
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**April 10, 2014
12:45 P.M. in SKH 369**

Present: Mitch Berbrier, Wai Mok, Phillip Bitzer, Carolyn Sanders, Charles Hickman, Fan Tseng, Peggy Hays, Debra Moriarity

Guests: President Altenkirch, Provost Curtis, Brent Wren

➤ Mitch Berbrier called meeting to order at 12:45 pm

➤ Report from President Altenkirch
University Drive Entranceway

The entranceway on University Drive is under construction. They have concrete blocks up right now. It should go pretty fast.

Madison Hall Replacement

The preliminary design is done. The committee that is reviewing it looked at it. We've asked them to go back and figure out if they can add a room where the Board of Trustees would meet. I think the room in the Bevill Center is too small. The University Center is not really appropriate. There isn't really a meeting place on campus. If we are going to build this building and it is the welcome center, we might as well look at that. It won't add much cost to the building. They have some rearrangement ideas. We won't finalize it until we can decide if there will be a Board of Trustees meeting room. It will function as other things too. The Board only meets there once a year. Initially we thought that there would be a 2-story rotunda, so you could walk in and see everything. They've come up with a slightly different idea, and I think it will work. It is sort of a rotunda, but it pulls you to the back of the building where there is a corridor that is all glass so you can see the entire greenway. The other feature, which is architectural, is when you look at the building at the entranceway, there's a theater. If visitors want to take a tour, they enter the theater and watch a video about the campus; it's a very small theater. It's a 2-story deal and they will pull the roof up and angle it to give it an architectural feature so that it doesn't look like it's in the shadows of the Shelby Center. Shelby Center has a lot of mass to it from the street, so you can't put a building next to it that is "small." So in order to get some mass to it, they've stretched it, so it isn't very deep. This theater feature draws your eyes so it takes away from the Shelby Center. I think they did a pretty good job. Actually, they had three designs, and the committee liked this one. As soon as they figure out the Board room issue, they will be able to shop around. They are on track to go to the Board meeting in June with a rendering. Get the construction bids in and then start late summer. Be done in January of 2016.

We've been looking at parking replacement options. There will be parking in front of the building. We some other locations of potential parking lots that Mike Finnegan has gone up and has been looking at the walking circles (how many minutes it takes to walk from place to place). I'm talking to them tomorrow about this. Once we get some preliminary results on that, I'll show it to you. We won't lose parking spots number wise, but they'll be in different locations.

Property

We off and on have looked at buying those 2 churches on Holmes and Austin. We continue to do that. It will take a while. In addition to that, we are looking at purchasing the little park behind the softball field. The city wants to sell it and relocate it elsewhere. We are in the process of getting an appraisal. There is a nice concession building there. Probably something like intramural fields would be good. That would move them out of the center of the campus.

Board Meeting

There were three faculty members who received designations as Distinguished Professor: Gary Zank in Space Science, Don Gregory in Physics, and Ray Vaughn in Computer Science.

The Education degrees for Secondary Education was approved. Basically we have a parallel path now where a student can come in and get a disciplinary degree with the teaching certification, or can get a teaching degree with a disciplinary concentration. They will have a choice.

- Deb Moriarity: Any idea how the numbers might work out?
- President Altenkirch: No, but we want the overall numbers to go up.
- Deb Moriarity: I'm just wondering if it will shift some of our students who normally come in and be a Biology and Chemistry major, to opt to go that route.
- President Altenkirch: We will have to learn by experience. The bottom line is, on a top-level view, that Athens State and UNA have on the order, each, of 1,000 Education students. We have on the order of 100.
- Deb Moriarity: That will be a B.S. in...
- Provost Curtis: A B.S. in Secondary Education.

Athens State

Athens State is proposing an Instructional Role change so they can offer Master's Degrees. They've submitted that to ACHE. We've objected. I sent a letter to every ACHE Commissioner and I met with the Executive Director. I met with a few elected officials. I talked with the North Alabama President, A&M President, Jacksonville State President. I talked with our Chancellor, our lobbyist, etc. Next week will be a meeting at ACHE of the Instructional Affairs Committee where they will consider this proposal. They can do one of two things: they can table it or send it to the full commission. Historically, they will probably send it to the full commission. We will be at the meeting. The President of A&M will be

there too. We will speak against it. Hopefully, he will speak against it. If we oppose their role change, they will oppose our getting Undergraduate Education degrees.

