Senate Meeting Number 542 was called to order at 12:50 p.m. by Dr. Mitch Berbrier, Faculty Senate President.

Chris Allport motions to suspend the rules for administration reports. Charles Hickman seconds. Ayes carried the motion.

President Robert Altenkirch

There are a series of projects that are ongoing:

1. **HURON** consulting group is on campus today. They will deliver their “final presentation” to the committee that’s involved. They will give UAH a copy of their PowerPoint and write a report and submit it to us. President Altenkirch will give it to Mitch Berbrier and the Senate can go through it and comment on it. UAH will look to the Enrollment Management committee to assist in looking through it. Enrollment Services, Financial Aid, and Registrar will be involved in the implementation. Some of it has already been implemented and minor details on process have helped. Applications and Admissions up 13% for fall 2014. The numbers are small right now so must be careful with percentages.

2. **Assistant Provost for Enrollment Services** is going to be vacant at the end of November. Working to put someone in there on an interim basis and then work with HURON recommendations on how to proceed with permanent basis.

3. **iFactory** was on campus this week and made a presentation. They went over the presentation with me, Bob Lyon, and Joel. They seem to be moving along for their design of the website in chunks that migrate over to mobile device. Seems to be a very
nice technology to me. They’re on track. We are looking to deploy the redesign by August.

4. The **GER Revision** is underway. The target is to finish by spring for deployment in the fall.

5. **Madison Hall** is underway. Board approved the renovation of the old bookstore location in University Center. Next process is to select an architect for Madison Hall. Architects selected based on qualifications. There is a preferred list put out that architects respond to. Half a dozen will be interviewed the first 2 weeks of December. We will take a recommendation, a ranked list of 3, to the board in February. They allow us to pick the first one and negotiate with that. Our selection will be done before Christmas. Campus architects and Mike Finnegan are conversing with people who will inhabit Madison Hall, which is a programming exercise to figure out how much space is needed, what kind of configuration, who are next to each other, etc. Planning on a 60,000 square foot building, which is what current building is, but have a lot of latitude because it’s a new building so the footprint can change, location can be shifted some. We have to account for parking. We have to account for a welcome center in it so will need a place for touring space.

Searches:

1. **Provost** – The interviews are the first 2 weeks in December. 2 each week. Resumes are posted on Chargernet. Schedules will be posted on Chargernet. Individuals who are involved in the interviews will get an email about an open session. There are 4 resumes.

2. **Dean of Honors** – We met with the search committee this morning. It’s up and running. The Honors Council assisted in drafting the position description announcement. That was used to float ads in The Chronicle, National Counsel of Honors Colleges website, Diverse Issues in Higher Education, and Women in Higher Education. Deadline for applications and nominations is January 31st. Should finish up some time in the spring.
   - Kader Frendi: Is this internal/external?
   - President Altenkirch: No, it’s open.

3. **Nursing** – That committee is set. I have a meeting setup with them to start that process.

4. **Science** – I sent out an announcement of the committee but I need to make adjustments to it so I will send out a revised version. Come out this afternoon.
   - Richard Miller: Are the Dean searches search firm oriented searches?
   - President Altenkirch: No. So far we’ve chosen not to use search firms for those. We have to pay a search firm generally 1/3 of the salary. We definitely won’t use one for the Honors College. We will see how the others go, but at the moment, the answer is no; we have chosen not to do that.

Madison Hall Project:

- Student Services and Administration, also Student Services and Enrollment center.
- Other dominos have to fall in order for all of this to work. Have to vacate Madison Hall. As Mike Finnegan and campus architect go around, there will be some minor adjustments.
- Originally, Testing Services and the Counseling Center would be in Madison Hall. That’s probably not the case now. Those 2 will likely be more aligned with the Health Clinic than with Enrollment Services. Things might change once we begin asking who wants to be next to whom. The level of details in the programming will be adjusted a little bit.

