

---

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**March 13, 2014  
12:45 PM in SKH 369**

***Present: Mitch Berbrier, Deb Moriarity, Wai Mok, Jim Blackmon, Phillip Bitzer, Peggy Hays,  
Charles Hickman, Deborah Heikes, Carolyn Sanders***

***Guests: President Altenkirch, Provost Curtis***

- Faculty Senate President, Mitch Berbrier called the meeting to order at 12:45 pm.
- Administration Reports

**President Altenkirch**

Summer School

The summer school issue is done. Set up a lot of courses.

Block Tuition

The block tuition transition is done.

The reason for getting Executive Committee to approve it was to start marketing it internally to students before registration on April 7. Dr. Curtis and I need to talk about how to train the advisers. A student asked if we can implement this immediately for Graduate students, then why couldn't we do it for Nursing, because Nursing students generally take 16-17 hours per semester. Undergraduates is a 3 year transition; Graduates goes into effect immediately since there aren't many graduate students who take more than 9 hours, so there is no financial impact.

Board of Trustees Meeting

The Board meeting is here on April 4<sup>th</sup>. The Agenda:

- There is a lease for a building next door to us across the street that is for sale. We will lease part of it for Gary Maddox operation, which will move him out of BBRH. He pays for it with grant contract funds.
- There will be three Distinguished Professor namings on the agenda.
- General Via, honor doctorate, for the commencement speaker. I think he is one of only thirteen 4-star Generals in the Army.
- We have a proposal to establish education degrees for secondary teaching. We only have disciplinary degrees with certifications to teach. We will keep those but we will also provide teaching degrees with a concentration.
  - Provost Curtis: The big difference is the change of the total number of hours students will need to take. It will lessen it probably by about a year.
- So that should make us more competitive with North Alabama and Athens State.
- We will change the name of Master of Science in Information Assurance and Security to Master of Science in Cyber Security.
- The Governor will be at this meeting. It's unusual that the Governor shows up but Paul Bryant asked him to show up.
  - Mitch Berbrier: Do we know why he asked?
  - President Altenkirch: The Governor committed to attend a meeting before Bryant stepped out of the President Pro-Temp position and this is the meeting Bryant chose.

- I will make an institutional presentation before the meeting starts on Friday, and then the Faculty Senate President speaks and then the Student Government Association President speaks.

### Athens State

Two years ago, Athens State pulled out of the 2-year system and by legislation they had a separate Board set up. There is a statement in the legislation that says their mission shall remain limited to servicing upper-division transfer students. They can only offer strategic graduate programs. The President of Athens State says every program is strategic. So they are going down the pathway to set up two graduate programs, Master's level: Religious Studies and Logistics. The Logistics conflicts with what we do in Business, so we have objected. Ray Vaughn and I met with the President of Athens State. He tried to convince me what they were doing didn't conflict or duplicate anything. I wasn't convinced. We are doing what we can with the politics of it, marshaling other institutions and commissioners on ACHE, the system office, etc.

- Deb Moriarity: That would go through the Graduate deans too?
- President Altenkirch: Yes, the grad deans have gotten together and are opposed to Athens State doing this. It isn't clear if there is any way for them to formally weigh in.
- Deb Moriarity: They give a recommendation to ACHE.
- President Altenkirch: This is different. Athens State is first proposing an expansion of institutional instructional role. Graduate Deans don't weigh in on that. They weigh in on programs. So it's confusing. April 16<sup>th</sup> is a meeting of the Instructional Affairs Committee of ACHE. This will be first considered there. We are trying to get that committee to turn it back so it is off the table. Likely they will move it to the commission. The commission meeting after April 16 is in June. The Executive Director of ACHE doubts that it could be on the agenda in June, most likely in September.
- Mitch Berbrier: So there are two purposes to the objection? One is the duplication and one is the strategic graduate studies?
- President Altenkirch: Well, the objection is that according to their mission statement they shouldn't be offering graduate programs. There is a contradiction and confusion in the law, but ACHE doesn't have to approve graduate programs.
- Mitch Berbrier: Right.

Their strategy is the following: the reason that they are going to propose Religious Studies and Logistics is because no public university offers a Master's Degree in Religious Studies. Alabama and, I believe, A&M offer a Bachelor's Degree in Religious Studies, but no Master's. Logistics—nobody offers a Master's Degree in Logistics because logistics acquisition and supply chain is a separate CIP code. So they will argue that we don't have the CIP code. We don't, no, but we teach the material under the Business CIP code. The CIP code by itself doesn't necessarily follow the degree. But that's their strategy. They will pick out every little CIP code that nobody else has. The President met with a commissioner yesterday, Bill Jones, who used to be the lobbyist for the Alabama System. He retired and is now on the ACHE board. So the President met with him and flat-out admitted that they will look at what degrees people offer and what they don't offer, they will go after them. For example, if everyone offers a Master's Degree in English, they will offer one in English Literature and they will look at CIP code to fix that. We are moving to block that.

