

---

**FACULTY SENATE Executive Meeting**  
**September 8, 2016**  
**12:30 P.M. in SSB 212**

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

**Guests:** *President Bob Altenkirch*

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- Summary of meeting to include policies and bills:
  - Class Scheduling was sent to Undergraduate Curriculum and Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs for review.
  - Bill 382, Notification to Senate on Deanships, passed first reading and will be sent to full senate.
  - Policy on Use of Facilities was voted non-shared governance and was sent to all committees for review.
  - Bill 386, Optimal Class Size, passed first reading and will be sent to full senate.
  - SSB Conference Room was voted non-shared governance and sent to all committees for review.
  - SSB Digital Signs was voted non-shared governance and sent to all committees for review.
  - Bills 382, 385, 386, 387 were added to the agenda for the full senate meeting on 9.15.16.
- **Administrative Reports**
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - Mike had asked me to get some information together in regards to how much we spend in advertising. The sheet I am passing out shows the expense from 2012 – 2017. Billboard advertising doesn't go back before 2012. I don't know if it existed before. In 2011, many people complained there weren't any billboards. This cost covers billboards that use different advertising methods than admissions. They put out information specifically for recruitment. Billboards only recruit by second order. They are mostly for a psychological impact. Most of that impact is targeted by our employees. When someone sees billboards for other universities, the first thought is why don't we have one? I receive a lot of compliments from people about the billboards. It helps develop a network. 2017, the new FY, there is one existing contract with Graduate school. Admissions and Enrollment services are trying to figure out what they will be doing.
      - Kader – Most on the interstates?
      - President – Yes, and back and forth from Tuscaloosa.
    - I also have a handout showing the revenue received from UAH License Tags. As you can see the revenue versus what goes out in scholarships is minimal.

- Christine is out of town today, but feels we need to settle on a schedule for spring 2017. I am passing out a graph this is what the task force has recommended. The other side is the same except MWF classes are extended. This is the 50/75 minutes. We put together a scenario with 55/80 minutes. This will show start times putting 20 minutes between classes. Not shortening classes, we have to change the start time. It still takes 20 minutes to walk from Tech to Morton. If you went to 30 minutes between classes, you would have to chop off the last class.
  - Kader – I think some times of the day aren't as bad as other. I think 20 minutes has more affect during work traffic. Later in the day or morning, isn't an issue.
  - Ramon – How many people walk Morton to Tech?
  - Joseph – There are so many Gen Ed courses in Morton. It does have a problem.
  - Mike – At the freshmen level, look at that carefully. Freshmen and sophomores need better balancing with their scheduling. We haven't been smart with the problem. We have made the problem, and it could be solved easier.
  - Earl – Are we more spread out than other large campuses?
  - Kader - I think if you move Tech Hall out of the equation, the issue doesn't really remain.
  - Tim – First, I think that the proposal to reduce our contact hours is problematic in a number of ways. It means every faculty member on campus has to remove something from their lecture material. It also puts pressure in certain disciplines to complete the material in that course. The first proposal would take us to what UAB and UA have. What the Provost has proposed is adding two classes. All those proposals reduce our contact time. I think that we could actually use to a recruiting advantage is that we have the highest contact hours among the universities. That is a competitive advantage for us. On the issue with the 20 minutes, there are some other solutions we could consider. The biggest problem is from the southwest to north. Possible solution is at one of those locations not having a class so we wouldn't have that long commute. Nor we could have a limited shuttle bus with only two stops. That is a really limited solution that doesn't impact anyone teaching. I sat down one afternoon and made a schedule that would give 20 minutes between classes and 55/80 minute class times, all we have to do is move start time up 10 minutes and end back 10-15 minutes. We can do this and each class doesn't have to move their start time. That is limited impact on scheduling. All our systems work right now for certain classes that have labs. All those things would be preserved. Another thing we have been wedded to the idea that the TTH classes have to start the time as the MWF classes. You could work with those class times and move the start times much. Then you would have 25 minutes around the lunch hour when traffic would be heaviest. I don't think these are as disruptive.
  - President – I don't know how this will affect labs.

