FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING
March 17, 2016
12:30 P.M. in SKH 301

Present: ***Azita Amira, Carolyn Sanders, Eric Seeman, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Lenora Smith, Monica Dillihunt, Michael Banish, Ramon Cerro, Tim Newman, Wai Mok, Joseph Taylor,***

Absent without proxy: Eric Fong

Guests: ***Provost Christine Curtis***
President Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President Kader Frendi called the meeting to order at 12:31 pm.

- **Administrative Reports**
  - President Altenkirch
    - The full audit showed a negative asset rating. It was unusual because the rating is actually an A plus. It was unusual because it was a huge hit on investments and we had to book our pension liability for the first time. We have to be careful going forward.
    - The Board meeting is the 7th and 8th of April. It should be in the new building. They are delivering furniture as we speak.
    - Commencement is May 1st. The guest speaker is Jeff Sessions. We will give him an honorary degree. I have list of speakers going forward that was recommended. Senator Shelby already has an honorary degree and Board rules say they can only have one. Jeff Sessions does not have an honorary degree and he is not up for re-election this time. Commencement will be difficult to attend. Panoply will be going on at the same time. A lot of the roads will be closed off due to this. The front access to the arena is closed. Another event will be going on in the concert hall at the same time. We did look to see what could be done about this issue. We were unsuccessful.
    - Two policies will be posted today on the website. They are the Electronic Sign on Sparkman Drive and the Interim Hoverboard Policy. The hoverboard policy is to keep them out of the buildings. They can be used around campus outside, but not inside or charged inside.
    - Lastly, SACSCOC review team is gone. The preliminary report we received several months ago showed we were out of compliance in 17 standards; we got rid of 16 during the visit. The only standard we are still out of compliance is that we have a very small number of instructors that SACSCOC states do not have credentials to teach the courses they do. They made some recommendations regarding QEP. Both of these areas are easy to address. My impression is they thought we did an excellent job in the whole process. The Provost and her team did a great job.
  - Provost Curtis

- The committee was complimentary of everyone. They thought we did great as a university and how much everyone contributed. Yesterday they had lunch with faculty, students, and two board members. Then they asked us to bring together all the chairs for one session and then the deans. From what I hear, one of the topics was QEP. That was a question they asked that morning, "What do people think?" The Collaborative Learning Counsel was there and answered. They had discussions on the QEP with faculty and students. This was a topic people knew about and talked about. The committee was pleased to see how excited the university community is about collaborative learning. They did stress that we needed to be more specific on our implementation plan. We knew the weaknesses and they recognized them as well. They wanted to know specific plans and how we will implement them. We will send in a report to show what was changed. They want us to go more directly from our goals to our outcomes. They started asking early Tuesday. They aren't being prescriptive but they are seeing it as a body of eight people, and they stated what they saw. It was a very thoughtful review of the QEP.
    - President – It wasn't clear to me in the QEP if it comes back that we were in compliance.
    - Provost – It was recommendations. They asked us to address a specific standard. We went through the faculty recommendations. An early email stated we had problems. Some were solved and others stood as is. Basically, we ended up with ten individuals teaching part time that don't have the SACSCOC approved credentials. We need a written policy that describes the criteria and the procedure to get approval for those teachers. I am going to ask the senate to create a policy and have a committee of five or six to create a draft. We need this quickly. Unfortunately, you aren't here during the summer but that is when it is due. I would like to ask one person to participate.
        - Ramon – Was the objection no PhD?
        - Provost – No. I am waiting on the list. I am sure these teachers have Bachelor's.
        - Ramon – There were no qualifications?
        - Provost – In these cases, they did not even after more explanation.
        - Kader – I think we talked about this after the final meeting. I learned a lot from yesterday's lunch meeting with the faculty. There is a lot going on campus with collaborative learning. We need to have more of these discussions. They are helpful.
        - Provost – Let's talk and set something up.
- Honor's convocation is April 12th. This is university wide. Research posters will be in the library to celebrate research week. Starting around noon the different colleges will have their convocations.
- Faculty awards will be on April 14th in the Bevil Center. This will also be a celebration for QEP and SACSCOC. This will be to honor everyone for all their efforts towards this. We will honor the QEP team, committees, and the faculty senate.
- The College Academy will be starting this summer. Orientation will be July 23rd. It will be from 8:30 – 2:00. Carolyn Sanders is going to be the FYE teacher.
    - Carolyn – It will be interesting. We are determining the information to be used for students who just moved up from 8th grade. We want to

teach information that can be used. We will use the same FYE textbooks. We believe there are tools that can be utilized. It will be Monday thru Friday, 9:00 am – 11:30 am. It will be a collaborative learning environment.

