

---

**FACULTY SENATE Meeting  
December 15, 2016  
12:30 P.M. in NUR 205A**

***Present: Xuejing Xing, Laird Burns, David Stewart, Ryan Weber, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Carolyn Sanders, Anne Marie Choup, Kyle Knight, Ramon Cerro, Fat Duen Ho, Earl Wells, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Ann Bianchi, Tracy Durm, Marlena Primeau, Maria Steele, Mary Bonilla, Shanhu Lee, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Michael George, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Shannon Mathis, Michael Banish***

***Absent with Proxy: John Schnell, Sophia Marinova, Yongchuan Bao, Jeremy Fischer, Christina Carmen, Qingyuan Han, Debra Moriarity, Harry Delugach, Ming Sun, Vladimir Florinski***

***Absent without Proxy: David Harwell, Irena Buksa, Eric Seeman, Dianhan Zheng, Tingting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Casey Norris, Amy Hunter, Monica Dillihunt***

***Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis***

***Guests: President Bob Altenkirch  
Dr. Chittur***

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- Approval of faculty senate meeting minutes #573, November 17. Carmen Scholz motions to approve. Ramon Cerro seconds. Ayes carry.
- Accept FSEC Report from December 8. Tim Newman motions to accept. Ayes carry.
- Bill 398 did not pass second reading unanimously.
- **Administrative Reports**
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - In regards to construction, a message was sent out with a map in regards to the residence hall. This will start shortly. Around June, the incubator will start. We will build one Greek house at this time. This will start in the spring as well. The incubator building is funded from the state, economic development, UAH foundation, and a private gift. The private gift is sufficient according to the board to name the facility after the donor. This will be the first building named after someone that has given a gift.
    - Director of Compliance and Title IX has formed a selection committee. We will start shortly after the first of the year. Currently there are 46 applicants.
  - Provost Christine Curtis
    - The good news is we received our accreditation. They had two recommendations, QEP and faculty credential. The faculty credential policy was developed and being implemented as we speak. They accepted that in response to the recommendation. They had eight individuals. We accepted seven that they were correct on. One individual we said was the most qualified and stood our ground on that. We are in

good shape. We have a number of things we have to do. We have to follow through with our assessments. We don't want to fall behind. If we do this in a routine manner, it won't be difficult to get this done. We have to follow our policies. I need to thank everyone for all the hard work in preparation of the visit. It was a team effort. Congratulations to us all. It is a positive thing for the university. Baylor and Louisville did not satisfy the requirements.

- I need to ask help with one thing – grade reports. The grades were late coming in. There are a couple of exams on Friday. On Monday we had 341 classes without grades. In some, it was only a few grades. We sent out an email that day to the Deans. By Monday night, there were still 105 sections missing grades. At that point, I asked an email be sent out to the individual faculty member. By Tuesday morning, we were down to 19 sections. The deadline was 9:00 am and it was extended to 10:00 am, then we had seven. We went ahead and rolled the grades. I would ask the senators to encourage faculty to get their grades in. We did have some grades that weren't in and exams were on the first day. The students need to know grades to plan for the next semester.
  - Carolyn – One question, Janet is good to send reminders out to Deans, Directors, etc. Is it fair to assume that it only goes to Deans?
  - Provost – The Deans need to send it to Chairs, and then they send it out.
  - Carolyn - Have you considered sending it to the Chairs?
  - Roy – A little automation would be good on this. One thing the system doesn't do is let you know when you are done. It's not too difficult to get lost. It occurs to me that an automated email sent to let you know you are complete would be good.
  - Provost – We are transitioning to Banner 8. If you would Roy, send me an email and I will forward that to Malcolm to see if it is in Banner XE, and if not, see if it can be added.
  - Roy – It may not be the biggest problem, but it would help to get the notification.
  - Provost – If something is missing, it would notify you.
  - Member – Some know the grades aren't going to be rolled and they push the deadlines.
  - Provost – We need to know what a reasonable deadline is. If it is impossible to grade and get it in by Monday morning, we need to set an absolute time.
- Honor's Day is April 11<sup>th</sup>. We are dispensing with the University Honor's Day. We will start with the Honor's College early in the morning. Then the colleges have a time frame that doesn't overlap. We had some overlapping last year. If you don't go over your time slot everything will be good.
- The IRS and the Federal Government have changed the interpretation of the insurance for graduate students. We complied with the ruling that wouldn't allow us to provide the insurance to students that we were, it was illegal. We stopped doing that and supplemented them with the funds we used for insurance. We asked the PI's do the same with GRA's. As of fall, we are going back to offering insurance, unless new administration changes something else. We will go back to regular insurance and pay graduate student insurance. We will be requiring that of all including GRA's.