Project Updates:
1. **Financial** – Ray Pinner pointed out that our revenue from summer school has been declining. It declined last summer. So he asked why? I think that there are some rules in place, probably put in place a few years ago, that when put in place all at once creates an over-constraint problem. We are deconstructing it to figure out how to make it simpler. My opinion is that summer school ought to be a revenue generator. So we need to cover the costs, and then what’s left over is the revenue. So if cover the cost in overhead and then have funds left over, that is revenue to me. We are putting in some constraints that are causing us to make some decisions that don’t make any sense when trying to maximize the revenue. For example, there is a rule I just learned about that the cost shouldn’t be more than 35% of the revenue. One way to accommodate that is to cancel a whole bunch of classes and reduce the revenue, which doesn’t make any sense. Those are the types of things we are looking at to see what their impact is and get rid of them. So we are really looking at what difference does it make if you have a class of 5 students if in that discipline we will make money on it. We will simplify this quite a bit.

2. **Block Tuition** – We looked at this last year but didn’t have time to finish it so we are looking at it again. HURON recommends this. From 1 to 12 hours, undergraduates are charged by the credit hour. From 12 to some number, it is flat. So there’s no financial penalty for taking 15 hours compared to 12. Once you get to 16 or 18, then start charging again by the credit hour, so there’s sort of a penalty for taking too much. This is very common. We charge strictly by the credit hour. If you look at the distribution of how many hours a student takes, there’s a big poll at 12, and then it drops off. The idea is that with block tuition we may be able to push some of those 12 hours into 15 hours or more and improve the graduation rate. I checked some of our “sisters and competitors”. Tuscaloosa is a block from 12 to 16, so by the hour up to 12, 12 to 16 is flat, above 16 pay more. Auburn seems to be by the credit hour up to 12, from 12 on don’t pay any more. Mississippi State is the same as Auburn. UNA is strictly by the hour. Athens State is strictly by the hour. It’s not easy to do this because if we want to keep the revenue the same, it’s almost necessary to increase the lower hours, 1 to 6, at a much higher percentage than the upper hours. Is there going to be an unintended consequence of driving some of those part-time students away? I don’t know if you can answer that. If we took the hour distribution right now and applied block tuition to it, and put a constraint on it to keep the revenue exactly the same, it isn’t an easy problem. You will have huge increase percentage wise on the lower end, a reasonable percentage increase on the upper end. I don’t know how to make a transition incrementally.

   o **Unidentified Senator**: Is there a maximum number of hours you can take?
   o **President Altenkirch**: From a financial point of view or an academic point of view?
   o **Unidentified Senator**: Either way.
   o **President**: Financially, when I looked at Auburn or MSU, no. Mitch says 21.
   o **Mitch Berbrier**: I think it’s 21 academically here.
   o **Brent Wren**: That’s correct.

3. **NCURA (National Counsel of University Research Administrators)**. Ray Vaughn brought in a team from NCURA. It’s a professional organization where you can contract with them to bring in a review team, look at management of research enterprise, and then give an assessment of how you do. They’re working up a summary of a report on that. They’ve also looked at administrative processes. Rules about how much summer pay you can get, are you adhering to Circular A21, etc. I think they’ve finished and are writing a report.
Wai Mok: Going back to summer school, the faculty salary for teaching summer has stayed the same for the last 7 years. That’s actually going against what you’re talking about, as far as increasing the cost of teaching in the summer. Do you want to review that?

President Altenkirch: We can take a look at what is paid in the summer, but like I said, we have to make money.

Tim Newman: One thing that brings concerns is a lot of sections aren’t offered this summer because the faculty says that little bit of money isn’t worth it to teach.

President Altenkirch: If we can provide incentive to offer classes and there is enough students to at least break even and us make money, it seems to me it’s okay. I haven’t looked at the pay, but I will look at it now that you’ve mentioned it. What is it?

Charles Hickman: It’s capped at $5,775

Brent Wren: College of Business has several searches going on and a lot of the candidates who come in, when they ask about summer pay, they say it’s really low. They say other schools they’re looking at pay 15 or 20% per course. Ours is 10% or the cap, whichever is first.

Wai Mok: There’s not many faculty willing to teach in the summer and that drives down the number of courses available for the students. So it’s a vicious downward cycle.

President Altenkirch: I will look at the pay because I hadn’t factored that in. I only looked at the rules for constraints of classes of a certain size.

