Faculty Senate Meeting 4-20-2017

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 20, 2017
12:30 P.M. in NUR 101A

Present: Sophia Marinova, Laird Burns, Kevin Bao, David Stewart, David Harwell, Ryan Weber, Joseph Taylor, Irena Buksa, Christine Sears, Carolyn Sanders, Jeremy Fischer, Anne Marie Choup, Kyle Knight, Ramon Cerro, Tinting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Earl Wells, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Babak Shotorban, Christina Carmen, Tracy Durm, Maria Steele, Qingyuan Han, Roy Magnuson, Debra Moriarity, Carmen Scholz, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Ming Sun, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathis

Absent with Proxy: Michael Banish, Fat Ho, Amy Hunter, Shanhu Lee, Jeff Weimer

Absent without Proxy: Xuejing Xing, John Schnell, Dianhan Zheng, Casey Norris, Ann Bianchi, Marlena Primeau, Mary Bonilla

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guests: President Bob Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President-Elect Carmen Scholz called the meeting to order at 12:32 pm.
- Approval of Faculty Senate Meeting #577 minutes. Kader Frendi moves to approve. Ramon Cerro seconds. Ayes carry.
- Meeting Review:
  - Librarian Policy passes second and third reading.
  - IRB Policy passes second and third reading.
  - Bill 402 was tabled.
  - Bill 406 passes second and third reading.
  - Bill 407 passes second and third reading.
  - Bill 393 was tabled.

- Administrative Reports
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - Residence halls are full this fall and next fall. In order to accommodate the overflow, we entered into a lease agreement with apartment complexes. We have 209 beds. We have more request than we have beds. We have the lease agreement, the student pays us, and then we pay Sealy Management. The lease is for a year. The students generally only stay nine months. We have an obligation to fill the apartments during the summer at 75%. If the student were to go their privately, it would cost them substantially more than to go through us. We did get a break on the lease, and it is equivalent to staying at a residence hall. We have asked...
students who requested to stay at an apartment if they are in need of transportation. The answer has been no.

- Harry - Are they subject to the residence hall rules?
- President – Yes, there will be residence assistant’s onsite and police officers to help maintain order. We have a MOU between our police department and the Huntsville department to share communication.
- Kader – For the apartment 6.2 miles away, how will they get to campus if they don’t have a car?
- President – We have asked and if it is needed, we will run a van.
- Joseph – How quickly will we build a residence hall if we are already at half capacity of the new one?
- President – I will discuss that. They all don’t live on campus and all don’t live at home. They are sprinkled around on their own.
- Kader – Is the on campus housing priority to freshman?
- President – Yes.
- Ramon – We are leased for a year but they only stay nine months, are we obligated?
- President – We have to fill at 75% during the summer. If we don’t, we still have to pay. We don’t see there to be any issues to fill at that rate during the summer.

- The purchase of executive plaza was approved at the BOT meeting. For some time to come, the only piece of property that was available to us to develop for the campus and a college town neighborhood was the executive plaza. It has been for sale for several years. The white lines represent one story office buildings. Most of them are vacant. In 2014, the owner approached us about what we would like to see over there. They came up with a plan accordingly. We met two or three times. They then defaulted on their loan. It was then bought at a foreclosure sale. Around 2016, other developers showed up and were determined to be land flippers. It became more evident that we may get sucked into this financially. That is when the Board got involved and the decision was made to approve. We purchased 58.2 acres. The asking price was $7.5M, we offered $7.1M which was accepted. One strategy to this would be to develop housing, and not take up space on campus.
- Tim – We used to own a building south of that. Have you thought of repurchasing that?
- President – Yes,
- we would like to get that back. This is Holmes Ave with a lot of houses. Over time as they come up for sale, we could purchase them. This would be a shorter term project.

- We will go through an RFP for a developer. They then market the plan to individual developers. They will want to acquire it through us and then we would lease it.
- Roy – Do you know who owns the field across from the residential area?
- Tim – I am pretty sure it is Lockheed Martin.
- Ramon – This property will have a problem similar to Holmes. Would it make more sense to move towards Jordan rather than cross Sparkman?
- President – Moving towards Jordan is part of the overall plan. Jordan consists of individual houses. Between the campus and Jordan, that is a development strip.
• Laird – is there any concern for environmental audit?
• President – If there is an environmental issue, we back out. That is why we have 120 days to due diligence.
• Debra – You mentioned a campus community development. You think this is a place to put commercial areas?
• President – If you are in Tuscaloosa at the edge of campus, there is a strip of business that is thriving.
• Kader – What is the plan to link it to the campus?
• President – The first owner we dealt with had in their plan a bicycle bridge.
• Kader – Is it possible to make that for cars?
• President – It is more expensive but you can.

- The committee for Ray Pinners replacement is in place and the search will start soon. Ray initially was going to retire Sep 30 but has moved it up to June 30. We may need an interim between June 30 and Oct 1.
- We have a parking committee working on parking. We are making good process. We are drawing the map. We are considering the consultant map and police map. We take into consideration the beds at residence halls and the employees per building. We should be finished with this soon. I met with the staff senate and student government, they had good ideas. They weren’t enthused with hang tags; they said colleagues would pass around hang tags. We will have to consider that. We have taken the approach of keeping it simple.
  • Laird – Have you taken into consideration the demand during special events?
  • President – There will be situations when we block areas of parking. There are no special zones for event parking.

- Provost Christine Curtis
  • Commencement is May 7th. Notify Peggy if you will be there by early next week. She has parking passes for you.
  • We had a new BOT member come to campus last week. I gave him a briefing of academic affairs. I told him our goals of improving our retention. We looked last week at the retention of our freshman cohort. That is a national number we report. As of last week, we had 79% of students in the freshman cohort enrolled. The important thing is to remind our students to get registered before they leave campus. They don’t have to pay until fall semester starts. It would be very helpful. Retention is important because we want the students to meet academic goals. We are also monitored on our retention rates. Incoming students look at those rates along with graduation rates. I talked with him about hiring faculty. I worked on this table Tuesday evening, and then had emails that changed the table. I didn’t change it at that point. This is in flux. We have 18 assistant tenure track professors we are looking for. We have hired ten, and have six offers out. We have one associate professor hired. We have six professors we are interviewing. At this point we have eleven and a half lecturers; one is a replacement for the videographer. These lecturers are a combination of retirements, people leaving, and new ones for increase. In critical professors, we have ten. You have to realize in nursing there is a constant change over in clinical faculty. This number is in constant flux. We are constantly hiring in clinical faculty. We have two new librarians. There will be one new staff member in the COS, and that position will soon be advertised. I know a lot
of you have been involved. It is paying off. The candidates we have hired are excellent.

**Officer/Committee Reports**

- Kader Frendi, Past President
  - No report.
- Carmen Scholz, Interim Ombudsperson
  - No report.
- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
  - No report.
- James Swain, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  - We approved 07.01.02 which is on the agenda today.
- Earl Wells, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
  - No report.
- Monica Dillihunt, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
  - I have nominations for President-Elect: Mike Banish and Nick Jones. We also need nominations for ombudsperson. We have none right now. They need to be voted on this week.
    - Carmen – I nominate Kader Frendi for ombudsperson.
    - Monica – We also need to do committee chairs.
    - Carmen – We need to do that today. We do have a special meeting on May 4th.
    - Monica – Those that are new starting in the fall can be committee chairs. We have a student parking appeals committee. We need two faculty senators to serve on that committee? I have one – Angela.
    - Carmen – Faculty appeals committee meets on an as needed basis. If the student one operates the same way, it won’t be unless there are many reports.
      - Dr. Sanders volunteers to serve.
- Christine Sears, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  - No report.
- Joseph Taylor, Finance Committee Chair
  - No report.
- Carmen Scholz, President-Elect
  - Librarian Policy: We are going to view the last one sent. I need a motion to approve this policy. Kader Frendi motions. Debra Moriarity seconds.
    - Tim – I have a minor thing. It starts talking about librarians then goes to non-tenure track faculty. I think it would be better if it said non-tenure tracked librarian faculty.
    - Carmen – Is that in the blue section?
    - Tim – They are in the blue and black after blue. I move that we add the word librarian. Kader Frendi seconds.
    - Tim – The senate bylaws place those three as senate representation. You don’t want to put librarian titles because per bylaws they couldn’t serve in a voting role.
    - Carmen – All in favor of inserting the word. Ayes carry. Now we can vote on entire policy. All in favor of policy ayes carry.
    - Joseph – Is that the final reading?
- Tim – It was unanimous and was approved on the third reading too.

