



## **FACULTY SENATE AGENDA**

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING # 513  
THURSDAY, 20 January 2011- 12:45 PM  
SHELBY CENTER ROOM 107**

- 0. Call to Order**
- 1. Administration Reports (attached)**
- 2. Dr. Larry Cantor, Director, Counseling Center & Disability Support Services**
- 3. Faculty Senate President Report (attached)**
- 4. Approval of Minutes of Meeting #512 (attached)**
- 5. Acceptance of Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report (attached)**
- 6. Committee Reports**
  - Senate Committees (see attached reports)
  - University Committees and Ad-hoc University Committees
- 7. Old Business**
  - Remaining Agenda Items from Meeting #512
    - Senate Bill 340: Eligibility to Vote in Department Chair Selection (attached; discussion ended by adjournment; motion to approve at second reading still open)
  - Status of Senate Resolutions: FSR 10/11 01-07 on the website
- 8. New Business**
  - Bills for Second Reading
    - Senate bill 350: Conflict of Interest (attached)
- 9. Adjourn**

## Notes Made Available to Faculty Senate Executive Committee Prior to the January 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting

- The President sends his regrets at not being able to attend the meeting due to his having to be at the NCAA meeting.
- Contingent on approval from Dr. Nash and the Chancellor the following items will be presented for approval at the Board of Trustees meeting in February:
  - NISP for a Master of Science in Integrated Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
  - Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Federal Contracting and Procurement Management
  - Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Supply Chain Management
  - Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Technology and Innovation Management

We have been asked to provide further clarification and information on the proposed Individualized BS degree and the proposed MS in Earth Systems Science. NISPS for both have been approved.

- I would like to thank Carolyn Sanders, Diana Bell and the instructors in the FYE program for what appears to have been a very successful start to this program. They are currently assessing results in order to further build and strengthen this program for next year.
- The University suffered a tremendous loss from the sudden death of Mr. Jim Harris. A national search is being initiated for the Athletic Director. The search committee will be chaired by Dr. John Horack and will have representation from faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community supporters of the athletic programs. Details will be announced next week.

Faculty Senate President Report  
January 13, 2010 Senate Executive Committee Meeting

1. I have received official written responses for all resolutions sent to the Provost this academic year. I have attached them in your packet. You will find these on the faculty senate webpage at summarized with the resolutions at [http://www.uah.edu/facsen/fs\\_resolution\\_status.html](http://www.uah.edu/facsen/fs_resolution_status.html). I encourage you to read through them so we can discuss any actions we might take at the next meeting.
2. Gloria Greene has sent a memo regarding the RCR training. It is attached.
3. We need to make an effort to encourage our faculty to turn in midterm grades.



Memorandum To      Deans, Center Directors, and Department Chairs

Cc:                      Dr. Jennifer English, President Faculty Senate  
                             Dr. John Horack, Vice President for Research  
                             Dr. Vistasp Karbhari, Provost

From:                    Gloria Greene, Director Sponsored Programs

Subject:                Responsible Conduct in Research Training

Date:                     January 7, 2011

It has been brought to my attention that there are a number of questions related to the federally mandated RCR training. I would like to take the opportunity to address some of these questions and clarify the requirements.

1. RCR training is an Office of Research Integrity (ORI) requirement for institutions receiving federal research funding. <http://ori.dhhs.gov/documents/rcrintro.pdf> (see pages 12-14). The National Science Foundation and National Institute of Health are the first federal agencies to require institutions to provide proof (certification at the time of proposal submission by the AOR (me) that we are in fact in compliance with ORI requirements.
2. Regardless of the funding agency, RCR training applies to everyone charging to a federally funded research contract or grant, or related cost share account. The purpose of RCR training is to ensure everyone understands and follows responsible research conduct and ethics.
3. The minimum initial RCR training required is a total of 8 hours, of which at least 4 hours must be face-to-face and 2 hours must be web-based. Counting the current on-line training course (0.5 hours web-based) and the upcoming training on January 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 (3 hours per course face-to-face), UAHuntsville can offer 6.5 hours towards the 8-hour requirement. It is not mandatory that individuals complete both the Research Misconduct and the Authorship course at this time. However, if they choose to take both courses it will get them that much closer to completing the required initial 8 hours of training.
4. Undergraduate students charging to a federally funded research contract or grant, or related cost share account are only required to complete the UAHuntsville on-line RCR training. The Provost is working with the Deans of each college to identify courses currently being offered that will satisfy the face-to-face requirement for undergraduate students. Once these courses have been identified, more information will be provided.

**Subject: Responsible Conduct in Research Training**

**Date: January 7, 2011**

5. If an individual is unable to attend the 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> face-to-face training, future training opportunities will be offered sometime in the Spring 2011. Not attending the January face-to-face training will in no way prohibit anyone from submitting proposals.

6. Please note that in January 2010 NSF required the AOR (me) certify that UAHuntsville has an RCR plan and is conducting RCR training. February 12, 2010, caused a delay. NIH is now requiring the same effective January 2011. UAHuntsville is in the process of building our RCR Program and it is our goal to have the personnel and courses in place so that anyone at anytime can complete their requirement. However, in the interim we encourage you to make use of every opportunity to complete your requirement when training is offered.

7. Until the Compliance Officer is hired, the OSP will coordinate and track RCR training for UAHuntsville. If you have any questions regarding training requirements or the number of hours you have completed, please contact me at [greeneg@uah.edu](mailto:greeneg@uah.edu) or ext. 2657 or Susan Phelan at [susan.phelan@uah.edu](mailto:susan.phelan@uah.edu) or ext. 3747.

I apologize for any confusion I may have caused. If you have additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.



**Faculty Senate Meeting  
November 18, 2010  
12:45 p.m. SC 107**

Faculty Senate Meeting 512 Called to Order—12:47 p.m.