4. **Signage** – There is a signage committee that is working. Idea is to get this all settled by the end of the spring semester. We will put an RFP out to get a company to build signs. Thinking about brushed metal, so there’s no maintenance. We will let them do their work and we will get the feedback and then talk about the implementation of it. In addition to just a sign on a building, it’s also way-finding. As part of the signage, we have been talking about the University Drive entranceway. There will be a corner marker that squares off the property. All the same architecture. On Holmes Avenue, the two columns coming from downtown will have a sign on it that informs you it is the entranceway. There are 5 components, 2 walls, the corner, and these 2 posts, that we think will come in under $750,000 so it doesn’t have to go to the Board. We only have to write them a letter and say we are going to do this. That’s going out for bid. The request for proposals might already be on the street. Plan to build this in the summertime when there’s not so much congestion.

   Deb Moriarity: Given that we are looking at purchasing additional land, is it possible the location for this will change?

   President Altenkirch: Well that is an issue. It’s possible, at some point in time down the road we will want to move one post, but we can’t move the other because we don’t own that property.

There are 2 outstanding projects that are sitting on my desk, but are at the top of the pile. I have begun integrating the comments on the BETA revision and I will get it to the Senate, Student Government, and Staff Senate for final review. Then I will have to tackle the Faculty Handbook.
Carmen Scholz: A couple of months ago I asked about lockdown procedures for classrooms. I talked to the police chief and the idea that we wanted, we borrowed from Virginia Tech, was shot down by the fire marshal. So where do we stand on that?

President Altenkirch: I don’t know the answer to that question at the moment. I will find it out.

Carmen Scholz: The idea was to use the same type of door handles as Virginia Tech.

President Altenkirch: That’s a very expensive project.

Carmen Scholz: The fire marshal said we can’t have the handles that slide side to side.

President Altenkirch: I don’t know about that, but I will go back and see where that stands because I’m not familiar with the details.

Tim Newman: I received a “Dear Colleague” letter the other day from VPR and a colleague got my attention that there is a provision in there for an “industrial graduate degree” or an “industrial PH.D degree.” It’s a deal where an individual can work 20 hours in a company, work on research, and then come on campus. We had a proposal similar to that from the Williams administration 4 years ago. My colleague was a little surprised that it’s come forward again without apparently getting any Senate feedback on it before that went forward. Secondly, I wanted to put out publicly what some of the concerns were that my colleague and I remember. All of the concerns are intellectual property related. One is the defense. Can we insist on open thesis or dissertation defense or can the company say no, it has to be a closed defense. Last time that was an issue, it was strong that the Faculty wanted an open defense. There are a lot of ramifications of that and we need to notify our students and the companies of that and the expectations up front. The other issue is related to publication. Can the company say, no we have an intellectual property stake here and so the result can’t be published. I think those issues should be worked out before going forward. My colleagues would oversee a students work assuming they can publish the result but then get to the end and can’t.

President Altenkirch: I suggest this: Let the Senate setup a small group to talk to Ray Vaughn directly or have him come here to explain it. That’s a program that he put in place at Mississippi State that apparently worked very well. It was well received by industry, it provided a little funding, etc. So yes, I understand those issues. There are similar issues with some funding agencies. The thesis, dissertation defense, ought to be public. There may be some aspects of the work that isn’t published, but the content of what is going to be put forth for a degree should be public discussion.

Tim Newman: One difference is that up front everyone understands the relations. Our concern is to make sure we do not get all the way to the back end, and spent all this time advising a student, and then find out there will be no publication.

President Altenkirch: I will ask Ray Vaughn to contact Mitch Berbrier. When trying to work with an industry, there are big arguments over intellectual properties, which wind up being an argument over nothing.
President Altenkirch: I have the Faculty Handbook revision. The Faculty Senate gave it to me and I haven’t been able to find enough time to review the whole thing. How long did you work on that revision?

Charles Hickman: 4 to 5 years.

Richard Miller: The hard work was the last 2 years.

Bhavani Sitaraman: Have the legal people already looked at?

President Altenkirch: No they haven’t, but once I get through it, I will explain to them it’s okay. That’s my general approach with the legal people. I say, “This is the answer. I want you to tell me what backs it up.”