- On the lecturer and librarian policy we are consulting with John Cates and will get back with you at the first of the year.
  - Tim – First, I want to encourage the administration to move ahead with chapters 7-9 on the handbook. It has been four years since that has been sent. If they would like to reject those, just let us know. Second, we sent forward 16-17-01 resolution. I think it fell short in three areas. I don't think it is satisfactory. We asked for ninety days, sixty came back. We asked for an interim policy and only a statement came back that administration would provide an informal response. I think there is a big difference in the two. If we think about the motivation for the system of policies, we want to get away from memos. I think the response was disappointing in this area. I think the biggest one is we asked that an analysis of risk for deanship be done and there was no response to that. I think that one thing that drove the bill to come from the senate is there are a number of deanship creations. The final straw was deanship of continuing studies. I don't run across any faculty that was aware of why that happened. I don't think we want a deanship created and no one understand why it was created. That was some feedback. My third point is on the deadline for proposals. It seems that the deadlines are always very short. I checked with another colleague at another institute, there deadline was two weeks beyond ours. That is a disadvantage. Some know those are coming down but most don't. Most people on campus don't know. When it comes in on a Tuesday, with a Friday deadline, I know I can't do that. It seems that they are wired for the faculty member that knew about it. I think we should open it up to have the most diverse ideas. It is my understanding that this has happened recently.
    - Provost – Do you have a recommended time for a deadline?
    - Tim – I would be hesitant to throw out a time. I think ten days would be nice. I just think we don't want a situation where faculty find something out and have to have a response in 72 hours.
    - Mike – Typically it will be a six page mini proposal. Most of these are EPSCOR and you have to cost share. It has to go through OSP and they have to verify all these and verify the one to one cost share. I have a complaint of we do this following NSF format, but I have never received a proposal back telling me why I didn't get it. Either we need to follow the NSF format and go through OSP to receive feedback or not.
    - Provost – Your request is?
    - Tim – If the institution response is twenty days, we should be given half that.
    - Provost – You think ten days would be the minimal time?
    - Tim – I think we need a broad umbrella.
  - Kader - At first I want to join the senate on the SACSCOC work. You all stepped up to the plate by passing key policies on time. Handbook chapters 4-6, appendix a, we passed that in the summer and it hasn't gone to the board yet. I would like to see it go forward, or we want an answer.
    - Provost – The President hasn't had a chance to review these yet. He did ask that I find out what the deadline for submissions is for the Board meeting.

- Ramon – I want to voice a concern from a colleague, he is embarrassed that we have lost Carnegie one status and not seeing much being done by administration to help. There was a proactive meeting with the ad-hoc committee with Dr. Frendi. I still don't think anything will happen until administration embraces the request.
  - Provost – The key thing that hasn't happened is PhD productions. We need this in areas outside of the areas we have PhD's. Our numbers are 20% becomes PhDs, when nationally the number is 40%. It has to be done at the local level.
  - Ramon – There is a lot that needs to be done at the administrative level.
  - Provost – Do you want to write down what you think we should be doing?
  - Ramon – No, there are still meetings in regard to this.
  - Provost – I asked Dr. Berkowitz to meet with the FSEC to discuss various issues.
  - Ramon –The point is that all faculty should be embarrassed that we have lost this status and concerned that administration has not done much to fix this.
  - Carmen – Is the 20% of PhD production held against us?
  - Provost – In regards to PhD production, yes. As far as GTA's that pursue PhD's, we are not at the national level. We have to have funding for these students to get through the PhD.
  - Carmen – Master students don't help?
  - Provost – No, they look at the PhD production.
  - Earl – If you want to increase PhD production and create new, one wouldn't solve it. We have to increase current production and create new.
  - Provost – The PhD in science is in science. They are looking at the breath. We don't have those at this time.
  - Earl – Is there a possibility of the rules changing?
  - Provost - I haven't met this person but the President has. He says this person won't change his mind unless he wants too. He did give us more information this time than any other as to what it was. It wasn't research funding, it was PhD production.
  - Christine – In terms of breath, one of the problems for expansion is the lack of librarian resources. We can't produce PhD candidates without quality resources.
  - Provost – Dr. Moore is working with UAB to get those resources. When Dr. Whitt was working with the three he encouraged them to work together. Dr. Moore is trying to get this going.
  - Mike – When Chancellor Nash is here in January that may be a point to bring up to him since they want all three campuses to be strong.