### Construction Projects

#### *Madison Hall*

The architects are working. The existing building is scheduled to be demolished in October. The Shelby and Madison parking lots will be closed at that time. We are looking to replace it as we close it. There are a couple of options close by. One is between Charger Village and the Credit Union. Another option is across the street, south of South East apartment complex. There will be some replacement parking but I can't tell you exactly where it will be. When the building is built,

it will be pushed back towards one that is from the Greenway side. When the building is pushed back, there will be parking in front of it and it will be arched like a circle but it won't accommodate lots of cars, and a lot of it will be dedicated to visitors since that is the building's purpose. We need to figure out how to regulate that parking.

*Swirl Building*

Will be done in September.

*Nursing Building*

Construction of the new wing scheduled to be done in mid-July. Bad weather has pushed it out a bit. Once that's done, then the renovation of the existing one will start, and that should be done sometime in the summer of 2015, so that everything is done in the fall 2015.

*Greenway*

Second phase of the Greenway, north of Holmes, should be done in April.

*University Drive Entranceway*

There will be a marker on the eastern edge, if you look at University Place School to the left, all the way to the edge of that property. We will put two "posts" on Holmes, so you know when you enter the campus. The construction will start Monday. It takes 70 days to construct.

*University Center*

We got the bids in for the renovation of the lower level to move the Army over there. It will start in 20 days and be finished in August. That's the first move that starts to vacate Madison before we tear it down.

*Wilson Hall*

The third floor will be renovated for student and staff clinics, counsel and advisability services. That design is underway. Should get the bids in June, start construction beginning of July, finished by September.

We will do some landscaping by the South East housing complex. It will start Monday.

*Roberts Hall*

Renovation of the Recital Hall is under design. Should get a bid in in May and start construction in June. Takes about 60 days.

*Incubator Building*

This is in the plans. We have priced that out at about \$14 million. We have requested that the state provide \$7 million. We will put in a proposal to USED A for the other \$7 million. Don't have a site for it yet. You'll notice if drive past Biztech that it's for sale. They were burning cash, so we knew it was coming.

- Mitch Berbrier: That building isn't adequate?
- President Altenkirch: The way they've set it up just isn't going to work. It isn't successful. The building isn't the right type of building and it's in the wrong location. Its stand-alone doesn't have much tie with us.
- Deb Moriarity: We used to own it and got rid of it.
- President Altenkirch: One problem with the way they're operating is, there's a board that's a Non-Profit Corporation, but the board members themselves invest in the companies. So they're making decisions as to who to bring in there based on if they can personally benefit from them. That's not a good business setup. A lot of people who walk

in there think they want to setup a company, but then look at the way it operates and change their mind. So philosophically the way it's run isn't successful.

## **Provost Curtis**

### Deans Searches

Honors, Nursing and Science. There are 2 sets of airport interviews going on today, tomorrow, Monday, and Tuesday. We should be getting reports back from the committees as to what their thoughts are on the candidates. Process is moving forward. Retirements are June 1 so time is of the essence. We will bring people in for campus interviews so we want the Senate to be involved.

### Departmental Visits

I'll be doing departmental visits starting this Friday. We want them done before the end of April. Some of the departments will be combined in certain colleges, like College of Liberal Arts and maybe Engineering, for example. We have left it up to the Deans and Peggy Bower to figure out how to fit everyone in on a Friday afternoon, and those are limited. I'm looking forward to meeting the faculty and listening to them. I have no intention of speaking more than 5 minutes in the one-hour meeting.

- Deb Moriarity: On the Dean searches, are you going to be moving ahead with the issues of any interim over the summers? It seems unusual to get someone in by and here on June 1.
- Provost Curtis: I have already started thinking through that. June 1 is coming very quickly. It will be somewhat dependent on what the committees report back and how quickly we get the interviews going in order to see what the feasibility is of getting someone here quickly, which isn't easy to do. I am already thinking about what to do next for the interim.

### Student Affairs

The HURON report strongly suggested a Vice President for Student Affairs. In looking at the organizational chart for the Provost's Office and how to divide up the duties between the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Provost's Office, and reading through the report and thinking through what it is that will make us successful. Not only do we have to recruit students, we have to make them successful while they're here, figure out a way to teach them and make them independent learners and critical thinkers, and make the grades so that they are successful, and we retain them and then we have to graduate them, and prepare them for employment. That employability is becoming more and more important to the parents and the parents have a lot of influence over their students and where they go. So we have to make sure we do all of these things very well. I've just listed out the key things that are in the Vice President's for Student Affairs arena. Students change regularly. With the way technology is, what worked 2 or 3 or 5 years ago isn't necessarily working, so things are constantly changing. Enrollment management and the entire recruitment aspect. Retention in terms of student life and all the programming that is needed not only on campus but in the residence halls, the communities, and hopefully we can work with the Vice President for Student Affairs to enhance what we have to even deeper programming that will meet the needs of the students. And then career services. So we are talking about not just the job search and how you go about interviewing, but also internships and co-ops that will prepare the students for their potential jobs. And then career counseling in terms of the beginning of their freshmen or sophomore year. The student success center, the academic aspect will stay in the Provost Office. I see that we will be working hand in hand with the Vice President of Student Affairs. There is no line of division; it has to be integrated and we all have to work together in order to make sure that we are student centered and our students are successful.

- Mitch Berbrier: The Student Success Center will be under the Provost?