Brent Wren: The Cross Discipline Bill has now been added to the current Faculty handbook that’s online. Once the President finishes his review, it will be added to the revised one. Rieder lost his son this week in a car wreck. Visitation is tonight at Mayfair from 5:00 to 9:00 pm. Funeral is tomorrow at 1:00 pm. Keep his family in your thoughts. Reminder that commencement coming up on Sunday, December 15th at 2:00 pm. Need to pick up your parking pass at our office or let Peggy know so you don’t have to pay $5.

President Altenkirch: Going back to the summer school thing; it’s 1/9th of your academic year salary up to this cap?

Charles Hickman: The $5,775 cap.

President Altenkirch: Then it might be useful to say it’s up to 1/9th and we will negotiate what it is. If you get enough students in the class, we will pay you 1/9th. If you can’t, do you want to do it or not?

Charles Hickman: We did something like that historically with the Romania study abroad program.

President Altenkirch: Did it work?

Charles Hickman: Yes, but it changed.

Carolyn Sanders: Are the adjustments to summer school going to impact this next summer? It seems like we are scheduling so early for summer school.

President Altenkirch: We will do it as quickly as we can because it’s not a lot of detective work to do. Pinner and Chi Lu have planned it out. We just need to think of the constraints and start getting rid of them until we have something that makes some sense. As soon as we get a preliminary assessment I will give it to you. I would think that before Christmas we will have something to talk about.

Deb Moriarity: In regards to the summer schedule, one of the problems we have is that we don’t advertise our summer school like other places. Besides our own students, in the summer we often get the transient students who are home for the summer. If they or their parents don’t see anything out there... Some people have said they didn’t know UAH had classes in the summer because they’ve never heard about it.

President Altenkirch: When is the schedule put together?

Deb Moriarity: They’ve asked for it February 28th.

Mitch Berbrier: The chair has to get it in sooner than that. February 28th is the final draft.

Brent Wren: To Deb’s point, not only do we have a lack of advertisement issue, but we had another significant issue this past summer. When we set the date for the first summer session, we set it before high schools finished and before
Calhoun finished. So we didn’t get any of those students. So this year, we start after Memorial Day to account for all of those schools being finished first. But it was a complete oversight last year.

- Mitch Berbrier: In regards to the summer school, the 35% is because there is a rule that if you don’t have a profit margin of more than 65% it isn’t worth it to the university to do.

- Mitch Berbrier: Approval of the minutes and the Senate Executive Committee report.

  - Wai Mok motions to approve minutes of Senate Meeting 541. Andree Reeves seconds. Questions, comments, or corrections?
    - Wai Mok: We caught a minor mistake in Dr. Hickman’s report from the budget committee. $50 billion should be $50 million.
    - Mitch Berbrier: Let’s vote. All those in favor of accepting the minutes as amended?
      *Ayes carried the motion. No oppositions.*

  - Charles Hickman motions to accept the Executive Committee report. Kader Frendi seconds.
    - Comments?
      - Tim Newman: On page 6, clinical degree should be “terminal degree.”
      - Mitch Berbrier: Let’s vote. All those in favor of accepting the minutes?
      *Ayes carried the motion. No oppositions.*

- Reports:
  - Are there any Senate Officer reports?
    - All officers (Richard Miller, Tim Newman, Deb Heikes, and Wai Mok): No report.

- Committee reports:
  - Fan Tseng for Faculty and Student Development Committee: We are working on the lecturer ladder. Close to finalizing.
  
  - Dan Sherman for Governance and Operations Committee: We had a meeting about 2 weeks ago and we continued our discussion of the committee structure and responsibilities.
    - Mitch Berbrier: So we are getting close to post-revision of the committee structure?
    - Dan Sherman: Yes.

  - James Blackmon for Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee: We are evaluating 4 requests for academic bankruptcy.

  - Deb Moriarity for Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: No report.

  - Charles Hickman for Finances and Resources Committee: The call for proposals for the Distinguished Speakers Series was just sent out this morning. Please encourage our colleagues to think about who they might want to bring to campus. Dr. Altenkirch increased the number we can fund and the funding for each speaker, so we want representation from across campus.
Carolyn Sanders for Personnel Committee: No report.
- Mitch Berbrier: Carolyn has agreed to take over as chair of the committee.

