SENATE EXECCUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
December 10, 2015
12:30 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: Kader Frendi, Michael Banish, Carolyn Sanders, Tim Newman, Lenora Smith, Joseph Taylor, James Swain, Ramon Cerro, Eric Fong, Eric Seemann.

Guest: Provost Christine Curtis

President Altenkirch was not present.

➢ Faculty senate president Kader Frendi called the meeting to order at 12:31 pm.

➢ **Administrative Report**

- Provost Christine Curtis
  - o Dr. Altenkirch is away at a Foundation Meeting, but he wanted me to encourage everyone to come to graduation. We will have Major General Charles Bolden. He will be our speaker. He is a NASA administrator and has been since 2009. He is a native of Columbia, South Carolina. I had the opportunity to meet him at a groundbreaking for the planetarium at the State Museum there. There were a bunch of high school students there at the Challenger Center. During that particular groundbreaking he spoke and his brothers and sisters were there. He spoke of his mother who was a force to be reckoned with. After, there was a rocket to be shot off and it failed. Then the kids started shooting off their rockets. He was having so much fun, it was a sight to see. Later that year I went to a presentation by some of our faculty. They had written a three-volume book on women and the history of South Carolina. All of a sudden the name Bolden came up and it got my attention. It was Mrs. Bolden, Charlie's mother. They are African American. In 1957, the schools of South Carolina were very segregated and Mrs. Bolden was a librarian. They allowed her to be the librarian in that high school, which they thought was okay because she wouldn't be teaching. So she was able to break the race line in South Carolina which was rather a phenomenal event. She raised children that have really made their mark. He's a very interesting speaker and pleasant person. I encourage you to come and to greet him.
  - o The other thing I wanted to mention to you is that I sent out a notice that we will have workshops starting the beginning of January, provided by IT, for working with Canvas so that faculty can learn how to hold classes on Canvas just in case of shut down for winter weather. Last winter we lost so much class time and it was quite devastating. IT will provide the instruction and opportunity to practice. These workshops will be

January 4, 5, 11, and 12. They will also be happy to come to individual departments at other requested times to provide special training for you and your colleagues. This will encourage us to keep contact with students over snow days to keep them working on their materials. Huntsville City Schools did this the whole time last year.

o Spring registration is now up and I want to thank you for encouraging students to register. If you know of any of your students who have not registered for Spring please ask them to register. Let them know we want them to come back.
   ▪ Carolyn Sanders: Is registration up percentage wise compared to last year?
   ▪ Provost: Yes, but I don't remember the number.

o The SACSCOC team will be here March 15 – 17. We don't know who they are going to ask to see so you need to be here. They will send a list ahead of time of whom they would like to meet with and we will set that up, but when they get here they may change their minds. Be prepared. The thing that we have to make sure of is that everyone on campus knows what our QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) is. Ours is Collaborative Learning, which is students working together to pose questions, explore options, and create solutions. We will be marketing this after the first of the year because everyone on campus needs to know what it is. Sometimes the SACS teams go around and talk to people and they may say "Do you know what the QEP is? What do you think about Collaborative Learning?"
   ▪ Kader Frendi: Will this make its way down?
   ▪ Provost: Yes, it's supposed to. Has Al Wilhite come to the Senate? I know I made that suggestion earlier. It would be good if the Senate had him come in January or maybe February to talk about this so they can be updated.

o We got our offsite review back. It turns out we are average. Five or six of the issues are things that we either forgot to attach. Some standards have 8, 10, 12 or many more attachments. Then they asked about audits that we can't provide until the Board Meeting in February and then the Financial Aid one in June. So we're handling all those things. The questions that are hard are institutional effectiveness. What happened of course was that in September we submitted everything we had. There were whole colleges that had not submitted their assessments, and SACS said that we are non-compliant. We very much need the Fall assessment to be in on January 25 and to the Deans by January 18. Then we will have to do the same thing in the Spring and get that in quite early and then we'll go onto an annual cycle. We must demonstrate compliance.