**Present:** *Gupta, Mok, Burnett, Fong, J. Johnson, Rountree, Bollinger, Neff, Gyasi, Thomas, Sanders, Hawk, Seemann, Sitaraman, Banish, Ashour, Joiner, English, Milenkovic, Componation, Cassibry, Slegers, Moore, O'Keefe, Warboys, Magnuson, Scholz, Baird, Etzkorn, Aygun, Newman, Slater, Miller, Bonamente*

**Absent With Proxy:** *Gaede, Newman, Herrin, Mecikalski*

**Absent Without Proxy:** *Kovacs, Frederick, Wu*

**President David Williams:**

- Dr. Williams stated if you have read the papers you know the republican party has taken a stand on proration. We will watch closely. The UA System is working with the Representatives to see what the statements mean. We will learn more as the year goes on.
- Thank you for those who participated in the Education Summit on Tuesday as part of the Education week on campus. The Department of Education took a lead role. The feedback was positive.
- The FASTSAT Satellite launches tomorrow from Alaska. Many here on campus and in the community played a role in building it.
- Tomorrow on campus there will be a cyber security meeting lead by Mayor Battle. There are needs for increasing cyber security but also increasing visibility and many here are taking roles in cyber security. Sara Graves will lead the meeting tomorrow.
- Next week the Tennessee Valley Corridor group meets on campus. This partnership attempts to bring components together to bring federal money to the community. Politicians and University representatives from 5 states. Lead out of University of Tennessee, Knoxville. We have been a player for several years but this is the first time to host it on campus. Many leaders in the research community along with congressional representatives new and old will be here Monday and next week. Extending our role in the community both locally and regionally. Thanks to those that helped put various meetings on and look forward to meetings as they go on.
- Want to remind you of Neil deGrasse Tyson the speaker for Commencement.
- Question: What programs are of concern—vulnerable? Answer: no programs in jeopardy but investment in infrastructure of concern.

### **Provost Vistasp Karbhari:**

- Dr. Karbhari reported the Proposal for the BFA received preliminary approval. Will meet with the Committee of ACHE and fast track for fall. Work continues on other proposals—such as MS in ESS, MS in ISTEM, Individualized Bachelor of Science.
- We have been successful in recruiting Ingrid Hayes as the AVPES—replacing Rick Barth. She will start January 3. She is experienced. Thank you to the Search Committee for their efforts and the quick and successful search.
- We have recruited Regina Hyatt to replace Scott Walter. She comes from the University of South Florida and will start January 3. Both positions will be filled by the time spring semester begins. Thank you to the Committee and especially those who served on both Search Committees.
- Access to buildings—discussed this at length with the Deans and we are working on it and will work with Chairs and then hand something out to faculty.
- We are doing a sweep of buildings to look at the wireless network and then put an implementation plan in place for 2011. IT should complete the sweep next week.
- Drs. Boyd, Givens, and Bell will give a seminar in the Library room 111 at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow about their HERS experience.
- A Call went out to faculty regarding the Teaching Professor Conference. We received 3 applications. There will be no committee. The 3 are selected.
- Tim Newman asked if Regina Hyatt is still working on her PhD. Answer: Yes, she is defending in May.

### **Associate Provost Severn:**

- Dr. Severn thanked Carolyn Sanders for her work this fall on the first year experience program that she put together in the summer with faculty to teach. The feedback was very positive from teachers and students.
- Dr. Baird asked what does this program do?
- Dr. Carolyn Sanders explained this is a program for all freshmen to take a course—learning more about one's self, working in the classroom, working relationships, and time management. There were 630 freshmen taking the course for 1 hour of credit with 23 instructors. Will add components as each one becomes strong. Looking at adding learning communities—peer mentors—common reading. Most universities have programs like this. They can be very successful. The course is Charger Success 101.

### **Faculty Senate President Jennifer English:**

- Dr. Jennifer English stated you have my written report. Vision statement forums took place last week. Gave you the *url* to find and if you have input email to the pres@uah.edu—next meeting is Friday.
- The Board of Trustees meeting was very short. Board members needed to get to LSU for the game.

- Faculty Success Center—looking at a person from another campus to come talk about one at their campus to help us put this together. Parallel effort on teaching excellence and other faculty development-- 2 part. The Executive Committee discussed this at length. If you have input would like to hear from you on what you want to see—a Faculty Development office is not here but others have it and we want something here.
- The Executive Committee held a special meeting to talk about Research and Creative Committee. One concern for the Provost is that we may not achieve the desire we are looking for with this committee. He wants to meet again and we will come back with a report.
- The anniversary of February 12 is coming. The Provost met with key people on how to deal with this. The suggestion was to have something the second Friday of every February and to have a memorial—no permanent site yet.
- The seminar by Drs. Lynn Boyd, Sonja Brown Givens, and Diana Bell will be held tomorrow.
- Dr. English noted concern for public discussion of salary increases due to economic times. Staff and Academic Faculty lines--base about equal—4% faculty no prohibition but less than 2 or more than 10 required justification by Chair or Dean—Provost had additional used for gender equity and compression—staff was 3%--could put more if had in recurring budget. Any at VP or above must have approval of the Board.
- Bhavanai Sitaraman question: do you know the base? Dr. Jennifer English responded she did not know.
- Dr. Richard Miller asked if there was any further breakdown? Dr. Jennifer English requested it but did not have the breakdown—if it is important I can push.
- Dr. Richard Miller stated 4 or 5% for those making \$200,000 is more than faculty making \$50,000. Dr. Jennifer English stated the budget unit heads decided staff—not many got below 3%.
- Dr. Richard Miller stated it might be worth the Senate to look into—equity—someone making more getting 8% is much more than faculty--not taking away from administrators doing their job and doing it well.
- Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman stated there is a climate of suspension and distrust. There was a student initiative to ask that administrators' salaries be made transparent. If a person in administration gets 9% raise—there is no transparency of what is being given. Ask finance committee to give report directly addressing issue of administrators, faculty and take all things in consideration. What is the absolute amount of money allocated to higher administration, faculty and staff raises.
- Dr. Richard Miller stated that statements were made for faculty and staff to be at 50% of CUPA salaries for region. Look at 50 percentile and there are personnel far exceeding that and faculty at 25 and 30% so to clear up misunderstandings it makes sense to have a conversation and clear it up.
- Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman asked for information on how Academic Affairs pool is distributed.
- There needs to be a review of summer salary it has been like it is for the last 10 years.



- Dr. James Baird asked for clarification on what he was told on salary increases.
- Dr. Richard Miller stated compression and equity are problematic also. Some made a lot and were given increases and made matters worse.
- Dr. Michael Banish stated he would be blunt in addressing the real issue of an administrator and his wife got more than the faculty in liberal arts did.
- Dr. James Baird asked for clarification on the justification for less than 2% or more than 10%. Dr. Jennifer English stated that some form of above average for the department was determined using FARs.
- There was a question if the pool for VPs and above was 3%. Dr. Jennifer English stated that it was as part of the staff pool.

✚ **Minutes 511:** One correction Mike Banish-called someone to be a proxy. It was not received until after the meeting. Dr. James Baird moved, seconded by Dr. Clarke Rountree to approve the minutes.

✚ **Senate Executive Committee Report:**—Louise O'Keefe moved, seconded by Laurie Joiner to accept the Senate Executive Committee Report. There was 1 abstention.

