

---

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING #567**

**April 28, 2016**

**12:30 P.M. in NUR 205A**

**Present:** *Wai Mok, John Schnell, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Diana Bell, Irena Buksa, Christine Sears, Kyle Knight, Michael Banish, Earl Wells, James Swain, Ken Zuo, Mark Lin, Cheryl Emich, Lenora Smith, Udaysankar Nair, Luciano Matzkin, Tim Newman, Grant Zhang, Ming Sun, Vladimir Florinski, Kader Frendi, Carolyn Sanders*

**Absent with proxy:** *Tim Landry, Jeremy Fischer, Anne Marie Choup, Richard Fork, Babak Shotorban, Ann Bianchi, Azita Amiri, Marlana Primeau, Larry Carey, Debra Moriarity*

**Absent without proxy:** *Xuejing Xing, Xiaotong Li, Joe Conway, Eric Seeman, Ying-Cheng Lin, Casey Norris, Monica Beck, John Shriver, Jeff Weimer, Peter Slater, Monica Dillihunt*

**Guests:** *Provost Christine Curtis*

- Faculty Senate President Kader Frendi called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm.
- Dr. Frendi motions to table Hoverboard Policy. Tim Newman moves to table. James Swain seconds. Ayes Carry.
- Approval of Faculty Senate Meeting #566 Minutes from March 31, 2016. Michael Banish **motions to approve** Minutes 566. Tim Newman seconds the motion. Ayes carry the motion. No oppositions.  
*Motion to approve Faculty Senate Minutes 566 **passes.***
- FSEC Report from April 21, 2016  
Michael Banish **moves to accept.** Ramon Cerro seconds the motion. Ayes carry the motion. No oppositions.  
*Motion to accept Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report April 21, 2016 **passes.***
- **Administrative Reports**
  - Tim Newman – I have had comments on two issues from my department. One is on student instructor evaluations. We are seeing lower rate of participation on those. Second issue is they are not closing before final exams. Last semester my participation rate was higher in January.
    - Provost – The spring they are scheduled to close the 22<sup>nd</sup> at 11:59 pm.

- Tim – The faculty thinks we need to do something about the low participation rate and the comments are coming from students that are really after us.
- Provost – First, the Friday before the 22nd of April the SIE’s were moved. Training has been completed through the company that works the reports. I suggest we have a committee on the SIE’s or ask for volunteers to work with us and ensure we are responding appropriately to the faculty. We have had several concerns. The schedule is now issuing the reports after the finals are over. We need input from everyone on ways to increase participation and that is what is needed for the faculty.
- Ramon – Is there a way to tie receiving their final grade based on completion of the survey?
- Provost – We don’t make it mandatory.
- Ramon – Why is a quick, biased report better than something that would take longer to receive?
- Provost – Hopefully we can figure out a way to make the report more appealing to the students to participate in.
- Diane – Research demonstrates that women and minorities evaluation tend to be lower, so there is a built in biased for that reason. The second thing is I had a student ask if they would receive extra credit for completing the evaluation. I said no. I later discovered that another Professor was doing this. So what do we do?
- Provost – I think that is a personal decision.
- Diane – I think it should be a university decision.
- Provost – That can be addressed to the committee this fall.
- Eric Fong – We need to make sure that the closing date works for late night courses.
- Provost - This will have to be tailored for each class. This needs to be remembered in the fall discussion.
- Tim Newman – Next, there is a lot of issues with the digital measures product. They stated it was tedious and had to research what the boxes were asking and had to dig. So many faculty members were very agitated. Once the report was done, we had to hand correct it.
- Provost - Why did we do it? For those that were here when it first came about, the good news is the contract is over next year. I have no intention to renew it. The question would be what to do in the meantime. Maybe can it and just pay the remaining balance. I know we did this to compile the activities of the university. That was the purpose as far as I know. Is that important to us? If it is, we will have to find another option to complete this. I have to commend the faculty for their patience in completing it. I do understand and this fall we will discuss this. We need to put together a selection committee to find something and do a pilot test.