- Provost Curtis: The Student Success Center is under the Provost, the portion that is career services will move to the Vice President of Student Affairs.
- Wai Mok: How does this position relate to the Dean of Students?
- Provost Curtis: The Dean of Students reports to the Vice President of Student Affairs instead of the Provost. The Dean of Students is really involved in student life and student conduct.
- President Altenkirch: On some of the recruitment stuff, we cranked up the level to get things moving quicker and better and follow the HURON report. The number of financial aid packages that have been completed is up 34% this year compared to last year. John Maxon has come in and followed that HURON report and laid out communication strategies and timing, so they're getting to them a lot earlier.
- Mitch Berbrier: I suppose you have spoken with Allen. So what happens to the Student Success Center?
- Provost Curtis: Yes. What I have told Allen, and I think he agrees, is that his number 1 job is to work with our students and with our colleges in terms of all aspects of retention. He has a huge job ahead of him. We want him to help lead us toward higher retention rates, not only from freshmen to sophomore, but sophomore to junior.
- Mitch Berbrier: So his job won't change?
- Provost Curtis: He will be glad student services are gone because he will be so busy working with faculty to retain the students.
- Peggy Hays: So he will be working with all of the colleges?
- Provost Curtis: Yes, that is the concept.

➤ Officer and Committee Reports

**President, Mitch Berbrier:** I do not have too much to report.

I'm working on setting up a special meeting where Dave Berkowitz, Dee Childs and Ray Pinner will speak to us in a joint meeting with the Staff Senate. I'm working on getting a space set up. It was originally the date for our meeting but I will push that meeting back to April 10. I will make the Agenda as best as we can and if it needs adjustments we can do it over email.

Making another special meeting. Andrea Word is heading the GER Revision Committee. They are coming up with some recommendations right now. Most of the committee is made up of faculty members. We are a good forum for her to come and explain things. They are very formal recommendations and sound very sterile in a sense. She will come explain this to us.

Faculty Handbook

Wai and I met with Dr. Curtis about it. She was on top of it and asking pertinent questions, the primary being, "Is there a track changes version?" It made perfect sense when she said it but as far as I know there is no track changes version.

- Deborah Heikes: There should be one.
- Mitch Berbrier: We haven't been able to track one down.
- Deborah Heikes: Talk to Peggy because there was supposed to have been a track changes version, which was supposed to have tracked all the way along. Ask Tim, too, but Peggy should know.
- Mitch Berbrier: I've emailed Tim and Rich about it.
- Deborah Heikes: There is a track changes version somewhere. Tim was careful and while we went through it every change was tracked. I don't know how far back the track changes goes, but when we got whatever came back from the Senate Handbook committee all of the changes were tracked from that point on.

- Wai Mok: I spent some time this morning on it. I took the PDF file that I was sent and converted it into text. Then I grabbed the Handbook on the website and converted it from HTML to text. Then I compared them and sent that version to you [Mitch Berbrier]. I didn't do the whole thing, just Section 7.1 and 7.2.
- Mitch Berbrier: Okay.
- Deborah Heikes: Well, we were putting one together for Charles Nash so there's probably one floating around somewhere.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's good because Christine emailed me last night and said that she learned last night that the system demands a track changes version. And I was wondering if someone told us that at the beginning of this process.
- Deborah Heikes: Contact Peggy because she should be able to answer this question.
- Mitch Berbrier: Okay, thank you, Deborah. We will redouble our efforts there. And if it's not there, what do we do?
- Deb Moriarity: The problem is that people change who work on this.
- Deborah Heikes: This started the year Frank left. That is when the committee was formed, and then it worked its way slowly through the system so it's been a while.

The other thing about the handbook was that she was very receptive to the idea of doing a piecemeal since this has taken so long. They will conveniently move to Chapter 7, which is the one that we are most concerned about that deals with Faculty Personnel, and Appendix L, the Faculty Senate By-Laws. They'll get those done first so if it's possible to just get that. So we can move on because so much of our discussion and bills is about amendments in there, and everyone asks which one we are amending. She's already informed me, and so by extension Wai, that this is what we are going to be doing all summer. Once she gets the track changes version she will go over it and pull either me or Wai into the room and ask us why the change.

- Deborah Heikes: Tim, Rich, and I, and whoever we could get, would have marathon sessions where we went through the entire handbook in a week so I can answer some of these questions. I've come across another problem with the Handbook. It has come to my attention, and I don't know if we fixed this, Appendix E deals with grievances and Appendix F deal with discrimination grievances. One has a very definitive timetable and the other one has nothing. This is in the current version of the Handbook. I talked to Tim about this and it is his recollection that there was disconnect between grievance procedures and I don't know if we've cleaned that up or not, but it's odd that we would have different standards and time tables.
- Mitch Berbrier: The first thing to do is go look at what's new before we start looking at changing anything.

**President-Elect, Wai Mok:** I'm working on the Handbook conversion.

**Ombuds Officer, Deborah Heikes:** We are working on a survey on some campus issues. There is some discontent among certain members of the faculty. The Provost seems interested in doing something about it. We are doing a survey to figure out what some of the issues are and what people's perceptions are, not necessarily what the reality is. If something is perceived to be a problem but it isn't a problem, then that's an easy fix.

