THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
VOLUME XXV
MINUTES OF MEETING #514, 24 FEBRUARY, 2011
APPROVED 10 MARCH, 2011

Present: Wei Mok, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Clarke Rountree, Laurel Bollinger, David Neff, Carolyn Sanders, Kathy Hawk, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Mohamed Ashour, Laurie Joiner, Jennifer English, Aleksandar Milenkovic, Paul Componation, Louise O'Keefe, Ina Warboys, Brenda Talley, Carmen Scholz, Ramazan Aygun, Peter Slater, Dongsheng Wu, Richard Miller

Absent with Proxy: Jeet Gupta, Samuel Thomas, Seong Moo Yoo, Kristen Herrin, Roy Magnuson, TIm Newman, James Baird, Max Bonamente

The meeting was called to order at 12:50 by Dr. Jennifer English

Provost Karbhari:

- Four items approved at the Board Meeting. We are preparing for the submission of a few more.
- BETA Document –This document was distributed and Dr. Karbhari asked for comments.. He stated this is not a perfect document. It doesn't say do "x" or "y" but provides a process for the Committee to look at concerns that are brought forward. Individuals do not have to report everything they see or that believe that everything is a threat. The Senate should nominate and individual or individuals and the Provost will approve an individual for a 3 year term. Will answer questions on the document and the team. Please send your comments by early March. This is a living document and as we learn more we will change it. We have been working under this document although we have not had a policy in place but working from this document. Will have something on website and will know the process. Deans have seen the document and the group from EMOG wrote parts of it and then the Deans saw it and you have what has been discussed . There have been a number of changes. This was leveraged from other universities. Have borrowed and have spoken to others. Talking to other people as to what should go in. New for academia. Learning what we can and cannot do and what we should and should not do. Learn from those before us.
- Higher Education day April 7. Important to represent SGA decided to provide letter for instructors prior to April 7 and get a letter signed by a representative to prove the student made the trip. Faculty should get a letter saying the student is going and then proof that they were there. We seek your assistance that tests or anything like that not be due that day and if it is

please give the students a chance to make up missed work. Honors Day is April 5, at 9:00 a.m. The correct time is 9:00 a.m., the time in the second memo. Colleges have individual events do not overlap. Spread the events out.

- We are establishing a Committee to review the Honors Program. It will be done in 2 stages internal and external. The internal review Committee will be Chaired by Jack Fix . The Deans provided names from the different colleges. We will send an official memo when all say yes.
- Athletic Director search is going on. The Committee is in communication. Search process now –nominate or send names forward.
- HERS program—Rhonda Gaede is going—those who did not apply are encouraged to apply next y ear. This will be ongoing.
- Miller—bills are going to the Legislature across the country—for students, faculty and staff to carry weapons, health and safety of campus –can we get a commitment from the administration that you will oppose such bills submitted to the Legislature. Dr. Karbhari will speak to the President.
- Bhavani Sitaraman—midterm grades—heard we are changing to "S" and "U"—there was an email saying preferring "S" and "U". Basing on exams prior to the day but you might see "S" or "U" instead of grades. Didn't think they knew they got grades—up to students to check grades—if to catch students not doing well—not checking grades. SSC will send something out. Contacted by students. Contact made through official UAH email. Everything is sent electronically now. No snail mail to students. Addresses were not correct and it was a challenge to keep up to date with snail mail. Unless they tell us it is not possible to find out. Dr. Carolyn Sanders stated she is on the Admissions Advisory Board and in Orientation and FYE they make sure the students know we use the official mail and make sure they know how to forward their mail.
- Carnegie Foundation—There was a question regarding a change in rankings. The latest ranking is very high related to the research ranking. There will be an official statement in the near future. We used to be research 1, etc. and now it is high and very high. We are in very high. They are using 2008-09 data. It is not just based on expenditures but the number of faculty involved, reputation, post docs, etc. Richard Miller asked what are the tangible benefits beyond advertising. It goes to funding agencies so being in very high ranked with some of the very prestigious schools.

Faculty Senate President's Report:

- Jennifer English has a report—for those who do not understand the Research Centers discussion report from Dr. Gaede. There is a delay in research funding for the URII. Dr. English does not know why the delay. Dr. English will check and send an email on what she finds out. Development team—you got an email before this meeting—we have 3 that are not Senate Members to participate and Senators—there are 3 meetings scheduled. Carmen Scholz asked how did a research person get on the Committee—Dr. Jennifer English responded that we asked for faculty not specific on which faculty. Did not specifically say who could and could not be on the Committee. Dr. Pogorelov is a research person. Dr. Carmen Scholz stated he is not associated with Senators. Dr. Jennifer English stated she does not have a problem taking