- Wai Mok: When UAB setup their Information Assurance Master's Program, we didn't really know until after the fact. So why?
- President Altenkirch: When was that?
- Wai Mok: At least to 2-3 years ago. Cindy Graham emailed that program to all IS faculty. We were blindsided by that. What is different between this and Athens State? Is it because UAB is part of the system?
- President Altenkirch: No. It should have come through the Graduate Dean's office.
- Wai Mok: We were totally in shock because they are like 90 miles away from us. Do they not have to consult with us?
President Altenkirch: They don't have to consult with us other than the way every institution has to consult with us, which is that program would have gone to the Graduate level, it would have come to the Graduate Dean for comment, and it would be on the Board agenda, and on the ACHE agenda.
- Wai Mok: The faculty wasn't informed about that.
- Mitch Berbrier: The only difference would be is that it would go through our Board.
- President Altenkirch: That is correct.
- Mitch Berbrier: If there is a duplication in the system then our Board might be concerned. Is there duplication?
- Wai Mok: We've had a Master's degree in Information Assurance longer than them.
- President Altenkirch: The name just got changed.
- Wai Mok: Right, so not it's Cybersecurity. But the UAB program was setup by an old UAH faculty member. He left us, went down there, setup a camp down there, and we got blindsided.
- President Altenkirch: All I can say is that it would have come to the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean should have sent it out for comment and collected the responses and decided what to do with it. So maybe that step didn't happen.
- Deb Moriarity: I think the list came out the last year that I was Grad Dean. And we did send the list out. It was probably sent to your Dean. I would send them to the Dean of the college and ask them to send them to the appropriate people in the college. That was just the notification. I wasn't there for the rest of it.
- Wai Mok: I felt blindsided. I don't know if we can protest because of the distance.
- President Altenkirch: At this point we can't.
- Wai Mok: Not now, but in the future.
- Deb Moriarity: Theirs is a little different than ours. As I recall, theirs has a big emphasis on forensics. Ours is more prevention, theirs is more investigation.
- President Altenkirch: If internally, we would be "not in favor of" something like that, then I think they it would work is: I would discuss it with the Chancellor and see what the take is. Because if the Board is in favor of it, there is no sense in opposing it.

The interesting thing about Athens State in Education—they don't have Education degrees, they have disciplinary degrees with teaching certification. They're the only institution like that other than us.

- Mitch Berbrier: So it's a lot shorter program.
- President Altenkirch: That's true. So, we can expect a few fireworks on that.
- Mitch Berbrier: The leap we are making is much smaller than the leap they're making.
- President Altenkirch: Yes. The role change for them would allow them to offer as many Master's degrees as they get approved through ACHE. It is possible, though, that the Commission would allow them to offer a higher degree in a single discipline, which is okay by the rules of ACHE. They don't need a level change. That's basically what we've been pushing behind the scenes. The first program they want to offer is a Master's in Religious Studies. There is no public universities in the state that offer that. So the Commission could say that they could do that, but that's it—no more.
- Deb Moriarity: Typically when the new Grad programs come up for the Alabama Council of Graduate Deans to look at, one of the things they look at is if there's faculty for it in terms of providing graduate education, and look at the scholarly activity, so that might be one of the issues they run into in a number of areas. They aren't very research active.
- President Altenkirch: As far as I can tell, ACHE is entirely political.

➤ Report from Provost Christine Curtis

Searches

The Nursing search is basically in the phase of going to the committee for the final recommendations and discussions of the candidates, which they will forward to me. All three candidates have been here and have had a complete interview schedule with the faculty and with the Vice President, the President, and me. We've gone through process and we're now waiting on the committee. They're meeting on Friday.

The Science Dean search is in progress. The second candidate is here today, and we have two more next week.

The Honors Dean search has completed their Skype interviews with the individuals that they wanted to talk to. One of the candidates has to pull out of the search because of family issues. They're hopefully meeting this Friday and are going to give recommendations as to whom we should be interviewing.

- Mitch Berbrier: Is there a Chair of the committee now that Dean Dasher is out of town?
- Provost Curtis: They have asked for a volunteer to lead the meeting and chair it.
- Mitch Berbrier: So there's no specific person appointed?
- Provost Curtis: Not at this point. If we need to do that, we will do it.

Faculty Handbook

The Faculty Handbook has been distributed to a number of entities on campus to make sure that their sections are up to date (research, HR, registrar, and the like). I've heard back from Research. After one look, they said this is way out of date. So they are going to be updating and hopefully they will submit it to us by mid-May.

Vice President for Student Affairs

The committee is being finalized. The paperwork is being finalized, which needs to be done before the committee meets. We will be meeting hopefully in the next week or so to discuss the job description, etc., and then move forward.

Facilities

The Department of Education will be moving to the third floor of Roberts Hall. We will be adding in the technology for the classrooms this summer. So they should be ready to go this fall.

SACS Accreditation

We are in final discussion with a faculty member who has tentatively agreed at this point to help us lead the SACS accreditation visit. We haven't heard back from her yet.

Questions

Charles Hickman: Technology. We have gotten a number of lecture-equipped classrooms. We got some last summer and we got some over Christmas. Are there more to come?