o Every college now has an assessment person who is responsible for working with all the chairs and faculty on getting the assessment back. The Deans are being held responsible for assessment now. This is part of their evaluation. We are getting the infrastructure fully in place. Now we have to do it and continually do our assessment. Yes, we're doing this because of SACS, but the end goal is to improve ourselves.
   ▪ Kader Frendi: 10 years ago the idea was to have a system in place to keep us from repeating the same mistakes and here we are again.
   ▪ Provost: What we have done so far to date is October 1, 2014, I hired Suzanne Simpson as our Institutional Research and Assessment Director. She then immediately started putting things into place to make sure we got the assessment done. That's when she brought in Mary Harrington January 2015 to

kick things off. She also bought Compliance Assist, which has an assessment module that is open for everyone to put in their assessment documents. So the computer infrastructure is in place. We're also interviewing for an Assistant Director of Assessment. The candidate has a background in assessment so we'll see what the committee has to say. Then that person will work with all colleges and units within the university to ensure assessment is done and do all the training. They will continually train new people in assessment and make sure we're self-improving.

- Mike Banish: Who are the assessment people in the colleges?
- Provost: In your college it's your Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, Mike Anderson. In Business it's the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies when hired. For Nursing it's probably Karen Frith or Haley Hoy. I think it's Emanuel Waddell in Science. I'm not going to remember in Liberal Arts. I think it's Andy Cling. The other thing for the offsite review was we did a good job, but not a sufficient job on our faculty credentials. There are still a few issues that have to be addressed.
- Mike Banish: What do you mean by faculty credentials?
- Provost: They have a, and when I say "they" it's really us, the SACSCOC is self-governing and we are all members of it. We elect senators right here in the state to serve on the governing board. The governing board has a bunch of committees and it is the entity that brings forward standards and polices and then the body of over 800 institutions vote. So we develop the faculty credentials. Faculty years ago were not teaching in their field. Now we have to prove that they are and that they actually have the credentials to teach either through coursework they took or additional training.
- Mike Banish: So take me for an example. Here at UAH there is a copy of my transcript and a copy of my diploma, but it's other things that are required?
- Provost: We have to show it on the table that has been developed by us.
- Ramon Cerro: The Chair of Computer Engineering is evicting emeritus faculty from their offices on December 15. There was an email sent about this. This is affecting important people who have been here for years.
- Provost: Are they providing them a shared office?
- Ramon Cerro: No.
- Provost: I haven't seen the email. I saw the write up, but did not see the email. Please send me the original email.

➢ **Officers and Committee Reports**

- Faculty Senate President Kader Frendi
  - At the meeting last month we announced the climate survey. The meeting that was supposed to happen in November did not happen and will happen next week instead in Birmingham at UAB on December 16. I have been invited by Delois Smith to join just to hear what they are going to do. The other item is that at the Senate meeting next week we'll invite Azita, and Karen Clanton will give a presentation on professional

studies. She's going to talk about the courses that we are approving as well as the program as a whole.

- o Reminder that the January full Senate meeting is the Spring annual meeting so Ray Hayes is presenting. We may not have time for business items. We can call a special session if we need to.
- o Lauren Baker has accepted the position so from January on she will take over.
- o This semester we have reviewed three policies. We have the final substantive change policy. This is an important one because it's out of SACS so we need to have it in place. Faculty Separation and Emeritus Faculty are being finalized.
    - ▪ Mike Banish: Please send these out to your committees. I'll make a few comments about them later regarding the changes.
- o Another thing I sent out also is the responses for the IT policies.
    - ▪ Mike Banish: I will start this out with the fact that we are advisory to the President and the Provost. So the changes that we did for the Substantive Change were fine. The Provost took all of these changes. As far as the Emeritus and Faculty Separation, what changed is that we asked for PI accounts to stay within the department. The Provost has told Dr. Frendi and I that the President won't let that happen because they need the money for start-up funds and other things. I have ready for you Academic Titles which we can go through at the end. I have not seen the redlines from Dee yet. One of the things that was confusing to me is that I had a hard time delineating what the IT policies were trying to say. Tim and I will go through these and add more verbage to the "purpose." So that we can actually understand what it is that we're reading. Then we'll move forward from those and I'll take the redlines that we have gotten back so far and proceed from here.
- o I got an invitation from the Provost to sit down with Counsel to go over the intellectual property part.
    - ▪ Mike Banish: I have one more thing. Can I ask the committees next year, while it's not an official position, to have a deputy chair that if you're not here then somebody really knows that they're supposed to come in your place so that we're ready to go because especially for Senate people will come but they don't know what they're supposed to do.
- Ombudsperson, Carolyn Sanders
    - o No report.
- Governance and Operations Committee Co-Chair, Jim Swain
    - o We didn't succeed in scheduling a meeting this month, but on January 7th we'll meet in the Nursing building.
- Personnel Committee Chair, Ramon Cerro
    - o We didn't meet to exchange opinions on policies, but I'll give you a general feeling that there is something really difficult to deal with between the policies and the faculty handbook. What is the role of the policies vs. the role of handbook?
        - ▪ Provost: I'm wondering if we should include that in the discussion with lawyers because they are system people and really whatever the system says is going to define it. It might be good to get their viewpoint.