**IRB Policy:**
- James – Scroll down to A3. There is one typo in there. Change “manners” to “matters”.
- Carmen – Do I have a motion to accept the policy as amended? Debra Moriarity moves. Ramon Cerro seconds.
- Laird – My years during Michigan State, I was trained on IRB issues. When I look at the composition of the members, I don’t see where anyone has to be trained.
- Carmen – Where would you like to have that?
- Laird – I think if they are going to serve, they need to be trained. I don’t believe it says that they have to be trained. I have to be trained as a PI, it is required.
- Carmen – As a second point, we will add and “needs to be trained.”
- Laird – I make a motion that all members of the UAH IRB be properly trained on regulations prior to serving and voting on committee.
- Debra – Under UAH composition, all members of the UAH IRB must have human subjects training as provided by VPRED prior to voting on the IRB.
- Member – If I submit an application to IRB, do they have to meet and discuss?
- Debra – There are several categories on the website. A lot of what is done is exempt from meeting. In most cases, they are handled by a subgroup of the committee or the chair. Bruce Stalsmith is the new chair.
- Member – If I am recruiting, does the entire committee meet?
- Debra – It depends on the protocol you are trying to get approved.
- Member – At Vanderbilt, I could call someone and discuss it in ten minutes.
- Tim – It is my understanding that all our IRB requests are sent to Tuscaloosa for a first reading. I called down there this morning and it was confirmed. Why is everything being sent to Tuscaloosa now? My experience with the chair is not what is being presented here. I wanted a phone call, but was told I needed to send an email. I think we need face to face discussions with these committees. Also, students submit these and aren’t certain that all are even being read. I hope whatever we do, addresses these issues.
- Provost – This is done out of the VPR office. We do not have any support staff here to support IRB. The decision was made to contract with Tuscaloosa to review the proposals. We have a chair and a GRA that the VPR pays the stipend, and I pay tuition. My understanding is the committee meets for the non-exempt. The exempt is handled at Alabama. If there are problems with the process, my suggestion is to let the VP for Economic Development know.
- Member – I submitted a minor adjustment to a protocol sent March 7th and received approval today.
- Carmen – Are there any changes to the policy wanting to be made?
- Member – I want a faster process. Is it quicker to go through Alabama or a committee here? This is a lengthy process.
- Roy – I am chair on a committee similar. One thing that makes the process difficult is the sheer volume of things coming through. A lot of this is
exempt and doesn’t really need to be reviewed. In comparison to the animal committee, people have to wait a long time. If you have to go through review it is hard to get everyone together. I don’t think we should be legislating this much.

- Carmen – Amendment of point eight, all in favor. Ayes carry. 1 abstains.
- Tim – I wonder if this is an oversight or intentional. It says members of colleges are appointed. Does that mean student, faculty?
- Debra – It appoints one member from the academic college. You don’t want to do students or staff. It should be faculty.
- Carmen – Would you like to see it read one faculty member from each academic college?
- Ramon – Whoever wrote this was thinking about faculty.
- Carmen – I think the amendment clarifies that point.
- Carmen – Unless there is a federal requirement, I don’t want to go to other universities.
- Provost – There is.
- Carmen – Can we find that to be inserted or does this need to be tabled?
- Laird – What is the standard regulation?
- Carmen – I don’t think there is anything out that would prohibit us to go forward? Can I have a vote on the amendment? All in favor of amendment. Ayes carry. 1 abstains. All in favor of policy. Ayes carry. 4 abstain. This passed second and third reading.

- Bill 402: Motion to accept this bill. Ramon Cerro moves. Kader Frendi seconds.
  - Ramon – There is no indication of how the review board should be formed. I think the review board should be indicated.
  - Carmen – I believe that we have amendments to this from the physics department. In light of me knowing there are amendments, I would like to table this bill. Laird Burns moves. Roy Magnuson seconds. Ayes carry.

