FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING
August 25, 2016
12:30 P.M. in SSB 212

Present: ***Joseph Taylor, Ramon Cerro, Mike Banish, Carmen Scholz, Kader Frendi, Tim Newman, Christine Sears, James Swain, Monica Dillihunt, Eric Seeman***

Absent without proxy: Earl Wells

Guests: ***President Bob Altenkirch***

- **Faculty Senate President Mike Banish calls meeting to order at 12:34 p.m.**

- **Summary of policies and bills discussed at this meeting:**

  - Class Scheduling Bill – currently on hold.
  - SGA Plus/Minus Grading – It was assigned to undergraduate scholastic affairs and undergraduate curriculum.
  - Hoverboard – It is on the agenda for approval at next Thursday's full senate meeting.
  - Dean of Students and Handbook Revisions – It was assigned to personnel, finance, and student development.
  - Giving to Departments – It needs to be brought back for review.
  - Optimal Class Size Bill – It was assigned to undergraduate curriculum and student development.
  - Nepotism Policy – It was assigned to personnel and governance and operations.
  - Course Forgiveness Policy – It was assigned to undergraduate curriculum and undergraduate scholastic affairs.
  - Use of University Property and Facilities – It was assigned to the executive committee for review.
  - Unmanned Aerial Systems Policy – It was assigned to faculty and student development.
  - Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects – It was assigned to governance and operations.
  - Copyright and Distribution of IP – Tabled.
  - Bill 393, Student Evaluation of Teaching – It was assigned to undergraduate curriculum and finance.

- **Administrative Reports**

  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - Christine is in Tuscaloosa at a system wide Title IX meeting.
    - There was a committee looking at course scheduling. The group has finished a draft copy of the policy. It does move from 15 minutes to 20 minutes between classes.

We will have 10 – 12 students walk paths to understand timing from buildings and parking. Fifty minutes is the standard class time. The gist is 20 minutes between classes. The increase between classes would add at least one extra day to the semester.

- Ramon – No change in hours?
- President – Just a small change. It will cause for redefinition of the length of semester. It doesn't change the start time of classes.

- Currently the Graduate School and Office of International Engagement are functioning as one unit. Formally, they are not one unit. David Berkowitz is proposing we merge both offices and make one. The organization chart would change. Employees in the engagement office would have a clear supervisor. That is current practice, he is just proposing it.
- I am passing out a write up on policies to summarize what transpired over the summer. Nepotism policy issue arrived at the start of the semester. One professor was teaching two of his children.
- We had to put in a free speech area due to Office of Counseling agreeing with the challenger. Designated free speech was the slab and the challenger argued that the main area for student traffic is south of that. So we are putting in another area rather than going to court. The use of this area will be under our control. The sidewalks on Holmes Ave is generally where these people stand, we don't control that. There is a difference in a public place and a designated place.
    - Kader – Is this open to anyone outside of UAH or only someone affiliated with the university?
    - President – Mainly for outside people, but there are places for UAH.
    - Ramon – How is it related to the use of university facilities?
    - President – If you want to use a conference room, there is a process to use it. The free speech area will have also process for that usage.
    - Ramon – What happens during the year if I invite people from English to speak to my class? Will that fall under that?
    - President – No. If the people talking to your class want to speak with students later in the day in a room; they will have to go through the process.
    - Carmen – How often is the free speech area requested?
    - President – Infrequently. This individual that challenged tends to stand on the Holmes Ave sidewalks. I don't know that he has used the free speech area on campus.
    - Tim – The optics of this disturbed me. I thought as a university we stood for free speech? Is that what is meant here, free speech?
    - President- That is what it falls under.
    - Tim – Can we use a different term to use?
    - President – If you look at the policy, it doesn't call it that.
    - Christine – The University I used to be at, a preacher would come and preach things in a particular area that I didn't want to hear. I am glad that this will be controlled to an area.
    - President – The purpose is so that people won't be harassed.
    - Mike – We have motions of students, faculty, and traffic, so you do have areas that are safe for them to speak. We don't have to let them set up in front of busy buildings.

- Tim – My point isn't to not have limits, but the issue is labeling it "free speech." We need to call it something else: protect area, public forum.
- President – I am comfortable to say that the attorneys that created this are using the correct verbiage.
- Tim – Public forum area - that is what I would like to propose that as the language used.