- Peggy Hays: What issues are you talking about?
- Deborah Heikes: Issues specifically related to the way certain non-white and non-male faculty members may be experiencing their life on campus. Every once in a while there is some serious discontent and this may be one of the issues this year of some serious discontent. I'm just trying to get some information anonymously and as objectively as possible.
- Carolyn Sanders: Who is doing the survey?

- Deborah Heikes: At the moment, Sociology has graciously agreed to create the survey. We are starting with something from the University of Michigan that we are scaling way back because we don't need the kind of in depth information that they asked for. We just want to get the general sentiment on campus, and there might turn out to be no problem.
- Peggy Hays: Through surveymonkey?
- Deborah Heikes: This will be Qualtrix. Once we get our work done, we will send it to the Provost and she and Brent Wren will look at. Then, once we iron out those details, it will go to IRB.
- Carolyn Sanders: Do you have an idea of the time frame?
- Deborah Heikes: I'm hoping by the end of the semester. I was afraid of opening up a can of worms. But if anyone here has issues that they want to bring up to me, I am more than happy to listen. We are trying to do this without strong emotions that get attached when people aren't happy.
- Charles Hickman: I think the can is open and I think the administration is aware of it.
- Deborah Heikes: Yes, they are.
- Carolyn Sanders: I think the administration is aware of some things, but I also think there is a lot they're not aware of. It seems to me that having the new provost in place is an important time to bring this up.
- Deborah Heikes: That's how this came up. After an important conversation I had with the provost, she indicated that she would be interested in poking around.
- Carolyn Sanders: I think that there are a lot of people who are not willing to come forward unless it's anonymous, for fear of repercussions.
- Deborah Heikes: I have some anecdotal things that have come my way that we are trying to bring to light in a positive fashion.

**Governance and Operations Committee Chair Phillip Bitzer:** Elections are dragging. Liberal Arts and Engineering are still outstanding in a couple of random spots. Regardless, I've given them a couple more days to finalize. Then we will do President and Ombudsperson nominees. I'll be able to announce who is the new president by the last Senate meeting.

- Mitch Berbrier: It's time to start thinking about nominees and volunteers.

**Personnel Committee Chair Carolyn Sanders:** The focus of our work has been Bill 378. It's hard to get the committee together, though.

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Co-Chairs Peggy Hays and Deb Moriarity:** We met on the 27<sup>th</sup>. There was a stack of course changes and approvals. All of the course issues went through without any real problems; there were little discussions about a couple. The big issue was the change in College of Science, where the College of Science is eliminating required minors. Only Liberal Arts and Science still had a required minor one. The minors will still be there if a student wants it but it is not required. There were several reasons behind it. They were told by the Associate Provost that that was a college requirement and at the Dean's level, with the Department Chairs, they approve this, and it did not have to go through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The information was sent to Brent and wasn't intended to come to the committee. There was a lot of discussion about whether that should or shouldn't go through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee since it is a big change in the curriculum. I went back to the Dean and the Associate Dean and this is what they were told: to move ahead with it and get it in the catalogue. One of the departments, specifically Physics, felt that they hadn't known, they hadn't been told about it. It turned out that their new chair apparently was appointed the day after, or several days after, they had the first meeting about this, but he was there at the second meeting where they all went around and said yay or nay. So most of us there perceived that as the vote. There was 1 department that was against it and 1 department that was iffy. But in general it

passed. That was the first issue that came up because there were some faculty members in two specific departments who were upset and said they hadn't been told about it and had no chance to voice their opinions about it. So I went back to the Dean and went back to the Associate Provost and I was told again that it doesn't have to go through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. So I'm not sure what to do with it. They're just allowing them to have options. There were 2 main reasons for the change. One, more and more students are wanting interdisciplinary educations, and locking them into a specific major and minor, with the GER which gives them essentially no electives and no chances to take courses that are in that major or minor. We had the old cognate, but we did away with those. So the alternative was to say we aren't going to require them to do this 21 hour minor. But all of the majors will list ancillary courses. And we can have tracks and concentrations and some of those may have required minors. But it has to be possible for a student to not do a minor and graduate.

- Mitch Berbrier: That all goes to the merits and the purview.
- Deb Moriarity: Right. There was worry on the committee about advising for the students. What happens if they just take a bunch of courses? Well, then they take a bunch of courses and they get an education. But whether or not it's all in a specific area, well they do get advising from the College of Science advisers, and then they get advising from the faculty. By the time they take whatever the ancillary courses that are required, they really will only have 3 or 4 other courses they can fit in.
- Mitch Berbrier: Again, that goes to the practical and the reasonable.
- Deb Moriarity: I forwarded an email from Bhavani to the Dean. What I got back from the Dean was that we were told by the Associate Provost to go ahead with this because the chairs had approved it. So right now I don't know what to do with it.

James Blackmon: Can a student set up a program of independent study and have it approved?

Mitch Berbrier: In Science you can.

- Deb Moriarity: In the College of Science we have that build your own. There is a certain amount of hours you have to do to major in it.
- James Blackmon: Well more multi-disciplinary. For example, at UCI my son set up Philosophy of Cognition as an undergraduate, and he received a letter that said it was the first program they had approved in decades. It had everything from science to you name it in there and that is the career he followed. Other than a major and a minor, can someone set up something that took from English and Philosophy and Physics? Would that be approved? Is it even acceptable?
- Deb Moriarity: Right now the way things are set up, the specific degrees vary in their General Education requirements. It would be difficult for a student to do too many cross-disciplinary things, with a major and the ancillary courses. We do have an individualized degree in the College of Science. Each department put together a basic core of 18 hours and then for the other 18 hours the students could pick and put together other science areas. What this new change would do is allow the student to take 18 hours in Biology and the other 18 in Chemistry and Physics, and then without the minor they could take some Philosophy and things.
- James Blackmon: If a student set up Philosophy of Cognition and it involved a whole bunch of courses, it would be difficult to get it approved because it wouldn't be in the College of Science.
- Mitch Berbrier: There would be an issue of advising to make sure there is cohesion in the program.
- Deb Moriarity: It would be unusual.
- James Blackmon: We would have to set up a structure, like a General Studies. There are structures that can be set up. I don't think we have one, though.



- Deb Moriarity: It's not in place right now. They would have to either be getting the BS or the BA and meet the General Education requirements for that, pick a major, and then put courses from the other areas in there. If they're in the Liberal Arts then they would still need to do a minor of some kind.
- Mitch Berbrier: This is where the advising comes in because you would have to have somebody that's watching over, making sure that if the students are putting together their own program, there is some coherence to it, and that it isn't just a bunch of courses the student wanted to take.
- James Blackmon: It's an isolated, single example, but it made me wonder if somebody here wanted to set up a program that was so multi-disciplinary that didn't fall into Science or whatever.
- Deb Moriarity: They would at least have to have a major in one.
- James Blackmon: His major was that program, and he had a minor in English.
- Deb Moriarity: The closest we have, in Science, is the individualized major.
- Charles Hickman: We've had students who have gotten degrees in different colleges, but that's just different degrees after meeting the requirements in each college.

Mitch Berbrier: Well let's look at the charge for the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

- Deb Moriarity: I went back through it and looked at it.
- Mitch Berbrier: [reads the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee charge] It's a matter of how you define these things, but to me, basic degree requirements, if you need a minor or you don't need a minor, is a basic degree requirement. And so it seems to me that maybe there was an error.
- Deb Moriarity: When I looked through it, I felt that it should have come through our committee. Had they been told that originally it would have, but now they're already working on it for the catalogue.
- Mitch Berbrier: And that's a problem.
- Peggy Hays: I don't think it makes any difference whether they're already doing the catalogue or not. It doesn't follow what we're supposed to be doing.
- Mitch Berbrier: This is something I need to pick up with Curtis.
- Deb Moriarity: What our committee would like to know is more explanation of how this is going to impact students and how students would be advised.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's assuming you're supposed to be talking about it in the first place.
- Deb Moriarity: Right, and that's what our assumption was. It seemed like it certainly should be going through us, and if so, this is what we want to see.
- Mitch Berbrier: Can I mention it to her?
- Deb Moriarity: Absolutely because at this point I don't know what to do with it. Do we need to?
- Phillip Bitzer: That's a tricky question, whether you need to. If you read this [the committee's charge], it's advisory. So do you need to approve it? No. But you need to see it.
- Deb Moriarity: Right.
- Mitch Berbrier: Nothing we ever say they have to listen to us.
- Deb Moriarity: Right, we just pass it on to the Provost, so we should have been advisory at least.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think that's a general rule.
- Deborah Heikes: Having or not having a minor is not a decision that should be made in 2 weeks.

- Deb Moriarity: Well it was first brought up in September. We went back to our faculty and discussed it. Then we had to vote on it in January. So we had that amount of time to take it back to the faculty and talk to them about it.
- Peggy Hays: One of the things that seemed to occur is that the steps didn't seem to have been laid out, so who knew what when.
- Mitch Berbrier: That goes to the broader problem of the university, not us. Procedures are made up as they go.
- Deb Moriarity: And this unfortunate switch in chairs at the same time they split Physics, because this was all happening at the same time they split Physics. So Physics was much more concerned about that. Then they got a new chair who wasn't in on the original meeting about this. So there was a mix-up. The chairs were instructed by the Dean to go back to their faculty and discuss it with them and get a sense of their opinions on it.
- Mitch Berbrier: Right, but that's the College of Science's problem, that's not our problem.
- Deb Moriarity: But that's what a lot of the talk has been about. People saying procedures weren't followed. They were, but there were a couple of glitches.
- Mitch Berbrier: Well, that could be a problem, but it's one within the College of Science, not one of our purviews. Our purview is degree requirements and programs, so I'll ask Curtis what she thinks.
- Peggy Hays: We both understood the concerns of the people. What I see has been happening in the College of Nursing, changing things about curriculum and stuff, is the problem of certain people deciding on things without consulting everyone. After looking at the material, I felt that they didn't really seem to know what they would do when.
- Mitch Berbrier: To me, the issue is whether your committee is going to be questioning this.
- Deb Moriarity: Because they did go all the way through the college curriculum committee. There was a representative from every department all in the college curriculum committee that voted for it, but somehow didn't go back to their department.
- Mitch Berbrier: When Bhavani mentioned this to me, my first reaction was, if every time, as Chair of my Department, I change a course number, it has to go through the committee—if these little details have to go through—why wouldn't such a major thing go through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A lot of the things you're dealing with are small things.
- Wai Mok: So some faculty weren't consulted about this. What power do we have? Can we stop it from going into the catalogue?
- Mitch Berbrier: No, we can't. We have the power of being very angry about it.
- Deb Moriarity: We can send a recommendation back about ensuring that all faculty and departments are aware of these decisions. And maybe making sure that representative of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee understand their responsibilities.
- Mitch Berbrier: Ultimately, they have the power to do whatever they want to do, but if the entire faculty is motivated against or joins together against this, is it worth their while? That's where our power comes in. We can't make the decisions on where the money goes and other things, but we can have influence.
- Wai Mok: What happened in Science happened in Business too. I didn't know what was going on, and all of a sudden the curriculum was changed. Nobody told me anything.
- Mitch Berbrier: This same thing happened in the College of Business, too? They didn't go through the Undergraduate Curriculum either?
- Wai Mok: It was several years ago, but that's what I don't know. Definitely, though, I was in the dark.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's an internal college, internal department problem. To what extent is the Chair or the Faculty Senator going to inform the college of what's going on.

- Deb Moriarity: Certain people in Science are upset because they weren't in on it, but their big complaint is the college is watering down the curriculum.
- Mitch Berbrier And that goes to what I just said.

**Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair James Blackmon:** I don't have anything to report, but I need some advice on what to do next.

- Mitch Berbrier: Were you going to convene your committee?
- James Blackmon: I haven't yet.
- Mitch Berbrier: I suggest you convene your committee and see what they say.

**Finance and Resources Committee Chair Charles Hickman:** We had 65 RCEU applications, and we have funding for maybe 30. The committee met. One of the things we proposed and are going to do, unless everybody thinks this is a bad idea, is because we have so many, there were 14 who had GPAs of less than 3 points, so we are going to cut them off. Then we will rank the rest and go talk to Ray Vaughn and Provost Curtis. Alabama's Grant Consortium last year funded 25, 26, or 27, something like that.

- Wai Mok: 100% were funded last year.
- Mitch Berbrier: Why did we get so many more applications this year?
- Deb Moriarity: Because everyone was funded last year. Plus, there was a lot of good advertising.
- Charles Hickman: We put it out earlier and more often.

So we are going to rank them and then go talk to the Provost and Ray Vaughn to see how many we can fund. Then, however many we can fund, we will just go down the rankings. We did have 6 from Centers. 2 of those will be eliminated because of GPA. So that leaves 4, and we will rank those the same as we rank the others. Then, we had 10 applications for the Extinguished Speaker Series, but we only have funding for 8. We will rank those and then take them to Provost Curtis and see if we can have all of them funded.

- Mitch Berbrier: RCEU instigated a committee that we are setting up with the Provost and the VP of Research to investigate how that works, the role of Research Faculty versus Research Center Faculty, Research Staff. Ray Vaughn's impression is that there is more of a split here than there was at Mississippi State. So we are setting up a committee and Wai and I will meet tomorrow with Provost Curtis and Ray Vaughn to hammer out the list of people we will strongly request, people appropriate for this committee. We have 3 members that we bring, and one of those is chair, and Provost Curtis will give 2 names and Vaughn will give 2 names. The committee initiated from the issue of funding for the RCEU, where Ray wanted us to open it up to Research Faculty and Staff. At some point we agreed to do it and them to fund it for this year and we will open it up to everybody to see how it goes. That then developed into a broader committee to look into the issue of clarifying what the role of Research Faculty, Research Center Faculty, all of those people relative to each other at this university and to other faculty. What are the formal structural roles and their interactions to those people? It's a committee that will start at the beginning of spring and report by end of fall, or even earlier, to us (Wai Mok, Christine Curtis, and Ray Vaughn).
- Deb Moriarity: That particular topic has been coming up over and over. When I was Graduate Dean it was an issue. When Williams first got here, that was one of the things he wanted the Grad Dean to work with the VP of Research to try to facilitate more involvement of the Research Staff, specifically at the Graduate programs, at that time. So we looked at a couple different things, and then when Borack came in, he was charged

with that as well. So he and I say down and talked about it. One of the things he did was incorporate into his review of the centers what their contribution to supporting graduate students and graduate research and mentoring was. Then, if they weren't doing it, putting graduate student support into funding requests and things like that, it was going to be a strike against them. That was the first step. There are a couple models on campus where it works very well. Propulsion has an excellent interaction with the academic departments. Earth Systems Science works very well. But there are a couple of others that seem to be really separate.

- James Blackmon: I love working with students. The problem I had was I was also doing things not too long ago there were department things that professors would normally do as part of their job. But when you're funded by an agency, it isn't part of your job; you're doing it on your own time. So I worked longer. But they finally decided this wasn't right so they told me I didn't have to do certain things. I personally didn't want to be a disappointment to the department by not participating, but it is easier not to have to do it, because you're doing it on your own time. So I'm perfectly happy to be here, but I can't charge it to my contracts.

Deb Moriarity: Are those the kinds of issues that this committee will look into?