➤ **Officer and Committee Reports**

- Kader Frendi , President
  - I want to take this opportunity to thank you for showing up and being supportive this whole year. I spoke about you all to the BOT and how well you all support the senate. I have enjoyed this time working with each of you. I am very proud of you.
  - Mike Banish presents plaque to Dr. Frendi in honor of his time as President for the Faculty Senate.
- Jim Swain , Governance and Operations Committee Co-Chair



- Kader Frendi – Do I have a motion to adopt this policy? Michael Banish motions. Ramon Cerro seconds. Any input from the senate?
- Diana - When it says return to work/school it says there should be documentation from attending health care physician or health dept. Would the faculty clinic suffice for this?
- Member – We could add qualified health care provider.
- Michael Banish – We say health department for Huntsville/Madison County or attending health care physician.
- Provost – We say Huntsville/Madison County, is it necessary to be that department? Can they not use their hometown?
- Member – If we add qualified health care provider, we could take out health department.
- Michael – This will be accepted as a friendly amendment.
- Kader Frendi – Any more comments? We will add the amendment. All in favor with policy in front of you with amendment? All in favor. No oppositions.
- Bill 389 Chapter 4 Handbook
  - This is the second reading for the bill.
  - Tim Newman – In chapter 4, the changes from what the senate has forwarded are cosmetic. We have done some updating in position titles, position descriptions, and unit titles. We do have two colleges now that need to be added. There is a slightly revised statement about the expectations for the chairs and deans. It wasn't a big difference. In section 4.4, there is an elaboration on process of establishment of a department. We added that the faculty will be consulted in this process. There will be a review cycle that every unit will go through. We added that decision is based essentially on education decisions and financial reasons. There is also a provision if the decision is made to close a unit there is a repeal process. Under additional considerations, there is more material. This states as to what happens if units go away. This goes with sister institutions. The attempt will be made to place faculty members at another institution. Hopefully this will make it clear to everyone here and those coming.
  - Ramon Cerro – We took out the reference to guidelines. I think what comes from 4.4 is explicitly what is in the guidelines.
  - Tim – At the end of this is where the ombudsperson position is listed.
  - James – This position will replace the faculty senate ombudsperson. We are in the process of revising the bylaws.
  - Provost – Wouldn't that be up to the senate to decide?
  - Kader Frendi – Yes, it will be the senate's decision.
  - Michael Banish – I move to accept Bill 389. James Swain seconds. Any more discussion/input?
  - Member – Yes, that is the problem. I don't know if everyone has read all of these. I have not. Unlike the senators in Washington, I want to know what this states.
  - Diana – Friendly amendment, there are inconsistencies in grammar. I am happy to do some additional proofreading to correct these issues. It is basically just simple corrections. I am happy to do the work.
  - Ramon – This is second reading?
  - Kader – Yes.
  - Ramon – Will there be a third?

- Frendi – Yes, if the second passes.
- James – How long do you anticipate it would take? A month from now or in the fall?
- Kader – It was a small suggestion to make it quick. We can push it to summer or early fall.
- Mark – Additional considerations – On the last sentence, if no petition is available. I wonder why?
- Tim – I think it should say, there are some positions that are without other training. You may serve in a unit that your degree is in another unit. It covers someone that doesn't need retraining.
- Mark – The way I read it is the opportunity for training opens with/without job opportunity.
- Tim – I think legally this implies if training could allow someone to serve in a new position, training will be provided.
- Diana – With the retraining, the faculty member would be able to teach any course that relates to his/her prior work and have it move departments.
- Kader – Any more comments? There was one objection so the bill will not pass second reading. All in favor of the bill as it stands. 25 in favor. 2 oppose. 1 abstains. Bill will move to third reading.
- Bill 390 Chapter 5 Handbook
  - James – Motions to suspend rules to move to librarian/lecturer policy since the handbook bills will be moved to third reading. Diana seconds. Aye carry.
- Librarian/Lecturer Policy
  - Kader Frendi - We received this policy about a year ago. It had all the positions listed in the policy. The argument was we had a handbook why duplicate it into a policy. Provost agreed to take out the positions that needed to receive approval. I have been receiving calls asking about the librarians/lecturers. What you have in this policy is just a shortening of the original policy. We should just always refer to the handbook. The ladders are listed within the librarians and lecturers. We change the name of some titles that would help distinguish between different positions. The policy passed the FSEC. This is not a hiring policy. We are trying to cover those that exist and are on campus now. We use lecturers in my department and help relieve the load.
  - Michael Banish – If you take English as the example, because of the nature of UAH and the student body, we are way out of whack in the student population. I think English is going to teach 50 plus sections in the fall plus honors. They are limited to a class size by guidelines. They have had several lecturers work for them that have never seen recognition. This isn't to replace tenure-track positions, but recognize the ones that are here.
  - Ramon Cerro – Can I show a graph that shows relates to this?
  - Kader Frendi – Do I have a motion to accept policy as it is. Michael Banish moves. Joseph Taylor seconds.
  - Ramon Cerro – This graph shows four decades on the teaching positions of the university. The full time tenure tracked has decreased in 40 years. The university has gotten bigger but faculty has decreased. The change is with tenure-tracked. The young faculty to become tenured has decreased by 50%. People that are in the pipeline to become tenure are smaller than ever. In number of years, that will