someone off. She does not expect everyone to attend all 3 meetings. But everyone should attend at least one and then have a meeting after that to finalize everything. Richard Miller stated he is troubled at the delay in getting this worked out—the first or second bill passed this year and now it is almost 7 months later we are meeting to discuss goals and issues if we form a committee it will be the end of March and school will be over a month later. An academic year has gone by and the reason to have interaction with the Vice President for Research won't happen this academic year. This seems to be problematic. We are not meeting with the person who should be discussing ongoing issues. Jennifer English stated she does not know if he is going to be there, she is letting Provost Karbhari invite him. Richard Miller asked if there is opposition to an ad-hoc committee? Jennifer English stated she agrees it has taken a long time and she has gone as fast as she can. Richard Miller stated that the comment was not directed at Jennifer. Key element of faculty productivity has not risen to the level to get on the administration's schedule for 7 months. Laurie Joiner asked have we gone as group and said we want a meeting. Richard Miller stated we met in November and Provost Karbhari has issues with the Committee. Laurie Joiner stated the blame is on us. Bhavani Sitaraman asked why not set up an ad hoc Committee and start working and when he has time to come and talk to us then it will happen. Jennifer English stated the first meeting is Tuesday. Jennifer English stated if you want to set up ad hoc to work in parallel then no problem. You have to have faculty willing to be involved. Richard Miller asked if the goals and issues of the committee are resolved will they sign off? Jennifer English stated she hopes to get from the meetings where we are lacking and how can the committee effectively make needs, etc. known. Richard Miller stated the committee needs to be in the Senate to discuss the needs and serve as an advocate for scholarly activities and supply to the Provost and Vice President for Research and can act or have a discussion. Just like legislative and executive body does. It would be much more effective to speak with a consistent voice rather than have 10 speak with 10 different voices. Jennifer English stated anything other than ad-hoc committee would require approval. It was stated the bylaws are restrictive. Richard Miller stated we need to develop a uniformity of opinion and present it. Some at the meeting are not very productive. It is troubling that people who are supposed to support scholarly activity don't know the requirements and this is the reason for the committee. Carolyn Sanders suggested revising the meetings to not include administration—would this serve the same purpose? Jennifer English asked why is 4 faculty positions not working on the Research Council? Right now there is one voice in Research Council. Why would putting this committee in place be more effective? How can we make it more effective? Carmen Scholz stated the Vice President for Research knows Centers and their budget but he does not know about those outside Centers. Carmen Scholz stated she mentioned a Committee to work with him and it was met with rejection. Jennifer English stated if the Provost has not paved the way for this Committee then there is no guarantee it will be heard. We hope from the meetings a path is created to make sure we are a position to be considered valuable. This is not a group that can be pushed aside. Carmen Scholz mentioned that the Vice President for Research sent students to Prague and is now sending some to South Africa. Carmen Scholz asked if other disciplines might be included or considered and it was met with a no. The Vice President for Research needs to represent all. David Stewart stated if the

Committee bill stated there should be an ad hoc committee then we should have an ad hoc Committee. Jennifer English stated she asked for an ad hoc committee and got only one volunteer. Carolyn Sanders stated the meetings sound like a means to talk them out of having a Committee. Jennifer English stated she doesn't think so, what faculty want and need in general is to be heard. Committee could argue every college has certain needs like a budget person. David Stewart proposed an ad hoc committee. The Parliamentarian stated we should have a bill but it is not necessary we had bills before. Bhavani Sitaraman seconded the motion. How will it be formed, who will be on it, how will we elect a chair. The Parliamentarian suggested those interested start it and do a straw vote. Carmen Scholz stated we will only meet with those on the Senate right now. We passed a bill saying anyone could be on it and those on the list are not all senators right now. Louise O'Keefe asked if those interested are here now and could they decide. Carmen Scholz agreed to be the contact. Ad hoc with Carmen Scholz for Research and Scholarly Activities—she will send email to the Senate for involvement and determine how the group will interact. Richard Miller made the motion and Paul Componation seconded. The vote was 1 abstained. Still meet on Tuesday.

Jonna Greer was supposed to talk about Higher Education Day but she is out of town. Jennifer English stated Higher Education Day is April 5 and requested that faculty be understanding of Higher Education day but do demand slips that the students are supposed to have signed and give to faculty. Jonna will speak in March.

Minutes Approved:

- Minutes from the last meeting January 20, ,motion to accept by Clarke Rountree, seconded by Louise O'Keefe.
- Executive Committee minutes of Feb 17, correction to "radio" button. Move to accept by Ina Warboys, seconded by David Neff.