- Mitch Berbrier: I think so.
- James Blackmon: If they're going to do it, by all rights there ought to be a time charged to it, the way I was taught about truth and time charges. If you're on a government contract, and you're doing this other stuff, there's a presumption that you're charging the government contract to do it. As I recall when we went through training, in my former life, about filling out your time card, it had to be absolutely true, evidential, etc. So being able to volunteer to do things didn't automatically come across as doing it on your own time. It came across as guilty until proven innocent, and they didn't like that. So they would send guys into a person's cubicle to look at his time card. So from that environment to this environment, the people in the same situation as me are a little bit unclear as to what they can do. And there's nothing written down that I know of.
- Charles Hickman: With regard to the effort certifications, I thought they had gone away from time to percentage.
- James Blackmon: They have here. I don't know what they're doing at the Boeings.

**Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair, Fan Tseng: Absent**

➤ Discussion Items

Bill 378

This is the first reading. The purpose of this first reading is to make sure everything is in order and will be brought to second reading in front of the Senate itself where we can debate there.

Mitch Berbrier: It is my impression, from the conversation over email last night, that most of Rich's suggestions, I'm not sure all of them, thus far were mostly about the details of the bill and the substance, and some suggestions about changes. Some of the things that he said about Number 3, "it is unclear whether this bill is designed to apply to administrator hires or general faculty hires..."

- Deb Moriarity: Is that too general? Because sometimes you will hire a faculty member and recommend tenure, but that would go through the typical.
- Mitch Berbrier: That was his Number 2, "I believe the bill needs to either refer or to reiterate the procedures outlined in the Handbook." The reason that I paused on these things was because I was thinking: What are the situations under which we send things

back to committees? It's not the substance, so if 5 days is right or 10 days—that's a substantive issue. The form of it, last year and this year we have sent things back to committees, there was one this year that wasn't specific enough.

- Carolyn Sanders: This started with Ramon when he was chairing the committee and it wasn't in the form of a resolution at that point, nor was it specific regarding an accelerated time-line. It was very general.
- Mitch Berbrier: So here is the question: are those the things that we want to send forward for a second reading and appropriate for us to want to change them, or is it something that we want to send back to the Personnel committee and have them specify those things? With the understanding that if want to get them done by the end of this academic year, much better off moving on to the second reading, but we also want to do it right.
  
- Carolyn Sanders: I'm trying to understand the procedures. If it goes back to the committee, that's it for this year?
- Phillip Bitzer: No, not necessarily.
- Mitch Berbrier: If it passes unanimously at the second reading then it's final, but there's always the possibility that I can call a special meeting.
- Carolyn Sanders: But at this point it could go back to committee? Is that accurate?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes, with specific instructions on changes.
- Carolyn Sanders: If it went back to the committee, and there wasn't another extra meeting, then we have to wait until the fall?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes, for a third reading.
- Phillip Bitzer: Not necessarily. We can force a third reading at that time.
- Deborah Heikes: Yes, you can actually. If you get 2/3 vote, you can go straight to third reading.
  
- Carolyn Sanders: One difficulty with this, because I was not chair originally, I was not privy to the discussion that you all had. For instance, I think a lot of Rich's points are valid. Some of it is about getting more specific. What was really clear with my committee is that we want to double-check with the new handbook draft to see if the wording was specific, but we were in unanimous agreement that this was not specific enough. We are happy to strengthen this bill and if there is a way procedurally to make any suggestion to quickly get it back to the committee, but not have it wait until next year.
- Mitch Berbrier: It would be nice not to have to wait until next year. We can try to plan on that. I suppose you should get 2/3 majority at the second reading to bring it to a third reading, but if you don't pass it with a 2/3 majority in the second reading, majority being 57%, then the same 43% that voted against it could kill it that very day.
  
- Carolyn Sanders: I thought the questions Rich posed and the points he made were good, and I think they're fairly easily changed, without me knowing the exact intent of the spill. To Deb's point: should it just be focused on administrators and make that very clear? That was a question for us in the committee. That's why it says "new hires," but it needs to be more specific. I'm just predicting it may not pass on the second reading the way it's worded because those points were valid, and a lot of it its making it more specific.
- Mitch Berbrier: The point is that at the second reading we can amend it, but I do think there are several amendments and I, myself, have some suggestions. We can do this at second reading, it's very time consuming and it's very difficult to do it in that forum. But I think these kinds of things, if we agree, need to be done it might be more efficient in the long run to be send it back to the committee.

- Deborah Heikes: The messier a bill is, the less chance it has of passing because people get really worked up about it.
- Carolyn Sanders: I think we probably agree. I don't want it to go out into the full Faculty Senate and not have the best chance to pass.
  