- Brent Wren: Yes, there is another round coming this summer.

Deb Moriarity: Do you have any idea when testing services might get back on schedule?

- Brent Wren: I just talked yesterday with the staff where I shared that while we continue to be concerned about Melinda Lyles' time away, it's time to get this done. We are holding up performance reviews and that sort of thing. I got a pretty good status update on Monday afternoon. There are 2 hold ups: there is the sheer volume of the Fall 2013 SIEs that need to be scanned, and it's time to get the Spring ones out to everyone. It's not a simple "order a bunch of forms and here they are." Most colleges have their own form and they have to print those unique forms, on the order of about 15,000 forms across all of the colleges. So there's the hold up on printing those and scanning the old ones. So I asked what can we do over here to take some of that load off. We just received the templates this morning for us to print the new forms so they can focus on scanning the old forms. My hope is that soon, the fall of 2013 will be done. They were about halfway through them.

Mitch Berbrier: When do you anticipate the announcement of Distinguished Speaker awards?

- Charles Hickman: I sent those out this morning. I didn't broadcast it to the entire campus. We had 10 proposals. Dr. Altenkirch as Interim Provost had authorized 8. Dr. Curtis sent me an email yesterday saying to go ahead and notify them. So I notified the 8 that were awarded and the 2 that were not this morning.
- Deb Moriarity: That went to the proposing faculty member?
- Charles Hickman: Yes.

Mitch Berbrier: We are going to talk about the Faculty and Student Development Committee which has sent out a report for us to review about Lecturers. You and Wai and I talked yesterday about the Library Faculty. In terms of the change to Library Faculty, they recommend the Library Faculty be treated differently. Is there a philosophical objection, or another kind of objection, to the "Clinical" designation for Library Faculty?

- Provost Curtis: We will need to talk about it.
- Brent Wren: If my memory serves, they had representation on the Senate and then y'all decided to eliminate them from having representation on the Faculty Senate. So now y'all are trying to put them back on it?
- Mitch Berbrier: My understanding is that they had representation as long as there was one tenured-track member still. The last one, Linda Vaughn, retired, and all they had left were Lecturers, and Lecturers don't count towards representation, so they lost their representation.
- Brent Wren: I just know at one time they had representation, but it stopped.
- Mitch Berbrier: That was because they lost their only tenured-track faculty members, but now we are trying to find a way to get them representation. They don't have representation on the Staff Senate and they don't have representation on the Faculty Staff. If the designation is changed to Clinical, then Clinical Faculty are considered counting towards that.
- Provost Curtis: When did they change from hiring them as tenure-track to hiring them as Lecturers?
- Fan Tseng: In the memo that was sent to the committee, it said 15 years ago. If that number is correct.
- President Altenkirch: What about Research Faculty?
- Mitch Berbrier: Well, there are a number of designations, and Research Faculty would work too. I personally don't have a preference. My interest on Faculty Senate is that they get representation. They want some kind of representation. We have to find a way.
- President Altenkirch: Research Faculty right now don't have representation?
- Mitch Berbrier: If they're in an academic department they do. For every 7 faculty members you get one senator.
- Provost Curtis: Why are lecturers not in that count? Is it historic that they've never been in the count? Or is it a conscious decision that has been made recently?

- Mitch Berbrier: I don't know how historic it is. I think there's reluctance on the part of tenured faculty to encourage including adjuncts and instructors, around the country.
- Provost Curtis: Are lecturers similar to instructors?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes. There are different points of view on this. I think that's part of the move away from tenure track towards shorter term and adjuncts. I try to discourage that. Some people would argue that lecturers aren't committed to the long-term interests of the university. Others would argue that it should be open because some lecturers have been here a lot longer than some of our faculty, and are much more committed to the institution. I'm speculating and I think that's where this comes from.
- Provost Curtis: Some instructors/lecturers have been here a very long time.
- Mitch Berbrier: There are some lecturers who would love to be on Faculty Senate.
- President Altenkirch: The bill that you wrote up, what does it specifically address?
- Mitch Berbrier: To try to make an exception to that. I was hoping to get this moving forward this year so they can have their representation somehow and this can be resolved. At this point it doesn't look like that's going to be the case. The report that the Faculty and Student Development Committee ended up making, their recommendation, was for everyone but the librarians. So we are going to start with the librarians again. We will discuss this later on. I want them to get representation on the Faculty Senate sooner rather than later.
- President Altenkirch: A while back we talked about developing a promotion ladder for our lecturers. Is that what that is?
- Mitch Berbrier: That's what that is, but it excludes the library faculty.
- Fan Tseng: There are 2 reasons why we excluded the library faculty. One is representation. The second issue is they have a proposal and their proposal is completely different from our "lecturer ladder." They have a proposal for clinical track.
- President Altenkirch: Who has it? Who have they submitted that to?
- Fan Tseng: The librarians. It's the proposal they have and they've shared it with this committee. They said there should be a copy on the Provost's desk.
- President Altenkirch: Wouldn't it be simpler if we separated the two issues?
- Fan Tseng: That's why we did it.
- President Altenkirch: In other words, one question is: are you going to recommend a promotion ladder for lecturers? The other question is: are lecturers represented in the Faculty Senate. Then, whether or not librarians are lecturers or clinical faculty. Those two to me are separate.
- Mitch Berbrier: They are technically separate issues. The reason I submitted it was because I anticipated that this would somehow include the librarians and we would move forward on that. At this point, they're going over a separate track with their own recommendations. And we are moving forward with getting them representation on this.

