
FACULTY SENATE MEETING # 545

February 20, 2014

12:45 P.M. in BAB 123

Present: *Wai Mok, Charles Hickman, Pavica Sheldon, Derrick Smith, Ryan Weber, Linda Maier, Christine Sears, Anne Marie Choup, Bhavani Sitaraman, Mitch Berbrier, R. Michael Banish, B. Earl Wells, James Swain, James Blackmon, Kristen Herrin, Anna Benton, Peggy Hays, Phillip Bitzer, Luciano Matzkin, Debra Moriarity, Carmen Scholz, Peter Slater, Letha Etzkorn, Craig Cowan, Leonard Choup, Richard Miller, Lingze Duan, Seyed Sadeghi, Nikolai Pogorelov*

Absent with proxy: *Fan Tseng, Dan Sherman, Carolyn Sanders, Eric Seemann, Ellise Adams, Marlana Primeau*

Absent without proxy: *Chris Allport, Keith Jones, Joe Taylor, Deborah Heikes, Nick Jones, Ying-Cheng Lin, Junpeng Guo, Kader Frendi, Jeff Evans, James Baird*

Guests: *President Robert Altenkirch*

- Faculty Senate President Mitch Berbrier called the meeting to order at 12:45.
- Derrick Smith motions to suspend the rules for President's address. Phillip Bitzer seconds.
- President Altenkirch

Block Tuition

There is a movement towards block tuition. Right now we charge tuition by the credit hour. The more credit hours you take the more you pay. There was a suggestion/recommendation from HURON to move to the same model that Tuscaloosa, Auburn, and Mississippi State use, which is charge by the credit hour from 1-12 hours. At 12 hours there is no additional charge until you get to some upper now, which we are going to peg at 18 hours, then charge by the hour after 18 hours. This pushes students who might take 12 hours to take 15, 16, or 17 credit hours, which means they will graduate at a faster rate. Tuscaloosa's percentage of Full-Time enrollment at the undergraduate level is 90%, and their graduation rate is 66%. UAB charges by the credit hour and we charge by the credit hour. Both of our Full-Time enrollment percentage is about 73% and our graduation rate is 48%. We can push students to take Full-Time enrollment and there will be better graduation rates. Graduation rate right now is 6 years.

The other thing that the consultants wanted to do, and it sounds right, is when charging by the credit hour, a student signs up for 12 hours, so they get financial aid, and they can then go to Calhoun and take another course for cheaper. Hopefully this will stop that.

Where is this? I've worked with the Chancellor and Board and we initially thought to implement this next fall. But if you look at the implications to make this revenue neutral, we will have to have too big of a tuition increase around 9 and 12 hours to make this work. So the plan right now is to phase it in over a 3-year period.

- Mitch Berbrier: Too big how, in terms of too punitive or too hard for them?
- President Altenkirch: Too punitive. It would look like a huge hit all of a sudden. We will reduce the slope of the 12 to 18 credit hours over the next 3 years.
- Letha Etzkorn: Does this apply to undergraduate students only or to graduate students also?
- President Altenkirch: So far we've only done the arithmetic for in-state undergraduate students, but we will get one for graduate students. At 9 hours it will be flat. Tuscaloosa stops at 16 hours instead of 18 hours. If you take 18 hours for 6 semester, and go to summer school for 3 summers, you can graduate in three years. So 18 is a magic number. I started to work with SGA to explain this and get them to help us market it.

Summer school

People seemed okay with what we proposed last time. The write-up that we came up with talked about tenure track faculty, but it really is faculty, all titles. Summer school pay would be 10% of AY salary up to a cap of \$7,500. The cap used to be \$5,775.

- Derrick Smith: Does this go into effect this summer?
- President Altenkirch: Yes. The deans have that so they know what it is. The trick is to generate more revenue. There is no minimum class size, but we will watch it. Ultimately the provost will be the referee on what's offered and what isn't.