continue to decline. The number of part-time and lecturers has increased by 50%. This policy is presented to help lecturers that have an unstable position, but we are really pushing an unfair system of two classes. We have so many comments from part-timers that it is degrading to have to wait to see if they have work. The reason why it is happening goes back to the Governor of Wisconsin. The tenured-track positions disappeared and could hire lecturers at a lower cost. I will accept policy that the lecturers/part-timers have a right to be heard before dismissed, not just because of contract. Tenure isn't something you have and enjoy for life; it is just saying you can't be dismissed without due process. I ask that part-timers be given the same respect.

- Diana – I am concerned about the word Master. I am concerned about the history of that word. I have looked it up and the dictionary definition indicates it has a negative cogitation. If you say senior, I am concerned about the use of master.
- Member – Can you use a more common name?
- Tim – I think this policy would move the university in a negative way. I think of a lecturer as someone who is here for a time, not a permanent basis. I think that has been our traditional understanding of this position. I think by this policy we are institutionalizing lecturers to be here for a long time. This policy is set up to give a lecturer a career path. Looking at the graph it's alarming to me of what is going on. Lecturers speak without the benefit of tenure. We grossly underpay these people and it is obscene in my view. We need to remedy this situation, not what this policy wants to do. I vote against this. I hope it is revoked and comes back just for librarians.
- James – I understand Tim sentiments. The one concern I raise is the proposal that you are making. We are going to have lecturers here and it should include them. I certainly appreciate the insight on setting up a ladder for these people. They have no voice if they should be terminated. Their underpaying goes along with our stipend amounts to our graduate students. I suggest it should contain something about lecturers so they can voice back in an appeal process. It should recognize the thrust of a dept that it shouldn't continue taking in lecturers versus associate professors.
- Member – I see another problem with senior and master lecturer. If you take lecturers who are already overloaded and add to their plate that is a mistake.
- Diana – Is it possible to break this up because I know the librarians needs this and deal with the lecturers separately?
- Provost – Librarians have two positions. There are some that are lecturers. The senate can choose to respond to the proposal and give recommendations back.
- Member – I would like to disagree with the statement that tenure only gives the protection of dismissal.
- Kader – I am against hiring more lecturers. I have made that clear. I have lost lecturers to Research Park because this is a dead-end job. They have nothing to look forward to here. When I look at this as a Chair that is where I see the balance. The graph is frightening to see the number going down of tenured.
- Ramon – This is not an attack on lecturers. My point is not to get rid of lecturers.
- Joseph – I agree with Ramon. My concern is for my lecturers on the ground today. It would be nice to give them something that is winning teaching awards and

advancement. The due process is important, they can't be dismissed. This policy refers to the handbook about reappointment process.