- President Altenkirch: What are their titles right now?
- Mitch Berbrier: Lecturer. So the bill was just trying to make an exception, even a temporary exception, for librarians so they can have representation. They haven't had representation anywhere since Linda Vaughn retired.
- President Altenkirch: Maybe the title of Librarian ought to be a Librarian and then the Senate can decide what a Librarian is.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think that these titles that we are talking about are not decided by us. They are decided at the Board level. Lecturers, Professors, Associates, etc. HR might know, but these titles don't come from us.
- President Altenkirch: It's easy to check the Board rules. All I've seen in those Board rules are the Distinguished Professor and the Tenure Track Ranks. I haven't seen anything else.
- Mitch Berbrier: So it's in the University's purview to call people Lecturers, Librarians, etc.?
- President Altenkirch: If I had to guess I would say yes, but I'll need to check the Board rules.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's not what I was told about the Board rules, but I haven't checked the Board rules.
- Provost Curtis: I think we need to read the Board rules and get with you. Is there any policy on names?
- President Altenkirch: The Faculty Handbook defines various titles.
- Provost Curtis: That could be a change to the Faculty Handbook.
- Mitch Berbrier: If we can do that, that's a reasonable solution.
- Fan Tseng: We studied other universities on library/faculty issues and most have different titles than Lecturers, such as "Library Faculty" or "Librarian 1, 2, and 3". No one that we checked has just the title "Lecturer." We are unique. But our sample was pretty small.
- Mitch Berbrier: I wonder if when, whenever it was, we decided not to hire them as tenure-track anymore, and why the decision to just go to Lecturer over anything else. It might have made sense at the time.
- President Altenkirch: Well I would separate the issues to keep it simple.

➤ Report from Associate Provost Brent Wren

The Institutional Research position is about finished with the committee. Did use 2 out of 3 names you submitted as faculty representatives. One of the people submitted indicated a preference not to serve due to conflict of interest.

- Provost Curtis: We also used 2 out of the 3 for VPSA.

➤ Officer and Committee Reports

❖ President, Mitch Berbrier

I have a couple of things today. One, we now have a room for the meeting on April 25th at 10:00 am with Andrea Word and Brent Wren. Business 114, which is the room immediately

to left when you walk into the building. I want to discuss with you the wisdom, desirability, of blocking that off from 10:00 am to 12:00, so 10:00 am to 11:00 am will be the meeting with Andrea Word and Brent Wren. Then 11:00 am to 12:00, if we don't finished the bills the day before at the last Faculty Senate meeting, we will have people there to finish the discussion so we don't have to call another special meeting at the end of the year. I believe in our case, the bills can continue onto next year. We can choose to do that. The alternative is to try to send an email prior to the next meeting to ask people to do what Rich asked them to do last year—If they have any proposed changes to the bills in front of us, to have them ready to go when we begin, in order to keep the discussion more to the point and we can move faster. Bills 373, 376, 378. That will be quite a bit to get through. Discussion?

- Carolyn Sanders: I think it's a good idea. It takes the hassle out of finding another meeting time.
- Deb Moriarity: I agree.

Putting together this committee to look into the Research Faculty/Staff versus Academic Faculty relationships. What is normal at other campuses. Ray and Christine each pick 2 members, 4 total, and they asked us for 4 members to be on the committee of 7. We get the chair. Their members are Robert Lindquist, Paul Collopy. Kathleen Hawk, Sundar Christopher, and I have asked Carmen Scholz to Chair. I looked at the research committee that got the information for us last year and knew I wanted someone from Science, or Engineering, and Carmen was the Chair of the committee. She said yes, but then said she's on sabbatical next semester. Jason Cassibry from Engineering was on that committee. Peggy Hays was asked to do it, but she can't because she is retiring this year. So I will go look at that list again.

- Phillip Bitzer: I recommend picking someone from Atmospheric Science since we have such a strong relationship with Research. To me, that is the model for Academic/Research relationship.
- Deb Moriarity: I strongly agree.