✚ **Committee Reports:**

**Finance and Resources** —the Committee has no chair. Dr. Jennifer reported she called a meeting. Ray Pinner came and spoke about a list of things. The fund balance in the college—one way to deal with proration issues—mostly out of institutional funds. Distinguished Speaker Series should have something today. It will be an abbreviation in the spring and then accept at the end of the year for next year which should be full. Dr. Richard Miller asked if the \$1500 is an honorarium and for bringing to campus. If speaker cannot come because of the \$1500 talk to the Senate we do have a small budget. REU will come out. Talked to Bernhard Vogler.

**Personnel**—Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman reported the Committee is looking at the Handbook and will meet and figure out how to put through the entire set of revisions to the Senate

**Undergraduate Curriculum** – no additions to the report submitted.

**Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs**—no additions to the report submitted.

**Faculty and Student Development**--Dr. Ina Warboys reported no additions to the report submitted.

**Governance and Operations**-- no meeting. No report.

**Employee Benefits**—Dr. Jennifer English attended the meeting—the report is on the web. HR is doing a study of possible employee plus one healthcare option. Quick

analysis shows that the average family contract has 2.1 people and the majority of family claims are from 2-person contracts.

**Budget Committee**—This was the second meeting of the Committee on November 12 and Ray Pinner went through the audits and compliance the university has to go through—most of information is on the website which is "budget and management information office". So far meetings have been a review of how the university gets the budgets—real work will begin next semester. Dr. Jennifer English was asked how the Committee was formed.

Louise O'Keefe explained Ray Pinner sent a memo and asked her to serve. They are trying to have transparency in the budget so there is constituency. You can ask Louise if you have questions—Louise represents the Senate and the College of Nursing—there is someone from resource management, effort reporting, a dean, the secretary for student government, Andy Cling was the Chair on it but he is not going to serve so they need a replacement for him—one from research, a center person, Louise O'Keefe named the members—you can email Louise O'Keefe with questions and comments. She sent the minutes from the last meeting.

There was an announcement from Louise O'Keefe regarding the Faculty and Staff clinic in Spragins--\$5 cost --have minimal budget—charges for immunizations are what it cost the clinic—call and ask if Louise can see you. We augment private physicians. We are there in the morning—We are trying to find new space because this space is on loan for 5 years, we are asking for more money to hire more people—we are saving money for the university—sent memo to the administration to let them know—saving on multiple levels. Dr. Jennifer English commented on the new federal health care ruling regarding the dependents who can stay on a policy up to age 26. If you use FSA you cannot be reimbursed for over the counter medication. The University is self insured—we design our own policy and BCBS is advisory—could raise what we pay next year.

**Old Business—Bill 339—Dept Chair Eligibility**—adjourned during discussion last meeting—no amendments that were approved—still in debate and discussion—Dr. Jeet Gupta proposed modifying lines 23-25 and change to two parts. First part department chair cannot hold dean or associate dean position and second part—cannot simultaneously hold chair and director position without approval of majority of eligible faculty. Dr. Richard Miller proposed change the vote to 2/3 instead of majority of eligible voting faculty of department and concurrence of college dean and provost. Dr. Paul Componation asked do we need to include assistant dean to the first part. Dr. John Burnett asked if interim chair is included. Dr. Michael Banish asked for clarification of eligible faculty vote. Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman stated that after discussion last time a couple of other things came to mind—dual appointments. How people are evaluated—if chair and director do they have dual reviews—Dr. Jennifer English said—yes. There is nothing in the Handbook about that—second is compensation—two full time positions—there is nothing about compensation—could be compensated twice—nothing about limits. Dr. Jennifer English does not want the Senate body to decide compensation—Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman—there is a limit on what faculty can do and cannot do a good job when over extended—if no limits on

compensation open things up. Dr. Jennifer English wants the department faculty to decide those things—hard time letting Faculty Senate decide what compensation should be. Dr. Richard Miller—not setting compensation per se but setting limits on what can do—like consulting—limit what I can do—spread too thin and doing too many things affects performance and guidelines set and not horrible to think about to set limits. Dr. Jennifer English stated Chairs can buy. Dr. Jeet Gupta stated individuals cannot be paid more than 100%. Dr. Michael Banish stated people do get supplements to the salary. Dr. Jeet Gupta stated there needs to be a separate bill for that. Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman state she is just bringing up the issue. Dr. Clarke Rountree moved to call the question on the **amendment**. None opposed, none abstaining. P

Dr. Jeet Gupta—moved that **lines 31-32** be changed to state that elements of bill take effect immediately. 1 opposed, 2 abstaining. P

Dr. Clarke Rountree moved to call the question on the bill.

**Vote on the Bill**—2 opposed, 4 abstaining. Bill passes at second reading. P

Dr. Clarke Rountree moved the bill to **third reading**. 2 opposed. 3 abstaining. P

Dr. Jeet Gupta called the question. 1 opposed, 5 abstaining. The bill passed at third reading.

**Will go to the Provost as Resolution 10-11-06.** P

✚ **Bill 349: Non Senate Faculty to Serve on Senate Committees**. Dr. Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Dr. Clarke Rountree to forgo the resolution report and move bill 349 to third reading.

Dr. Clarke Rountree moved, seconded by Dr. Jeet Gupta to call the question. 5 abstaining.

Passed at third reading and will go to the Provost as Resolution 10-11-07. P

✚ **Bill 340: Eligibility to Vote in Department Chair Selection**.—Dr. Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Dr. Tim Newman the bill to the floor for second reading. Dr. Richard Miller—submitted original bill—Personnel Committee modified—with due respect they gutted the intention. The spirit is a good one. Need guidelines of who votes and subjective and left to department to decide—subjective aspect could be manipulated. Some Senate group define objective group to vote—Dr. Tim Newman clarify-- thought terms defined already.—Dr. Richard Miller point in subjective—eligible to vote if 2/3 department vote to enfranchise them and could be manipulated. If want to allow then do it and not left to group to enfranchise.

Dr. Jeet Gupta—just like other bill—want to maintain department and faculty in department to decide and core faculty is tenure and tenure earning.

Dr. Laurel Bollinger—don't like idea of individuals not being enfranchised—not problem in some departments but in department of English not granted tenure earning positions and have lecturers and would alter politics of department and what understand as department chair.

Jill Johnson stated the Committee discussed this extensively and worked on bill—some people on committee felt like if include research faculty to vote should allow lecturers to vote—status of lecturers from department to department very different. Lecturers in our department as much as any other faculty—what they say is considered. Some places makes sense to allow and some where lecturers outnumber tenure earning faculty or either party not as involved in function of department—discussed long time so came up with idea of allowing enfranchisement by vote as way to balance—let department decide what is appropriate. Year to year could change. Dr. Richard Miller stated it is mainly tenure and tenure earning but wanted to include others.

