
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 20, 2020
12:50 P.M. BAB 204

Present: Kevin Bao, Dilcu Barnes, Joey Taylor, Rolf Goebel, Candice Lanius, Jose Betancourt, Andrei Gandila, Christina Steidl, Mike Banish, Sherri Messimer, Kader Frendi, Christina Carmen, Ron Bolen, Elizabeth Barnby, Sheila Gentry, Darlene Showalter, Lori Lioce, Melissa Foster, Maria Steele, Jeff Weimer, Tim Newman, Shangbing Ai, Paul Whitehead, Sarah Roller, Ron Schwertfeger, Laird Burns, Carmen Scholz, Fat Ho, Eric Mendenhall, Harry Delugach, Seyed Sadeghi

Absent with Proxy: Jose Betancourt, Carolyn Sanders, Jeremy Fischer, Gabe Xu, Katherine Morrison, Monica Dillihunt

Absent without Proxy: Tobias Mendelson, Sophia Marinova, David Allen, Amy Guerin, Shuang Zhao, Jeff Neuschatz, Abdullahi Salman, Seong-Moo Yoo, Earl Wells, Leiqui Hu, Huaming Zhang, Gang Li

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: President Darren Dawson

- **Faculty Senate President Laird Burns called the meeting to order at 12:52 pm.**
- **Meeting Review:**
 - **Bill 446** voted to be sent back to FSEC.
 - **Bill 447** passed **Second Reading with amendments.**
 - **Chapter 6** voted to be tabled until the next meeting.
- **Approve Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes #604.** Mike Banish moves. Rolf Goebel seconds.
 - Laird – We made a few corrections. Ron, you had some corrections. Do you want to discuss those?
 - Ron – I emailed six possible changes to consider. Change “too” to “to”. In Q&A to Ron Gray, what could “we”?
 - Laird - Motion consider Ron’s amendments. Mike moves. Carmen seconds. Ayes carry. All in favor of amended minutes. Ayes carry.
- **Accept FSEC Report from February 13, 2020.** Mike Banish moves. Carmen Scholz seconds. **All in favor. Ayes carry.**
- **Administrative Reports**
 - Provost Christine Curtis
 - Shelby Center basement is delayed. There are two sump pumps running out on the west side. They are bringing in a team to figure out what we can do. We have bids out to renovate the facility. We still have the bids, but we can’t move until we deal with the rising ground water. I talked with Todd Barre and the experts in the area seem to think something has changed underground. That is the latest as of this

morning, we just have to wait to see what experts say. The water isn't in the building. They have drilled holes to relieve pressure under the slab.

- Mike – Is water inside the building?
- Provost – Not at this point. They are doing everything they can to prevent that.
- Kader – Is the building structurally sound?
- Provost – Yes.
- Laird – I asked President Dawson if instead of sheetrock we use other material that can withstand water. He said they are considering that for the basement.
- Provost – We don't have answers just an update to status.
- The Dean of Science - four candidates have passed through the vetting process and will be coming for interviews.
- You should all be working within your colleges on the strategic plan. It is due May 15th.
 - Mike – What about Morton?
 - Provost – It is on schedule and furnishings have been ordered. Construction should be done May, furnishings in by June.
 - Carmen – There was a dispute with faculty in Morton. Has that been resolved?
 - Provost - I haven't heard anything in the last couple of weeks. When facilities are developed like this one, new furnishings are provided.
 - Carmen – So they can't bring furnishings?
 - Provost – No, because that leaves rooms behind empty and we want continuity. There will be as many bookshelves in the offices that they can accommodate. The offices aren't the size of the ones in older buildings.
 - Carmen – So I can assume it is resolved?
 - Provost – I am not saying that. The rooms aren't large but we have to make sure there is room to get out in case of fire.
 - Joey – The offices are decent sizes. It seems that we are only allowed two more bookcases. We need more than that with all the books we have. I have some cases that I purchased myself and those can't be brought.
 - Provost – I will make sure that we have as many that can fit.

➤ **Officer/Committee Reports**

○ Laird Burns, President

- We had a meeting with the Provost, President-Elect Newman, and President Dawson. We discussed several issues with those offices that don't have budget analyst. I believe that is being taken care of within Chapter 5. I received a first cut of the structure of the salary analysis. One challenge we have as a senate is we have four past senate presidents to look at the fact that we are below the median on salaries. We had a UAH Budget and Planning meeting. We went through the budget process and timelines. We discussed the faculty senate wanting a voice in that. We agree to three meetings a year. We may want to do a joint optional meeting between us and the staff senate. We want to stay informed on the process and where we have a voice. The ADA Advisory Committee meeting is still being pushed. We talked about financial aid scholarships. One question that came up in the budget process was spending more money on scholarships than budgeted. We

want to have a say in that. Campus Planning still supposed to be happening. Faculty 180 is a useful system but it is hard to find some data within it. The Provost is working on providing information to help with that.

- Rolf – Faculty and staff official travel is not encouraged due to the coronavirus. What about students?
- David Berkowitz – This includes students as well. This is system wide. We are keeping track of the issue and are SOS system keeps track as well. We monitor daily any viruses or safety issues.
- Tim Newman, President-Elect
 - I did receive a report from colleagues on campus in regards to a classroom instructor that traveled back to UAH from China after the Chinese New Year. I heard that the individual was sent into the classroom before the 14 day period was over. Laird and I communicated this fact to the Administration.
 - TIAA Cref issue - Starting in August there was a week delay in posting. Todd Barre ran this to ground. The system for putting our money in had issues, but those issues should be addressed now; monies taken out of our pay should appear at TIAA the same day or within a few days now.
 - On Faculty 180, I had a concern from an individual about reappointment. Some directions in Faculty 180 makes it sound like we have changed our process. The process is still the same. The committee should meet in person and create the letter then load in 180. I suggested a memo be created and sent out. Laird and I met with other senate Presidents in Birmingham a couple of weeks ago. I think this is a positive thing.
 - Mike – I will add to Tim’s report. We did come back to Clay and he is working with Shelby’s office. He is aware of the cost increases in our library databases. We continue to get promises but we won’t give up.
- Carmen Scholz, Ombudsperson
 - I usually have four cases, one has been dropped. Three new cases have opened. One was the furniture issue. One may be soon resolved and another is a serious case.
- Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
 - The bylaws are on the agenda and we request a special meeting if they can’t be discussed today.
- Paul Whitehead, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
 - We are meeting today.
- Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
 - He wanted to discuss the response on the copyright bill. Jeff suggested that we form an ad hoc committee to respond back. There were a few different pathways suggested. He is willing to serve on that.
 - Laird – Do we need to make a motion to form that committee?
 - Tim – Yes, a motion.
 - Laird – Do we have a motion? Carmen moves. Mike moves.
 - Tim – Jeff volunteered to serve. He suggested a few other senators that may be willing to serve.
 - Rolf – What is this?
 - Laird – It is the copyright policy. Harry is willing to serve. Carolyn was nominated as well.

- Mike – I would suggest a senator from every college.
 - Laird – Beth volunteers. Dilcu will serve for business. Sarah will serve for education. Candace volunteers.
 - Ron – I will check with other faculty members in the library.
- Seyed Sadeghi, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
 - We met on January 23rd. We discussed counseling center website updates.....
- University Committee Updates
 - Faculty Appeals – No report for today. We may want to discuss the appeals process.
 - Laird – Where does that fall under?
 - Carmen – Appendix.
 - Financial Aid – There is no record of this committee meeting. No one on the campus really understands how decisions are being made.
 - Library – We met first week of March.
 - Student Affairs – As far as I know, we haven't met.
 - Traffic Appeals – We send out excel files that we vote on. I have sympathy for students getting ticketed for forgetting to hang their tag.
 - Laird – I am curious as to why we don't know what is going on.
 - Lori – We probably just need to ask.
 - Faculty 180 – We have met.
 - Christina – I have a faculty that teaches a very large class and he was asking about any extra compensation for teaching a large class.
 - Laird – We use to have that and I think it went away. It was declined by the administration.
 - Provost – There were two resolutions and two responses.
 - Mike – Both negative.
 - Christina – I think it was just around \$500. I think the pay is better than unhappy employees.
- Laird – I did have a request to suspend rules to discuss the last two items first. Mike moves. Member seconds. All in favor. Passed with 7 oppositions.
- Bill 446:
 - Laird – motion to consider. Tim moves. Mike seconds. I did have a request for a secret ballot.
 - Lori – I want clarification on the notification.
 - Laird – The issue was that the faculty handbook was violated. It was an informal process.
 - Lori – These kind of motions only say we are going to post this to our website. It is already there.
 - Laird – It is a formal resolution. It sits as a formal statement. I think they want it on the record.
 - Tim – I receive bills and received this from a faculty member.
 - Laird – The President and Provost are responsible for this. I think the name may be protected potentially.
 - Lori – Would it be useful to capture the positive in this situation? This makes it look super negative.
 - Tim – My understanding for this to come forward is because on the Board of Trustees agenda was the merger of Philosophy and Political Science. But that merger did not go through the Senate's Curriculum Committee before it went to the Board. I am deeply disappointed in the administration for that action. This bill is much too mild in this senate's response. It is also an issue that is dear to me. Mike, Carmen, and others were on a senate

committee for realignments. That committee and this Senate have been on record said that moves like this need to go through our curriculum committees.

- Beth – A lot of us in nursing feel the verbiage of these bills are offensive. I personally don't think we would vote for bills that represent us that way.
- Carmen – I think this discussion shows how important it is to go through a path for realignment. Ten years we are here again discussing the same issue. The realignment process is not in order.
- Lori – This doesn't produce anything. This doesn't have a resolution. This is one person's view of what happened. Can it go back to a committee? What are our options?
- Rolf – What I see missing is language that such a merger or realignment should involve relevant faculty involved. The resolution asks legitimately for more transparency from the administration. Shouldn't we advocate direct involvement and possibly vote by the relevant faculty?
- Laird – When we met with the Dean they said they voted but the votes weren't on record. I am not going to challenge our Deans. If you want to amend to add a "whereas" to reiterate that faculty be involved.
- Provost – Could you point us to where that is stated in the faculty handbook?
- Lori – I haven't seen that. I think this needs to be sent back.
- Harry – I vote it is sent back to FSEC, it seems to be incomplete. Lori seconds.
- Ron B. – I would like for it say specifically where it is referenced in the handbook.
- Tim – One area in the handbook is Appendix L that this issue is discussed.
- Provost – What academic programs were changed? The policy that is quoted talks about academic programs not departmental structure. To my knowledge, there was no changes to music curriculum/major, theatre, political science, undergraduate, MPA, or philosophies. Why does this need to go back to curriculum committee when no curriculum was changed?
- Member – As member of the curriculum committee, we did approve course changes after the fact.
- Provost – That happens every year. The major didn't change. They change their courses every year.
- Member – The justification on the form was because of the merger.
- Provost – Was there any change to the meat of the curriculum?
- Tim – There is no Chair to Political Science. I would argue that we had a similar situation with theatre department. Given the history of the university, the realignments from 2008-2010 are on record that they need to go through the curriculum committee. I don't know why they don't. It is always after the fact. Even if you don't want to buy that, it is violated of shared governance between the faculty senate and administration.
- Mike – As a member of the realignment committee, we went through a process of evaluation and ~~stated there is developed~~ a procedure. Back then, I couldn't find anybody that would own up to saying yes, we are the authors of the document (realignment and restructuring) that we thought this was a great idea. If we had the recorded departmental votes, we wouldn't have this, similar -issue. Again, No one can come up with that idea how this developed procedurally.
- Lori – Can we hear from anyone in that department? I feel Carolyn spoke and stated they were involved. Looking back at November's FS minutes we find a statement from Carolyn saying music was fully vetted.
- Laird – The requirement is that the faculty vote.

- Candace – As a member of the AHSS department, I would respectfully ask that I can take this back to my department for comments. It is missing important facts. We then could evaluate the intent of this.
- Beth – For clarity, thank you for speaking up – that is shared governance.
- Laird – All in favor of sending this back to FSEC. 29 in favor. 3 opposed.
- Bill 447:
 - Laird – This is a concern that Chapter 7 went to administration in 2013 and haven't received this back for review. Do I have a motion? Mike moves. Member seconds.
 - Ron B. – Where it says formally objects, can I get this history on this? It sounds like since January 2013 it has been sitting on the Provost desk with no action.
 - Laird – Are you suggesting an amendment? Tim, do you know sentiment behind this?
 - Tim – The senate passed this in January 2013 and there is no official response back.
 - Lori – Can we hear from the Provost?
 - Provost – I gave the senate March/April 2019 of all the actions we have taken as a working body. As you remember, the documents were given to President Altenkirch without any redlines. In fall of 2014, the Faculty Senate President provided redlines. At that time, I worked on it and presented Chapters 1-3 and they passed through the board. I then started working on Chapter 4-6, Appendices A and B. That took some time, about a year. I gave my first response back. Chapter 6 is on the agenda today. Appendices A and B are still with the senate. Chapter 4 is still with the senate. In the meantime, I have worked on Chapter 8. Chapter 9 has been submitted and it is back with me. I have been working on Chapter 7 between times. I asked the senate if they would like to have a working group, they say yes, but I haven't been given any names. It would be more productive if we had a small working group. So I ask again for a group.
 - Mike – That is the senate personnel committee. That is their jurisdiction by the bylaws. We are happy to work together on this. We have gotten three or four chapters through this year. We have been fairly productive. We don't need a motion. Any ad hoc should come under our committee.
 - Tim – The senate had a bill in either 2007-2008 with an ad hoc committee formed for Handbook revision.
 - Laird – Is this amendment correct? All in favor of amendment. Melissa seconds.
 - Christina – Why do we need a bill for this to go to Provost?
 - Provost – I am asking to work with a group. Is the personnel committee willing to work with me? I can give you what I have worked so far.
 - Laird – It sounds like she is suggesting a working group. In this case, it will be to work through pieces at a time.
 - Provost – That is what we did initially with Chapter 4, 6, Appendix A and B. It was successful and then it just stopped. We worked very effectively together. I would like to work together and then take the process of coming back to you.
- Mike motions to extend meeting ten minutes. Lori seconds. Ayes carry. Five opposed.
 - Laird- All in favor of this as amended. Ayes carry. Six opposed.
 - Maria – “a working group to include faculty senate personnel committee and Provost to prioritize Chapter 7 resolution”. Lori seconds.
 - Laird – All in favor of amendments. Ayes carry. Five opposed. All in favor of bill as amended. Ayes carry. Five opposed. Bill passes its Second Reading as amended.
- Chapter 6:
 - Member moves to consider. Mike seconds. Ayes carry.

- Mike – One of the things that we noticed is that within the Graduate Council it operates alone. We had a very active discussion in Personnel Committee whether a college as two people then three. We just agreed on two representatives. So that there is some knowledge within the faculty senate is the senators would elect the representatives. This isn't to close anyone out but give more responsibility. There have been Graduate programs created and deleted that we didn't know about. So we changed "undergraduate" to "graduate" curriculum committee.
 - Laird – There is no link to the faculty senate.
 - Lori – Is there faculty senate representation on this committee?
 - Mike – No there is no mandatory requirement for our senate representation.
 - David – The reason there was three was because colleges who have a PhD have three. We meet the third Friday every month. This committee is responsible for the Graduate school. I think graduate education be separate and should always be. The other schools operate the same. They do have an ex officio that attends for the senate.
 - Tim – This does not say that graduate course changes go to the curriculum committee. It says creation/deletion/merger goes there. This give us clear language. I hope that we approve this language.
 - Lori – What affect would it have if we take a completely different model than other universities?
 - Member motions to table until the next senate meeting. Beth seconds. All in favor.
- Meeting adjourned 2:32