I gave a speech at the Board of Trustees meeting. I will type it up and send it to you. The gist of it was that we are a quality institution across the board; that we have excellent instruction across the board; and that we should market ourselves as a much higher quality institution. We should keep the costs down, but we should market that.

This is our last meeting. I am putting together an agenda for myself for the summer of stuff I wanted to do but couldn't do over the course of the year, most of "F" on our Agendas. As far as these orientations and guidance initiatives that I wanted to put together, I will be emailing everyone for input on what do you think we should be telling incoming senators, and incoming committee chairs, that isn't in the official listing of what your responsibilities are. I was talking to one Faculty Senate President, and I don't remember if it was one from our system, who said their first meeting of the year is all about orientation for new senators.

I don't want a meeting for that, but I would like a PDF document or something. People just kind of show up and figure out what to do.

- Peggy Hays: Since I've been on Faculty Senate, early on when I was just here, I didn't know anything about it. No one wants to be on it, so too many times they're voted and don't know anything. And they just look to their colleagues and see what they're voting and they vote the same thing, which isn't good. I think the orientation thing is really strong. The other thing I see is people don't come to the meetings. And when they do come, now that people have tablets and phones, they're not paying any attention to the meeting. They're just sitting there getting checked off. They're at the meeting, but they aren't participating in any way, shape, or form. They just arrive. I also see the proxies. One time someone comes and proxies for somebody else, and the next time another person come to proxy for that person. There are too many proxies for one person. If you're not committed to it, then don't do it. They have it on their Vita.
- Mitch Berbrier: It's very irritating. The people who work hard have the same line on their Vita as the people who do nothing.
- Deb Moriarity: Too often I think that Chairs look at who isn't doing anything in their department and they vote for them to be Faculty Senator. I see people in there that I think were put there for that reason. Or the Chair selects the new person. It's a bad thing to choose a new person who doesn't know much about Faculty Senate, and it's a bad thing to see it as "punishing" someone. A lot of it comes from the fact that people don't know what the Faculty Senate does. They don't know why they should be interested and they don't understand.
- Mitch Berbrier: You think we should do a pre-orientation?
- Deb Moriarity: In general, I think when faculty come in, and existing faculty, they ask what is the Faculty Senate? So either they don't know or they have a poor opinion of it, thinking we don't do anything except sit and argue the whole time.
- Mitch Berbrier: There was one thing that I was hoping for, and it was a newsletter that goes out to the faculty and informs them of what's going on in the Faculty Senate.
- Deb Moriarity: If for nothing else, for bills that are being considered. Not every Faculty Senator goes back to their department and tells them anything. But the other faculty actually have opinions about some bills and would like to have that relayed to them.
- Mitch Berbrier: I was reluctant to do this broadcasting thing because it is the Faculty Senator's responsibility, as the representative of their department, to tell people what's going on periodically. It's a matter of both/and. That's another thing I would want at the orientation, which is "this is what you're supposed to do." And tell the chairs too. They want to know what's going on in Faculty Senate too.
- James Blackmon: Shouldn't there be agenda items for the department meetings that have representatives from the Faculty Senate to say what's going on?
- Deb Moriarity: There should be.

- Mitch Berbrier: Some departments are very small and don't have many formal meetings. But I think that's a good idea. It makes it part of the culture in the department when Faculty Senate gets it say.
- Deb Moriarity: Certainly the deans could tell the chairs of the departments that they expect them to get the information from the senators.
- Peggy Hays: Another thing we can do is when we [Nursing] do the change process every day, we ask people if they understand their charge. In the Faculty Senate, we don't do that sort of thing so people can't repeat back what their charge is. Maybe that could be part of the orientation process.
- Mitch Berbrier: For the Chairs?
- Peggy Hays: For all Faculty Senators.
- Carolyn Sanders: Also, it looks like there are a few people who are on more than one committee, and there may be a good reason for that, but any of us can say that it is so hard to get these committees together. Then, when you have someone who is on more than one committee it is doubly hard and we can't really blame them. I don't know if there is a way to avoid that?
- Phillip Bitzer: Well departments have been underrepresented, and when that happens you have one senator who has to sit on multiple committees.
- Mitch Berbrier: I'll go back and look at all of this and try to find a solution. Then we have this issue of people who are on the Faculty Senate for more than one term, and somehow it became a process that a specific seat on the Faculty Senate is associated infinitely with a specific committee. That means if you're on Faculty Senate and you get reelected to three or four terms, you're on the same committee every time. It's reasonable when someone wants to sit on a different committee, so that needs a new process.
- Deb Moriarity: Do we not give people the opportunity to pick?
- Mitch Berbrier: No we don't.
- Carolyn Sanders: I think we should.
- Charles Hickman: Several years ago when I first was on the Faculty Senate, I got something in the mail asking me what committee I would prefer.
- Fan Tseng: It used to be that way. You would volunteer for a committee.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's a potential problem, though, because not everyone gets what they want.
- Deb Moriarity: True, so you can do it like a match, and they put their top three committee choices.
- Charles Hickman: I think that's what used to happen, and Peggy administered that.
- Mitch Berbrier: What happened to that? I think we will think about going back to that. I was told, here's a list of Faculty Senators and they're on these committees.