- **Officer and Committee Reports**
  - President, Kader Frendi
    - First, I have an apology I need to make to this committee and the full senate. I have agreed to a small change to the handbook that was sent to the BOT on January 7th. The change regarded the Dean of Students. I should have gone with the one we voted on or I should have gone back to the senate. Instead, I said I was fine with it. I am sorry for this action. I shouldn't have allowed this change without senate approvals. It is outside of my job description. There is a bill that goes along with this apology. Senate Bill 384 addresses changing back the description of the Dean of Students once we know what should go there.
      - Provost – At this point, I sent the original request to Kader asking that the language be changed because this is based on the previous Dean of Students. These are no longer the duties assigned to the interim Dean of Students. He is not in charge of most of the things listed. It is inaccurate. The job description of the Dean of Students, the interim, is not yet written. We don't know yet what that person will be in charge of .
        - Ramon – Should we keep it open?
        - Provost – We could find out what the current duties are of the interim dean. I know the interim is in charge of student judiciary, student behavior, and Title 9.
        - Eric Seeman – As we were discussing this at the last meeting on the handbook, we discussed modifying the language to state something to the effect of, "As duties assigned by policy X." Then the policy is put into place. It is much easier to modify policies than the handbook. We have flexibility as that position changes. The policy states the duties and the handbook references that policy. If the policy isn't correct, we update the policy.
        - Provost – The Dean of Students isn't even in Academic Affairs. It isn't within faculty jurisdiction.
        - Eric Seeman – If it isn't faculty jurisdiction, why is it in the handbook?
        - Provost – It is a hangover. Kader reminded me that I emailed him on January 7th. I have read through the chapters before we sent them to the board. I realized this was before we had a VP for Student Affairs. They do not report to the Provost. We don't have the authority or the faculty, to tell the VP what to do. That is why I came up with the language that I suggested to Kader.
        - Eric Seeman – If it isn't faculty jurisdiction, remove it from the handbook, or we need to change the title.
        - Carolyn – I think we had an unusual situation.
        - Provost – The Dean of Students was doing most of the duties of the VP for Student Affairs. The Dean of Students doing the behavior and helping students.
        - Ramon – The other question I have is can modifications be done without senate approval?

- Kader – It is not clear in the duties of President of the Senate. I am trying to prevent future quick decisions. Any more comments on this bill?
- Carolyn – It seems clear it shouldn't be there and I support removing it completely.
- Ramon – Why don't we take it out completely?
- Kader – This is why we are talking about this because it has been voted on. We can take a proposal to remove section 3.3.2.
- Carolyn – I move that we remove 3.3.2 Dean of Students description from the faculty handbook all together. Eric Seeman seconds motion.
- Tim – I would like to massage this a bit. We should modify line 21 to state that Dean of Students description should be removed as well as 22-25.
- Carolyn – Tim, wouldn't it still show the statement is in the handbook.
- Provost – I don't think one month should be the time requested. She may not be ready in a month to tell you what the duties are. Why would we try to dictate that to her when to bring it forward?
- Ramon – Can I make an additional motion to removed lines 26-29?
- Tim – I think there is a purpose for the time being there. I don't think we solve this by removing this. I am opposed to the amendment.
- Mike – This becomes one of the questions what is the primary duty of the faculty and faculty handbook. We used to have faculty advisors to various clubs. If we still have advisors to academic clubs, it then becomes an issue of how involved is the faculty. How far down does the handbook go? This should be argument of removing it at this point in time. I am unsure if it is true but I think there are faculty representatives of student judiciary. The faculty should know based on the handbook that this person is in charge of student judiciary. There are other positions that shouldn't be in the handbook. It depends on the position. My argument is if we have an official representative to someone that should be in the handbook. The time frame to list that description is questionable.
- Provost – Can you dictate to the VP that they make decisions on their org chart? We have an interim for the current dean of students. You are asking for the duties for the permanent dean. If you are asking for the interim duties, that is different.
- Tim – Our committee discussed that a current plan of responsibilities should be listed if someone is in that position. I don't think that should be delayed. We have a serious problem if we have someone in a named position and we don't know what their duties are. I think most of our positions have duties listed. I think they can give us something within so many months.
- Andrea – If we have an interim list those duties. Then give a relative time to get a description for the permanent position.

- Ramon – My question is how is the Dean of Students different than a representative?
- Mike – Since there were things traditionally in the Dean of Students description. There isn't a lot of faculty interaction in the subgroups. As far as housing, there isn't a lot of faculty involved. I don't know where we draw the line. It would be nice where we have clear faculty representation in these organizations be listed.
- Ramon – All faculty representation has to come from the faculty senate.
- Mike – Yes, we typically do that.
- Ramon – Even if the VP decides on the duties. Is she just going to tell us? Can she just change them? Should they be listed in a policy? Then the senate can place their input.
- Mike – I think that is what Tim's bill is stating.
- Ramon – The policy should define the views.
- Provost – Do we have any policies that define other positions at the university? Why would you have a policy to define these duties? We don't do that elsewhere.
- Ramon – It is addressing that this person is interacting with faculty and a clear statement of their duties.
- Tim – (After reading the bylaws.) We aren't proposing anything outside of the bylaws.
- Provost – My issue is to list interim. I don't think the permanent position duties are defined at this time.
- Mike – Tim, do you accept the friendly amendment to state interim dean of students?
- Tim – No.
- Mike – I make a friendly amendment that in line 28 we put, "including interim,"
- Carolyn – Would that make us have to do a correction in one month? As long as it's clearly spelled out.
- Kader – Do we have a motion to delete 3.3.2 from the handbook, delete lines 22-25 from the bill?
- Kader – All in favor of removing lines 22-25 from bill. One opposed. Motion carries.
- Mike – I introduced a motion on line 28 includes after dean of students, interim, position.
- Ramon- Should there be a way this information is communicated?
- Mike – This is a bill.
- Eric Seeman – If it isn't in a policy, it should be in a job description from the VP within a month.
- Kader – We can have a form of memo addressed to the senate stating these descriptions.
- Kader – Motion to add, interim, position. Eric Seeman seconds. Ayes carry.
- Tim – There is a typo on line 41. Faculty is spelt wrong. I move a correction on that. Mike Banish seconds. Ayes carry.
- Kader – We will take the bill to the senate.

        - Mike _- I motion we approve this bill as modified. Tim Newman seconds. Ayes carry.
    - The BOT meeting is April 7th and 8th. This is our time to show our campus. I have invited UA and UAB senators to a luncheon. There are at least twelve coming from these campuses. We should receive the final number next week. This is the same thing that was done at UAB. We want to keep this going. We are looking to reserve Shelby Center room 301. It will be directly after the BOT and is open for all of you to attend.
    - I may have to call two special meetings in April. We have only one executive committee meeting and two senate meetings before summer. I would rather call the meetings in April before summer.
    - The last point is Professional Studies is making progress. The ADHOC committee is coming to a close and will meet tomorrow at 10:00.
- Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
    - My committee reviewed the policy for academic titles. The first issue was that Chapter 7 already deals with this issue. It should be in agreement with chapter 7. The second issue is that the members do not believe there is not a need for lecture ladder. The emphasis is that new faculty hire should be tenure tracked faculty. They do realize there is a heavy reliability of lecturers.
- Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
    - We finished the distinguished speaker call. We did have more than last fall. We are reviewing those now and will make an announcement by the end of April.
- Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, Eric Seeman
    - We discussed the SGA grading resolution. Most of the committee didn't see a problem. We did come up with a recommendation for plus/minus rating. First point, we want the SGA to feel affirmed. I think to maintain the academic freedom for the professor should be considered. I don't see an issue with making these be weighted. Some discussion was old plus/minus rating that previously existed. I don't see that as good idea. I think we should grandfather it in. I don't think plus/minus should go below C.
        - Mike – Are we going to have a A plus?
        - Eric – Yes, it would be a 4.33?
        - Mike – It would be A plus to C minus?
        - Eric – I saw one policy stated it didn't apply to pass fail.
    - We could add a line to the syllabi so it could be stated which grading system the professor is using.
        - Mike – Can I ask you to put together a bill as far as this goes?
        - Eric – Yes, if you will review it.
        - Ramon – Do we say that A plus is 4.33?
        - Mike – Yes.
        - Ramon - I think this is a bad idea to modify this.
        - Eric – You would show that a new scale was implemented at this time.
        - Carolyn - A plus would be a major change.
        - Ramon – I suggest we keep the same scale.
        - Eric – I am ok with A being 4.0.

- Joseph – We could use a fraction scale.
- Eric – They should be differentiated.
- Carolyn – Does it seem like it would put some students at a disadvantage if some instructors don't go along with this?
- Joseph – I have always had some issues with current standards.
- Mike – It removes the idea that you almost made it.
- Joseph – We need to do one or the other, and not sway.
- James – I have no objection to .33. I wouldn't mind having this. I could see a use for it.
- Carolyn – At your institution did it include D's and F's?
- Joseph – It did, yes. We had D plus and D minus. To me, the majority of the time it benefits the student.
- Carolyn – Would it eliminate the confusion to stop a D and F?
- Eric – If a student has a C, it warns them that they may not graduate. This isn't a true scale. The range of performance from a A and B is different from a C and D. If they get a D, they can't graduate.
- Kader – You have some courses that are prerequisites. Some departments can modify D.
- Eric – In those cases, it doesn't have that much meaning.
- Andrea – A plus and A becomes a 4.0 then you go down. Pluses work for everything except A plus.
- Tim – I am wondering about the C minus grade. If they have a 70 most of our instructors will get them to a C plus. If it drops, will students have academic ineligibility for scholarships and athletics?
- Eric – Yes, the traditional ten point scale will change.
- Ramon – A C minus is a passing grade.
- Mike – Eric, if you will create the bill, I will look over it.

- Faculty and Student Development, Lenora Smith
  - Communicable Disease Policy
    - One member did bring up an issue with membership on page 3. The member wanted to know why we needed a faculty senate representative or Provost Office representative. The member said they could see notifying the Provost office if something occurs, but doesn't see the need for faculty senate. The problem is if we have too many members on the committee, we could risk violating patient's rights for privacy.
    - The other question has to do with page 5B. This is in regards to who we notify in case something does occur. The suggestion was to notify the chair of the CDMT if it was during normal office hours. If not, we need to know the next office to contact. They would like to see a phone or email tree created to send out to the committee with all contact information.
      - Mike – Do we want to move forward? They recommend we don't do anything.
      - Lenora – Yes, they don't see adding the additional members. They do see creating the phone/email tree for the current members listed.

- Mike – My opinion is that I am happy to give up faculty senate representative. Provost?
- Provost – As I looked at the policy and all the impacts, I did see it important to have those suggested members added. I do understand the HIPAA issues. That is true in a lot of things we do.
- Mike – I would like to make a motion that we do add someone for the provost office.
- Carolyn - I support adding someone from the faculty senate.
- Mike – Ok, I would like to make a motion that we add someone from the faculty senate and provost office to the bill.
- Kader – I second.
- The motion carried anonymously.
- Mike – I would like to motion that we go forward with the modified bill to the full senate. Tim Newman seconds. Ayes carry.

- Governance and Operations, James Swain
  - The committee met on the 3rd of March. I declare victory to our new senate members list. We did discuss IT policies. We have a couple of questions that will need answers from Dee. One of the things that we looked at is trying to be careful signing up as faculty representation. Then that led to the question of where is the faculty committed. If bills are starting to add things that faculty need to be on, we may need to take a census on where we are at. We may have lost some continuity. The senate secretary or someone needs to look at the allocation of members from the colleges.
    - Kader – We have the election of officers coming up, correct?
    - James – Yes.
- Parliamentarian, Tim Newman
  - The handbook committee has met four times looking at Chapters 4 and 5.
- President – Elect, Mike Banish
  - Back to Jim, I understand the OIT policies are overwhelming. I have a suggestion that we call a special meeting with the FSEC, the governance and operations committee, and get some clear paths forward on what the purpose of each policy is. Many of them overlap. My suggestion is that we call a special meeting Dee Childs to look over these and move forward. Is that in agreement with everyone? Will April 14th be ok with everyone?
  - Provost, we need clarification from you on the emeritus policy regarding wifi. There was question if they do have access to this. Can you check into this so we don't have to do a new bill?
  - Provost – Yes.
  - A new policy from the President is the hoverboard policy. I would like to have a motion if we move forward with this to the full senate.
    - Ramon – What if we have a handicapped person that needs a hand free device?

    - Mike – They wouldn't use self-balancing devices.
    - Ramon – Someone who is handicapped is not limited to this?
    - Mike – I would assume that a handicapped person would not use this.
    - Eric Seeman – If that is a concern one line could correct that. We could add the statement, "This policy does not apply to any assisted device required by a person with a documented limitation."
    - Ramon – I would like that as a friendly amendment.
    - Tim – I am not sure what a self-balancing device is?
    - Mike – A skateboard or hoverboard.
    - Kader – All in favor of the policy with the friendly amendment by Eric. Ayes carry.
- Mike makes a motion to extend ten minutes. Eric Seeman seconds. Ayes carry.
- The next bills to look at are 385, 386, and 387.
- Optimal Class Size Bill, bill 386. This was put forth by a professor in Philosophy. I can't say much about this bill, sorry. I asked Deb to add in some recommendations, she didn't have any. This can be moved to the full senate if we are all in agreement.
    - Kader – I would like to send it to the Undergraduate Curriculum committee and Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs committee.
    - Mike – I will tell Deb it has been sent to these committees.
    - Tim – Did we vote? We need to.
    - Kader – All in favor of moving to the two committees. Aye carries.
- The next bills are two that I put together. This is bill 387 – Faculty Authored Textbooks. I think that we should be able to buy books in the bookstore that are written by faculty.
    - Ramon – The bookstore is run by an independent company.
    - Mike – I think that we have some say. There is a contract in place.
    - Tim – Is the intention that all the books written by faculty would be sold there or just some? The way this is worded if they have one book by a faculty member they comply.
    - Mike – Let's put all there then.
    - Joseph – That could be problematic. In my field, some books are over $100. I don't know if we can massage it, but it may need to be reconsidered.
    - Mike – I think that this should go to finance.
    - Kader – All in favor. Aye carries.
- Bill 385 – Development Giving Directly to Departments
    - Mike – One thing that has highly irritated me and gotten worse, is the donation process on the website. First thing it asks for is your credit card number. The last time I checked we operate at 4% of the national average of alumni giving. I would like for them to come back and give. One way would be to announce to give to a department without first giving your card number. I think that finance, personnel, and governance committee needs to look this over.

        - Carolyn – What has been left out of the nonbinding suggestion is that we should help everyone with equal footing.
        - Joseph- A lot of the donations that come in are not allowed to go to certain areas.
        - Tim – What does our departmental statement look like?
        - Mike – I couldn't see it without giving my card number.
        - Tim – I think that this is great for people to support targeted investments in our units.
        - Mike – Joe, Ramon, and Lenora will look over it. All in favor with finance, personnel, governance, and student development say aye. Ayes carry.
    - Kader – The last item on the agenda is to approve Agenda 566.
        - Mike – We need to add hoverboard policy, Bill 384, and Communicable Disease Policy after senate officer reports. All in favor. Aye carries.
    - Tim Newman makes motion adjourn FSEC meeting. Mike Banish seconds. Aye carries.
- FSEC meeting adjourned March 17, 2016 at 12:40 pm.