Committees:

- **Finance and Resources**: Jennifer English reported it still needs a Chair. There are 3 Distinguished Speakers for an abbreviated series. There are some concerns for not enough money for truly distinguished speakers. We had preliminary discussions for extra money. The Senate has some money and could match for the College or Department. The Committee would welcome input. Make awards larger. Reducing numbers maybe from 7 to 5. Historically 7 were given with about $10,500 in the pot. Happy to hear what you have to say. Clarke Rountree suggested reducing the number so we have a decent amount for good people. Matching College and Department. Some do not have to match. Richard Miller suggested this is an opportunity for the Vice President for Research to chip in. Deans match 3 or 4 to 1. Eric Seemann suggested language in the instructions based on what we receive and other is covered by the Department or College. Better to reduce number by half and increase amount. Kathy Hawk asked for clarification regarding whether the one that they did now is just for Spring. One coming out in a month or so for the next Academic Year. Reduce to 4 or one per College and

every College have an opportunity. Carolyn Sanders suggested approaching the Dean of Students for assistance. Jennifer English reported the REU program is woefully behind. We have not had time to get it out. John Gregory and Bernhard Vogler have offered to step up and do it. Eric Seemann moved, seconded by Richard Miller to allow them to go forward.

- **Personne**l: Bhavani Sitaraman stated she has nothing to add. The Committee has gone through 3 or 4 chapters and have comments. The first few are introductory we need accurate information about positions etc. We are looking at other chapters this coming week that deal with personnel issues.
- **Undergraduate Curriculum**: Laurie Joiner reported there was a bunch of stuff from history and changes to the course approval form.
- **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs**: Clarke Rountree stated there was nothing to add to the submitted report.

- Jennifer English reported she is currently on the **BETA Team**. The BETA team member is elected during the regular elections for a 3 year term. The individual does not have to be a Senator. I would like feedback on that—nominate just like the President-Elect and Ombudsperson. Eric Seemann, Carolyn Sanders, and Louise O'Keefe- volunteered for the BETA Team to finish out this year. We would like background on those to serve between now and next meeting so we can make an educated decision. Clarke Rountree suggests they send information on the 3 willing to serve and Peggy can send to the Senate and they can vote by email. Ina Warboys wants a bio on this person in a formal election. Eric Seemann suggested including a bio with the name on the ballot. Maybe should be for all officers. Kathy Hawk suggested the President-elect stand and tell what the plans are. Jennifer English stated for now send bios to Peggy and then send her how you want to deal with the elections for a permanent position.

  Senate Bill 350 Conflict of Interest—open at second reading—Clarke Rountree moved to call the question, Paul Componation seconded. There were 3 abstaining

  Did not carry.

  Senate Bill 340 Eligibility to Vote in Department Chair Selections—amended at second reading

  Richard Miller moved to 3rd reading, seconded by Bhavani Sitaraman. Laurel Bollinger asked when does it expire? Change to "prior to each secret ballot for chair selection" in line 14, a friendly amendment from Laurel Bollinger, seconded by David Neff

  Mohamed Ashour asked How is this applied to department for size. How do you deal with the vote if there are 3 or 4 people. Clarke Rountree stated size does not matter.

  Clarke Rountree asked what was the previous policy? Richard Miller stated there was none and it was different in different departments. This enables the Department to decide formally. Peter Slater asked if it was intended that there would always be such a vote. Jennifer English stated she thinks so. Paul Componation commented this implies some faculty could bring this up in the absence of an actual vote. Only tenure and tenure earning faculty vote. David Stewart

commented in the previous Handbook clinical and research faculty were allowed to vote. We are taking away votes from people who now have them. Participation in the Handbook is interpreted different ways. Eric Fong stated for some it enfranchises and some it disenfranchises. Laurel Bollinger stated she has concern for the inclination of some to give lectures more power and may make lecturers more like tenure and tenure earning faculty. Laurel Bollinger does not want to enfranchise lecturers. Carolyn Sanders stated they could still have a discussion in the department and prevent. Carolyn Sanders stated the goal is to allow the department to make the decision rather than decisions made in other ways. It still leaves it to the department but it gives tenured and tenure-earning a greater voice. There was some discussion regarding the Dean's part and different groups and different recommendations. Richard Miller stated there are people voting in the election that have spent no time in the department and not active and people voting in the Department not seen and not here. Tenure and tenure-earning should have primary say because they have a long term commitment but are some clinical and research involved in health of the department. No problem with just saying tenure and tenure-earning per Richard Miller. Louise O'Keefe—stated still in hands of tenure and tenure-earning but gives an out for those who need it. Like the way it is. Laurel Bollinger stated she has concern for dirty politics. Someone offering courses want for support. Jennifer English stated she is not interested in legislating to deal with bad behavior. Carolyn Sanders stated there is a change in behavior and in interest of protecting faculty. Eric Fong asked can we cross out lecturers. Richard Miller stated in our department lecturers are more involved in the health of the department. Ina Warboys asked for the Chair—isn't it a recommendation to Dean—how much power are we worried about.

Bhavani Sitaraman moved, seconded by Clarke Rountree to end debate

Vote to Accept with amendment at 3rd reading: 2 opposed 2 abstaining. Passed at third reading goes to Administration

Clarke Rountree moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.