- Mitch Berbrier: I'm curious about the 5 days.
- Carolyn Sanders: That came from the notes that I have from the meeting that you had with 2 Personnel Committee members. That was exactly what Dan put in this, 5 days would be allowed for each of these to submit their recommendations to the Provost. I was under the impression that came from the meeting you had with Dan and Nick.
- Mitch Berbrier: If it did, I don't think it was me saying President Altenkirch said it should be 5 days, I don't think. It might have been just a discussion of these for possibilities.
- Carolyn Sanders: In that case, you're the one who had the discussion with the president. I made an assumption.
- Mitch Berbrier: I don't recall him specifying a number of days.
- Carolyn Sanders: But we will have to make it specific enough.
- Mitch Berbrier: He said he wanted it specified but he didn't say how many days. I'm sure he would be happy with 5 days and I'm sure he would not accept 2 months, so we need to figure out what.
- Deb Moriarity: One week is a typical timeframe.
- Deborah Heikes: Presumably 5 days is one week, depending on how you count the weekend.
- Deb Moriarity: And it depends on the way you predict the process.
- Deborah Heikes: Then just fix the wording to 5 business days.
- Mitch Berbrier: That gives you a whole week.
  
- Carolyn Sanders: For those of you that were here from the beginning of this discussion, is it just to focus on administrators, and leave faculty totally out of it?
- Mitch Berbrier: No, I don't think so.
- Deb Moriarity: Aren't the faculty covered in the normal procedures for hiring?
- Mitch Berbrier: Is that what you meant by the Board Rule 301?
- Carolyn Sanders: 301 has to do with administrative appointments. They do not carry tenure but an administrative officer also may hold an academic appointment.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think it's about the issues that we were dealing with last year, which were not just about administrators. The two issues that came up were both Department Chairs. The ones that led to this whole problem were certain Department Chairs.
- Carolyn Sanders: That's faculty.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think it should be all, anyone who is getting tenured.
- Carolyn Sanders: Is there a way to strengthen that wording so it is totally clear that it is faculty and administrators?
- Mitch Berbrier: It needs to say faculty and administrators.
- Deb Moriarity: With an accelerated timeline when necessary. Because if it's a regular faculty hire, as opposed to if you want to hire somebody who's been in the system as a Professor, then we want to bring them in as an Associate for tenure. There's no reason for us to have to do a super accelerated thing for that.
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes, but that's vague language.
- Deb Moriarity: Yeah. When requested?
- Mitch Berbrier: You might want to put in some kind of leeway where, if everyone agrees, because it doesn't have to be 5 days.
- Deb Moriarity: So then "if requested."

- Mitch Berbrier: Yes, if requested. Whoever is doing the hiring can ask.
- Peggy Hays: “If requested”—what is the definition of that?
- Mitch Berbrier: It’s whoever is doing the hiring. If the President is hiring an administrator, and he wants URB to approve them, he has to make that request.
- Deborah Heikes: With some faculty hires you might want to do this because they might be looking elsewhere.
- Mitch Berbrier: That’s the point. That’s why you want to accelerate. That’s why we understand the need for accelerating.
- Carolyn Sanders: So if a request is made for an accelerated timeline, this is what it would be...
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes.
- Deb Moriarity: Request made to whom?
- Deborah Heikes: The Dean of the College?
- Mitch Berbrier: To the committees.
- Wai Mok: PTAC and URB.
- Mitch Berbrier: PTAC reports to the Dean, and URB reports to the Provost. So the request has to go from the Provost to URB, the request from the Dean has to go to PTAC. The Departments report to their Chairs, and the Chairs report to their Dean, and the Dean gives it back to PTAC. So we should probably focus on more efficient wording that says from whoever is in charge.
- Deborah Heikes: If we just said the request should go to the appropriate committee, PTAC and URB, and then if they want to filter the request to the Provost or the Dean, then can do that.
- Mitch Berbrier: Through the appropriate channels.
- Deb Moriarity: Presumably the Department has already done it if it’s a faculty member, but if it’s an administrator that they’re wanting to hire, then it has to come back to the Department to decide.
- Mitch Berbrier: Do we need two different bills, one for administrators and one for faculty? We could do 2 kinds of twin bills. It might make it easier for you to write 2 bills.
- Carolyn Sanders: In terms of procedure, can I draft it and send it to you all before I send it back to my committee to look at? I’m just trying to do this in the most efficient way. I can send this to my committee and then it goes back to you all to look at and you might not like the wording.
- Mitch Berbrier: If you send it to your committee, you don’t do anything. You tell your committee, “They want us to do x, y, z.” And then you won’t hear anything back and you will do it yourself anyways.
- Carolyn Sanders: Yeah. I actually don’t mind it; I’m just trying to figure out how to do it without breaking procedure.
- Phillip Bitzer: Right, staying in order.
- Mitch Berbrier: If it’s just a conversation about people’s opinions, I don’t see that as being out of order.
- Deborah Heikes: You can write it up and send it to your committee and say, “It’s in your court now.” When I chaired a committee I always said I take silent as assent.
- Mitch Berbrier: Give a deadline—I need to hear from you by this date, otherwise I am required to send it on.

#### FSEC Report Approval

We discussed whether we are going to bother going through minute approval for FSEC minutes and there were no objections to not doing it. I thought it was a reasonably good point to make that it’s nice to actually have some sort of formal acceptance of them. So I think the solution here is

that we stop having a discussion about them and instead have the Senate willing to accept the FSEC report.

- Everyone agrees.

➤ Approval of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting

Mitch Berbrier: I have 2 things to change. I need to add after Officer and Committee reports, that we should have a formal vote on the appointment of Earl Wells and Michael Banish to committees. I also need to correct the indentation for Bill 378.

Approval for Agenda? Ayes.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm