

    • Laird – Right above this is the clinical requirements. If you are not tenure tack or clinical there is a third level. We are hiring part timers. If we have someone who has taught for six year and then hire a tenure track person, under this policy, you can’t send this person home.

    • Mike – Hopefully you are growing and accommodate both of them. One the reasons we worked through this policy is the administration argued if you don’t have enough classes. You have the models you should know what is happening a year out.
• Harry – Making assumptions about planning and growth, I am opposed to passing a policy based on assumptions. The red isn’t binding. It reads the intent. It isn’t a policy.
• Joseph – The history of this bill include the history of the institution. We pulled parts out that were not part of the handbook. The initial purpose was to create a tier system for those that are here. I have never viewed this as a hiring policy. We have made this about hiring practices, and added patronizing information.
• Roy – I think we have had good comments. I move that we vote on this policy.
• Carolyn – The amendment?
• Roy – Strike the red that starts with teaching at all levels.
• Mike – Roy had a motion to strike the red letters.
  • Joseph Taylor seconds amendment.
• Tim – This is a vote to close debate.
• Mike – All in favor of closing debate and vote to vote. 29 in favor. 4 opposed. 1 abstains. We now vote on the amendment. All those in favor of striking the text in red. 10 in favor. 16 opposed. The amendment fails.
• Tim – I think we need to change tenure track to tenured or tenure tracked faculty.
• Mike – Is that a motion?
• Tim – Yes.
• Mike – Second? Carmen Scholz seconds.
• Mike – All in favor of this amendment. 29 in favor. 3 abstain. Amendment carries.
• Member – I am wondering could we have an amendment to include clinical.
• Mike – Clinical faculty are covered in a section of the faculty handbook. This is something that isn’t covered in the faculty handbook. Clinical faculty is like tenure and tenure earning.
• Roy – Is this policy meant to be retroactive?
• Mike – No.
• Roy – I am concerned about unintended consequences.
• Mike – That will be left to department chairs.
• Mike – Could I have a motion to vote on the lecturer policy?
• Laird – I understand this to read that if they have been here for six years they will receive tenure?
• Mike – We have fifty lecturers on this campus, correct? We have fifty people who go semester by semester without knowing if they will be employed. Many have been here fifteen years and never received recognition. We have been working on this policy for two years. It isn’t perfect and we may have some consequences.
• Sophia – Have you looked at what other institutions are doing?
• Joseph – Yes, they have something.
• Tim – Maybe there is an easy way out of this. Laird, I agree with you about the language at the top of page two. Can you think of another term to add there that would address your concerns?
• Laird – Maybe five or six year contracts?
• Harry – If your program is cancelled or limited, we can’t be promised to keep you.
• Tim – What if we added educational considerations for a cause of dismissal? Would that satisfy liberal arts and business?
• Laird – I just thought it was a strong statement.
• Tim – What if we added educational considerations, Laird? I would like to make an amendment to add a third condition, unit educational considerations.
Mike – Is there a second? Carolyn Sanders seconds. All in favor. 24 in favor. 4 opposed. 3 abstain. Motion carries.

Mike – I would like to call a vote on the lecturer policy as amended for third reading vote. All in favor. 26 in favor. 1 opposed. 2 abstain. Lecturer policy passes third reading.

Mike – I am going to introduce Bill 396 with a correction. The second $2500 should be changed to $5000. The VPR has already implemented this policy, but we are saying we like this for the long term. I would like to introduce amended Bill 396 for discussion and vote. Carmen Scholz seconds. All opposed. No oppositions or abstentions. Passes second and third reading unanimously.

Mike – I am going to introduce librarian policy for second reading. Tim Newman motions to approve. Joseph Taylor seconds.

Mike – Why do lecturers get a 6 year probationary period and librarians get 8?

Mike – That was from the librarian director.

Vladimir – We discussed this in the personnel policy. Librarians to serve on the faculty senate? Is there language?

Mike – There is language there.

Mike – All opposed to librarian policy. Ayes carry unanimously. Policy passed second and third reading.

Tim – I move to untable the Hoverboard policy. Joseph Taylor seconds.


Motion to adjourn by Harry Delugach, seconded by Joseph Taylor. Ayes carry. Meeting adjourns at 1:57 pm.
Bill 397
UAH Tuition Capital Campaign

WHEREAS, financial circumstances are a primary reason for students’ inability to attend and/or complete college; and

WHEREAS, the cost of higher education has shifted to students and their families due to diminishing State support of Higher Education, putting more and more financial burden on students and families, and

WHEREAS, the State of Alabama has one of the lowest household income levels in the United State; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the University of Alabama in Huntsville believe that a college-education can substantially improve the livelihood of individuals and families, and

WHEREAS, the University of Alabama in Huntsville aspires to an undergraduate student population of 10,000 with a 5-year graduation rate of 75%,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the University of Alabama in Huntsville embark on a Capital Campaign with the goal of providing every accepted and continuing student with at least one semester of tuition within five years and up to 9 semesters of tuition within 25 years; this goal is to be achieved with minimal deviation from the current scholarship matrix and from recognizing scholarships that currently exist at UAH.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That Capital Campaign funds also have the goal of providing the cost of on-campus housing to students who fall below certain income levels and follow established procedures.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the UAH Faculty Senate will change its bylaws and establish a new permanent committee for Faculty-Senate-shared-governance of the Capital Campaign and the establishment of criteria for acceptance and continuing student standards, as well as income and academic criteria for housing provided to students at no-cost. The title of this committee will be the Capital Campaign and Disbursement Committee. The composition of the primary Capital Campaign and Disbursement Committee will have greater than 50% of its members comprised of tenured Faculty who currently serve as Faculty Senators.