As far as the budgeting is concerned on summer school, the way it has worked is the beginning of the fiscal year, there was money put in the budget based on previous experience with summer school. Then you come around to the next summer, which is still in the fiscal year, and you run summer school, and then you have the real revenue from summer school for that fiscal year. A calculation was made as to what distribution should have been last fall, and then the money is redistributed. So there are some situations where one college would see a "budget reduction" and another might see a "budget increase." We won't do that anymore. We will budget summer school after the fact, after the revenue has come in, then send the revenue out so there is no shuffling going on. Summer school will be budgeted as a pool when we give the budget to the Board, and the budget will balance and when the money comes in for summer school, all of the readjustments for the pool are set out for the next fiscal year. This gets rid of the issue where someone's budget might take a reduction because you go through about 10 months of the year before that happens.

4-day Summer Schedule

We are not doing the 4-day summer schedule. I didn't want to manage all of the excuses, the good and the not so good, as to why it wouldn't work. We will continue to look at it and maybe in the course of the year we can come up with something that will work.

Scholarship Matrix

We've been making some adjustments on various aspects of tuition. Last year we made changes to the scholarship matrix to make it more attractive to students. One thing we will do this cycle is when you come in as a first time Full-Time freshmen, and you fit into that scholarship matrix, your scholarship starts in the fall and you can keep it for 4 years if you perform. We will offer incoming freshmen in the fall who might want to start summer school before that first fall, and say this one time, that scholarship matrix applies from the beginning of summer school to the end of the fall semester. It's a marketing/recruiting hook to get someone started. And in some cases, a student might have to take or want to take some sort of preparatory course so that when they start in the fall, they start in the curriculum, and it gives them a leg up. Suppose a student takes 6 hours in the summer, and they have a 50% merit tuition scholarship from that matrix, when they take the 6 hours in the summer, they will have to pay 100% of that tuition. Then when they come in the fall,

suppose they take 15 hours. For those 15 hours they only owe us 7.5, because they have a 50% scholarship. So they pay for 6 in the summer and need to pay for 7.5 in the fall. That's 13.5. But for 21 hours, from the beginning of summer school to the end of fall, they've taken 21 hours, but they only owe us for 10.5. But they really don't owe us 10.5 because they've already paid for 6 in the summer. So they actually owe us for the 7.5 instead of the 10.5. So you're actually recouping more money in the summer than you need and use it to pay for something in fall. Why do we want them to pay in the summer? Because what if they don't enroll in the fall? The scholarship doesn't really count for the summer, but it's a way to entice them to come because it gives them a head start. The same thing will happen when get to this block tuition for somebody who starts in the summer but doesn't have a scholarship. If they came in the fall and took 12 hours, they owe us for 12 hours, but if they start in the summer and take 6, they've already paid for 6. And then from 12 to 18 you don't pay any more, so you really only owe 6.

- Charles Hickman: I ran it by our marketing people and they thought it was a great idea.
- President Altenkirch: Some of these things are beginning to take hold. The admitted student day, which happened 2 days ago, was our largest one in history.

Madison Hall Architect

The architect for Madison Hall is on board. We met with them earlier this week. They have some preliminary designs, designs being what the footprint might look like, what would be on each floor. There are no artistic designs yet, but are beginning to move into the design of what the building might look like. They're on track to be done with the architectural design within the 5-month window.

- Richard Miller: Is that going to be Madison Hall or will it be a new naming opportunity with the funds?
- President Altenkirch: That's under discussion. Madison Hall is named because of some in the community and in Madison County provided funds to build that building. So we will go by whatever the board rules are on demolishing a building and building something that is sort of a replacement for it. So we are working through that. Right now we are just calling it the Madison Hall replacement.

Vice President for Student Affairs

We are working on what's involved in putting that in place, which brings together all of the student services, affairs, and activities under one. It was another recommendation from HURON. It is a very common structure. I've been at universities with that structure and it works very well. The new provost will be here on Monday, and this is the structure that is in place at South Carolina where she is from.

Mitch Berbrier: Thank you.

➤ Faculty Senate Meeting 544 Minutes

Mitch Berbrier: Comments?

Derrick Smith motions to approve the minutes. Charles Hickman seconds.

Ayes carried motion. No oppositions.

- We just had the last Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting on Tuesday, and so you'll see no FSEC report to approve. Another reason they aren't there, because we had a question via email about why the whole Senate approves these minutes if the whole Senate wasn't there. The by-laws don't say anything about needing to approve the Executive Committee report, as far as I can tell. So we discussed it in the EC on Tuesday and nobody found it there either, and so I think we will do away with approving the Executive Committee minutes in Faculty Senate meetings. It

will still be available to everyone, but the approval will be done by the Executive Committee, by the people who were there.

- Bhavani Sitaraman: Amazing. During the Frank Franzi time, or maybe even before that, we (the sociologists present) used to raise this question every time, abstain from approving, and then we were looked at strangely every time. We asked how can we approve something that we were not a witness to? Well we were just confirming the Executive Committee's work. So some people continued to abstain. I'm glad that this is happening.
- Richard Miller: I would like to offer a counter perspective. This needs to be double checked in Robert's rules, not just in the by-laws, which I agree it doesn't say anything about it. I believe that any executive committee of a governing body needs to offer an opportunity for all members to comment and to critique. Correct is how we view it but obviously you can't correct it if you were not involved. But I think by not formalizing that opportunity it is a problem for the governing body. I think the approval of Executive Committee and Committee meeting minutes is a common thing. The Board of Trustees does it. It isn't necessarily to correct the minutes but it is to formalize an opportunity for Faculty Senators to offer input and raise questions. It doesn't usually take a lot of time.
- Mitch Berbrier: Sometimes it does. Phillip mentioned needing to check Robert's Rules, which is why I mentioned we might be going to that, so we aren't going to it yet because we need to check them. We can still possibly modify the way it's done.
- Richard Miller: The only role of the Executive Committee, officially, is to set the agenda for the Faculty meeting.
- Michael Banish: You can say we are going to incorporate them instead of approve them.
- Mitch Berbrier: We can also have the discussion of who said what in another forum.

➤ President's Report, Mitch Berbrier:

1. I received a revised BETA Policy document from the President that we've been waiting on. I will forward it all to you. He sent it to me (the Faculty Senate President), the SGA President, and the Staff Senate President, and asked for comments back by mid-April. If you can send me any comments or questions that you have about it send them back to me in the same email if possible.
 2. The Provost, Christine Curtis, starts on Monday. I've been talking about getting a list of things to say to her because at some point we will have a meeting to discuss Faculty Senate business. Turns out she wants to talk to me and Wai Mok on Monday. She says it's informal but she wants to know what our priorities are. So I want to have a sense of your priorities from you so I can tell her. A fine, short list that's important to everybody. She's coming in with a strategic plan and she will have a lot of things to do so we don't want to bombard her with too many other priorities. Two things on my list for the Faculty Senate are:
 - a. I want funding for Kala's position to be made permanent. President Altenkirch only agreed to fund it for one year, and he said wait until next year for the provost to re-approve.
 - b. The other thing is the Handbook. I'll make sure she knows how long we've been waiting for that.
- Charles Hickman: It sounded like, back in the Executive Committee meeting we had back in the fall semester, President Altenkirch said he was looking at it and would have it back by the summer. So I thought we were close. Do you have any idea where it is?
 - Mitch Berbrier: He has been vague on it. Every time I ask him he says it's coming, and I can't order him to do it. We ask periodically. I've asked in several emails. I think he has just been too busy with too many hats. We could just ask him to focus on the by-laws and get that done. I'm not sure what the division of labor is going to be between the new

Provost and old interim Provost. But this is important and there have been a lot of things that have come up over the course of the year and we want to pass some bills and make some adjustments, and we are not sure which Handbook to follow.

- Richard Miller: It was in the Office of Counsel and I don't think anything has been reported back by them so I'm not sure if it is just Bob.
- Mitch Berbrier: I don't think he's sent it to counsel yet.

So please send emails with offers on priorities. You can Reply All or just Reply to me.

- Michael Banish: The one thing that's a continuing concern to me, we are always scrambling for money here. One of reasons for that is that our alumni donation rate is so poor. We get emails from students. There's this disjoint between students being friendly with us and friendly with the University, in terms of donations and money that comes in to the place. That's something that needs to be addressed. Isn't our enrollment down from 3 years ago? The administration contacts the students for money and they say, "No," but they're friendly with us (the faculty), and that's a problem.
- Mitch Berbrier: Send me an email about that.

3. Our email discussion about the timing and the structure of meetings.

Kala is doing some benchmarking to see how other places do. How do they structure their meetings? How long are their meetings? How often do they meet? I've heard of different models. I spoke to President Altenkirch about this, about what happened last time with Gordon Stone and how once he left we only had 5 minutes left in the meeting. I think the problem is more structural and so we need to figure out how we want to organize our structure. In our by-laws, you'll notice that it says that all of the minutes, approvals, all of the administration reports, and all of the discussion about those should be done within 30 minutes. We discussed this at the Executive Committee and everyone thought it was not nearly enough. There are other structures, though. President Altenkirch said at Mississippi State they had separate meetings; meetings for internal Faculty Senate business and meetings with the administrators. I spoke to the Faculty Senate President of UAB at the Board meeting and he said that the Faculty Senate President meets separately with the Provost prior to setting the agenda and they go through a list of what the Provost can talk about and for how long.

4. We do have some time constraints coming up because of a number of things. One is the Provost might want to visit us and we might want to chat with her. Also, I have two guests scheduled for next month's meeting, and Les Stuedeman wants to come talk about Staff Appreciation Day, but she promised to keep it short.
- a) Dee Childs wants to come talk about updates to IT and infrastructure.
 - b) David Berkowitz is going to come talk to us about a new plan/a different way of admitting Master's students that will be more centralized and maybe more efficient.
 - c) At the Board of Trustees meeting there was a discussion about our statewide pension plan, for all state employees, teachers, and faculty members at the universities, and how it's 9.5 billion dollars underfunded according to some estimate. I don't know what those numbers mean and how they stack up relative to the whole pot, but I do know that these Board of Trustees meetings are prearranged and everyone knows what's going to happen, but all of a sudden the Board of Trustees members were very concerned. So I'm going to ask Ray Pinner to come talk to us. Maybe in a join meeting with the Staff Senate

since this has to do with them too. I'll ask him to explain this to us since he understands it.

So, that's a lot of meeting time taken up on top of our own business. I've looked at the schedule and there aren't many opportunities coming up to discuss everything that needs to be discussed. However, supposedly, we all have Tuesdays and Thursdays open times from 12:45 to 2:15, no teaching obligations or anything. Then there's the whole summer.

- Bhavani Sitaraman: Instead of lumping everything together into one category of discussion versus things we have to vote on and things we need to listen to, if we push things we have to vote on to the summer, we may end up not having a quorum or we may end up with having people not interested. I continue to push for extra meetings being those meetings that are information sessions and regular meetings to vote.
- Mitch Berbrier: In the short term that may be harder to manage but in the long term it makes sense. I'll try.

No other Officer reports.

➤ Committee Chair Reports

Governance and Operations Committee, Phillip Bitzer

Departments have been notified of expiring terms and a number of vacant seats. That should be done by the end of this month. Then we will start soliciting nominations for President-elect and Ombudsperson on March 1.

Finance and Resources Committee, Charles Hickman

I want to remind everyone that the deadline for submitting proposals for the Research and Creative Experience for Undergraduates and the Distinguished Speaker Series are both May 28. Thank you for getting the ones submitted that are already coming in. We are looking forward to evaluating them.

- Mitch Berbrier: Have you gotten anything from the Research Center?
- Charles Hickman: Yes, I've had an inquiry. Have you heard anything?
- Mitch Berbrier: No.
- Charles Hickman: You were going to schedule a meeting with the President?
- Mitch Berbrier: I have asked for a meeting and I have not heard back from Ray or Bob.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Deb Moriarity

We will meet a week from today to go through a good stack of course changes and course approvals. Remind your Department to get these in. The intention is to get these through and approved to get them into the fall schedule, but you can add some later and we will go back and do them individually by email.

- Mitch Berbrier: After it's approved, it has to get to Janet Waller to put into Banner. Sometimes Janet is overwhelmed with other tasks and it takes a couple of weeks.

No other Committee Chair reports.

➤ Faculty Senate Bill 373

This Bill is a revision of a resolution from last year. There are a series of preamble statements ("Whereas").

Phillip Bitzer motions to consider. Seconded by Michael Banish.

This was radically changed from the prior resolution. Bob Altenkirch rejected it last year because of the wording. The last paragraph is very similar to what was in the prior resolution but it is worded differently, and hopefully it is clearer.

President Altenkirch rejected the prior resolution. He made it clear in the letter and afterwards when I spoke to him on behalf of the Faculty Senate that he didn't like that we said "Faculty representation on university level committees initiated by the administration...shall be defined as faculty members appointed from the Senate". He said it was too directive and this causes problems. I talked to the President about what he would accept. I asked if he was okay with having Faculty representation on the committees, he said yes. I asked how we could word it. The suggestion was made that we reword it, and we ended up with Bill 373. So I kind of rewrote it and sent it to the President. He edited it less for substance as for grammar and clarity. We discussed it in the Executive Committee meeting and there were some technical issues raised, so we sent it back to Governance and Operations. They worked on it and now here is this version.

Mitch Berbrier: Open it up to discussion.

- Richard Miller: With all due respect, I am really troubled by the bill as it is currently written. By mandate of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Senate is the representative body of the faculty at the University in matters of shared governance. The previous bill, which was rejected, simply was defining what was "official faculty representation," and didn't preclude other faculty from serving. It reestablished the statement that administration committees that claim faculty representation have to have at least members that were appointed by the Faculty Senate so that the usual suspects aren't rounded up. I think personally we need to stick to that. This is about establishing precedence. We don't know what future presidents or provosts will do. So I think we, as the representative body, need to establish ourselves as the representative body.
- Mitch Berbrier: What does this do to establish ourselves?
- Richard Miller: The fact that the previous bill was rejected because it said faculty representation is representation designated by the Faculty Senate is troubling. I understand trying to make something acceptable but I'm troubled by providing a slate of names to the administration and having them choose. If the Faculty Senate decides that someone is the appropriate representative to sit on a particular committee, that is the Faculty Senate's representative whether they like it or not. If there's a conflict of interest, then a request can come back from the administration for a new name for that reason and we provide another one. Giving a slate dilutes some of the import of the Faculty Senate in shared governance. We don't have much power anyway.
- Letha Etzkorn: One thing I did note in this is that there isn't a minimum. You can give a slate of one person if you really wanted a certain person on the committee. It says you can't have more than... but there's not a minimum. I understand the idea, but it doesn't say that.
- Deb Moriarity: So you can give them a slate of one.
- Mitch Berbrier: Phillip, I thought what you meant is here that they will ask for a slate of 6 for 2 people.
- Phillip Bitzer: Correct. If there are 2 positions on the committee, they can ask for no more than 6 names.
- Letha Etzkorn: Well, you don't have to provide 6 names.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: Loopholes aside, I agree with Rich. On principal this is not what representation means. I don't give a list of candidates for someone else to pick someone to

represent me. I have a symbolic issue. There is nothing at stake here for the administration because they can still make the committee very large, they can add additional faculty. If we send 2 people to a committee of 15, we won't have much slate, but we've sent who we want to symbolically represent us. By doing this, we are pretty much letting the administration control over the committee and we are getting a token voice by saying, you can give me three names, but I get to pick. I think it's a huge signal that we are in a very subservient position when it comes to recommendation. I don't want to accept that as a compromise.

- Richard Miller: Faculty Senate's role is mandated by the Board of Trustees. As elected senators, your roles are to serve the faculty as a whole but specifically the faculty in your units. A handpicked faculty member assigned to a committee doesn't have that responsibility to serve the unit or the college or the faculty as a whole. They have a responsibility of giving their own opinion. So the role of a faculty senator or a designated Faculty Senate representative on a university committee is very different than an individual faculty member that is assigned to it.
- Michael Banish: So why is that not in the preamble? This is the job that is mandated by the Board of Trustees for the Faculty Senate. That should be in the preamble, whatever the chapter and verse is. Therefore, this is why we are following it this way.
- Richard Miller: It sort of is.
- Michael Banish: Well how about not sort of.
- Mitch Berbrier: We can change that. Rich wrote this original preamble.
- Michael Banish: It says Faculty Senate by-laws, not by the Board of Trustees.
- Mitch Berbrier: That can easily be changed. Before we move on, do you want to motion to change that?
- Michael Banish: I don't know exactly what the Board of Trustees says.
- Mitch Berbrier: The Board of Trustees by-laws are long. So in the ideal that we get to choose precisely who we want, it would still be the case that there might be a committee of 15 and we only send 1.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: That's okay. We aren't requesting size of the committee. I think it's a symbolic statement that we get to choose who represents us. I don't want somebody else who isn't in the body and doesn't know the rights of the body choosing who represents us.

- Wai Mok: I believe I asked for 4 names when Bob formed the Search Committee for the Dean of the Honors College. I asked the Faculty Senate body to send me 4 names from which Bob will select. What was your experience with that? Have they met? Did they push you aside?
- Nick Pogorelov: You sent me.
- Wai Mok: What is your experience? Are they pushing you aside?
- Nick Pogorelov: No, absolutely not. I don't think so.

- Bhavani Sitaraman: I think it's more the principle.
- Richard Miller: There was a bit of controversy last year when I was Faculty Senate President that a few senators had an issue. The issue is the following: I was asked to provide 3 names for 3 positions on the committee. I called senators, because it wasn't during a meeting, and asked them if they would be willing to serve and if they were then I submitted those names. There were a couple of senators who didn't like that. That I was "handpicking." So I understand the discomfort with that, but I think that's different than what this is. Because as the presiding officer of Faculty Senate there is some discretion given to the presiding officer of this governing body. That's different. The President or the Provost isn't part of this body. Providing them names is different from the presiding officer of this body deciding who should or should not serve.

- Deb Moriarity: I was wondering if one of the things Dr. Miller mentioned about conflict of interest was some of the problem that they were having with the original wording because it was very short and didn't really give much explanation and the idea of saying official faculty representation shall be selected or appointed by the Senate. I wonder if the problem with that and why they rejected that was well there could be a conflict of interest, there could be a very good reason, why that person is not the best choice for this committee. So maybe more discussion with Bob about what the specific issues were versus with the previous one and the new one. And get him to understand our point of view. It's not that we don't want to just give a lot of people and you pick, but the Faculty Senate wants to select from the faculty body.
- Mitch Berbrier: He understood that. From their perspective, they are rejecting it for the obvious reasons: We might want to put somebody on there that they don't want. So we can say it again and they are going to reject it. So if we say it again, and they reject it, as a symbolic point Bhavani makes a very good point.
- Deb Moriarity: An example of why it is important to be sure that somebody from the faculty is actually designated to be a faculty representative is when Banner was being implemented, someone who was not a faculty member was assigned as the Academic faculty representative, but found out after the fact. And then she quickly realized that she couldn't speak to the issues that there would be.
- Mitch Berber: This bill wouldn't let that happen.
- Deb Moriarity: Right, but it's another reason to be sure that we do something about making sure that whoever is called the official faculty representative is a real faculty member.
- Mitch Berbrier: He had trouble with the wording of official faculty member representative. There might be a way that we can reword this that explicitly says that the official faculty representation is from the Faculty Senate but that isn't the only thing to be called faculty representation. We talked about calling it the Senate representation last year, but if I recall, there was an issue with that, but it's still an option. The idea is that the Faculty Senate is the official representative of the faculty, then the logic is that that would be the official faculty representative. He might still reject it and then we don't have any guarantees that they will ask for a slate. The only downside is the practical matter: it's rejected and we have nothing on which to demand any kind of representation on ad hoc committees. This allows us to represent ourselves. This is the compromise to make sure that we get some representation on these committees. We make the symbolic stand now, and say no we won't change the bill, what happens next?
- Bhavani Sitaraman: We have some kind of a vote, but it's not going to be a true representation because it's not much of a vote. Symbolic is important because it is about shared governance. You can look at it 2 ways, from our perspective we are always worried about the optics and how administration will view us. Should we be flexible? Should we appear unreasonable? Let's turn it around and show that faculty feels so strongly about this that it won't be good for the optics of the administration to be too stubborn on this because it is an optics issue. Faculty will feel good. And faculty won't be dominating the committees because administration can make them however large they want. The dialogue isn't about just how we appear but how the administration will appear to us. They're losing a symbolic battle but they're also giving something to faculty. It's in their best interest. If they don't approve, well I don't want to compromise.
- Mitch Berbrier: But what is the next step?
- Bhavani Sitaraman: The next step is that they go on record as having rejected the bill again. And then it's up to the Senate to proceed.

- Mitch Berbrier: They're already on record as having rejected it. They rejected the prior bill. It's already done.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: Then it's up to this body to vote on this and decide if it's important or not.
- Mitch Berbrier: So you're suggesting that we reject the bill and let it go?
- Bhavani Sitaraman: I think we have to communicate strongly the reasons why we rejected it.
- Mitch Berbrier: But that doesn't bind them to any action.
- Bhavani Sitaraman: Ultimately, the body decides if they want to compromise and move to the next level of rewording this bill.

- Phillip Bitzer: This isn't Senate representation. It's faculty representation. We just pick the faculty. So it doesn't have to be anybody that's in this meeting to serve on the committee. We just pick from the big pool of faculty.

- Michael Banish: I'm going to disagree with Rich and Bhavani and say that I can agree with the President in this in that when you transfer the word over "official," although there may be logic in the transferring of the word "official faculty representation," it makes the other people that are on the committee seem non-official. You go at it the other way. I can understand why he rejected it if we said, "this is the official faculty representation." I think there's probably a bit of careful wording there that maybe we need to think about in some way.
- Mitch Berbrier: If anyone wants to make a motion to change the wording, that's available. There are two options: we can change the wording, and anyone can make a motion to do that, or we just go to a vote. Does anyone want to make a motion to change the wording?
- Peter Slater: Is this the first reading?
- Mitch Berbrier: This is the second reading. The first reading was in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- Peter Slater: This is the second reading, so we get a third reading. At the third reading, we can fiddle with the words?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes.
- Richard Miller: Unless it's unanimous and then it's passed.
- Peter Slater: Then the observation that I would make is that previous bill was rejected, so we have nothing. If we get this bill passed then we have something, and if we don't think it's enough, then we can come back later and make it stronger.

Call to question.

All those in favor of the bill as it is written now? 12 members

All those opposed? 12 members

How many abstain? 6 members

Mitch Berbrier, Faculty Senate President, is in favor of this bill as it is written.

Senate Bill 373 passes the second reading, which pushes the bill to a third reading.

Mitch Berbrier: I would appreciate any informal feedback on it.

➤ Senate Bill 376

It is only necessary because we don't have our Faculty Senate Handbook. Submitted by Dr. Rich Miller.

Phillip Bitzer motions to consider. Charles Hickman seconds.

President Altenkirch has seen this and he's okay with it.

Call to question.

In favor? Ayes. No oppositions.

1 abstention

Call that the bill has passed.

- Pavica Sheldon: Question about the automatic one-year extension of tenure track. Why is it automatic? Does it mean that the faculty member needs to take this additional year to go for tenure and then if go up at original tenure date, is that considered early tenure?
 - Richard Miller: That's an upper limit, not lower limit.
 - Mitch Berbrier: It's just an option.
 - Anne Marie Choup: I remember discussions about this and the idea was that the default should be to extend so you do not have to make any special requests to extend.
 - Phillip Bitzer: In the by-laws elsewhere, this doesn't prohibit you from going early.
 - Pavica Sheldon: So then it's considered early.
 - Richard Miller: If this wasn't in there, you would have had to make a formal paper request for maternity leave and then another separate request to extend your tenure-clock. This just links them together. It doesn't preclude you from going early. It just means less paperwork.
 - Pavica Sheldon: Are people who go early treated different?
 - Charles Hickman: Yes. The standard is that it's ordinarily meritorious in this college to be early tenured.
 - Christine Sears: So if you get the automatic year, then if you go up for tenure at your original tenure date, you are automatically considered early tenure and it's not considered the regular tenure?
 - Charles Hickman: No.

 - Phillip Bitzer: I would mention that we've already voted and passed this.
 - Mitch Berbrier: I think your concern is justified, but we want to pass this and once the new Handbook is through then we can go back and revisit and change if needed.

 - Mitch Berbrier: I will go back and look at Robert's Rules and consider if we have to make any adjustments to today's votes If so, I will let you know via email.
- Deb Moriarity motions to adjourn. Michael Banish seconds the motion. Ayes carried the motion.

Faculty Senate Meeting # 545 adjourned
February 20, 2014, 2:15 P.M.