❖ President-Elect, Wai Mok

I met with Christine Wednesday after Spring Break for about half an hour discussing the Handbook. I mentioned Chapter 7 is very generic, so we need to leave the details up to each

individual college. She mentioned there should be excellence in the university. I don't think this can be measured quantitatively, or across all departments. Of course we can increase the standard, but it needs to be gradual, incrementally.

- Deb Moriarity: We also can't, at the university-level, easily give specific quantitation to what each college, let alone what each department within a college, typically sees as excellence in their field.

❖ Past-President, Richard Miller – Not present

❖ Ombudsperson, Deborah Heikes – Not present.

❖ Governance and Operations Committee Chair, Phillip Bitzer

Nominations are still being solicited for President-Elect and Ombudsperson. I have 2 nominations for President and 1 nomination for Ombudsperson so far.

- Mitch Berbrier: Deadline?
- Phillip Bitzer: I have set a deadline of tomorrow. Ask your committees.
- Mitch Berbrier: Or nominate someone you think from the Faculty Senate. They won't be on the ballot without their okay.

❖ Personnel Committee Chair, Carolyn Sanders

As a result of our last meeting and in consultation with and assistance from Mitch, I am resubmitting Bill 378.

❖ Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair, Deb Moriarity

We've had a lot of submissions for new courses after the deadline we gave everyone. We've approved a lot of new courses in English, History, a few in Business, some in Science. We've had a few bumps in the road. I think we are about to resolve the issue of the required minor going away in Science. I got a memo from Dr. Rochowiak that I will send to the committee. We had another issue with a course that we needed more clarification in the Space Science Department, but I think that is now under control. We had a bunch come in but I think it's tapering off now and settling down. Most of them have been no problem.

- Mitch Berbrier: So it's clear at this point that the committee is allowed to pronounce a view on a minor?
- Deb Moriarity: Yes. I think there was some confusion just as to thinking that it had, but I think that's been clarified.

❖ Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Charles Hickman

The much easier half of what our committee does every year has been finished. We sent out the Distinguished Speaker Series notifications yesterday.

- Mitch Berbrier: Did you say all 10 were getting funded?

- Charles Hickman: 8 are getting funded. All of the committee members ranked them 1-9 and I added up the rankings, with the smallest number as the highest, and the top 8 were funded.

With regard to the RCEU, I also sent out notifications prior to reading Bernhard Vogler's complete email, where at the end he said it isn't completely final yet. So, they've all been notified, primarily, that they're getting funded. This has been very frustrating. Bernhard Vogler wants to start earlier next year, and set the deadlines earlier. I have 9 people on the committee, and 3 initially recused themselves because they either submitted proposals or their department submitted proposals, but with 69 proposals I said no to that, and they just couldn't evaluate their proposal. Ultimately, a maximum of 6 out of the 9 did evaluations. With regard to the process, I agreed with Bernhard that we start earlier. Apparently the RCEU program on this campus got started with an REU grant from the National Science Foundation. For a college our size, I think we are a natural for that. Al said we ought to put together a group to submit a grant. I certainly think it's something that ought to be thought about. Bernhard said some of the larger schools bring graduate students in from other schools, house them in dorms, and then they work on research throughout the summer. There were 27 funded. We didn't get the National Space Grant Consortium proposal in early enough. I don't know why. I'll talk to Bernhard about that. The Provost and VPR both funded at the levels that they committed to. The Chemistry Department funds 3 or 4 out of their settlement fund. The process could stand some further tweaking. We want the best proposals possible. It would be nice if we had more money.

- Deb Moriarity: Some of our students are the ones who go to those other schools in the summer to work on those grants.
- Charles Hickman: Science and Engineering probably are the 2 natural colleges for that.

- ❖ Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, James Blackmon
Senate Bill 374, the validation of pre-requisites during student registration process. We got a lot of information from the spreadsheet from Janet Waller. I looked to see if there was any smoking gun, and eventually converted it into percentages, but I didn't see anything, no anomaly or outlier or anything like that. There were a small percentage of waivers across the board.

- Mitch Berbrier: And there is a process that Janet explained to us.

So it didn't look like the enforcement aspect was an issue, and it looked like the legislation process was handling it. So the committee members didn't see any reason to go forward with it.

- ❖ Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair, Fan Tseng
We finally finished this report on the lecturer ladder.

➤ Discussion Items

❖ Bill 378

The revised version of the tenure upon hire bill. Our role here is simply to decide whether this revised bill (which was submitted to us and on the first reading we decided it needed some cosmetic changes so it went back to be changed and now has been resubmitted with those changes) is ready to go forward to a second reading at the Faculty Senate.