- - Mike Banish: But the Faculty Handbook is approved by the Board of Trustees, whereas a policy is not.
    - Provost: That is true, but I still think you ought to hear what they have to say.
- Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair, Lenora Smith
  - We have not met, but we did discuss the policies and sent that to Mike.
    - Mike Banish: I need an update on Communicable Disease or maybe we can meet with Louise next week.
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Co-Chair, Eric Fong
  - We have the dean coming to the next meeting. I really want to put this to rest now and hopefully my committee will be able to make a decision after hearing what she has to say and asking questions. The other thing is that I shared the schedule change with faculty and asked for comments. By and large Option 3 where we add an extra class is most hated. No one likes that one where we extend the semester. The one they prefer is Option 1 where we add morning sections on Monday and Wednesday or even Option 2, which is the very early start time but also have this break during the middle of the day for student clubs.
    - Ramon Cerro: Many of our students commute and I have a hard time with my 8am class because they cannot start experiments until everyone is present.
    - Eric Fong: For graduate students who work though, they could actually come to a 7am class and then turn around and get to work on time so it just offers an extra opportunity opposed to strictly night classes.
    - Kader Frendi: That would be more viable to graduate level classes.
    - Mike Banish: I'm surprised that people don't want the extra day since we're so misaligned with the school year right now anyway.
    - Eric Fong: Well it's a small sample, but I think people don't see it as just an extra day. They see it as an extra week.
- Finance and Resources Committee Chair, Joseph Taylor
  - We met last Thursday and mainly prepped to evaluate all the RCEU proposals. We're on pace to speed up the process compared with last year, which makes us very competitive. Bernhard also noticed a large cluster of faculty proposals coming from certain areas so he's interested now in pursuing an NSF grant for that. We also discussed a Distinguished Speaker Series. We had 6 applications for 8 spots last year so I'm trying to generate more proposals and the Provost allowed us to take those 2 that weren't funded last year and possibly group them into a single $4000 proposal for a speaker. We talked about maybe cross-college speakers to generate more interest.
    - Eric Seemann: One of the criticisms that I've heard about the program is that it's a good idea but for a lot of people that we want to bring in $2000 isn't enough especially when it's covering travel and other expenses. It's not that there's not interest. People want to bring people on campus but they're not going to invest the effort if they don't think there is even a marginal chance of success.
    - Provost: Let the committee come up with what their recommendation is for change if they want to make any changes. There might be ways to leverage the money through Humanities or the Research Office or the college. Less speakers, more money per speaker.

- ▪ Kader Frendi: How many of the students are going to be funded?
- ▪ Joseph Taylor: Right now we have 27, which is roughly what it was last year. $3200 each.
- Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair, Eric Seemann
  - ○ We didn't meet in person but we exchanged emails regarding policies. Approved 3 bankruptcies. What came out of that discussion though is something interesting. 1 student had a bad idea for their academic plan. We're going to discuss at the beginning of next year some way to add a recommendation clause to bankruptcy or readmit. Must meet with advisor to approve plan. Regarding scheduling options, the faculty and students that I talked to didn't have a whole lot of push back on the extra day. I found that with the early classes people said "It's a good idea but . . ." You can't even get them out of bed at 9:30am. The other issue is what happens to the faculty member that's expected to teach those classes. We're asking them to be on campus at 6:30am to prepare for a 7:10am class and then also ask them to teach a 5:30pm class. It's too long of a day from a productivity point of view. The extra time between classes is good because 15 minutes is too hard.
    - ▪ Tim Newman: If we go to the calendar where the semesters get longer, previously we have had a situation where because we allow our Faculty PI's to charge 75 days in the Summer which is 40.5% of their academic year salary, we've had a problem in the past that our first 2 days of class or our last two days of finals are part of that summer term and I think we have done that a little bit recklessly. If we have someone that is charging 100% in the summer technically what we are telling them is that you are teaching this class at the same time that you are being paid to spend 100% of your time on research. I think we've been lucky and skirted the issue before. I don't know how. I think if we push our calendar out a half week on each side we run the risk of a serious issue with this.
    - ▪ Provost: I understand and in the Fall I don't think this is an issue. We can fit everything in before graduation. In the Start I think we're going to have to start a bit earlier. We'll have to look at that very carefully. We don't want to go away from that 40.5%.
    - ▪ Tim Newman: Some years the calendar falls in such a way that we can't start any earlier in January just due to when the holidays are and when we can get the students back. That's where we've come into those issues in the past.
    - ▪ Carolyn Sanders: Not every department has to have the early classes. It's really being marketed to a certain kind of person who is working and would rather slip in their classes early in the morning before work.
    - ▪ Ramon Cerro: I am concerned that every time we change one class we interfere with other schedules too.
    - ▪ Provost: The President asked about this because of parking since we tend to concentrate at a particular time and need to spread it out. But the second issue is the safety of students. It creates traffic issues and leads to them driving too fast which is a hazard for pedestrians. It is almost impossible to get from some places on campus over to Tech Hall in 15 minutes. This is why we want to add

    20 minutes. The easiest thing to do is to shorten the day and add those extra 2 days.

- ▪ Ramon Cerro: What about a shuttle service?
- ▪ Provost: That would be too expensive and we would need to add transit fee for students. You have to be at the right places at the right time.
- ▪ Kader Frendi: I think we have one more item. Coming from SACS there is a disconnect between what is on the University web site versus the Faculty Handbook regarding the Mission Statement.

- Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Chair, Tim Newman
  - o The handbook committee is meeting early next week. We are going to try to get through all of chapters 1, 2, and 3. We will go through the marked up version that has come back from the Administration line by line and compare it to the original and try to find something to bring to the Senate next week. The logistic issue there is that everything we do has to go through 3 readings. So the meeting next week will count as 1 and then the Senate meeting can be 2 unless we're unanimous. If we meet next week we have 2 options on how we want to handle it if we want to get it in the agenda for Thursday Senate meeting. 1. Another FSEC meeting for the first reading and then 1 or 2 readings at the Senate meeting. 2 – introduce emergency legislation on the floor of the Senate and try to take through 3 readings. Or the third option is we just punt and say we aren't going to do it until January. But we want it to be on the agenda for the February Board of Trustees meeting.
  - o The meeting was set for Tuesday, December 15th at 1pm.
- Mike Banish: (Passed out a document for new academic titles). The only change we've made that hasn't come back yet is that this will not retroactively affect current faculty with tenure. What I consider to be the highlight of this is that lecturers can be appointed for up to a three-year term, which helps to stabilize our teaching base. I would like to get this one through next Thursday as well. Are there any comments or can we move forward on this and submit it to the Faculty?
  - o Eric Seemann: This is one I got very few comments back on. The one main comment was this is fine as long as it's not used to pry someone out of a tenure spot or to convert tenure spots to non-tenure spots.
  - o Tim Newman: I have had some negative feedback on this one. There is concern from a number of faculty regarding the lecturer ladder increasing reliance on lecturers. A lot of time lecturers are used to solve a short term problem and in the long run the department is not enriched because there is not that expertise or institutional memory. They can't help with updating curriculum and if you appoint them to a max load, which according to AAUP guidelines is 12 hours, then if they are teaching for that 12 hours it's 100% teaching responsibility and there is no time for research or to do any service at all. So those people aren't available to serve on a committee unless they do an overload.
  - o Eric Seemann: Our research and creative achievements are what separate us from an overpowered community college. This policy is not talking about tenure tracks it's talking about titles and how these positions are defined. One comment made by either a faculty member or a committee, I can't remember which, is that that issue would actually be the subject of a different policy. To say we need to have a certain strength

within the department to have research producing tenure lines. We're trying to make this policy do more than its actual title.

o Tim Newman: in direct response to that, the comment that I received is that once we have a senior lecturer in place that sets things up so there is a track in place.

o Eric Seemann: I'm not at all rejecting that. What I'm saying is that we need a separate policy, or bill, or document even if it's related to this as an addendum and it should be specifically stated to protect those concerns.

o Ramon Cerro – There used to be a trend for 80% tenured faculty, but now there is less than 50%. The trend is there. I don't know if this document is part of that trend but it's something to worry about.

o Eric Seemann: I agree with you and I think what you're saying is that you don't want this to be a springboard into removing tenured faculty and replacing them with less expensive, higher credit hour generating lecturers and senior lecturers. Let's assume that what you're worried about is actually happening and we manage to get rid of this document, nothing changes. We keep going forward with lecturers as they have been previously defined. This document really benefits our lecturers. It gives them an opportunity to get promoted and get more money. To address your other concern that if this is happening a separate action is necessary and it has to be considered and well drafted.

o Provost: In some of our areas tenure-track faculty do not want to teach intro level courses so we rely very heavily on lecturers. My point is that if we have to rely on lecturers then I want to get the very best that I can, as much as possible Ph.D. level lecturers who are committed to the institution. I come from a background of a University Senate not a Faculty Senate so I come from a background where everyone is represented and that's why I believe that everyone should be represented by a body.

o Eric Seemann: So the lecturers are not represented by the Staff Senate?

o Provost: No. They're not staff, they're faculty. In our situation we have a Staff Senate, Student Senate, and a Faculty Senate and then we have this group of people who are not represented at all.

o Tim Newman: I want to take an issue. First of all, if we're appointing someone for a 12 hour appointment that's a 100% appointment already and there is no leeway.

o Provost: It's an 80% appointment at UAH. We have a 15 hour workload.

o Tim Newman: 15 hours means we're out of compliance with AAUP.

o Provost: I never said we were in compliance. We have a 15 hour workload. It's in the Faculty Handbook. 12 hours for teaching and 20% service.

o Tim Newman: If we're at a 15 hour standard I think that needs to be vocalized because that has never been the case previously. If we are going to 15 hours then we need to make it clear to people that our lecturers are automatically assigned an overload, not a standard workload and it's out of compliance with AAUP standards. My second issue is that I think there is a fundamental difference between a lecturer and a tenured faculty member. Our lecturers are not expected to have a terminal degree, nor are they expected to be permanent faculty members. Their appointment is to serve special instructional needs within the department. In addition, my vision for UAH is that we would be working toward more tenure stream faculty, not toward lecturers. So I think

this document does not have this vision. This document has a vision that we're stuck with lecturers.

- The time limit for the meeting was reached so a motion was made by Eric Seemann to extend the meeting for 5 minutes. Ramon Cerro seconded the motion. Motion passed.
  - o Eric Seemann: I completely endorse your vision, but this policy doesn't directly address those things. Research Faculty have their role clearly delineated. Look at lecturers here. The definition says that even under 15 hours or 12 hours, if that time is accounted for then they cannot be expected to work an overload. I agree the Faculty Senate should be the Senate for the Research Faculty, but it sounds to me like the lecturers would be better served in the Staff Senate because if 100% of their time is spent on that one activity, even though they are teaching, they basically are staff. I see this policy as simply outlining definitions and not a course of action because there is nothing in here that says we are going to encourage the hiring of additional lecturers. If we have that concern, which we do, then we should address this through a bill or other policy.
  - o Carolyn Sanders: I'm concerned about the typical load for a lecturer, specifically the AAUP guidelines. I knew they taught four classes, but I didn't know they had service requirements. What is fair and reasonable? Can we research the national norm?
  - o Ramon Cerro: The transformation that is happening nationwide is also happening here at UAH.
  - o Kader Frendi: What do we want to do with this policy?
  - o Mike Banish: My opinion is Eric's opinion. This is a definition. One of the things this policy was supposed to establish was the position of the librarians to pull them back into the Faculty Senate. I'd like to move it forward.
  - o Kader Frendi: As a chair, I can speak to the fact that I lost a lot of lecturers because there was no ladder for them. Some had been here for 10 years or more with no growth so they left.
  - o Tim Newman: It's a bad idea to set up this ladder with three positions because lecturers will use this, which goes away from our vision.
  - o Mike Banish: It provides a vehicle to reward, in certain departments, people who have been here for a long time.
- A motion was made, by Tim Newman and seconded by Eric Seemann, to table this policy.

➢ **Approval of the Agenda for the Senate Meeting**
  - o A motion to approve the Senate Meeting agenda was made by Tim Newman and seconded by Mike Banish. It was decided to strike the academic titles policy from the agenda and to add the review of Faculty Handbook chapters 1, 2, and 3. The motion passed unanimously.

➢ The meeting then adjourned, at 2:16pm, after a motion from Mike Banish seconded by Tim Newman was affirmed by the Committee.