- Unmanned aerial systems - We weren't complying with law.
- Student services conference center - When a facility is new everyone wants to use it. We had to have something in place to control this.
    - Ramon – What makes a policy interim?
    - President – It's because there is a driver for it. It's a policy that is in force, but under review.
    - Mike – It's a response to SACS, a lawsuit, etc. Any policy can be reviewed at any point.
- Indebtedness collection policy - The language you suggested is the first entry here. He's suggestion is the second one, a legal opinion.
    - Ramon – What puzzles me is the counsel is employees of the system. Why does someone not at the administrative level have so much power?
    - President – It's like the auditor. He works through the system to report to the board. Counsel provides advice; they don't make decisions. The President makes policy on campus. If it reads legally determined, it has to go to court. They are trying to limit how many times we may have to go to court.
    - Tim - The concern was more substantial things, like if a lab blew up or loss of equipment. If there is no way to contest that, they are paying out of their paycheck. If it's a parking ticket, let it come out, but if it's major that was the legally determined issue.
    - President – If the counsel says it's a valid point, we use that. If you want to contest it, you can take it to court. The point was not to go to court over every little issue. The reading of the policy reads that every little thing goes to court.
    - Mike – Garnishment of wages never went out to a committee, right? We moved it through as an executive committee last year.
    - Kader – We made this change and moved it out.
    - Mike – Would someone like to go back and look at it? Or does the President-Elect want to look at it?
    - Carmen – How is indebtedness defined? Parking ticket is one thing, but a lab loss? How would an employee be indebted to a loss of something that they don't own?
    - President – It's when you owe something.
    - Carmen – I don't own what's in the lab to owe anything.
    - Tim – If there is damage in a lab, the contention could be made that you were irresponsible.
    - Mike – The example would be IT equipment. If you accidentally download something and get hacked. There is a $1.5M fee to be paid.

- Eric – How do we determine the validity of the debt? In listening to the discussion, I see it is taxation without representation. You don't have a lot of options.
- Joseph – It's like a singular entity than a faculty.
- Tim – The difference is it goes as a fact to the opinion of the counsel
- Ramon – Can we just figure out if we can establish a certain process to determine this? Maybe have a committee to look at it, rather than the office of counsel to determine.
- President – I guess you have a group that hears appeals.
- Mike – We have a grievance group.
- James – Parking tickets and payroll problems aside. How many times do we deal with any of this?
- President – Probably rarely.
- James – If you kick it to appeals, you have something suitable for everyone and not used frequently.
- Tim – I don't know the purpose, but I am sure people just want to be difficult and not pay tickets. I am sympathetic to get people to pay parking ticket.
- Ramon – In order to have a grievance, you have to pay the ticket first.
- President – I think we did away with this and they don't have to pay first.
- Ramon – The instance I am worried about isn't parking tickets. I am worried about is damage of some kind of material or IT. Does the counsel determine that? I think there should be a grievance procedure.
- President – All counsel wants to do is change the language to keep everything from going to court. Some things may go because everyone has that avenue.
- Mike – The concern here is if you look at the IT policy and say it was your fault your computer was on and hacked into it. That does not allow you the capacity to go the legal system. They may determine it valid, which puts you in the position to not go to the court.
- Joseph – We would assume that the office of counsel would be fair, but legally determined gives an option.
- Tim – Office of Counsel has a duty to defend to the system. If that was my duty as a lawyer, if I had the pretext to take money from a check to pay back the debt. I would do it because that is my legal duty.
- Joseph – I agree with you. I feel more comfortable that it leaves it open.
- Eric – The issue isn't paying a lawful debt – parking ticket.
- Monica – The parking ticket does still say you have to pay the fee before an appeal can be done.
- Ramon – Why are discussing this now and not when it is brought back under revision?
- President – I am doing that now. Presenting it with revisions made by counsel.
- Mike – We will pull it back in and leave it to the President-Elect to assign to a committee.

- On back of the sheet, there are some comments on the policy on policies. These policies can't pile up. There are 26 interim policies. You are supposed to review

policies in a month and interim policies are in place for six months. There was no experience when the policy was set up, maybe we should change the timing.

- Mike – That would be great.
- Monica – All these policies are in the handbooks?
- Mike – Policies are under the policy tab, not the handbook.
- Monica – Several policies mirror the language of handbook.
- Ramon – Many policies are redundant.
- Monica – How are going to fix that?
- Mike – Hopefully since handbook chapters 1-6 are done, the policies will be under alignment. This is a deliberative process. Everyone has an opinion. One thing that is beneficial to the time spent now on policies is in five years they won't need revision.
- Monica – Those that contradict un-reviewed handbook chapters and policies, which one should the faculty be following?
- Mike – The handbook is preeminent. You should look at the gray areas in the policies and handbook to move those out. There are many of them. chapter 7-9 will be fun to do. Do the best spirit you can. For example, chapter 8 says final exam times are set in stone. Our math department will have a final a certain time during the day, which is the middle final time. That is the one the handbook says they can't opt out of. If my exam time is the same, I have the choice to make them miss the math final or allow mine to be taken another time. I have to do what is ethically and morally right.
- Tim – That isn't right for the students.
- Ramon – I don't agree with you that the handbook would prevail. We had a statement in front of the handbook that states it is a suggestion.
- Mike – I take it more than a suggestion.
- President – It should be as consistent as possible. Previously there were policies in place but scattered everywhere. The whole point of putting the policy on policies on the website was to place them where they can be found.
- Tim – The nepotism policy was brought out with a memo a long time ago. Is this different than that?
- President – Most nepotism deals with employment, this deals with more.
- Tim – This one dealt with if there was a faculty and spouse in the same unit.
- Ramon – Nepotism is in chapter 7, right? In an ideal world, the handbook would lead as a constitution. If any policy goes against it, the policy is invalidated. We have so many policies that are overlapping and redundant. Some policies don't deal with the functions of the university. If they are not complimenting or make contribution on their own, why are we wasting time on them?
- President – Nepotism applies throughout the campus not just faculty handbook. Without a policy that is university wide, we have several who aren't following it.

- Parking – I am handing out a sheet that shows all the decals offered this fall. Each decal will be given to whom it applies. Late September/early October the parking consultant will be on campus to start collecting data.

- James –The requisition policy- there is a policy for a new approval for small/large expenditures. Also, PI accounts are available to department chairs. Since the provost isn't here, I am alerting you that there is unhappiness.
    - Mike – This is a policy put forth by the Provost.
    - President – I am not aware of this policy, so I will have to look into it.
    - James - Normally, I would wait for the chairs to go to the dean and but the deadline is the 31st. It will go into effect next week and there are several unhappy people. Why do we need this policy? Is there a problem this policy is addressing?
    - Mike – Does it involve faculty?
    - James – Someone said that it doesn't involve centers, but I am getting several calls concerning this.
- Monica – If a part-time faculty member also has another part-time job not associated with the university, does it have to be reported to UAH?
    - President – Yes, that could be a conflict of commitment.

➢ **Officer and Committee Reports**

- President Mike Banish
    - I sent out my report. My understanding is that you vote to accept it?
        - Tim – You will want to ask for a motion to approve the rules at the full senate meeting.
    - Standing Rule 1. For proxies, to send a proxy to the faculty senate and it count, you must send Carmen or myself an email stating who the proxy is and that you have informed them of the current business.
    - Standing Rule 2. This will be for some policies, hoverboard may be an example, we try to minimize the time we are spending on them. I propose when we get a policy to review, if we think it does not have any shared governance issues we will have two votes. One vote will be we don't have any governance issues with the policy, and then release it to be voted on between committees. Both votes, governance issues and from committees, has to be unanimous. We will then report it out to the faculty senate. If someone has an issue and a resolution, they can bring it up then.
    - Computer Science has two senators with the same length of time. Harry Delugach replaced Peter Slater. Harry will get the 2016 – 2018 term. He will be replacing Peter on the finance committee.
    - SIE task force - I thought I had three nominations but I have two. Sophia Marinova and Laird Burns want to be the faculty senate reps to the SIE committee. I say approve them.
        - Tim – They have to be approved through the faculty senate. The fastest way is to put it in your report. Ask if any objections, if not, move forward.
    - Faculty database – Digital measures is going away. Tim Newman has agreed to chair the task force for the new faculty database system. There are supposed to be two faculty senators. I will send out an email for volunteers.
    - There is going to be a task force for the implementation of the establishment of a teaching center. This force will be evaluating if the faculty want a teaching/learning center and the process of how to run one. Carolyn Sanders will serve as a senator. I will send an email out about that too.
- President-Elect, Carmen Scholz

        - No Report.
    - Parliamentarian, Tim Newman
        - No Report.
    - Government and Operations Chair, Monica Dillihunt
        - No Report.
    - Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
        - We merged the librarian policy with the recommendations from the last full senate meeting and are now up for consideration.
    - Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair, Christine Sears
        - No report.
    - Past President, Kader Frendi
        - We passed chapters 4-6 and Appendix A last senate meeting. The resolutions are on the website and changes will go to the Provost.
            - Monica – Can you send a list of the policies and where they are on the process?
            - Kader – All policies are on the website and state where they are currently.
            - Monica – I am the new chair to governance and operations and need a list of policies.
            - Mike – Undergraduate curriculum committee got behind last year. I have asked Joy to get everything in a table format. The committee will report what classes are being suggested, changed, and dropped. There are a lot of things going on and the rest of the faculty doesn't have a clue about.
        - Mike – For your committees, please find a second person. This person will serve if you are on travel, out sick, etc.
    - Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
        - We also reviewed the librarian policy. The call for distinguished speaker series proposals is now out. We will also be putting out for RCEU soon. Some want to include stipends this time.
            - Monica – Some of our students in the program are seniors. Their work is good enough to send for presentations at the spring meeting. However at that point they are graduated and no longer here. Can we help fund their trip to give their presentation?
        - Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, James Swain
            - No report.
    - Motion to approve the agenda for 569. Monica Dillihunt moves motion. Tim Newman seconds. Tim amends motion, I propose under this agenda is 1. Librarian 2. Lecturer 3. Hoverboard. Monica seconds amendment. All in favor of the amendment. Ayes carry.
    - Policies for Review
        - Mike – We have 12 IT policies that are hanging out there. We went through 5 of them with Dee Childs and Russ Ward; they sent some changes back to us. Since Dee left, I have not sent Malcolm an email. We need to come back to those. I will get in contact with Malcolm to look these over.
            - **Class Scheduling Bill** is on hold. The yearly calendar bill is being written by me. That will come out to you soon.
            - **Plus/Minus Grading** went back to undergraduate scholastic and undergraduate curriculum. We moved it back to the committees for reconsideration. I will make sure you do have copies of it.

- **Hoverboard** is hanging out there. It was tabled the last senate meeting and will be brought before the full senate next Thursday.
- **Dean of Students and Handbook Revisions**. That went to personnel, finance, and student development.
- **Giving to departments** is out there. Any progress? We will bring that one back.
- **Optimal Class Size** bill is with undergraduate curriculum and student development.
- **Nepotism Policy** – I have concerns. I don't want to move that out of this committee.
    - Ramon – It isn't marked as interim and should be. I think it should come to my committee. I don't see giving it any priority though.
    - Mike – Ok it will go to personnel, and governance and operations.
- **Course forgiveness** – It is assigned to undergraduate curriculum and undergraduate scholastic affairs.

▪ Mike – Can I have a motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes? Eric motions. Tim seconds. Ayes carry.

- **Use of university facilities and property** – All read through it and we will pass it out of here.
    - Ramon - I am not sure that this is a simple case. It is 22 pages.
    - Mike – It is assigned to executive committee. We will come back to it.
- **Unmanned Aerial system** –It is assigned to faculty and student development.
- **Institutional review board for human subjects** – It is assigned to governance and operations and undergraduate scholastic affairs.
- **Copyright policy and distribution of IP** – is being tabled.
- **Bill 393** –
    - Christine – Is that a stop for the task force working on SIE's?
    - Mike – It is basically moving SIE's up earlier in the term.
    - Ramon – One is not do it electronically. I put together the bill and Tim revised it. The ingredients of the bill were done over the summer before the task force. It is to move it to the middle of the semester when students are still coming to class. It should be tailored to the departments and colleges.
    - Eric – There should be different SIE's forms for different colleges.
    - Mike – Ramon submitted this. This is a sense of the faculty senate of what we would like out of the task force. I would like to see us go back to paper. Who would like this? It is assigned to undergraduate curriculum and finance committee.
    - James – I would suggest keeping electronic version available.

➢ Motion to adjourn from Mike Banish. Tim Newman seconded.

Faculty Senate Executive Meeting adjourned
August 25, 2016, 2:10 P.M.