- Bill 406: This cleared the executive committee. Motion to accept. Debra Moriarity moves. Roy Magnuson seconds.
  - Carmen – It says that a task force will be established and results be received by December. All in favor of bill. Ayes carry. Passed second reading unanimously.

- Bill 407: Roy Magnuson moves to accept. Kader Frendi seconds.
  - Carmen – This is a request to look into sharing library resources among other campuses. We are asking the President to look into it. I am not sure how successful this will be. The publishers want to sell as many licenses as possible, not to share. This effort has been attempted several years ago due to that reason but we can try again.
  - Ramon – Should there be clarification to what databases?
  - Carmen – This is library related. I do not read this in regards to personnel information.
  - Ramon – It reads all, not just librarian.
  - Laird - Can we make that non-medical library databases?
  - Carmen – All in favor of amendment. Ayes carry. Passes first and second reading.
I would like for the new committees to meet with each other before the end of the meeting.
We will take a quick look at Bill 393: Tim Newman motions to accept. Ramon Cerro seconds.

- Tim – There is one typo in this bill as it was reported out on first reading. We changed 10th to 12th.
- Laird – I would suggest saying it start in fall 2017. I tried to get this pushed to the last two weeks of classes.
- Carmen – Instead of 12 weeks, you want to say?
- Laird- I am just suggesting the last two weeks.
- Carolyn - I am in support of that. The 12th week has a lot of important work that needs to be focused on.
- Member – For the last line, I would prepare teaching effectiveness instead of style.
- Member – Going back to previous change of last two week of classes, I think we would want to delete the next phrase.
- Debra – Where is says all student evaluations will be done during class. These are still electronic?
- Carmen – They can do that in class.
- Debra – How would you begin to enforce that? They are either open electronically during those two weeks or not. I will not support using paper again. There was cost and machines needed. There were issues with people making up fake ones.
- Carmen – I was told paper would never come back.
- Ramon – If you look at the cost of other things, this is minimum compared to other expenses.
- Debra – That is why there was an SIE committee to look at this.
- Carmen – Paper is not coming back.
- Christine – How are SIE’s created now?
- Carmen – They are standard questions used throughout the university.
- Debra – The committee took all the college ones and tried to find common questions that addressed issues. There was an option for colleges to write questions for their specific college.
- Christine – SIE’s are important. I think it would be nice if we had a contracted out group to verify that the questions are fair and free of bias. I don't think every college has the opportunity to form questions on their own. If this is that important, it should be professionally created.
- Tim – I want to point out that the bill doesn’t speak to or against paper. I would like to speak in favor of paper. My participation rate was 80% with paper; they are 20-30% now. Even when I tell them we are doing them in class, the percentage is the same. We have a measurement system now that is not well measuring student evaluation of instructors. Many semesters, I am surprised of the comments. I hear from my colleagues the same. The evidence is the switch to online is a failure. If only one-third of the students are participating, that is not successful. If it cost to pay someone to scan them, it is worth the cost. I think it would be less than $100 per course. That is a drop in the bucket. If that is what it takes to get
vital information, we should spend it. We spend money for every assistant and associate, whatever it is, dean, and chair. Our university needs to put our resources where it actually matters and not hire more administrators. I think that is a false argument and we need to avoid it.

- Ramon – We have just reviewed a couple of assistant professors and in most cases the return was 4 or 5 of 30. The students who respond have an axe to grind. To put the review in the hands of those students who are getting a bad grade.

- Carmen – I am not saying I am in favor of not going back to paper, that is what I have been told.

- Tim – I am not attacking anyone in this room. I am attacking the issue that we aren’t going back to paper.

- Carolyn – I support Tim and Ramon’s comments. It is difficult to review faculty when the response is so low. There is an established procedure with paper. I understand economics. We are flying blind in trying to review faculty members.

- Carmen – I table this policy. I would like to introduce new committee members to committee.

- Tim – I move this bill be tabled today and brought back May 4th. All in favor. Ayes carry.

➤ Meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm.