



**Faculty Senate
JANUARY 5, 2012
12:45 p.m. in BAB 121**

Present: Wai Mok, Charles Hickman, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Derrick Smith, Laurel Bollinger, David Neff, Deborah Heikes, Kathy Hawk, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Ramon Cerro, Seong Moo Yoo, David Pan, Paul Componation, Nathan Slegers, Max Bonamente, Louise O'Keefe, Brenda Talley, Marlena Premeau, Kristen Herrin, Carmen Scholz, James Baird, Ramazan Aygun, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Richard Miller, Nick Pogorelov, Jason Cassibry, Vistasp Karbhari

Guests: Robert Altenkirch, Brent Wren

Absent with Proxy: Sam Thomas, Carolyn Sanders, Mohamed Ashour, Jeffrey Kulick, Ina Warboys, Peter Slater

Absent without Proxy: Eletra Gilchrist, Kwaku Gyasi, Roy Magnuson, Claudio Morales, John Mecikalski

- ❖ The meeting was called to order at 12:50 by Senate President Tim Newman.
- ❖ Dr. Tim Newman stated the Senate Bylaws say we have to continue unfinished business as the first item of business at the next meeting. The alternative is that we can suspend the rules and go in the usual order if you so desire.
- ❖ Eric Seemann moved and Paul Componation seconded a motion to **suspend the rules** and allow the meeting to continue with a usual order. The motion carries.
- ❖ **Minutes for meeting number 520**— Jim Baird moved, seconded by David Neff to approved the minutes after corrections to state that Derrick Smith was absent with proxy and Eric Fong was absent with proxy.
- ❖ **President's Report**: Robert Altenkirch reported that we are moving on the VP for advancement—we have an announcement drafted—I will be meeting with the Foundation Board next week and once they sign off on the Search Committee we will do the search—it will take about 6 months. I will meet with the Foundation because the VP for Advancement

serves as the executive officer of the Foundation. This was not the case currently—there were some rough patches—we want to make sure everything is ok.

We are moving forward on the CIO – Vistasp Karbhari is drafting an announcement—we will get it out early in the semester. We will hold off on the Library until the CIO is hired to see how they are linked. John McGowan is leaving at the end of the semester.

Putting together group to discuss—barriers to research—looked at ICR distribution and incentive pay and they are intertwined and we have to make sure when we sit and talk we know what are the barriers when we put things through—we want to make sure the policies are not disincentives—we will have a broad based discussion group.

Strategic planning—we have a steering committee picked and we have a memo written to go to each member and some background information to go out tomorrow.

Graduate dean and Library will all fold into the Strategic Planning process. Would like to get the bulk of it done in spring semester. There will be about 35 on the Steering Committee.

Carmen Scholz—ICR and incentive pay and how it is related—in the discussion look at what happens when a proposal is granted—sometimes this is where the problem starts after the proposal is granted. Dr. Robert Altenkirch stated all issues will unfold in the conversations. We don't want counterproductive actions and policies. Maximize ability to do research, don't want to put barriers and policies to prevent you from being productive.

Ramon Cerro stated there is a bill in Committee on dealing with institutional research as well as academic research—this might be something to consider. They need to be treated different—now they are treated the same. Robert Altenkirch stated this will require a longer discussion.

Jim Baird stated that one of the disincentives is the two course semester—we shouldn't hype research unless we are going to compete for same time.

- ❖ **Provost Report:** Vistasp Karbhari reported the noise you are hearing outside is the wireless process. We are currently putting wires in last few buildings. They are a little ahead of schedule. We hope the first phase is complete by January.

The Banner migration was done at the end of last year. There are a few hiccups that are currently being fixed. We hope to have it fixed by the middle of next week. This does not affect faculty but other areas. Registration is going well—we are flat over all. Currently up 0.1% compared to spring 2011. Increase in graduate and decrease in undergraduate in some areas. Some planned but some not.

Two programs will be brought to the Board for final approval in February. The MSSTEM and the MESS.

Richard Miller stated when we passed bills before and they went to the administration they were accepted or denied and that was the end of it. We would like that to change—one bill was rejected –10/11-06 Department Chair Eligibility—we debated it for some time. There are issues with someone being department chair while being a director or other administrator. This is a conflict of interest and creates other issues. Tell us more about what happened and why it was rejected. Vistasp Karbhari stated that it goes to Deans and we get input back and sometimes that takes a bit of time. In this case-some felt allowing someone to be chair and director would strengthen the ties between research and academics and to say they could not to do that outright is not good. The selection should be left to the faculty. Richard Miller stated this bill does that by requiring a super majority of a faculty vote. There is concern for the time frame for getting feedback. Vistasp Karbhari stated the President you and me can get together next week and sit together and talk about this. I will have my office set it up.

- ❖ Robert Altenkirch stated that at the Board meeting in February the Student Center will go in for approval. Ray Pinner will meet tomorrow with the Fiscal Property Committee. This one has a pub in it which makes it different from others. Other than that no problems.
- ❖ Acceptance of Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes—Laurel Bollinger moved, seconded by Ramon Cerro. There was a discussion regarding the relevance to the Handbook and would encourage this body defining what it means—we are not getting a clear answer from Academic Affairs and there have been violations. Motion carries and the minutes are accepted.
- ❖ Officer reports—Tim Newman—reported that in the meeting packet there is a resolution passed by the Senate at UAB and it was communicated to me and passed to you related to HB 56 regarding the immigration policy. There is something before you today on that. In November there was an Information Technology meeting—the line share of money was about \$12.1M. About \$10M for things related to fiber optics and DL classrooms over 5 years. \$150 to \$250K/year for high performance computing. The Dean of Engineering and John Horack is overseeing that. \$250K off-site backup for files. The President asked at the last meeting for us to take a straw poll and information on Commencement. Currently it is a two day with one graduation on Friday and two on Saturday for undergraduate. Willing to reconsider and we have reserved the VBC for 1 day in MAY –all names called and all together. The President says it doesn't matter but he would be interested in faculty comments and we need to take a straw poll. Not a binding action just a straw poll. It is less expensive at the VBC. Students can also connect with the faculty there. Students want to bring more people. The Fitness Center was mentioned. It is not available and not large enough. Students have trouble getting family to come when it is on multiple days. Many elect not to go. Many students are confused by the three ceremonies.
- ❖ Straw poll for this commencement only and if you want a full debate for the future we can do that. One day 28 in favor, 2 in favor of a two day ceremony.

- ❖ We had a meeting with the Provost—some issues came out and concerns for Chairs doing double duty. We look forward to talking to him again. Should this be a meeting with the Executive Committee? Ramon Cerro stated it is appropriate for the Provost to be prepared to discuss items with the Senate at large. The Executive Committee is the representative body we need to encourage him to be prepared to discuss items. Related to these bills—if we feel strongly—some get accepted but are not implemented, some accepted and implemented—some rejected—where do we go from there. Having a bill rejected does not have to be the end. A delegation met with the President with regard to the timeliness of responses and the response to this one—did communicate to the President that we expect more timely responses—discussed timeline for this one and communicated to the President this is not an acceptable mode to interact with the Senate—we had a good conversation with the President.
- ❖ This year we decide the Bylaws and Faculty Handbook changes—whatever Committee you are on please meet in the next ten days and finish the work and if you finish that is ok but get as much as you can do completed we need to bring it to the Senate floor. Get on the same page if you can—really want Handbook and Bylaws handled as before and there is some history of what we did before. Faculty rules and guidelines—if a change is made then it should come back to the Senate and discuss it—hope all are on the same page—will get Bylaws and Handbook you are comfortable with and there may have to be give and take but at the end of the day what the Board approves is what the Senate approved.
- ❖ Laurel Bollinger, Ombudsperson reported she handled two concerns in the fall semester. They were deadline issues.

❖ **Committees—**

Personnel—Ramon Cerro --no meeting. Will have a meeting Monday.

Finance and Resources Wai Mok—will get revision done

Governance and Operations —Paul Componation—looking forward to meeting next week.

University Committees: Carmen Scholz—Research Council—one of two on the Council—Carmen Scholz has done a yeoman's task on the Research Council.

Carmen Scholz—Research expenditures for last year—brought to Senate because colleagues asked questions of where the money goes, etc. Please pass along the reports I send to you to your colleagues.

Research Expenditures--\$86M--Largest is SMAP, ESSC, ITSC, CPAR, RSEC, RI—Showed colleges, centers, etc. This is money others brought in not tuition. Overhead Percentage. Explained overhead rates. Distribution of overhead. Richard Miller—accounting of how overhead is used. Carmen Scholz—not to my knowledge . Carmen Scholz would like to see what goes to colleges used toward research related matters. Carmen Scholz—believes with John Horack things are

more transparent than before. Ramon Cerro stated this money is generated by PIs and becomes a pot VPs can spend to get favors—we need accountability. Richard Miller—the Senate can ask for accountability. Ramon Cerro—when I need a computer—I am told it is in the overhead—but the Administration would say it is not there. It was stated that it is accessible through the budget. AARA funding University reporting—Robert Leonard will answer questions for disbursement and Chih Loo will answer questions for salary distribution. Let them know if there are problems with that.

Paul Compton—during the DL search—Ray gave a lot of help—we had specific questions and they were helpful. It is there but not for the faint of heart to get.

- ❖ **Senate Bill 356: Faculty Education Support**—Tim Newman stated when we left the last meeting we were debating on the second reading so it is properly open to continue the discussion—Is there anyone from Faculty and Student Development present to bring us up to speed. Tim Newman reported the intention was to provide added benefit to UAH faculty. Currently we have a ½ tuition waiver. This would increase that to a full waiver. Richard Miller stated he wrote the bill. There were a number of faculty who asked me to write the bill and it got their approval—the faculty made the point that to send children to UAH is more expensive than Calhoun—they felt that by increasing the benefit to enable students to come here would help enrollment because friends might come as well. Is this for faculty and staff was a question from Kathy Hawk. The response was that it was split allowing the Staff Senate to deal with the staff side. Vote—the ayes have it—passed on second reading.
- ❖ **Senate Bill 361: Disease Policy**—Tim Newman stated this bill was considered October 7 and is back before you for second reading. Richard Miller stated the bill is asking for clarifications for it to go back to the responsible people and ask for some things to be clarified and not asking for passing this specific policy. Brenda Talley—this is more for revision—the way it is written now is not acceptable. Ramon Cerro stated that in the Federal Government there are already policies and this is something new. Louise O’Keefe stated this does follow the federal regulations of ADA and it does say it in the policy. Louise O’Keefe—stated she is co-chair with the person from Student Health Services—they are looking at the definition of disease, adequate protection of privacy, and the involvement of the Dean of Students. We are going to meet with Legal Counsel, the Provost, HR, Environmental Health, and the Student Health Director and address these issues. Louise O’Keefe stated this is part of the Campus Disaster Plan--this relates to a disease becoming pandemic. Charles Hickman—should we defer this until you have a chance to discuss it and work on it. Does the bill do harm or help your work per Laurel Bollinger. Louise O’Keefe stated I can come back and report after we work on it. It is hard to write a policy to make everyone happy. Richard Miller asked would passing this bill give you additional leverage to push the issues that may not be addressed? Is your relationship a good enough working relationship that you don’t need that kind of support. Brenda Talley stated should we withdraw this bill and use our energy to review the new document that comes out. Tim Newman stated I will entertain a motion to defer. Brenda Talley made the motion to defer the bill until the work

of the group is complete or 3 months until the April 5 meeting, it was seconded by David Stewart. Vote—ayes have it—deferred to April 5.

- ❖ **Senate Bill 358A: Doctoral Student Professional Meeting Support**. Tim Newman stated this bill went back to Committee and it is now back from the Committee. We need a motion to approve at second reading. Richard Miller moved, seconded by David Neff to approve at second reading. Brenda Talley stated that we agreed to change line 21 to state "doctoral". Take this motion to change lines 20-21 from "advanced" and "Ph.D." to "doctoral". Paul Componation seconded. The bill is amended—vote on the amended bill—ayes have it passed unanimous. Passed on 3rd reading. Goes to the Provost as SR 11-12-06.

- ❖ **Senate Bill 362: Alabama Teachers Retirement System Advocacy**. Tim Newman requested a motion to approve on second reading. Ramon Cerro moved, seconded by Carmen Scholz to approve on second reading. Charles Hickman stated he is taking a fiscal conservative approach. If the plan is underfunded we are asking for it to be maintained at the current levels. We don't want to see it reduced but it does not bother me to pay an additional 2.25%. Richard Miller stated that we invented a new word in Line 27—Laurel Bollinger seconded the correction. The bill is amended. Ramon Cerro stated if the retirement system is underfunded, why—it is not because the contribution from faculty and teachers is not enough—it is not a problem caused by us but ask faculty to pay more. Charles Hickman stated this is where the raise came from 2% to 2.5% decrease from school and increase from faculty. Shifted from their funding to our funding. It is underfunded because someone looks at it and sees what is needed to satisfy the obligations. In 2008 it was nearly fully funded then the crash happened and it lowered the assets. The amount the University contributes increased. Ramon Cerro stated that there are games played—there is a need for a voice from the faculty to say put the cards down and play fairly. Charles Hickman stated if we look prospectively we don't want to see an increase and if the economy increases maybe we won't have to. The primary benefit to this bill is to combat future decreases. Be cognizant of the fact that when you look at any entities there are budget dollars in and dollars out and they have to approximate one another. We have to make informed decisions. Bhavani Sitaraman stated there are compromises in fiscal issues and this is one way of managing those. There are a host of things that come into play. There is the equity issue—some of those with lower salaries are hit hard. It hit people differently. There is something to say about how it impacts faculty. I don't know if we can do it by looking at one issue. Charles Hickman—stated this was a percentage increase—they took out of one and put into another. If it not been for that 2.5 % we would not have had this in the salary pool. Decreases in benefits—we have a vested interest—2% is generous nationwide. Bhavani Sitaraman asked if there is a way to make it stronger—apply to more than one issue. Charles Hickman stated he agrees with the bill—find ways to fund future increases. Richard Miller stated we are asking for communication with the Administrators. We are asking them to communicate how they are addressing this issue. Asking for it in a formal way. I would like to speak in favor of the bill—we are requesting communication in a formal way. Vote—ayes have it—any objections?—none--passed at 3rd reading. Goes to the Provost as SR 11-12-07.

❖ **Senate Bill 363: Differential Tuition Analysis.** Richard Miller moved, seconded by Deborah Heikes to approve the bill at second reading. Richard Miller—stated this was part of a restructuring report issue—this is an effort to enhance enrollment—Academic Affairs and the V.P. for finance look at differential tuition—this could potentially make UAH look more attractive—lower first years and gradient over later years. We don't know if this is viable but we are asking for an analysis to be done. Charles Hickman—stated that rather than class standing the place where this might be most applicable is between disciplines. It cost more to educate some students than others. Richard Miller stated he could add something to ask for that analysis be done and see if it is feasible. Charles Hickman did not want to request that. Brenda Talley asked do we have a mechanism for requesting information that has teeth. Tim Newman stated the bylaws indicate the Senate has the prerogative to request information but it has no teeth—we are using the mechanism of a bill even though this is not set in policy. Kristen Herrin stated we are spending time voting on bills and we might get a more positive response when we take a different approach—we need to develop a relationship—look at a different process and asking and communicating better—we might get a better reaction than we got in the past. Be more positive—make an effort to be more positive and get more done. Paul Compton stated I agree—somewhere out there they have done a study—has anyone looked—do other schools use this? Richard Miller stated what you are saying is 100% right—unfortunate that there is a history of a lack of communication and response—I don't feel strongly about it one way or another. The bill Tim and others formulated had recommendations to look at the benefit to the University—not only was the total report pushed aside and no dialogue on behalf of the administration even though a number of options were proposed. Struggled with myself and how to move forward with the relationship. Max Bonamente—we have an opportunity every month when we have the Provost and President here can we spend 10-15 minutes with the Administration. Put it on the agenda so they are prepared. Kristen Herrin—agrees—we are operating on an assumption—it would be more positive if we approach differently. Bhavani Sitaraman asked about the strategic planning—Tim Newman and Kathy Hawk proposed a discussion among ourselves—the faculty representative could be informed by the discussion here. Tim Newman stated we will defer that to February—we can send a brief document to the administration with bullets and let the administration see the issues that concern us. If there are broader issues and enough issues then we will have one document that consolidates. Deborah Heikes stated Dr. Robert Altenkirch is willing to reconsider some of the bills—ask him to reconsider the realignment bill and some others.

❖ Deborah Heikes moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.