Faculty Senate President report:
This morning we had the final meeting with HURON. They gave us a PowerPoint presentation. It’s very long and we went through some of it very quickly, but I want Rich to give some initial impressions. There will be a written report produced later.
- Richard Miller: This meeting was only this morning so I haven’t been able to scan the documents, the draft preliminary report. Brent said the right thing earlier. He said he doesn’t have a high opinion of consultants. But what HURON has done has started to change his mind and I second that. This is a very nice document, it’s very comprehensive, and it’s not cookie-cutter. It’s very specific for us. I think there are a lot of useful nuggets in it. Most of this is geared towards the people in administration that are going to be working with new policies and enrollment. There’s a lot of useful information for us at the college, and in particularly the department level, and instead of waiting for information to flow down about how to strategically prepare our department, I think there is a lot of information in the report. I realized when I made the draft proposal available to my department recently that nobody came to get it and read through it. We ignore this information to our own detriment. I would encourage you, as senators, to read this and bring it up to your faculty. It really goes to targeting geographical areas for recruitment, classes of potential students for recruitment. Things we might not have thought of but makes sense.

A few more points you will see in the report. They did a survey and some of the things they found are things that we know without actually having the data, but it’s nice that it was validated. There is a complete lack of awareness of UAH outside of the state, and a very limited awareness outside of the North Alabama region. There are a lot of applications from the North Alabama region, but they are a relatively low yield compared to other regions in terms of enrollments and such. Acceptances are high but enrollments are low. They are being data driven and that’s nice. They are making it very clear that the first thing we need to do is to focus within the state on getting enrollments and yields up and then focusing nationally on specific marketing programs. There’s a lot on improving enrollment services. As far as getting down to the departmental level, under the faculty level, hopefully, if we implement what they’re suggesting, it will be a much better communicator and coordinator. Hopefully the administration will put some resources into improving our enrollment services and modernize a lot of their processes. They are nicely saying our processes are out of date. Another big point they also made was in terms of trying to attract students, it is no longer sending flyers and emails to seniors or juniors. We have to start earlier, at the 9th grade. The life-cycle of recruitment starts as freshmen in high school. We don’t have a good awareness of the range of our programs and the breadth of UAH so they dismiss it before they even consider it.

Provost Search. You can log in to Chargernet for details. The Provost Search Finalists on the top left. There are 4 finalists who are coming for interviews. President Altenkirch made the point that they were initially having one or two come after commencement, but it wasn’t made in response to our request to get them done before faculty leave campus. So we are getting it done. It is during finals, but at least it’s within a semester. The only other option was putting it off longer and risk losing a candidate or two to another university. This is very important and we want as much input as possible. The committee has made our input and now it’s time for the
rest of campus to engage in the process. We want faculty to make sure we have an input. There are a variety of ways to do this. Each candidate will have an open meeting for faculty, staff, and the public. My experience with this is that it is mostly faculty that shows up. I would like for you to coordinate by department, to contact the home universities of these candidates. We don’t want 300 faculty calling everybody at every university, but if you can coordinate with other faculty in your department and collect informal information on these candidates that we can bring to the final committee meeting, it would be helpful. The committee can only look at their references and weren’t allowed to go outside of that reference list until their names became public. Now that their names are public, we can do that. I’m hoping we can send this information to me or Kader Frendi and we can collect it and look at it. There are other faculty members on the committee if you would rather take it to them.

- Kader Frendi: We have representation from all departments and colleges.

The preliminary schedule is out. Trying to have each of these candidates meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Meeting. FSEC meeting will be on the 2nd day at 2:30pm, and the public meeting will follow it at 4:00pm.

There have been a lot of questions about David Ashley because we Google. If you Google him, you will find that he was fired as President of UNLV a couple of years ago. Then you can read some stuff in the press about him and stuff about him and his spouse. The committee members obviously Googled this and looked into it and came away from the process somewhat satisfied that this wasn’t a reflection of his ability. But, we didn’t get to talk informally to people at the campus. So we need to do that. So take a look at this stuff but understand that the story is that there were conflicts with the Chancellor at UNLV who owns the media in Nevada. He isn’t an academic and wants it his way and has apparently fired about every president at every university and college. At UNLV, he fired Ashley’s predecessor and then he fired Ashley. So there are other sides to this story. David Ashley will probably have the opportunity to address it himself in a public presentation and if he doesn’t do it himself, feel free to ask him.