- Charles Hickman: Has this been run by Christine or Bob?
- Mitch Berbrier: No.
- Charles Hickman: With the changes, I was wondering if this was acceptable to them.
- Mitch Berbrier: I didn't officially run it by them, but they were CC'd on the email with the Agenda with this attachment.

- Wai Mok: At the bottom of page 1, does this mean that PTAC does not rely on the Departmental report? They just do their own independent review?
- Carolyn Sanders: Correct.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's right. That's how they accelerate it. Is everyone okay with moving this forward to a second reading?

No objections. Bill 378 moves forward to Faculty Senate for a second reading.

❖ Bill 379

Mitch Berbrier: I'm thinking that unless something happens at the end of this discussion, we withdraw Bill 379 for now at least. It will have to be changed so we will probably need to remand it to a committee.

❖ Lecturer Ladder Report

This is not a bill. It is a memo. At the beginning of the year, we agreed with the President to present some kind of recommendation for a Lecturer Ladder. My understanding was that the impetus for that came from the Librarians. What we ended up with, in part to the Librarians' request, was a report that just talked about the Lecturers that are in the academic departments. So what we have here is a recommendation. With the appendices, I think this is great information to have.

- Carolyn Sanders: Thanks to your committee for doing all of this research.

Fan Tseng: I'm sure all of you remember that originally we wanted a report. Some of the committee members objected to the idea of writing a report. They expected it would be longer with more detail.

- Mitch Berbrier: And too much work?
- Fan Tseng: No, it wasn't about the work. It was more because they wanted a bill and they felt some of the details weren't that important. So we left out some of the details, so this is a stripped down version of the original, which is why this is a memo. The report is not quite a formal report either. You can see we have a recommendation there. So this could be a possible foundation for a bill if it goes that far.

- Mitch Berbrier: It depends on how we want to approach this. I think ultimately we can have a bill, but we aren't at that point yet. He asked us to do this for him, make a recommendation. If you'll recall, he said that either he can come up with a recommendation and us review it or we can come up with one.

Fan Tseng: A comment on the library: in their proposal, they recommend that all of the current lecturers be appointed as Clinical Associate Professors. So there's a big gap between what we want and their proposal.

- Mitch Berbrier: This is all news to me. I think they might have changed their approach in the last year, but I'm not sure.
- Fan Tseng: It's in their report.
- Peggy Hays: Do they have written criteria?
- Fan Tseng: Yes but it's pretty vague and not vigorous. I'll send it out to this committee.
- Mitch Berbrier: Is it sharable?
- Fan Tseng: Sure. I sent it to you [Mitch Berbrier].
- Mitch Berbrier: What do they plan on doing with this? Are they going to submit it to the Provost? Are they expecting your committee to do something with it? Do they expect Faculty Senate to do something? Do you have any sense at all what they're going to do?
- Fan Tseng: No. They were expecting something to happen after the new Director of the Library was appointed. You are Faculty Senate President. What do you think?
- Mitch Berbrier: I'll have to find that letter. I don't recall specific reference to "Clinical". I thought it was a lecturer ladder, but I might be wrong. I remember discussing lecturer ladder, and the Library faculty wanted not just to be lecturer but to have an opportunity to be promoted. And that's what this is now. If that's what they want, then that's relevant.
- Fan Tseng: Well it doesn't even say lecturer in their report. From their point of view, it's good to separate. If we include that, the "clinical" designation, then it might jeopardize the chance of this lecturer ladder.
- Carolyn Sanders: It's a huge change.
- Mitch Berbrier: It sounds like these folks are completely amenable to that.
- Peggy Hays: In the College of Nursing, we have two tracks. We have a tenure track and we have a clinical track.
- Deb Moriarity: They say they're Lecturers, like Library Lecturers. Are they actually teaching courses?
- Mitch Berbrier: No. It's a nonsensical designation. They do some training and teaching.
- Deb Moriarity: There used to be one or two library courses.
- Peggy Hays: Like a Library Orientation or something.

- Deb Moriarity: Right. I know there are a couple of things that they do, but they're not really academic.
- Mitch Berbrier: The thing that makes the most sense to me is Library 1, 2 and 3. I didn't think that was an option. I thought we had to deal with existing categories. I didn't think it was our choice to make those kinds of categories because I was told it was the Board who sets those categories.
- Carolyn Sanders: But it did come on the heels of the Dean being reduced to a Director position.
- Mitch Berbrier: And that might change everything because being under a Dean you are only allowed to work within certain categories, but being under a Director it's a different format because a Dean is an academic title, and Director isn't. Fan, you say we are going to do 2 and not 3. The only reason I can figure that, because here you don't say why, you just say that's what it is, is because that's more common.
- Fan Tseng: One, it is more common. Second, because we have one level. The jump to three levels is too much because of the size of our University. I think that's the reason that I heard from the committee why we chose 2.
- Mitch Berbrier: It's just too much change too quickly?
- Fan Tseng: Yes.