Dr. Roy Magnuson—stated the process is straight forward--the ambiguity is with the class or individual—is it permanent or for particular vote. Jill Johnson stated the intent would be for class—clarify in bill. Kathy Hawk asked is this for full time lecturers—ongoing? The answer was—yes. Dr. Carolyn Sanders—stated she agrees with Jeet Gupta's philosophy—way to gain position through lecturers-lecturers part of reality do need to include when have status. Dr. Jennifer English—state ECE allowed lecturers to vote separately and submitted opinion. Dr. Michael Banish—asked do we want to agree with administration to allow more lecturers –bad message to send.

Dr. Jeet Gupta stated the —department chair is appointed by the dean.—The new administration had extended the concept of clinical faculty across the board.

Dr. Richard Miller—intent not to exclude anyone—has to be benefit for voice for academics to be tenure or tenure-earning faculty and should have stronger voice in processes—if enfranchise other people—people should have demonstrated long term commitment to viability and health of department. Does not ultimately benefit. Dr. Laurel Bollinger—reduced time can appoint lecturer so can be let go quickly –not well being of faculty. Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman—not evaluated by chair—lecturer, clinical, research not same some not evaluated by chair and some are not same investment—Handbook is not clear on voting and composition of committee different in different colleges—as a body we make clear by restricting or if expand don't know consensus on all categories. Bill allows department to treat differently one group.

Dr. Tim Newman—have some language to clarify—Line 14—beginning—"any one or more or other faulty class".

Line 14—"next" before secret. Dr. Newman made this an amendment. Dr. Jeet Gupta seconded the amendment—2 opposed 4 abstaining. The amendment carries.

Dr. Jeet Gupta called the question. Failed.

Jill Johnson moved to adjourn.



**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**JANUARY 13, 2011**

**12:45 P.M. in SKH 369**

**Present: Clarke Rountree, Paul Componation, Ina Warboys, Letha Etzkorn, Carmen Scholz, Bhavani Sitaraman, Vistasp Karbhari, John Severn, Jennifer English, Laurie Joiner**

✚ **Provost Karbhari's Report**—President Williams sends regrets. He is at the NCAA meeting. As you see from the notes I sent you we have four items on the agenda for the Board Meeting. Three certificates in business, and the NISPs for the MSISTEM.

The System has asked for further clarification on the other proposals—the MESS and the individualized BS. These should go forward in April.

✚ As you have heard we started the FYE. It seems to have gone well—faculty, staff, and others took part as instructors. Diana and Carolyn are going over the assessment and we will strengthen the program for next year. There will be some classes in spring but they will be smaller. We will keep in touch with students in the spring so they do not disappear.

✚ As you heard—the university suffered a loss when Jim Harris died. We will be starting a search for a replacement. Dr. John Horack will be chairing the Committee. There will be representatives from all parts of the university and from outside the university—further details will be announced next week by the President.

✚ Dr. Jennifer English asked if Dr. Vistasp Karbhari could give an update on the DL and IT and the status of things. Dr. Vistasp Karbhari reported that we are making changes in IT—we should be able to give an update by next meeting. The Deans are studying the report on DL and looking at different parts as subcommittees and we will report soon. As soon as we finish we will give you an update. At this point give any input to your Dean.

✚ Dr. Jennifer English reported that several Faculty feel they have not been given enough guidance about classes missed Monday and Tuesday. Dr. Vistasp Karbhari responded that faculty should contact their chair and dean and it should be handled by departments and colleges. We will let the faculty make those decisions—go to your chair and dean. Some deans have contacted faculty and some chairs have done so as well. There will be no change in the calendar. There may be minor changes to the last day to add a class but it will be handled on a case by case basis. We will hold to the schedule.

- ✦ Dr. Jennifer English reported some Faculty are concerned if they are teaching a section and want to make it up and others teaching another section of the same course do not want to make up the class there will be no consistency. Dr. Karbhari stated the faculty should coordinate with the Chair. Dr. Jennifer English asked about the last day to drop. These will be handled on a case by case basis.
- ✦ Dr. Carmen Scholz stated that when a faculty member tried to email the class using the email button in banner, it did not work and he was banned from the internet for 24 hours because he tried to spam internet. Dr. Vistasp Karbhari asked Dr. Scholz to send more details to see what can be done. Dr. Vistasp Karbhari would like to find out the real problem Dr. Scholz thinks 80ish or 86ish is the cut off for sending the email. Dr. Scholz made the requests to expand that quota.
- ✦ Dr. Clarke Rountree stated he thinks what Dr. Vistasp Karbhari is proposing sounds like it will take a long time. Dr. Vistasp Karbhari responded that it will not. Cards distributed now are passed around so when they log in there is no way to know who is in the Library and who is not. If anyone does it and is caught then can cancel the card—but if they transfer it and then they are just told don't do it then we have no way to know. Dr. Vistasp Kabhari stated we need a comprehensive system. Some are charged one fee and others are charged another. Have to have someone to check—have to have staff member to check. Show government ID and leave it and retrieve it when they leave. If individuals do not have ID then would have to use ID and be checked. Dr. Jennifer English talked about limiting the time on the computer in the Library if individuals are not students, faculty, or someone with a charger card. There is a maximum amount of time on the computer then the individual is blocked out.
- ✦ Dr. Paul Componation stated that intellectual property is an area of concern for some folks.
- ✦ **Senate President's Report**. Dr. Jennifer English stated the Committee has her report. Dr. Clarke Rountree and Dr. Jennifer English is working in parallel regarding not turning in midterm grades. We will send something from the Faculty Senate to Deans to ask them to remind faculty to send in midterm grades.

Dr. Carmen Scholz asked what is the significance of midterm grades. Dr. Jennifer English stated there is a report from the Registrar that comes out of banner. There was a question regarding Should it be 100 and 200 or just 100 level courses? Dr. Paul Componation stated some think it should be for all levels. Maybe it should be optional for all. Dr. Clarke Rountree stated it was originally designed as S or U but some like giving grades. We could just report U's if you do above 200.

Dr. Jennifer English asked Dr. Rountree if his committee can generate a bill to report U for all courses—everyone else does not get one. Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman suggests a message with the U telling them what it means. The Student Success Center gets a list and calls all students. We will have to talk to SSC to see if they can handle more than just freshmen. Check to see if they can handle it. Use the words "helping with retention". May have to send email to all students

explaining that this will happen. That way they are touched and said here is change. Maybe we should have a list of faculty not turning in midterms same as for finals.

✚ Gloria Greene sent out a message about **RCR training**. It is attached to this report. The first memo was not informative. I Spoke to Dr. John Horack and the Provost and the Provost is wanting to establish something over an 18 month period. The Provost is very sensitive and we will see changes as we go along. Don't worry about not submitting proposals if cannot make this set of training. If you can go you are encouraged to go but they should not be so heavy handed and it will not likely go away. Try to explain where the requirement is coming from and the memo was a start but it is not finished. Dr. Jennifer English stated the faculty should be receiving information from your dean—most have not—we will see what we can do to make it more accessible. Provost wants to see RCR more friendly to faculty.

✚ **Resolution responses.**

**Resolution Number 4**—Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman stated it seems "a" is affirmative, "b" and "c" are looking into notification, "d" is notification, "e" is formal notification. She stated she did not see "not agree". Others stated it is there, all responses are there. It looks like there are request for more information. Dr. Jennifer English stated it is our job to keep in front of these. I speak to Provost about them regularly. The Smoking Policy was brought up and Dr. Jennifer English stated this is in the hands of Mike Finnegan. We don't know how hard to push this issue. The ash trays have to go. Dr. English stated she does keep in touch with Mike Finnegan on this. She stated we may have to get Ray Pinner involved in this.

**Resolution Number 1**—This one we have taken as far as we can take it at this point—building access is in the hands of the deans now.

**Resolution Number 2**—research committee—we need to make an appointment to discuss this again. Should we try to meet Tuesday. Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman believes this is best addressed by those with research interests—those who are research active—to just have us (the Senate Executive Committee) is not best. Dr. Carmen Scholz stated she is the faculty representative to the Research Council and there is not much pertaining to faculty at the meetings. Matters pertaining to faculty do not really make their radar. Dr. Jennifer English stated this bill is larger and deals with interacting with the Research Council and the Office of the Vice President for Research. The Provost does not want to create a committee that still does not deal with the real problem. The Provost is sensitive to our concerns. We should have four representatives on the Research Council not just one. We need more people from the Senate willing to serve. Dr. Jennifer English stated there could be non- Senate faculty on this. Dr. Clarke Rountree stated there could be an ad-hoc committee with interested parties—let them have a series of meetings with the Provost and the Vice President for Research and hash these things out. Dr. Jennifer English stated that with your (Senate Executive Committee's) permission she will write up something for next week's meeting for an ad hoc committee. There will be 3 members from the Senate and 3 non- Senate. Dr. Jennifer English will write it this up. The representatives will be

from research intensive areas. Dr. Jennifer English will serve as ex-officio. She will write up something and send it around and then present it to the Senate.

Dr. English requested to move on and come back to the other bill responses. Will leave responses as items under old business per Dr. Jennifer English.

✚ **Finance and Resource.** Chair of this Committee is still vacant. Dr. Jennifer English reported she sent out a request for proposals for the Distinguished Speaker Series. The Committee just received one proposal. She will send a reminder and extend the deadline and see what they get. Dr. English will talk with the Provost and see if she can get 9 instead of 7 approved. Dr. Jennifer English stated we have \$7000 available to us in the Senate Budget if departments or colleges do not have funds we could supplement a small amount. Dr. Ina Warboys stated she is not crazy about that. Dr. Jennifer English stated she thinks there are not many responses because of the short deadline. She thinks we will get more next year. She stated she will talk to the Provost about increasing the funds or offering a \$500 travel allowance. Dr. Sitaraman asked if the Committee has thought about aligning with the Honors forum to help get proposals. Dr. English asked should we change it. Dr. Sitaraman and others stated no, just piggy back it on other programs, i.e. honors program, humanities, history, etc.

The REU program will be announced. Dr. English stated she and the Provost have not gotten together to get this worked out. The REU will be late and will be a rush. Dr. Vogler said he will relinquish the directorship if more students could be funded. Dr. English stated she does not think we need take that step right now.

✚ Dr. English stated she sent information about faculty salaries. Salary information will be updated this semester. If you want to know exact increases you can figure it out. The lowest percentage increase was engineering, liberal arts had the highest percentage. The increase was more than 4% for faculty. Associates got the largest percentage. Open positions--the money from these was available in the pool. The dean could decide how to distribute this money. Some salary compression was dealt with.

✚ **Governance and Operations:** Dr. Jeet Gupta—not here—he sent some changes to the beginning of the Bylaws—we have track changes and then edits. Dr. Paul Compton stated the Committee worked on this quite a while. We felt like we did all we could as a Committee so there are a couple of things that we were not unanimous on. We wanted to pass it on to the full Senate and have a discussion at the next meeting. Dr. English stated we will give these out and ask for questions and let Jeet Gupta and the Committee decide what to do after that.

✚ **Personnel:** Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman stated the Committee met before the break. We have the Handbook we are looking at Chapters 1,2,3,4 and 9. Since no one has the context for how the changes were made we don't know if the deletions will come up somewhere else or not. At this point some additions are welcome but people did not want to act on them because there was no background or track changes etc. The Committee has a problem with attendance. One person dropped from Nursing and another person is not showing up. Dr. English requested that Dr. Sitaraman let Dr. English know who is not attending by email and Dr. English will send an



email about the importance of attending. Dr. Sitaraman reported that at this point they may work chapter by chapter. Dr. English requested they do the same thing as with the Bylaws—send the information to the Senate and then submit a resolution. If you have changes to make—do that on your copy and we will post with tracked edits the Committee makes. On these chapters there are probably no major changes but in Chapter 7 there may be more. May have to deal with Chapter 7 section by section. Now we could draw in more people from the outside. Dr. English will send an email to the deans asking for someone to participate with the Personnel Committee. Dr. English will get Chapter 7 to the Personnel Committee. Dr. English stated the Committee could ask Linda Vaughan and Cindy Gramm to come to the Committee meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup>.

- ✦ **Faculty and Student Development.** Dr. Ina Warboys reported they are doing work to visit universities regarding centers of excellence. They are looking at Sanford and Vanderbilt. Dr. Warboys stated in her report is the close of investigating of OSP this is the report. Somewhere in the notes it should be stated this is finished. Dr. English will put this as old business as the final report on the OSP investigation. The recommendation is that the College of Science needs administrative support in this area. Dr. English will talk to the Provost about the findings. Dr. English will report back to you on the findings.
- ✦ **Curriculum Committee**--did not make the January meeting. Some items have been approved.
- ✦ **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs.** Dr. Clarke Rountree reported the Committee worked on U grades, military leave, and adjunct majors. Some Deans have waived some requirements with double majors—make it optional. Hope to pass a bill to waive the first 3 semesters or the 32 hours for second degree. We should have 3 bills on the agenda for the February Executive Committee Meeting.
- ✦ **Dr. English has a bill from Timothy Newman**--Conflict of Interest Amendment to the Faculty Handbook. Dr. English has permission to change the bill if needed. There was discussion regarding the "Be It Further Resolved" Dr. Clarke Rountree moved seconded by Paul Componation to delete lines 7-11 and just leave the rest as is. Dr. Clarke Rountree stated the first line should state "immediate family" This bill will go on the agenda as Senate Bill 350 for the next meeting.
- ✦ Larry Cantor will speak at the next meeting in preparation for the upcoming Memorial Ceremony.
- ✦ There was some discussion regarding who administers the PhD in Modeling and Simulation. Dr. English will talk with the Provost about this.

## Finance Committee Report

Submitted by Jennifer English

We did not meet in December.

- The smaller spring 2011 Distinguished Speaker Series was announced. At most, four speakers will be funded. The proposal deadline is January 7<sup>th</sup>. We will send reminder emails a few times prior to the deadline. The announcement for the 2011-12 Distinguished Speaker Series, which will fund the typical 10 speakers, will be announced in February, with a due date sometime in April.
- The REU program will be announced soon. Dr. Vogler and Dr. English met to discuss his role in the selection process. He stated that he would gladly relinquish his “director” role if more students could be funded. Dr. English will talk to the Provost about this. An announcement will be made shortly.
- Some unofficial faculty salary/raise pool data will be presented at the meeting.

The University of Alabama Huntsville

Faculty Senate Sub-committee -Faculty and Student Development Committee

Meeting Date: November 19, 2010 Time: 1:30 pm Location: Salmon Library 1<sup>st</sup> floor common area

Attendance: Mohamed Ashour, Roy Magnuson, Wai Mok, Carmen Scholz and, Ina Warboys

Topic	Discussion	Decisions	Responsible	Date Due
OSP Investigation Report	This was an assignment last year to the Faculty and Student Development Committee	Carmen Scholz completed her research concerning issues of procurement in the research process.	Carmen's report is attached for senate	Project completed.
Three Teaching Excellence Centers to visit	Gathering information on three centers the committee would like to visit for further information on how to proceed with our own center development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mohamed Ashour submitted a list of places reasonable accessible for visit. Committee will select 3.  <a href="#">University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa</a>  <a href="#">Samford University (Birmingham)</a>  <a href="#">Auburn University</a>  <a href="#">University of Arkansas (Fayetteville)</a>  <a href="#">University of Arkansas (little Rock)</a>  <a href="#">University of Central Arkansas</a>  <a href="#">University of Georgia</a>  <a href="#">Georgia Tech</a>  <a href="#">Georgia State University</a>  <a href="#">University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</a>  <a href="#">University of North Carolina at Wilmington</a>  <a href="#">Vanderbilt University (Tennessee)</a> </li> <li>Wai Mok will submit criteria proposal for faculty to work on the teaching excellence center in academic year 2011 – 1012</li> <li>Ina Warboys will submit speaker options for end of academic year conference 2011.</li> </ul>		Jan. next meeting
Adjourned	2:45 pm	NEXT MEETING – based upon teaching dates	Ina Warboys	TBD

## **Report: OSP Investigation**

In Fall of 2009, the senate has been asked to look into the operation of OSP with respect to supporting PI's in winning grants and in conducting the research/administering the grant after an award has been granted.

The committee started looking into this matter at the end of the 2009 Fall semester.

Work was suspended following the February shooting. The report was concluded by the beginning of the 2010 Fall semester.

### Observations:

Observations are based on some written communication received by the committee, and on conversations that one committee member (Dr. Scholz) had with faculty from the Colleges of Science and Engineering.

1. Upon polling all faculty by e-mail on their experience and satisfaction in working with OSP it was observed that only faculty from the College of Science responded. Their responses typically contained complaints and/or negative assessments.
2. There was no e-mail response from any other College.
3. Opinions were gathered from faculty in the College of Engineering by conversations
4. Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts indicated that their interaction with OSP was minimal.
5. When comparing complaints "pre-award" vs. "post-award" it was obvious, that the complaints regarding the "post-award" phase were more severe.
6. No response was obtained from the Colleges of Business and Nursing

### Specifically:

On the pre-award phase:

- While the funding agents requests only 'regular' budgets, UAH requires very detailed budgets, which are for internal use only (e.g. hotel and flight information for the travel-budget; detailed plan on money to be spent on basic supplies chemicals)
- Proposals have to be carried (literally) across campus by the PI to get signatures
- Statistics on the university are not available from any office (e.g. percentage minority students, number of students graduating per year and trends in graduation, percentage undergraduate students who go on to graduate school, percentage female students, all these data are needed for any given discipline) These data are typically needed for NSF proposals.

On the post-award phase:

- Faculty is overwhelmed with fiscal responsibilities (budget statements as provided through BANNER are completely incomprehensible)

- Faculty is unable to communicate with administration on reporting responsibilities (e.g. the effort reporting system and its rationale are not understandable)
- Faculty has a hard time working with Purchasing through the BANNER system (e.g. introducing new vendors causes problems, orders cannot be placed towards the end of the month because they will “fall out”, if a PI disapproves a purchase on BANNER, it is NOT automatically deleted, the PI is required to call Procurement and verify this disapproval, otherwise the money for this order will be held as encumbered)
- Faculty feels completely lost when it comes to the fiscal matters.

Light was brought to the situation, when a colleague in the College of Engineering left UAH, and Dr. Scholz was asked to take responsibility for the students and grants that this colleague had. There is a completely different situation in this Engineering Department when it comes to administering grants. All the issues listed in the post-award phase as problems are taken care of by a staff assistant. The staff assistant is the point of contact for all communication with OSP, and has a track record with the OSP administrator. In addition, the staff assistant places all orders and deals with Purchasing, in fact, students/post-docs don't even place orders in BANNER. For the first time at this university Dr. Scholz was provided with an understandable budget statement, that simply listed the amounts available in each category (salary, consumables, equipment, travel etc). In fact the staff assistant made suggestions for budget changes. All communications with the funding agencies (transfer of PI) were accomplished by the staff assistant and the OSP administrator, including the preparing of letters.

Upon further investigation it was found that all departments in the College of Engineering and the College of Business have staff assistants who are in charge of administering research grants, naturally, Research Centers also have administrative support.

The College of Science does not have staff assistants who are tasked with working on research grants in its departments. Ms. Collins does not fulfill these tasks, she is a liaison with OSP who provides support in the pre-award phase, specifically, she helps with preparing budgets. She also communicates question and requests to OSP.

This experience seems to explain why all complaints about OSP come from the College of Science. Rather than being complaints about OSP, these complaints seem to be expressions of frustration with being overwhelmed with administrative processes in the post-award phase.

Equally, the frustration of the OSP administrator(s) who deal with the College of Science is understandable, as they are constantly confronted with a broad spectrum of requests from individual professors who are frustrated, opinionated and not well versed in administrative processes.

In summary, the problems with OSP, which the senate was asked to investigate, seem to be College of Science specific and seem to be mostly due to the fact that the faculty in

this College has no administrative support. It is the believe of this committee that, if PI's in the College of Science were to have the same administrative support system that is in place in the College of Engineering (and Business), frustration with and complaints about OSP would diminish significantly.

1 **I. The Role of the Faculty Senate in the Governance System**

2  
3 **A.1.1 Preamble**

4 ~~–~~The basic structure of the UAHuntsville (henceforth called *University*) Faculty Senate, as well as its relationship to  
5 other University~~AH~~ bodies, is set forth in the Governance System proposed on March 7, 1973, as adopted with  
6 amendments by the President of the University on April 3, 1973. These by-laws set forth the specific mechanisms  
7 by which the Senate carries out its tasks under the Governance System. It is the guiding principle of the shared  
8 governance recognized by the University and the University of Alabama System that the faculty and the  
9 administration shall collaborate in major decisions affecting the faculty at large of the University. The nature of that  
10 collaboration, shared as appropriate with students and staff, varies according to the nature of the matters under  
11 consideration.

12  
13  
14 ~~B. The authority of the Senate derives from the Office of the President of the University and exists as a feature of~~  
15 ~~the bond of mutual trust which serves as the basis for the general system of governance for the faculty, student body,~~  
16 ~~and administration.~~

17  
18 **C.1.2 Role of Faculty Senate**

19 The Faculty Senate represents the faculty regarding university-wide academic affairs, and shall act as the official  
20 voice of the general faculty of the University regarding areas of faculty interest and concern including the protection  
21 of academic freedom and on matters involving the well being of the general academic community and the institution  
22 as a whole. All Faculty Senators shall represent and be concerned for the welfare of the entire institution regardless  
23 of their college and department affiliations.

24  
25  
26 **1.3 Representation of Faculty**

27 ~~–~~The Faculty Senate is the permanent body representing the faculty that initiates, advises, and recommends action  
28 for the formulation of university policies and procedures in matters pertaining to institutional purpose, general  
29 academic considerations, curricular matters, university resources, and faculty personnel (appointments, promotion,  
30 and tenure). All ~~issues of university governance~~ major decisions affecting ~~the~~ faculty at large should ~~go before the~~  
31 ~~full~~ be made in collaboration with Faculty Senate ~~before implementation. Senators are the voice~~ These bylaws and  
32 the rules of the Faculty Senate provide a system for participation of the University faculty in the governance of the  
33 University.

#### 35 ~~D~~1.4 Faculty Senate Communications

36 ~~–~~Issues of the faculty at large may be presented to the Faculty Senate by: its own members and committees, the  
37 University Administration, the student governance body, faculty petition, the Graduate Council, the Staff Senate,  
38 and any other appropriate University body. The Provost and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs  
39 (subsequently named: Provost / ~~VPA~~AEVPAA) will serve as the primary point of contact and conduit of  
40 information between the Faculty Senate and the University Administration. It is expected that the Faculty Senate  
41 will also enjoy direct and open communication with all other officers of the University, including the President.

#### 43 ~~E~~1.5 Faculty Senate Recommendations

44 ~~–~~It is expected that most recommendations of the Faculty Senate will be sent directly to the Provost / ~~VPA~~AEVPAA  
45 for further action by the University Aadministration. The Senate reserves the right to communicate with and submit  
46 recommendations to any university official or committee it deems appropriate, including the President of the  
47 University. ~~The Senate expects a timely response to its actions.~~ Once information is presented to the President of  
48 the University, the Provost, or other administrative bodies, the faculty senate expects a written acknowledgement  
49 within 5 working days and a written response within 15 working days. When recommendations from the Faculty  
50 Senate require the review and / or approval of other university personnel or bodies (e.g., VP's, Council of Deans),  
51 the Senate expects to be given suitable opportunity to provide its own representatives to meet with these persons or  
52 bodies to discuss the Senate's recommendations and to respond to any concerns, questions, or suggestions regarding  
53 the recommendations. When faculty senate is asked to respond to a query, it will discuss the said query at its next



54 scheduled meeting to construct a response. All minutes will be prepared for distribution to Faculty Senators prior to  
55 the senate's next schedule meeting and once approved will be made available to the full faculty within 15 working  
56 days.

## 57

### 58 1.6 Selection of Academic Administrators

59 The Faculty Senate will participate in the selection of academic administrators and in alterations of the academic  
60 administrative structure as well as be notified of proposed changes within 20 working days in all other university  
61 governance structures (including changes in position).

### 62

### 63

### 64 ~~F~~1.7 Faculty Senate Committees

65 ~~–~~The Faculty Senate may at its option delegate initial review of matters to committees of the Faculty Senate. Such  
66 committees are subordinate to the Senate. At its option, the Faculty Senate may create such committees as are  
67 necessary to facilitate its work. The Senate is self- regulating with respect to its structure and purposes, responding  
68 to changes within the University in a manner which it finds appropriate.

### 69

### 70 1.8 Review and Revision of Senate Bylaws

71 ~~An annual~~A regular review of the governance system will be a function of the Senate with a full review and revision  
72 of the senate bylaws to be completed once every three years.

73

74 ~~G. The Faculty Senate will participate in the selection of academic administrators and in alterations of the~~  
75 ~~academic administrative structure as well as be notified of proposed changes (in a timely manner) in all other~~  
76 ~~university governance structures (including changes in position).~~

77  
78

## I. The Role of the Faculty Senate in the Governance System

### 1.1 Preamble

The basic structure of the UAHuntsville (henceforth called *University*) Faculty Senate, as well as its relationship to other University bodies, is set forth in the Governance System proposed on March 7, 1973, as adopted with amendments by the President of the University on April 3, 1973. These by-laws set forth the specific mechanisms by which the Senate carries out its tasks under the Governance System. It is the guiding principle of the shared governance recognized by the University and the University of Alabama System that the faculty and the administration shall collaborate in major decisions affecting the faculty at large of the University. The nature of that collaboration, shared as appropriate with students and staff, varies according to the nature of the matters under consideration.

### 1.2 Role of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate represents the faculty regarding university-wide academic affairs, and shall act as the official voice of the general faculty of the University regarding areas of faculty interest and concern including the protection of academic freedom and on matters involving the well being of the general academic community and the institution as a whole. All Faculty Senators shall represent and be concerned for the welfare of the entire institution regardless of their college and department affiliations.

### 1.3 Representation of Faculty

The Faculty Senate is the permanent body representing the faculty that initiates, advises, and recommends action for the formulation of university policies and procedures in matters pertaining to institutional purpose, general academic considerations, curricular matters, university resources, and faculty personnel (appointments, promotion, and tenure). All major decisions affecting faculty at large should be made in collaboration with Faculty Senate. These bylaws and the rules of the Faculty Senate provide a system for participation of the University faculty in the governance of the University.

28 **1.4 Faculty Senate Communications**

29 Issues of the faculty at large may be presented to the Faculty Senate by: its own members and committees, the  
30 University Administration, the student governance body, faculty petition, the Graduate Council, the Staff Senate,  
31 and any other appropriate University body. The Provost and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs  
32 (subsequently named: Provost / EVPAA) will serve as the primary point of contact and conduit of information  
33 between the Faculty Senate and the University Administration. It is expected that the Faculty Senate will also enjoy  
34 direct and open communication with all other officers of the University, including the President.

35

36 **1.5 Faculty Senate Recommendations**

37 It is expected that most recommendations of the Faculty Senate will be sent directly to the Provost / EVPAA for  
38 further action by the University Administration. The Senate reserves the right to communicate with and submit  
39 recommendations to any university official or committee it deems appropriate, including the President of the  
40 University. Once information is presented to the President of the University, the Provost, or other administrative  
41 bodies, the faculty senate expects a written acknowledgement within 5 working days and a written response within  
42 15 working days. When recommendations from the Faculty Senate require the review and / or approval of other  
43 university personnel or bodies (e.g., VP's, Council of Deans), the Senate expects to be given suitable opportunity to  
44 provide its own representatives to meet with these persons or bodies to discuss the Senate's recommendations and to  
45 respond to any concerns, questions, or suggestions regarding the recommendations. When faculty senate is asked to  
46 respond to a query, it will discuss the said query at its next scheduled meeting to construct a response. All minutes  
47 will be prepared for distribution to Faculty Senators prior to the senate's next schedule meeting and once approved  
48 will be made available to the full faculty within 15 working days.

49

50 **1.6 Selection of Academic Administrators**

51 The Faculty Senate will participate in the selection of academic administrators and in alterations of the academic  
52 administrative structure as well as be notified of proposed changes within 20 working days in all other university  
53 governance structures (including changes in position).

54

55 **1.7 Faculty Senate Committees**

56 The Faculty Senate may at its option delegate initial review of matters to committees of the Faculty Senate. Such  
57 committees are subordinate to the Senate. At its option, the Faculty Senate may create such committees as are  
58 necessary to facilitate its work. The Senate is self- regulating with respect to its structure and purposes, responding  
59 to changes within the University in a manner which it finds appropriate.

60

61 **1.8 Review and Revision of Senate Bylaws**

62 A regular review of the governance system will be a function of the Senate with a full review and revision of the  
63 senate bylaws to be completed once every three years.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report  
December 8, 2010

- Approved new course
  - FIN 410 Financial Issues in Entrepreneurship
- Approved New Programs
  - BSBA Marketing Major: Entrepreneurship Concentration
  - BSBA Management Major: Entrepreneurship Concentration

## Minutes for Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee

12:45-2:05 p.m., Thursday, January 6, 2011

Present: Clarke Rountree (Chair), Eric Seeman, Dongsheng Wu; Michael Banish  
Absent: Kristen Herrin

The committee met with the Registrar, Janet Waller, to discuss processes used for restricting the registration of students on academic warning and to discuss adjunct majors and how they would be counted in headcounts.

The committee learned that the Student Success Center is now meeting with all students who are on academic warning to coach them. This alleviated the committee's concern that some students were registering without advice after falling below the threshold for academic warning. Although some concern was raised over the differences in college policies concerning restrictions on registration absent advising, the committee believes that the differences in policies across colleges may reflect differences in needs, and is perfectly appropriate.

On the issue adjunct majors—those seeking second majors from other colleges without finishing all general education requirements—Ms. Waller reported that the Deans may approve secondary majors without the completion of the college's general education requirements. (This will not work in the professional colleges, which have specific requirements necessary to meet accreditation standards.) The committee decided to propose a bill to address problems with students attempting second majors across colleges, to encourage such cross-disciplinary work. Clarke Rountree will develop this.

The committee was informed by the Registrar that faculty compliance with requests to submit midterm grades is low. The committee and Senate might consider ways to remedy this problem.

Michael Banish proposed that the committee write a bill ensuring an easy withdrawal and return of tuition to students called away for military duty. He will write this bill.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE FACULTY SENATE

## Senate Bill 340: Eligibility to Vote in Department Chair Selection

---

Bill History: Submitted to FSEC 08/17/10 and sent to personnel committee  
Passed first reading at FSEC on 11/11/10

1 **WHEREAS:** Tenured and tenure-track faculty have primary responsibility for  
2 teaching, research and scholarship excellence in an academic  
3 department, and

4 **WHEREAS:** Tenured and tenure-track faculty have a long-term investment in the  
5 well-being and growth of the department's academic mission, and

6 **WHEREAS:** Other academic personnel including lecturers, clinical and research  
7 faculty may have also demonstrated substantial involvement and interest  
8 in the department's academic mission,

9 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:**

10 That in addition to tenured and tenure-track faculty eligible to vote in the  
11 Department Chair selection process, lecturers, clinical faculty, and  
12 research faculty may be eligible to vote if a two-third majority of the  
13 department's tenured and tenure-track faculty vote to enfranchise  
14 lecturers, clinical faculty, or research faculty to participate in the secret  
15 ballot for Chair selection.

16 **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:**

17 That the Faculty Handbook and all other relevant University policy  
18 documents be amended to reflect this clarification to voting eligibility;

19 **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:**

20 That the elements of this bill take effect immediately.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE  
FACULTY SENATE**

**Senate Bill 350 : Conflict of Interest Amendment to the Faculty  
Handbook**

---

Bill History: 1/13/11 Reviewed/amended/passed first reading by FSEC

1

1 **WHEREAS,**           There exists an obvious conflict of interest when immediate family  
2                           members of an Administrator (such as a department chair) are enrolled in  
3                           courses taught by members of the academic unit directly supervised by that  
4                           Administrator

5 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

6                           That effective immediately, any Administrator in such a situation must  
7                           immediately report in writing such conflicts of interest to their supervisor.