
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING
August 20, 2019
12:50 P.M. ENG 117

Present: Laird Burns, Monica Dillihunt, Jeff Weimer, Mike Banish, Tim Newman, Gang Wang, Lori Lioce, David Johnson

Absent: Carmen Scholz, Christina Carmen, Vladimir Florinski

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: President Darren Dawson

- **Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:55 pm.**
- **Meeting Review:**
 - **Handbook Chapter 5 was approved with edits for the Faculty Senate agenda.**
- **Administrative Reports**
 - **President Darren Dawson**
 - I want to address collaboration with the faculty senate. I have always supported the senate as a Department Head and Dean. I believe it is an important organization. It is the cornerstone of governance. It is an open avenue of communication to administration. It is important for us to leave those avenues open. We need to work together in regards to policies, spending our resources, and procedures. We have to work together to preserve our shared governance.
 - Laird – We also discussed with you some committees that weren't as active as they used to be. We are going to look at that. The President has been very supportive of these ideas.
 - President – We have put together some procedures with the committees. We will mark when they meet and receive a paragraph or two in regards to their meeting discussion. We will have a format that we will share with you on spending.
 - Tim – On shared governance, I was sitting in this chair with our last President. There was a failure with shared governance with previous administration. In 2008-2009, the President said the handbook was optional. He said he had the authority to waive or change any part at any time. That did not go over with the faculty. I advised President Altenkirch of this issue and asked him to pledge to the faculty that he wouldn't change the handbook. I want to ask you the same thing.
 - President – I would never do anything like that.
 - Tim – With President Altenkirch, he agreed to do business the way we had in the past. If there was a change, it was proposed, the senate debated, the administration would respond. We would then work until we were in agreement. Your stance?
 - President – Yes, that is how I have always worked in the past.

- Tim – The building I am in, Tech Hall, a quarter of the student have their home department in. We’ve had some issues with the building. Some have been addressed, most have not. We have instructional issues as well. The building can be difficult to teach in. The whiteboards are worn out. This has been an issue that has been brought up over five years. A statement was made in FSEC and FS, that they would be replaced in December. That was then deferred to summer. We are starting a new semester with the same boards. I think that is not a way to have instruction at the university. It is frustrating that it has been so long and not replaced.
 - Provost – I transferred money to facilities and they said they would be replaced during the summer.
- Tim – Facilities came in and said they don’t need to be replaced. SR 18/19 – 05, this pertains to Shelby Center. A number of faculty have brought up concerns in regards to that building. We have several laboratories in that building. Several are concerned about the buildings structural integrity. We passed this bill asking a study to be done. The bill asked for a full disclosure of that report. The senate never received the report. I think our faculty, especially those in that building, deserve the full report. The last issue I want to bring up is, at the highest level of the university we have over committed financially and we are behind financially. It appears in response to that we are going to have to do more with less. It seems the highest level of authority writes the check, but the faculty have to cash the check. Example would be when President Altenkirch shared \$182M investment showcased several projects. It appears that all those activities spent all the money. Months ago, Altenkirch said that if a roof comes off a building, we don’t have the money to replace it. That conveyed how tight we are financially. We are given larger classes to teach, but to hire, we are given low salary ranges. The nationwide for increases in computing is 3-5%, we run substantially behind. Most of our faculty are behind the current salary ranges.
 - President – There is no doubt that the priority has been facilities. Enrollment has grown but the academic side can’t keep pace. This university only has \$14M in deferred maintenance. The university is young and it has invested a lot into facilities. Engineering and Tech Hall need some maintenance attention. There are places worse. Funding for core academic support have not kept pace.
 - Mike – We have in this department a really high graduation retention level. About four years, we funded sophomore peer mentors. We asked to bring on two more and we were told that it couldn’t be funded. It seems to me there are some problems.
 - President – That is handled at the department level.
 - Laird – We want answers to questions from Todd. We would like to have charts developed so that we can keep a look at some of the funding.
 - President – The problem here now is for example the bonds for Morton, they are locked in. What hurt us this year, is the board did zero tuition increase. We can get charts and look at it. What we have is a revenue problem. Revenue is matching enrollment. We

have expended dedicated revenue on facilities. The reserves have been spent down on facilities. If we want to add funding for core support, we will have to add it in student fees. There is nowhere else to cut. Facilities have been the priority not the people. You have two knobs you can turn to get new monies. That is increase of state funding/tuition and fees. We do believe the state increase will come this year. I have been told the board is going to look at a tuition/fee increase. Each college will have to make a priority list. Is advising more important, GTA's, instructors, advising? Then allocate state resources. We can't turn this around in a year. It will take at least three.

- Laird – ACHE drafts some kind of budget formula. There are two parts: legislature is looking at outcome base performance. They don't necessarily look at ACHE. The other part is UAH received a smaller percentage increase than the other two institutions. Where did that come from? ACHE?
- Provost – ACHE and we followed up.
- President- The system office was taken back that ACHE had that much authority.
- Provost – The consulting firm had chosen firms that weren't our peers. We developed a list of peers close to us in research but didn't include land grants. We used NSF in terms of research. We sent this back to Persell. It was sent back to us without NSF and eliminated some peers. The list now includes eight. We are showing more dollars per FTE than they do. We have tried so far to pick out those institutions that we may be able to put on the list. Those also came back to high. They only have accepted 14,000 or less. Suzanne Simpson is looking further to see if there is any other institution with research that we haven't found before.
- Laird- We appreciate the work. I am also saying we can't forget ACHE.
- President – We have to work with the system office if they develop a new model and work with ACHE. That will only make some small difference. That won't solve our problem.
- Provost – We were next to the bottom, Auburn was on the bottom. Dr. Altenkirch went back and they said the senate had accepted ACHE. We ended up around 6.1%, Alabama arose to 8.8%. The system office really didn't go out for us either.
- President – We have to work to develop priorities among each college. We have to make a case for to cover it through fees.
- Provost – Our fees increased by \$1 this year. The issue is the library is severely underfunded. We bailed them out last year and again this year. At this point, the new money coming from the \$1 increase and \$4 increase, \$300K would go to the library. If it continues to have inflation, we will pay for existing journals. Then another \$200M for IT. Oracle demands that each person brought on is paid for. Oracle is in banner. We won't make the number of new students that we anticipated. If we paid a certain amount,

around \$200K, we could buyout of Oracle. This will decrease the amount of new money that IT needs.

- Provost Christine Curtis
 - We have to have an Academic Misconduct Policy in place for tomorrow. We took the policy we gave you and worked on it. We now have an interim policy. I will send that out so that you have the most current version. It is much clearer than it was.
 - The online working group of the Deans are making a suggestion for the online policy. It is ready to go to the VP for your review.
 - In regards to committees, we have a master spreadsheet. We are going through the final review. It should be ready to come to you soon. There is one recommendation going to the President. The policy for Student Traffic Appeals be changed. About 8% of the students appeals were approved and faculty were substantially more. The parking committee is recommending a change to have three working groups.
 - Laird – How do we ensure consistency there?
 - Provost – My experience is the students are harder on themselves than we are. There are guidelines that are reasonable.
 - Laird – Is the \$50 fine still in place?
 - Provost – It has been lowered to \$25. When parking regulations were being changed, I sent Alabama, Auburn, and UAB.
 - Tim – President Dawson, the faculty senate rejected the last Academic Misconduct Policy. I think that was poor leadership to insert that policy as interim. I think that is a failure of shared governance.
 - Provost – It was my understanding it was being sent back to committee. Also that there would be a called meeting. I didn't hear a call for
 - Tim – All of us at this table have been a part of parliamentary law. It was sent back to committee with direction. Our bylaws are very clear. There is no mystery about them. They have to go through three readings before they are passed. It was returned with direction.
 - Provost – Policy on Policy allows us to place an interim when it is necessary. The code of student conduct has been and approved/signed. It is in effect without a way for academic misconduct appeals.
 - Tim – It is stepping on the right of the senate to express. Everyone in this room knew the complaints.
 - Provost – I asked Mike and Laird if we could have a senate meeting and was told it wasn't possible. They did not object. I am sorry, Tim. I did not understand.
 - Tim – It doesn't come back to the senate. It will be in place.
 - Monica – My notes from the last FS meeting stated that we needed to change the timeline and clear up the "and" language.
 - Jeff – It was sent back to committee, it was not approved by the FS.
 - Mike – The main issue is that it was forced as a policy because the handbook has no governance because it was forced to pass. The issue is after looking at other institutions, this is totally different than how they operate. It puts us out on a limb on how we operate with student governance. If you see how they lay out misconduct, how it is handled, the timeline. We have a severe disruption of that. This questions if they gave

their agreement to put policy in place that were necessary until a better version was approved. There was nothing that the FSEC saw that the policy should be moved forward. I didn't receive quorum for any meeting to discuss this. It was clear that we did not see that the policy should have been moved forward without going back to committee. There was no reason for the other policy to stay in place.

- Jeff – Protocols were not followed. I would suggest that we step forward and see how quickly we can get another policy in place. If it is in committee, how quickly can it be presented to the senate?
- Monica – From emails in May, there are other issues that were presented.
- Jeff – Can it be ready in a month?
- Monica – I think we need to see the interim.
- Lori – I think the FSEC needs to at least be looking at it. Committees aren't in place and operating. That would answer how quickly we can go through the process.
- Mike – I think we need to go back to the old policy until we can get another one in place.
- Provost – Remember, this started with faculty and student committee. It went to SGA and scholastic affairs committee. It was sent to Deans, Associate Deans, and Chairs. It came to the senate. It wasn't done administratively.
- Mike – I can't say what our Dean did. Until it came before us in FSEC, I never heard of it.

➤ **Officer/Committee Reports**

○ Mike Banish, President

- I am concerned about an assault that happened a month ago in Tech Hall. I did receive the link to WAFF48 news link from faculty after Huntsville community members asked me what happened. I have heard more since the incident happened. I am understanding that the faculty member handled it exactly how they should have. UAH did not release a statement stating we handled it exactly how they should have. We have to get ahead of these things.
 - President – If the Chief decides to not issue an alert, there is no procedure to follow up. If there is an alert, after the even has transpired, there will be a statement released from the university.
 - Mike – I have been here over 30 years. When I first came, we were a hard working center. I knew every police officer and they knew me. They walked through the buildings. Now, when we come here on the weekends, we have the outer door locked because we haven't seen a policeman in the building in a decade. They are great at giving parking tickets. As far as interacting with faculty and the institution, that has to change. Back to income, why can't I buy to hang down tags?
 - Provost – I have no idea?
 - Mike – Can we have an answer by Thursday?
 - Jeff – When they were introduced, there was some reason.
- Laird and I have met with President and Provost twice this summer. We discussed the UAH committee structure. We addressed if they are elected properly. Christine, anything that you may send to Laird, you send to Tim and myself.

- I did make budget charts. I looked at budget book numbers. I normalized everything from 2009 and how we are spending our money. There are a series of charts on how we are spending. Our income has increased by \$76M from 2009.
 - Laird Burns, President-Elect
 - We have figured out the schedule for the fall.
 - Tim, when we did the standing rules last year, do I bring that up Thursday?
 - Tim – Yes, in your report.
 - Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
 - No report.
 - Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
 - I would like the agenda to include bylaws. We need to meet with committees.
 - Gang Wang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
 - We approved close to 100 course forms. I have two left that I need response on so that I can pass to new chair. It was a pleasure to work with the Provost Office and committee members.
 - Mike – You have a big committee job and we appreciate it.
 - Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resource Committee Chair
 - RCEU is coming up. More information will come at the meeting Thursday.
 - Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
 - I am sending the link to the policy and the policy that the Provost just sent.
 - David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
 - No report.
- **Agenda for Thursday**
- Tim - Minutes, page five, my statement, line 6 – “was there under the old process.” Page 6, motion to refer, “for revisions consistent with senate discussion.”
- **Chapter 5 –**
- Mike – I took some comments from you and made some revisions. Are there any comments on this?
 - Tim – I have a question in 5.2. We had a discussion on the written report issue. The language that the senate stuck with said that the VPR would produce a written annual report. In 2018, that was gone. In this version, it just states written report with no time. We thought that the report be written and annual. Why was that struck?
 - Mike – I think that was Carmen’s comment. Maybe we add “provides a minimum of annual reports.”
 - Provost – They meet quarterly.
 - Mike – Do we want them to meet at least monthly? It does say that here, do we want it to say three times a year.
 - Lori – We can’t dictate when they meet.
 - Mike – We can do that with the handbook.
 - Lori – That isn’t a way to grow a community by telling them to meet once a month with a report.
 - Mike – It used to be that way.
 - Laird – We are dictating the time and we want posted reports, correct?
 - Provost – Is the FS President on the council? The Deans are on it, I am there, and center directors.
 - Laird – Two representations are there from the senate.
 - Tim – Here is the background on this. The handbook has had that statement in there for several versions. In January 2018 it was there, in November 2018 it came back revised. The

- replacement said they would meet two times in the academic year. I think it is appropriate for it to be there.
- Lori – I think a minimum is fine.
 - Mike – They are very valuable. There is a lot of opportunity to work together.
 - Tim – I would like to move adoption of Chapter 5 as presented. Monica seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry.
 - Mike - I would like to propose the amendment, “who provides a minimum of an annual written report.” Jeff seconds. Ayes carry.
 - David - In section 5.5, the last sentence, report should be plural. I move that correction. Monica seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry.
 - David – 5.1, a coma needs to be removed. I move this correction.
 - Laird – Moves for five more minutes. Tim seconds. Ayes carry.
 - Mike – All in favor of Chapter 5 as amended for agenda Thursday. Ayes carry.
 - Mike – I do want to thank you all and wish you the best of an academic year.
- Meeting adjourned at 2:28.