- Monica - Labs operate independently because they are 3 hours sections. The labs are scheduled in such a way that they run all week and don't interfere with class time.
- Mike – The last piece of paper is very attractive. That is moving start times. We are over constrained with trying to maintain the same start times. This probably needs to be pushed out to some committees to look at.
- President – The reason I put out 30 minutes, there is no issues. You don't need a bus. That is a cost. From experience, they are not efficient or effective. People don't wait and start walking.
- Earl – What about students trying to schedule classes all the same time of the day? There are student preferences that are not easy to avoid.
- Ramon – May I remind you that we already had a committee last year to look into this. Our recommendation was dismissed by the Dean's. Our recommendation was changing the times.
- Kader – I think the two to use are UCC and UGS.
- Mike – Can I pass it out?
- Christine – Yes, We will take it.
- President – What was the reason to keep the start time the same?
- Kader - I tried to get an answer for that and never could. I went to my department to work with those constraints.
- President – I think if you keep the start time the same, you have to chop off time.
- Monica – There was some discussion for students that are commuters.
- Mike – I think Dr. Newman is right; you get the full minutes here at this university.
- Carmen – Is there a system here for safety in place? Can you call police?
- Earl – If you are close to residence halls, it should be well light.
- We will have the parking consultant taking data at the end of this month using the different decals. Statically, the number of people per spot, we are ok. If you look at the attachment, that happens to be North Carolina Chapel Hill. On the back side, it is pretty complicated. I figured out why my daughter working at that university bought a moped.
  - Earl – I am sure we compare favorably to other institutions in our system. The comparison here is made with universities not in this area.
  - President- There happens to be a study out that was done around 2008 when Indiana University was trying to figure out the same issue. Clemson tried to solve the same issue in 2010. The parking consultant will have all the data from surrounding universities. I feel they will say we have sufficient parking; we just need to better manage it. A deck cost about \$20K a spot. It is very difficult to pay back. You are looking at about \$55K debt service to \$1M borrowed. That is why it is difficult to build these without DOT help.

➤ **Committee and Officer Reports**

- President-Elect, Carmen Scholz
  - No Report.
- Past President, Kader Frendi

- I sent an email to the Provost that contained Handbook Chapters 4-6 and Appendix A. They are currently under review by the President and Counsel. Hopefully the changes they recommend will be minor.
- Parliamentarian, Tim Newman
  - No Report.
- Ombudsperson, Eric Seeman
  - No Report.
- Governance and Operations Committee Chair, Monica Dillihunt
  - Bill 382, Notification to Senate on Deanship, was sent to the Provost and she sent back changes in the form of questions.
  - Ramon – Is this new?
  - Kader – No, it was put in very early last year. If I recall, this happened before the college of continuing education. The dean was called in before the college was created. We needed to address that.
  - Monica – Some questions were how many positions have been created?
  - Mike – The colleges are listed in the handbook. You created a deanship before the college existed. A college was created without anyone telling anybody.
  - Ramon – The point here is there is no procedure to create a college. Maybe that should be in the handbook.
  - Mike – Motion to accept first reading of Bill 382. Ayes carry. 1 abstains. This will now be sent out to the faculty senate for second reading.
- Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
  - We were assigned the policy of use of facilities. The members on the personnel committee is looking into it. It is 22 pages. I think it solves problem that doesn't exist. It deals with issues that are very sensitive like freedom of speech. I don't think it has any priority.
  - Mike – Does anyone have an opinion on this? All this is doing is solving a legal issue. This was a policy that I wanted to invoke the governance rule on.
  - Carmen – My feeling is this keeps us from doing actual work. In the Presidents own words, the problem to assemble happens infrequently.
  - Ramon – It has no priority.
  - Carmen – As soon as they deliver, let's deliver it out.
  - Mike – Let me explain the standing rule. The rule is that we would have two votes in this body. One would be we don't see a shared governance issue with the policy and second vote would be to release it to committees to vote and discuss. Then the chair of committee would report back. A committee could decide to bring a resolution up and discuss it in the full faculty senate. These policies can be brought back at any time.
  - Ramon – This policy was assigned to a committee and they are reviewing it. If no red flag is raised, then we move it out. But I am afraid there will be issues since it does discuss free speech. It is so dense that it may be interpreted incorrectly.
  - Carmen – If we are violating free speech, it would be trumped by the law of the land.
  - Tim – According to the standing rule was to send it to a committee. The advantage is if we do the two votes here, we are done with it. If your committee has an issue with it, then we will discuss it.