- Charles Hickman: My understanding is that he was fired for taking a principled stand. He was asked to do something that was unprincipled and he said no and the Chancellor fired him.
- Wai Mok: Do you know the details of that principle?
- Charles Hickman: Not much. It’s worth taking some time to read. He was fired for doing the right thing.
- Mitch Berbrier: And that’s one version of the story. Take a look at all of the candidates and their last job.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: Does the search firm that we use generally do this background research?
- Mitch Berbrier: They do their own background research but there are certain things they aren’t allowed to do. They’re not allowed, whether it’s legal or ethical, to go around campus and make aware of the fact that this person has made an application somewhere.

As part of this process, we’ve had a recent experience and a lot of concern, at least from the Faculty Senate, to make sure that whoever we get is somebody who has taught, who has worked as a professor, who has confronted some of the issues we have, who has been a chair, and preferably a dean. 3 of the 4 fit these criteria. The only one who doesn’t fit that category is Christine Curtis who went from professor’s position into a variety of other up the chain command positions like Associate Dean, Associate Provost. It is a bit different because she didn’t have supervisory roles, but she did some very interesting administrative things. It is important
for us to do our due diligence because it might have helped in the past if you did it and people listened.

- Luciano Matzkin: Is there going to be a formal recommendation for one of these candidates from the Faculty Senate?
- Mitch Berbrier: The only time the President was involved in this committee at all was he came in the first day to give us our charge which was to give him 3-5 names, not ranked. I wasn’t happy about that, but the explanation is that we might come to the same ranking, but that we might end up with 2 or 3 candidate just in case a person turns us down, and whoever gets hired has to be the first choice. Then it came down to how many can we interview? We are interviewing only 4. Then, how many do we eliminate? If everyone comes back with relatively positive comments, then we pass on 4 names. We can eliminate all 4 in theory if we started hearing horrible things about all 4 and then we go back to the drawing board. We aren’t making the decision, as the committee, we’ve done our work at this point. We just want to gather more information elsewhere to eliminate one or some of these candidates. I’m not sure what the President will do if we eliminate 2 names.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: I understood the question as we have 2 Faculty Senate representatives on that committee, so are we as a Faculty Senate going to give our recommendation of a particular candidate, so that it’s on record.
- Luciano Matzkin: Yes, as the Senate can we give a recommendation?
- Mitch Berbrier: I haven’t thought about that so I don’t have a strong opinion on it. I would like to hear what other people think.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: It’s a very good point partly because we talked about representation from the Faculty Senate on various committees. The second thing is what does that mean? If we become part of this amorphous committee, it doesn’t distinguish us. We may not have the power to decide, but it can go on record.
- Deb Moriarity: The first thing would be a problem to come to a consensus from the Senate if we wanted to pick one. That’s not what President wants at all from the faculty. He wants to know if we find any of them unacceptable. If there was a situation where there was a strong enough feeling on the part of all the faculty we talked to that one or more was completely unacceptable and we had time to say, here’s a resolution, we would like to put it forward, and formally approve it, that Faculty Senate wants to go on official record that this person is unacceptable to all faculty, we could maybe do that. But this is our last meeting and these interviews must get done. The better way is the individual feedback they will ask for from the faculty and as the Faculty Senate is to encourage the other faculty to get involved and go listen to them and provide the feedback. That’s probably the better way for us to do this.
- Kader Frendi: The other thing we need to do is to send feedback directly to us, Mitch and I, and we will take it to the final meeting of the search committee. We can have your comments there and say this is where the senators disagree.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: I wasn’t thinking of a formal vote or anything, but something that says, in case there is a situation, there are any strong concerns with the candidate and for some reason we end up with that candidate.
- Mitch Berbrier: Given the constraints on time, the recommendation meeting will happen soon after the last candidate is gone and that will be after commencement. So it’s impractical to have another meeting to formally vote. When Frendi and I are there, we represent the faculty. If we get enough feedback and it’s clear that the majority has
concerns, even if I don’t agree, we will represent those concerns. So let’s do that and try to get us some feedback.

Other University-Level committees that are ongoing:

**Signage.**
- Keith Jones: Dr. Heikes and I are on the Signage Committee for the academic buildings. These are ideas and not anything in concrete, but we are talking about doing a brush metal sign throughout campus because it’s more durable. They can be removable signs too, for buildings that have departments that move from time to time.
  - Richard Miller: Will there be an issue with visibility?
- Keith Jones: That’s my area, too. I’m looking at tilting the signage and moving the signage to improve the visibility. Also looking at signage that goes between places in interior campus places, like Salmon Library and Wilson. If you have any comments or suggestions, email me at joneskt@uh.edu. We are also looking at electronic signs, but trying to get a uniform look. The brushed metal with possibly an anodized UAH logo with a chrome finish is a possibility as well. We are going from public into campus, and then once inside campus. Also using the QR codes for smartphone apps.

There is a general issue of getting people to volunteer for committees. We have a bill that we are working on that is trying to get us representation on University Committees, official agreement from the administration that the Faculty Senate is entitled to representation on University Committees. The idea is to continue to get 2, and sometimes more, on most committees depending on the size. The bill was rejected last year by the administration. I had a conversation with President Altenkirch on rewording it and so we are trying to reword it in that way. When I, and future Faculty Senate Presidents, ask for volunteers for representation on these committees, we have to step up to the plate. The faculty picnic is coming up in May and we need someone to represent the Faculty Senate for that committee, so we need volunteers.

- Carmen Scholz: I am speaking for Dr. Vogler. He was wondering if there are any decisions regarding the RCEU program. What is the senate’s decision on it?
- Mitch Berbrier: We are working on it.
- Charles Hickman: I approached Ray Vaughn about continuing funding by VPR’s office. He said that yes, he is happy to do that contingent upon research staff being eligible to participate in the program as a mentor. That has generated significant amounts of controversy. We are trying to work through it in the Finance and Resources Committee, and more broadly with Mitch, Dr. Vaughn and President Altenkirch and Dr. Wren. I will send a draft of the letter out to my committee. Mitch has proposed that we accept his terms for this year and we form an ad hoc committee to look at it. I also to talked to Dr. Vogler because he wants us to take the money on the provisions. It’s not so much taking the money. It’s the Provost’s program. A Senate Resolution accepted by Dr. Franz, established the program, and in the recitals it says there will be a faculty-student team. Mitch and I have worked on a letter to send to our committee which will go to the VPR that proposes that we accept the money that it is specified for this year, but that we will look into the concerns via an ad hoc committee and look at it next year.
- Carmen Scholz: Vogler needs a yay or nay if we are going forward.
- Charles Hickman: I have a draft that would have gone out 2 weeks ago, but controversy hindered it. I ask you to convey to Dr. Vogler that it will go out as soon as possible.
- Deb Moriarity: The program itself is going forward; it’s just how much money is going to be in it.
- Charles Hickman: We don’t have any control over that because it is the Provost’s program. Ultimately, Dr. Altenkirch can say if you don’t want to make the selection, I will establish a committee to do it. We are moving as rapidly as possible, considering the circumstances, to come to a resolution. In fact, Mitch has made comments that I will incorporate into a letter that will go to the Finance and Resources Committee and if it’s acceptable I will send it to VPR. I hope to get the draft out by Monday to the committee. My initial proposal was to get Dr. Altenkirch, Vogler, myself and Mitch in a room and decide. That may still be what has to happen.
- Mitch Berbrier: The proposal will make it clear to the VPR that we will take the money now because of the expediency issue and getting the program moving this year, but there are significant concerns that we will be looking into that we want to discuss well before November of next year and see where we stand. We need people on that ad hoc committee.
- Wai Mok: With the help from VPR last year, we were able to fund close to 100% of the proposals.
- Charles Hickman: We did fund 100% and Dr. Vogler said that he talked with the Alabama State’s Grant and they may actually be able to come up with some more money. The Chemistry Department has apparently funded all of the students working with faculty in the Chemistry Department. So it’s just this money from the VPR’s office, which is about 40%.

James Swain motions to adjourn. Tim Newman seconds the motion. Ayes carried the motion.

Faculty Senate Meeting # 542 adjourned
November 21, 2013, 2:10 P.M.