- Ramon – What prevents your department from giving a contract? We are agreeing on a policy that will stand for many years. We are suggesting let's have this policy ready when it's ready. What prevents you hiring them again?
  - Joseph – It isn't an issue of hiring. It's just they have been here for 10 years with no recognition.
  - Michael Banish – Right now there is no senior lecturer. There is no promotion for them right now.
  - Tim – I think that there is a need for librarians. I think having three lecturer positions is an issue. This is a twelve year process with no permanence. I propose it go back to personnel committee and it be separated into two policies. They bring forward another policy with only lecturer with just two for only five years and add due process/protection for both librarians/lecturers. That is my motion. Ramon seconds.
  - Tim – We have the faculty handbook. Will this go into the handbook or will it be separate?
  - Provost – That was my thought. The reason it came forward was because of the length of time it takes to go through all the chapters. In response to the librarians/lecturers, this was it. The recommendation by Tim could be sent back to me with a strong recommendation that it be changed. My responsibility would be to change it and send it back. I wouldn't ignore what was said. As soon as Chapter 7 was ready it would fold in and the policy would disappear. It belongs there. The original idea that started when I came was provide something in the meantime.
  - Kader Frendi – All in favor of motion by Tim. 27 for. 2 against. 2 abstain. The decision is to send back to personnel committee.
  - Banish – I motion to suspend rules. Tim seconds. Aye carry.
- Bill 388 SGA Plus/Minus Grading
    - Ramon Cerro – The first statement is important.
    - Kader – My concern is the students have looked into this.
    - Ramon – From the statements, the students want a difference in an A and A plus. It could mean that an A is no longer a 4.0. I honestly think it is unfair. We have a generation with 4.0, then another with 4.3. The biggest issue is I am not 100% that SGA has factored everything. By survey, 53% want to stay.
    - Michael Banish – This came from students that have been applying to professional school and say they graduated with 4.0, but they say no that is 3.8. This bill has come forward because the beginning year I was approached by faculty because they wanted to use plus/minus grading. There was some faculty support. I said that the students do have a bill coming forward. Right now on banner we have a chance to put plus/minus. Some do this and some don't. We could choose to get rid of that on banner, or we could choose to give them an actual numerical value.
    - Diana – We could still use prior grades, but they could see the actual grade.
    - Michael Banish – They want to get rid of an A minus that will hinder their A minus.
    - Tim – I think we considered this 15 years ago at UAH. I have understood that if the student goes to professional school and doesn't get in. I don't see the benefit to

them. The second thing is they go to medical school with 4.0 but it goes to 3.8. Others could go to biology, and we recalculated their 4.0 to 3.8 and that hurts them. I haven't understood the argument.

- Provost – The student said that when he was a freshman he didn't understand the A minus.
- Banish – The other point to the full range scale.
- Tim – Can you pull up the last page of what I brought? I think we risk disadvantaging students with higher grades. We could potentially hurt some students that are reliant on financial help. I am thinking about this mostly about undergraduate. I could get to some current students close to graduation. Most are 3.0, but if we do the plus/minus, they go to 2.91 cant graduate. Then another has 3.0, and then has 2.96. I think we need to go to the registrar to evaluate how many students this would affect positively and negatively.
- Kader Frendi moves to extend meeting. Diana motions. Ramon seconds. Ayes carry.
- Carolyn – I don't know that I am strong for it or against it. I am more torn that if can be upon the professors decision. To me that seems unfair.
- Joseph – I agree with Carolyn. It doesn't change the fundamental problems. The bill allows people to choose and it's confusing. I would rather we do one thing all together.
- Kader Frendi – I had the same situation in engineering. We have the C or better for prerequisite. That will affect this across campus.
- Eric – I agree with Tim's view. We have to look at the whole context as to what the university is trying to accomplish. The ultimate goal is graduation rates. If we have border line students, we can send a message by giving a C, but a C minus would keep them from graduating.
- Diana – You can send that message prior with grades given out in class so that we have the both of best worlds.
- Member – I like the plus/minus grading. I use it with my students. What happens if you have an 88.9 or 89.1? What do I do in this situation? I look at the student and evaluate.
- Jeff – We need to be consistent, but I think it will hurt the students more than they think or confuse everyone. I think we should really think about this.
- Member – Any GPA that is calculated will be grandfathered?
- Kader Frendi – Yes.
- Mark – The problem now is other universities want to see it their way.
- Member – The current system is more beneficial to students. If we change to plus/minus, they get the grade regardless. We have a lot average students in my department; we will probably have to change the 3.0 graduation.
- Kader Frendi – Do I hear a motion to move to undergraduate scholastic. Tim motion. Mark second. 26 for. 0 oppose. 0 abstain. Bill goes back to undergraduate scholastic affairs.

Faculty Senate Meeting #567 lost quorum.  
April 28, 2016 2:05 p.m.