- Mike – Once we vote it to committees, they review it. If there needs to be a resolution then we will discuss this. I call for the shared governance vote on 06.06.14. All those who think this isn't a shared governance issue raise your hand. Ayes carry. Next vote is to release it to committees to discuss and vote. Ayes carry.
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair, Christine Sears
  - Our committee voted to send Bill 386, Optimal Class Size, to the full senate for second reading.
    - Mike – All in favor of Bill 386. Ayes carry. Bill 386 passes first reading and will be sent to the full senate.
  - We are also looking at SIE and SGA Plus/Minus Grading.
- Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
  - RCU has been issued and everyone can encourage faculty to submit proposals. We got new stipends thanks to science, nursing, and business. We are trying to get distinguished speakers for spring 2017, so far we have received zero.
    - Tim – Are there two classes for that?
    - Joseph – There is a \$4K slot, if you have an interdisciplinary speaker. In the fall no one really qualified for it, so we split to make two \$2K spots. Please encourage people to submit proposals. We are doing this each semester in hopes of getting proposals.
    - Monica – What is the deadline for RCU?
    - Joseph – October 28<sup>th</sup> is the faculty deadline. Student's deadline will be in November.
  - We also looked at Bill 393, but we will wait on Christine's committee to finish and combine the remarks.
  - Mike – I sent the President a budget sheet I put together out of the audit books six months ago. He said he would get back with me. He gave the presentation to Kader, Carmen, and me. We asked him if we would give it to the finance committee and the full senate.
    - Joseph – We are having him on October 3<sup>rd</sup> to present to the finance committee.
    - Mike – He took the request to present to the full senate as well. It is a very long presentation and I will make this be done in a special meeting.
- Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, James Swain
  - I was going to report that we completed our first re-admission appeal. Before I came to the meeting, I received another email in regards to it with reviews so I can't present it today.
  - Optimal Class Size also came to us. Since it has been sent to the full senate, do I need to move on from it?
  - Mike – No, discuss it and be familiar with it.
- Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair, Earl Wells
  - No Report.
- President, Mike Banish
  - Let me remind you to have a second chair for your committee.
  - The School of Graduate Studies is changing to "Graduate School and International Services." The Provost asked if we would make a change in the

handbook to designate this. There aren't many places in the handbook that graduate studies is mentioned.

- Ramon – In any bills, is there an issue with changing the name of a college?
- Tim – No.
- Mike – There are a few places that the handbook could be changed but not many. I am hesitant because for the Dean of Graduate Studies, I want to make sure that it is a dean and not a program director. I am hesitant about this. What kind of change has to be made if it has to be made?
- Ramon – I am worried about neither graduate studies nor international services doesn't know how to deal with international students.
- Kader – A year ago when we did these changes in the handbook, we took it before the senate and made the changes quickly. I don't really see the need for this change.
- Carmen – Right now, who is in charge of international services?
- Kader – Yeqing Bao.
- Earl – He can have several titles, but why combine these?
- Tim – With two titles, we don't need to change this.
- Mike – This is a director position. I don't see any reason to acknowledge this change.
- Kader – This is more of an internal change within this area.
- Carmen – Is this a chance to get rid of a Dean position?
- Tim – I have discussed this with the Provost. Our administrative overhead has tripled in this area. Provost said it hasn't because there was a director. You can think Yeqing as doing Berkowitz job, and Berkowitz doing another job.
- Mike – The motion is there is no change needed in the faculty handbook for "Graduate School and International Services." Ayes carry.
- Mike – We keep threatening to have a charger foundations committee come back. I haven't heard how many members are wanted from the senate.
  - Monica – Does it have to be someone who serves on the faculty senate?
  - Mike – No.
- Mike - The President asked me last time that we had been slow about our response to policies. He asked us to think about the time we need to have to respond. Carmen, will you look this over?
- Mike – We have Bill 385 & 387 that will go onto the next agenda. Also Bill 386 & 382 will go onto the next agenda.
- Mike - The two SSB policies. I would like to declare these policies non-shared governance.
  - Monica – I think the SSB conference room should have student organizations listed as priority as to who can use it.
  - James – What is a community even with UAH involvement?
  - Monica – Science Fair.
  - Tim – I think the students would go to Charger Union.
  - Mike – I call for non-shared governance vote on SSB Conference vote. Ayes carry. Release to committee. Ayes carry.

- Mike – SSB Digital Sign. I declare it non-shared governance.
  - Monica- Did they take out the issue that student could hack into them.
  - Carmen – That is somewhere else, but they removed the wireless.
  - Mike – Aye carry for non-shared governance. Move to committees. Ayes carry.
  - James – We will need some announcement that these have went out and a deadline to get a response.
  - Tim – Standing rule states the next FSEC meeting is the next deadline.
- Mike – The Librarian Policy:
  - Tim – The Provost’s comments are out of order. If you want to consider them, you have to have a motion to reconsider.
  - Mike – It did not pass first reading. It was sent to Provost and we are now here.
  - Tim – It was on the agenda for the last senate meeting?
  - Joseph – I thought it could be presented to senate without passing here.
  - Tim – If it is on the senate agenda it means it passed first reading here.
  - Mike – It never passed out of here.
  - Joseph – This is what the committees said and we merged them. We are creating the language that will go into the handbook. The description of librarians may go into the handbook. Then the process is listed for their appointment and promotion. This is all pretty generic. The key stuff is after so many consecutive years they cannot be removed without due process. The financial side is not there. The Provost took that out and referred to that section in the handbook.
  - Ramon- That is not true because there isn’t anything in the handbook about dismissal of faculty.
  - Mike- If we took out for non-tenured track faculty that is correct. That is the dismissal process for faculty.
  - Ramon – We don’t have a chapter 7 of the old handbook. We haven’t reviewed this chapter. Why is it wrong to put something redundant but assures there is a process and a reason.
  - Tim – I am lost here. What we passed last time had no reference to past handbook?
  - Mike – No.
  - Tim – So we want to add them and the Provost wants them there.
  - Mike – She wants it there, but process for non-tenure track faculty does not exist.
  - Joseph – Chapter 7 states dismissal of tenured faculty or faculty.
  - Tim – This applies to two areas.
  - James- I read her sentence that you are applying non-tenured to this process.
  - Tim – I think she is reading 7.14 that there is a due process right for a lecturer during their term. I think that is a correct reading.
  - Mike – I would like to see “for non-tenured faculty” distinction out. It just follows the process of 7.14.
  - Ramon – Why? The thing she has crossed out, why? What reason is there to take it out? You don’t want to be redundant.

- Mike – Motion for 5 minute extension. Aye carry.
  - Ramon – What is on the web was never approved by the faculty senate.
  - Tim – Yes, it was in 1998.
  - Kader – That is the one we have been using for years.
  - Ramon – When does chapter 7 comes back from administration?
  - Earl – If you refer to a section that gets modified, do you have to reapprove those things that are referred to that?
  - Tim – If something happens now, it will go with the current chapter 7. Say tomorrow, Provost comes to senate and says we are good with what you put together for chapter 7. If we change the handbook, and 7.14, then this will have to be changed to follow.
  - Earl –You could get into issues because it would be renumbered.
  - Mike – 7.14 is a much longer process.
- Motion to approve agenda for full senate meeting on September 15<sup>th</sup> with the addition of the lecturer policy and four bills. Carmen motions to approve agenda. Kader seconds. Ayes carry.
  - Meeting was adjourned September 8, 2016 at 2:08 p.m.