➤ **Officer and Committee Reports**

- Michael Banish, President
  - Thank you all for coming. This will be our last meeting for this year and last meeting in this room. We have two special committees. I have Dr. Chittur coming for charger foundation. I do encourage you to go through the policies that are on

the website. One was brought to my attention yesterday about video surveillance. The Provost and I have been discussing back and forth what I have found on it. It was basically that every video system on campus be tied through the police station. We did work through those.

- Ramon – Are these policies that doesn't involve faculty?
  - Provost – As we were preparing for SACSCOC, we had to have a set of policies that were public. The President started to gather all the policies, they were everywhere. A number of these that haven't been through the senate were long standing. That was long before the policy on policies. These were just long standing policies.
  - Ramon – I understand that. Who decides if a policy involves the faculty or not?
  - Provost – This was before the policy on policies. They were just long standing.
  - Mike – They are up and made public. We have the right to comment on one if we have a concern.
- Kader Frendi, Past President
    - We finally met on December 1<sup>st</sup>, we had a lively discussion. Bottom line is the faculty is concerned with the lack of research. If we increase the number of lecturers, we will go further away from the Carnegie ranking. We encouraged hiring tenure-faculty track. We mentioned the need for PhD GTA's. The expansion of PhD degrees based on the Carnegie ranking is based on the diversity of PhD's. The focus needs to become on other areas creating PhD's and are they ready? These are ideas we are throwing out. We mentioned the creation of graduate level matrix. We have heard there is a matrix for undergraduate, is there one for graduates? If we can get GRA's supported by research money, that is the top priority. We also threw out the idea of fundraising for graduate level. The idea here is for the departments that are not able to generate funding; this would be good seed money to start the program. These are ideas that we have thrown out. We will meet at the New Year.
  - Carmen Scholz, President-Elect
    - There is one bill that is coming to the full senate today. The second bachelors have been assigned the scholastic affairs committee. There was a bill in regards to on-call employees and has been assigned to committees.
  - Ramon Cerro, Personnel Committee Chair
    - No report.
  - Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
    - We are working through paper work.
  - Earl Wells, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
    - No report.
  - Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
    - No report.
  - James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
    - We did approve the course and repeat forgiveness policy. Since 9 am on Tuesday my committee has responded and reached an agreement on readmissions.
  - Joseph Taylor, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
    - We are getting ready to start examining faculty proposals. We will have those done by January 30<sup>th</sup>. In February, we will meet with Bob Lyon to meet with advancement and fundraising.

- Dr. Chittur, Charger Foundation Ad-Hoc Committee Chair
  - Mike asked me to revive the charger foundation ad-hoc committee. We met about six weeks ago to see what we need to do next. There was no specific charge from the faculty senate president, but to revive the foundation. The task force was never disbanded. Several from the task force didn't show for the meeting. Information about charger foundation is on the website. There were several objectives; the first question was to make the first two years more relevant and something to give students a foundation. A lot of chemical engineering students take the course because it is on the program of study and don't see the relevance. I think the importance would be to see how to make the foundation courses relevant to everyone on the campus. We are going to attempt to look at the courses and come up with a recommendation. I have more ideas and was careful to not push it at the first meeting. We will meet again during the spring semester. One of my suggestions is to look at the charger foundations under the perspective of the student. Can we look at it from the student's perspective? That is my personal objective. To end the meeting, I said if it was up to me they would take a class on programming.
    - Mike- Do you have members from every college on the committee?
    - Dr. Chittur – We don't. We don't have someone from science or business. We don't want rookies on the committee. We want a person who understands how it is to change something that has been done for years. There are a few members that have been here a year or two. If you have names send them to me.
    - Ramon – I think it is interesting because going to the university is more than a credential. Literacy is also in chemistry and science. You have to be around the person to be a dedicated person.
    - Dr. Chittur – This will be challenging. Concepts and ideas will be hard to change.
    - Carmen – I want to report an observation to your committee. You said look at the courses from the student's perspective. I observe that our interaction with students went away. It is my observation that students go to their classes and you never see them. When you speak with them they refer to central advising. They don't understand why they should take certain classes, because that would come from faculty.
    - Dr. Chittur – One solution in chemical engineering is starting last fall we had one day we invited students to come talk with advisors. I sent email to 200 and 75 came. I don't know the answer to the question, but you are right.
    - Carmen – There are a lot of students who don't want to be seeked out.
    - Tim – I want to put a plug in for maintaining the notion that we want our students to have a broad based education. In an effort to sell ourselves to the public, UAH makes the key for higher education for the job. I think we should stand for something more than that. Our interest should be more than. One that creates broad based students that are well rounded. It should be beyond the next professional university.
    - Dr. Chittur – That is my objective too. The biggest barrier will be to rethink the idea of education. One thing that everyone should know around the campus is you need to go beyond specific courses. What is the world the student is going to see in four years?
    - Member – I was on the original task force. We went through all of this. Are you starting over with this or picking up where we ended?
    - Dr. Chittur – We aren't starting over. Even in the way you ended, there were some ideas that were never pushed forward.

- Mike – From my understanding the charger foundations committee, still exist? We want to ensure this was well represented. Also, that many people had the chance to provide their input from the faculty senate side. Dr. Chittur is ready to give room to forty people. I have turned this over to him.
- Member – I was confused because it was all about producing good citizens, we also went through that. We did have faculty members there during my time. I wanted to make sure we weren't spinning our wheels and starting over.
- Dr. Chittur – We have to sell the idea that we are going to help them not make this impossible for them.
- Carolyn – I was well aware of this task force. I would ask the same question. Did you hear complaints from what came from that committee? I don't see the point in doing this. Do these young students really know what's best? I do think it needs to be disciplined specific so it is well rounded. I hate to see a group come from faculty senate come and rethink this. They will all have their own ideas. I am against not having a representative from every college. Were there people of significant number that pointed out problems with the end result of charger foundations?
- Provost – I asked for an oversight committee. We received two different requests for new charger foundation courses. There were a number of things that the task force recommended be done to ensure the students were learning the material. I was hoping they could take that forward. That is the reason I made the request. Since it is a curriculum issue, it should sit next to the university's curriculum committee.
- Carolyn – That makes sense to me. It makes more sense to look at this area than the whole charger foundation.
- Dr. Chittur – We are going to let the students dictate. We aren't throwing everything out. The question to ask is has anything changed from what the task force recommended? I think there is still some talk among the campus about the curriculum. I don't know the answer to the question.
- Mike – I am going to cut this off and say Dr. Chittur is looking for members.
- Ramon – I think a problem is that people don't know what was done before. I have some ideas after talking with Dr. Chittur. We need to become more knowledgeable.

➤ **Miscellaneous**

- Mike – The last order of business is Bill 398, cover a charger. It passed first reading in FSEC meeting. It says that Purdue University has a student loan program where you pay back a percent of your salary for a certain period of time and the loan is forgiven. Some never pay their loan back. This bill asks for the President to give several reports to see if we could cover a charger.
  - Roy – I looked up information in regards to this. The term is income share agreement; you pay back a percent of your income over a period of time. I want to propose an amendment where it says the President evaluates a pay it back plan. I propose a payback plan with evaluating an income share plan.
  - Carmen Scholz motions for the bill to come forward for second reading. Laird Burns seconds. Laird Burns seconds amendment. Ayes carry.
  - Roy – This seems like an unobjectionable request that we look into something. I propose to close debate. Laird Burn seconds. Ayes carry.
  - Mike – All in favor of second reading of bill 398. 3 opposed. 3 abstain. Ayes carry. Bill does not pass second reading unanimously.

- Motion to adjourn meeting at 1:56 pm. Ayes carry.