- Mitch Berbrier: For the promotion process (on the first page, the second to last bullet), it says, "The promotion process for lecturer includes an evaluation by the department committee, assessment by the department chairs in a separate report, and a final decision by the college dean in consultation with the Provost..." So there will be no URB component, which is fine—I don't see a problem with that. It does seem to me that once we have some critical mass of Senior Lecturers in place, or whatever we want to call them, wouldn't it be nice if they, or one of them, could be on a committee to evaluate who becomes a Senior Lecturer? It sounds to me like all of the people who will be on that committee will be tenure-track faculty. So as a suggestion, maybe a recommendation that at some point it be required that at the college level—
- Deb Moriarity: --something that says specifically "and when possible a representative of Lecturer 2 be included on the department committee."
- Fan Tseng: I understand. We thought about that and we discussed the issues involved in that. In the end we thought that this is the most important part to pass, then we will work on the details in the new Faculty Handbook. The goal is to get this to pass, and trying to find a component that can be agreed upon. Then in the handbook there's some sub-specification of the composition of the committee, which includes the lecturer. Something in their departmental review, possibly include a lecturer of equal rank or something. The language is there in the handbook, so we don't have to do a lot of changes.
- Charles Hickman: Are they full-time permanent at-will employees/instructors? Or do they have to be reappointed?

- Mitch Berbrier: Lecturers have to be reappointed after 3 years.
- Charles Hickman: Clinical faculty are up to 3 years.
- Mitch Berbrier: Yeah, it's the same thing with Lecturers. The next thing to do is to forward this via email to the entire Faculty Senate for comment. Since it's not a bill, I can send it by email to all of the Faculty Senate and give them time to respond or ask any questions. Then after a period of time, if there are no major objections, will forward to the administration, and pick it up next year. In terms of a bill, it's a much more complex thing.

- Wai Mok: Are the Library folks coming up with their own proposal?
- Mitch Berbrier: Apparently. We aren't sure if it's a proposal.
- Mitch Berbrier: So there are 36 Lecturers now, so modify the numbers in the report and send it to me. Did anyone speak to any of these Lecturers about what they thought about this?
- Fan Tseng: No.
- Mitch Berbrier: That could be helpful. Survey all of them and ask if they would rather have 2 or 3 tiers. I don't know if that will be a good idea or not?
- Fan Tseng: I don't know. Another issue is the term "Lecturer" and "Instructor." Nursing uses the term "Lecturer" differently than what's in the Faculty Handbook. A Lecturer has to be a full-time faculty member. But Nursing has a lot of part-time Lecturers.
- Peggy Hays: We do that because we bring in people with special expertises to teach certain classes.
- Mitch Berbrier: We would call that an Adjunct or an Instructor.
- Peggy Hays: We have that also. We have lots of titles.

❖ Election of Committee Chairs

I sent out something to all of you via email about ideas about how to elect committee chairs for next year. Last year it was done via email, and no one was really in charge, so it didn't really happen and at the beginning of the year we had to scramble. The history is that at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, which is the next meeting, which will be a joint meeting of the incoming and outgoing senators, we have groups and they decide on committee chairs. First of all, incoming senators don't necessarily have Thursday afternoons free. I think it's something that can be done via email. My suggestion to you, the committee chairs, is that you coordinate this, even if you're not on the committee next year, or not on the Senate next year, so that at least somebody is in charge of making sure that it happens before Wai becomes President.

- Peggy Hays: I think this helps make it transparent. I think transparency is important.
- Deb Moriarity: Or have a meeting of that committee.
- Phillip Bitzer: To me, email is the way to do it.
- Deb Moriarity: What if people don't respond?
- Phillip Bitzer: Then that's their problem. That's the official form of communication

so they have no excuse.

- Deb Moriarity: But you can't shame people by email to do it.
- Mitch Berbrier: That's a good point. I think the way that I wrote it is that it's up to each of you the way that you want to run it. This is also a good way to find out how best to do this.
- Phillip Bitzer: The problem is if we are going to start moving people around. Are we going to reassign committees? That needs to be decided before electing chairs.
- Mitch Berbrier: No, I think that we should continue with the committees as they are and then think about what the process will be in the future. In certain cases, such as in Carolyn's, we can ask somebody to change.
- Phillip Bitzer: So I can go look at who is coming in to my committee and have them pick a chair?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes, because it's already set up, but I think that in the future we should go to what Charlie was describing where people get to pick.

❖ Agenda Approval

The agenda was approved.

- Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm