FACULTY SENATE

MEETING #597 AGENDA
SST 103
THURSDAY, March 28, 2019
12:50 PM to 2:20 PM

Call to Order

1. **Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #596 Minutes from February 21, 2019**
2. **Accept FSEC Report from March 14, 2019**
3. **Guest Speaker Chancellor Charles Nash**
4. **Administrative Reports**
5. **Officer and Committee Reports**
    - **Bill 431**
    - **Bill 432**
    - **Bill 430**
    - **Faculty Senate Standing Rule Proposal**
6. **Miscellaneous/Additional business**

Adjourn

Proxies for Senate meetings must be a Senate-eligible individual from the same academic unit. No individual may carry more than one proxy.
PLEASE SEND PROXIES TO LAUREN BAKER: facsen@uah.edu

SENATE BILL 432: Tech Hall Upkeep

WHEREAS, The main entry to Tech Hall has become an embarrassment to current and visiting students and parents, including a large mold growth over that entryway, loose grip material on the main steps, dirt and grime caked on the entry steps and front "porch" flooring, and one main entry door that has been inoperable for over a year,

WHEREAS, The stairwells of Tech Hall seem to have been swept irregularly this academic year, with leaves, dirt, and dust regularly accumulating and remaining for days between sweepings,

WHEREAS, There has been a 7 foot tall tree growing in the middle of one rampway at the side of the building,

WHEREAS, Many white boards in the building resist erasure and are thus troublesome for classroom use,

WHEREAS, Faculty have had to resort to manual washing and scrubbing of white boards themselves before and during their classes,

WHEREAS, UAH has occupied the Tech Hall building for approximately 20 years,

WHEREAS, Past requests by faculty directly to chairs, deans, and higher administrators to correct issues at Tech Hall have not produced lasting correction of the issues identified in this bill,

AND

WHEREAS, Faculty desire the Tech Hall building to make a positive impression on prospective and current students as well as desiring that the building foster faculty and staff pride in their working space,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the deficient state of Tech Hall, including especially all items identified in this bill, should be immediately remedied by UAH's Administration,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the UAH Administration take steps to ensure that the conditions at Tech Hall permanently improve, with new accountability processes over those conditions implemented and carried out in response to this bill,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That steps to be taken to achieve the immediate and lasting remedies be reported to the Faculty Senate without delay,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That this bill be published upon the records of the UAH Faculty Senate.

SENATE BILL 429: Transparency in Flood-related Hazards in Shelby Center Bldg.

WHEREAS, Flooding has occurred in the Shelby Center building on the UAH campus,

WHEREAS, There are reports that the building was built atop and/or adjacent to springs,

WHEREAS, There are offices, labs, and classrooms in the Shelby Center building,

WHEREAS, Flooding may have caused structural damage to the building, including potential challenge to the building's structural integrity,

WHEREAS, Molds, fungi, and bacteria can arise in the wake of water contact with materials;

WHEREAS, Shelby Center may contain pathogens or chemicals in laboratories in the building,

WHEREAS, Faculty, staff, and students have a right to know the full status of the Shelby Center's structural integrity, structural certainty, and structural weaknesses in all parts of the Shelby Center in the wake of the flooding,

WHEREAS, Faculty, staff, and students have a right to know the full status of pathogen or chemical containment capabilities of Shelby Center building laboratories if the building's structure is compromised,

WHEREAS, Faculty, staff, and students have a right to know about possible health effects resulting from molds, fungi, bacteria, or any other pathogens or chemicals released due to issues related directly or indirectly from the Shelby Center flooding,

AND

WHEREAS, Faculty, staff, and Members of the University community have thus far been given too little information about the situation, which lessens confidence in physical safety,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the Faculty Senate of The University of Alabama in Huntsville requests that a study of the structural condition of the Shelby Center be commissioned by UAH Administration and undertaken without delay, if one is not already underway, to consider and report on all the structural issues raised in this Faculty Senate bill,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That said study (or another study to be conducted without delay) also include careful consideration of and report about pathogen or chemical containment capabilities of Shelby Center building laboratories if the building's structure is compromised,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That that study (or another study to be conducted without delay) also include careful consideration of and report about molds, fungi, bacteria, or any other pathogens or chemicals released to date or likely to be released in the next year due to the flooding, including report on health effects of said molds, fungi, bacteria, or any other pathogens or chemicals,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the completed study or studies described above be released in full to the UAH community upon completion,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That a report be promptly given to the UAH Faculty Senate by the Administration outlining a credible plan for central UAH funds, rather than department allocations, to be used to address the issues with the Shelby Center,

AND FINALLY BE IT RESOLVED

That this bill be published upon the records of the UAH Faculty Senate.

Senate Standing Order for 2019: Handbook Process___

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate from 2012 to 2013 debated and approved (through its bylaw-stipulated Three Reading Process) revisions to Chapters 1 to 9 and Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook, and

WHEREAS in January 2018 the Senate debated and approved (through its bylaw-stipulated Three Reading Process) a later revision to Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook, and

WHEREAS the Administration returned a rejection of the January 2018 Chapter 5 to Senate leadership in October 2018, 10 months after they were submitted, and

WHEREAS the Senate is confused about the Chapter 5 rejection as the January 2018 version of Chapter 5, as passed by the Senate, contained language that had already been signaled as being acceptable by Administration,

WHEREAS The Senate has never received a satisfactory explanation from Administration about why Chapter 5 was rejected or why its late-2018/early-2019 version of Chapter 5 is more worthy than the version Senate already passed in January 2018,

WHEREAS, the Chapters 7 and 9 have never been acted upon by the Administration,

WHEREAS, These insufficiencies fall short of being good faith efforts toward shared governance and interaction with the Faculty Senate

WHEREAS, Adminstrators have stated there are "deadlines" of this month for the Senate to act on Administration-submitted versions of Chapters 4, 5, 6, and Appendix B, despite the fact that Senate follows a Three Reading Rule according to its Bylaws and the Administration has been or is more delinquent in addressing the Senate's proposed Chapters 5, 7, and 9,

WHEREAS Thousands of faculty effort hours have already been invested in the Handbook revision in a process that began approximately 11 years ago,

WHEREAS University protocol dictates that the Senate is due a prompt response to its actions (Faculty Handbook Appendix L Part I Section E codifies this long-standing standard expectation),

WHEREAS It is not advantageous to spend additional faculty time on any other part of the Handbook before long-pending items, such as response to Chapters 7 and 9 and justifiable reasons for the rejection of Chapter 5, and

WHEREAS UAH is in the midst of an administrative transition, making proceeding forward with anything aside from obvious, non-controversial Handbook modifications not judicious at this time,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it is a Standing Order of this Senate that any other versions of Chapters 4, 5, 6, and Appendices A and B submitted to Senate by any individual are not in order for Senate business until the Administration has (1) given good reason for the rejection of Chapter 5 (or accepted Chapter 5's January 2018 version that was already in line with what Administration had negotiated from December 2017 to January 2018), and (2) provided a response on Chapters 7 and 9.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon passage of this order, that the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect publish this order upon the official records of the Faculty Senate, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon passage of this order, that the Faculty Senate President notify the Administration of the need to respond to all Faculty Senate actions in a prompt, responsible manner and notify the Administration that the Senate must follow its by-laws in regard to Handbook revision and handling of all other bills before Senate.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING
March 14, 2019
12:50 P.M. ENG 117

Present: Christina Carmen, Laird Burns, Monica Dillihunt, Carmen Scholz, Jeff Weimer, Mike Banish, Tim Newman

Absent: Lori Lioce, Gang Wang

Guest: President Bob Altenkirch, Sandra Parton, Todd Barre, Laurel Long

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:56 pm.
- **Meeting Review:**
  - **Bill 431 passes first reading unanimously.**
  - **Bill 432 passes first reading unanimously.**
  - **Telecommunications Policy was sent to Personnel and Finance committee.**
  - **Appendix B was tabled.**
  - **Bill 430 passed first reading unanimously.**
- **Administrative Reports:**
  - President Bob Altenkirch
    - The Executive Plaza survey came back. The planners analyzed it and worked up a summary. Most of these points are student and faculty/staff viewpoints. Students want fast, casual restaurants. Faculty want sit down restaurants. Everyone wants a coffee shop, 24/7 food service, and basic services. All have requested event space. If you look at the master plan, there is a master purpose event center. It is between Spragins and University Place School. The planners think it would better fit in Executive Plaza. Everyone wants a lively and walkable area. A public park is wanted. That would be easy to accommodate. Students want dense stacked housing. Half faculty and staff said they would live in Executive Plaza with high standards. Students would like to see small units due to cost. Faculty/Staff believe Student Services should be moved to that area. They feel they would be utilized if moved closer to living quarters. Everyone wants us to be environmentally responsible. There will be two town hall meetings soon. They will talk about the survey results and receive feedback. They have created a footprint plan. It appears to me there is too much taken up with student housing. We went to the zoning commission to change the zoning. The property that is under Research Park zoning has huge setbacks with the restrictions. Some restrictions require housing to be on top of retail. The planners evaluated the market and didn't think the market would support all the housing on top of retail.

- Mike – I am concerned about Dunkin Donuts have raised their prices and are out of line with off campus sites. Having a commercial entity in here and to split profit, seems to be a way to raise prices on students.
- Carmen – They doubled the prices in our site versus off site sites in our area. This happened about a month ago.
- Laird – That would be a concern extending to Executive Plaza. This wouldn't be the best practice for students in trying to reach them. My other concern is a multi-purpose center. If we grow, we need to make sure our events take priority to other events.
- President – If I look at the Texas agreement, up front there are certain dates setup for the university.
- Laird – We are trying to build more government programs and am concerned about the capacity to host those. I don't think we can always plan ahead to know those dates. I know commercial interest has to pay for it.
- President – There will be town hall meetings. The planners will come together with all the information to come up with a plan that would be an amendment to the master plan. We need to decide how we are going to execute. There is no cookie cutter way to do it. It is a tradeoff of risk and control. On the structure side, we are trying to figure that out.

  - Commencement is May 2nd at 10 and 2:30.
    - Provost – College of Engineering and Business are at 10. The other colleges are at 2:30.
    - Carmen – Can we have an update on Shelby Center?

- Provost Christine Curtis
  - The tenure and promotion letters went out March 1. Lecture promotion letters will go out tomorrow. After this our lecturers, clinical faculty, tenure/tenure track will go through at the same time.
  - I wanted to let you know that the Academic Appeals Policy is signed and posted. Copyright Policy is in the process of being signed. The Academic Misconduct Policy is with the Office of Counsel.
  - We have setup a committee of faculty and students with a representative from the senate. I asked Monica for someone from her committee or herself to serve. Deb Heikes' has volunteered to serve. The committee is creating a policy on authorship. If they were to author a book, what is the process in deciding when it can be chosen or is it proper used for textbook. The other part of the policy will be on selection on textbooks when a publisher provides a rebate to the university. In a couple of cases, rebate has went back to the department. Another case it was being requested. Rather than just letting it happen and having concerns about the textbook selection. I thought it would be best to have a policy in place.
    - Laird – Is there an order of magnitude to the rebate?
    - Provost – Alabama and Auburn have similar situations. UAB doesn't that they know of. One was 15%, one department proposed $5/textbook. Auburn stated they have a lot of control on how the money is spent. UAB has a strong authorship policy. They make certain their students know the faculty member is the author and receives royalties. All that information is given that information.

- Laird – Authors get royalties and others get rebates?
- Provost – I don't know that it is a royalty. I think it is a compilation of the course. I think it is a rebate back to the department. In the meantime, with the advice of counsel, we are removing all funds from the department and putting it in the college. The funds are restricted to only student activities.
- Carmen – This is for textbooks only? Other publications aren't under this policy?
- Provost – Anything we would sell for a course. It is what students are required to buy for a course.
- Carmen – We have no policy that organizes faculty authors and the royalties they receive. Does the department receive some of that? Can they make the students use their textbook?
- Provost – That is part of the policy. It is the use of the textbook in the faculty member class.
- Laird – It is transparency at a minimum.
- Provost – We are ensuring that it is the best textbook to use.
- President – If they selected the textbook for that class that would violate the ethics law.
- Laird – I think we support this.
- Provost – I started quoting a policy. They had a committee of peers. It was far enough removed from the faculty member but within the discipline that would evaluate the textbook. Every state has their own ethic law.

▪ In our retention and persistence efforts we have had, we had the survey. Many of you know of students or multiple students have needs that doesn't allow them to finish. The idea came up from the Hanover study with various discussion, how do we help these students? We talked with our advancement group. They agreed it would resonate with the community if we would develop a fund for students in their senior year and need financial assistance. We have been working with advancement to develop this idea. It isn't full fleshed out. It is a working progress. We have concluded to start on this it would be for undergraduate seniors. The amounts we would provide would depend on fundraising and the generosity of the community. Some would say they only do it once. We don't know all the details but we are working on it. We are trying to look at the best from each. The Deans want to make sure we all have the opportunity to help students that have needs. The Deans want to make sure that when a need is presented they are able to help then. Another way is done much more formally. I wanted you all to know about this. The idea happened about two months ago and we have met two times. Any suggestions are welcome. Personally, I would love to go into the junior ranks. We will start with seniors and see how it goes.
    - Laird – I think that is an excellent idea. Do they have a group beyond advancement to help the student?
    - Provost – I would think the Dean of Students Office.
    - Mike – The problem with the Dean of Students. The students know us. They don't necessarily know the Dean.
    - Carmen – TJ was very well known among the students when he was Dean of Students. Do we even have the person now?
    - David – They made someone that person.

- Carmen – I knew TJ but I do not know this person. We need a person of that statute to take care of those students.
- David – You could call TJ and it was taken care of.
- Mike – The President has $1M in the contingency fund in his budget. What is that used for?
- Monica – Flooding. It has happened 3 or 4 times in Shelby Center.
- Laird – Can we invite this Dean of Students in and ask questions?
- Mike – Yes, we could try for April.
- Carmen – We have a food bank for students. Do they know about that?
- Monica – Nope.
- Carmen – This would all fall under the Dean of Students.
- Jeff – The support we need for students are not within a contingency. This is something that we plan and prepare for.
- Provost – That is why we want to raise money for it.
- Carmen – I think we need to advertise better our resources for students.
- Laird – If you google it, you can't find it.
- Christina – I think knowing it exist is important, but the location should be discreet.
- Carmen – You don't have to advertise the address.
- Laird – I think making an email address known would be sufficient.
- Mike – Next time we will have Charles Nash to speak with us.
- Tim – There are many faculty complaints. I receive many complaints from faculty that all finalist should have been on campus. One candidate was brought and was hired. There was dissatisfaction that there was not more. I think it would be a mistake to hire someone that was never brought to the campus.
- Carmen – We are not a company. We are shared governance. The board needs to remember that.
- Tim - Our faculty may not buy into a new President if they do not come for a visit.
- Jeff – Can I ask is there an established procedure for how we hire Presidents or Provosts?
- Tim – Only for Provost.

- Provost – I walked through on the 10th and saw the stream. They drilled holes under the loading deck. The concrete was starting to buckle. A stream is still coming out.
- Todd – On 2/23 the intrusion started from the basement. We never have had deep water in the building. GeoTech recommended we drill holes in the loading dock. When it was full speed you could fill a 5 gallon bucket in seconds. The holes did help alleviate the pressure. We had to make decisions to remove items that water could cling to and mold grow.
    - Laird – Mike and I sat down with the President and Provost for a late meeting. We discussed the appendices and handbook. We asked about hiring a GRA to do some research. He suggested that he would do that. We also brought up prescription management. They said now the rebates go back to the fund not the pharmacy. Bob was also going to check into that. We requested that a benefits committee be set up to listen to faculty. He

suggested that he could do that as well. They said it was several millions of dollars that went back into the pool for faculty/staff.

- Tim – Their CEO is quoted in fortune magazine that he only puts prescriptions on the list that give him kickbacks.
- Laird – The fired and changed another company. UAH would be a candidate to go into this.
- Laurel – Us, Tuscaloosa, and System Office is under that group plan.
- Mike – The President did agree to set up a benefits committee.
- Member – We have one setup and faculty our on the committee. They also have input. We don't pick the members, they are sent to us.
- Provost – None of the information from that committee is relayed back to the senate.
- Todd – Sounds like there is a mechanism that needs to be straightened up some.
- Provost – Don't they volunteer?
- Christina – I don't remember there being a benefits committee on the list.
- Carmen – I think that is another example that faculty serve on certain committees, but don't report back.
- Todd – We keep the humidity down with fans. Carpet, sheet rock, furniture have all been removed. As soon as we came back from spring break, we are working with architect on the foundation. We don't see any signs of erosion. They feel comfortable that it is stable. Moving forward is to mitigate what we can. We will have to put in drainage. That is where we are. The temp being cool is helping. We will check air quality. We do have a one way air system so it doesn't recirculate. It's just heavy rain. It isn't on a spring.
    - Christina – Was this a risk we took?
    - Todd – It was built in 2006. I haven't seen records. General Counsel is involved to help UAH.
    - Carmen – Faculty wants to know who signed the permit. It was a swampy area.
    - Todd – We've heard similar events have happened at Huntsville Hospital.
    - Vladimir – What is the impact?
    - Provost – Physic lab. We have to figure out spring and fall.
    - Todd – It depends on what they find. Just the basement is affected. We are checking the whole building.
- Sandra – All companies get rebates. When we originally did a RFP in 2015, and chose OptiumRX. They do offer a percentage of the rebates.
    - Mike – How much do we get? And what are we doing with it?
    - Sandra – They put it back into the account to offset the cost.
    - Tim – This distorts the market. You aren't always getting the lowest cost. As employees, there isn't any transparency. The pharmacy managers can't tell you anything. BCBS can't tell you anything.
    - Sandra – What is that based on?
    - Tim – If I go to the drugstore and have to pay $2200 and could have paid $1100.

- Sandra – I have received a lot less of issues since our recent change. Every PBM is going to have issues.
- Laird – If you go to the lower premium, higher deductible plan, we should have notice of prescription coverage changes. That would allow us to choose the best plan.
- Sandra – For most, there is an alternative. There is the opportunity for you to do a PA. The employee can request that a PA done to the PBM.
- Tim – That process is about 90 days. It isn't permanent. If you are in a situation where your prescription is up, can you wait?
- Sandra – Usually it last for a year. It's usually 90 days if that haven't taken that drug before.
- Tim – That isn't true. The one I am talking about is you receive a 30 day supply.
- Sandra – I am not saying you get a year supply.
- Member – My husband received the PA and received the prescription for one year.
- Tim – I think that it isn't a fair process that this comes out after I chose the program.
- Laurel – BCBS sends out the notices.
- Sandra – Most received these notices in November.
- Mike – I am totally out of this. I have almost no clue of what you are talking about. I don't use the UAH plan. It seems like that while all the necessary steps are being taken. It seems like the best information for decision making isn't being collated. I think we need to look at that. The fact is that there are all individuals and don't know to communicate with each other about these changes. If you had a public disruption list, then in faculty or staff senate, then you could discuss the number of disruptions that were taken place within the campus.
- Sandra – I think your example is extreme. We have had very little disruption.
- Mike – I have three people complaining about the changes. You are going to down the path of taking an ineffective drug. I think we need to be more proactive and upfront.
- Sandra – If you took everyone, there will always be someone who is negatively affected. We can't choose a plan that will take care of everyone.
- Mike – The question will then be as we choose the two plans that some information will be out there to list the drugs that will be available. I don't ever remember asking for membership for this committee. Apparently, there are missteps on our part as well. We need to look forward on how we best do that.
- Laurel – We have a standing benefits committee with UA and the system office. The system office has chosen a benefits consultant. Sandra and I are not making these decisions in isolation. When we partner, we get the value of that. It may not seem the best or transparent but we do have a larger committee looking into this.

On the smaller benefits committee, we tackle these things. When we transitioned to the higher deductible plane, we thought we were sharing information. We will be happy to share any additional information.

- Laird – We think you are trying to be appropriate.
- Laurel– They will transition in 2019.
- Monica – Just like when we met on campus, when we saw the higher deductible plan the meat wasn't upfront.
- Laurel – We had 48 sessions on campus. We went into a tremendous amount of detail.
- David – There is a distinction between plans and the pharmacy.
- Monica – Not knowing which medicines change, I wouldn't have known the options I had. Those are the things that would have helped.
- Laurel – We talked about that in our presentations. That was a specific part.
- Tim – I did due diligence. I did exactly what they said. They did a wonderful presentation. The issue isn't for any failing among Laurel or Sandra. You couldn't have given all the information to make an informed decision. I think we have a situation with people in the two classes of plans. I am apparently subsidizing for the smaller plans.
- Christina – I think the mechanism for not having a faculty senate member on the committee relaying the information would have corrected this.
- Mike – This isn't an attack on you. The system is broken. We need to figure out how to address the system. You are doing the best you can. We don't seem to know who is represented on that committee.
- Todd – As we move forward with our sister universities, we will bring these issue up. They do try to address these issues.
- Jeff – Yes, compliments. It isn't an UAH problem it is a national problem. As you have said that you have done these reports, it seems that you check these plans and you know that we will do better. Do you know enough about potential spikes and make reports about specific drugs and their increase?
- Laurel – Around a class of drugs or specific drugs?
- Sandra – The formulary can change. What you pay may change in one month. You are dealing with a market that is volatile. We are just the victims in this. There are market considerations.
- Laurel – I had sticker shock with our new price on a drug. We are victims to that. We are trying and we will give information as best as we can.
- Monica – What happens to a staff member that can't afford these increases?
- Sandra – We tried to steer a lower paid staff members to the PPO plan. The PPO plan is still based on premier tiers.
- Laurel – We tried to diligent in that plan.

- Carmen – I had a point that I wanted to bring to your attention. One chemical company went out of business, we were able to obtain materials for low prices. The larger pieces went on auction for low prices. The department for three days trying to figure out to go about this. All the items we wanted was above $15K. When it came to the actual process of biding, then we were told we had to go through bid. We lost in excess of $100K.
    - Todd – That is one of the classic things we run into. State rules and regulations limit how high you can go. The only way to work around that is to work to get it changed. If we have examples, we can try to get that changed. We lose out on value because of these rigid rules. Universities just started letting us participate in auctions. It is an uphill battle.
    - Tim – I have been talking with a number of colleagues on campus have encouraged me to bring a standing order to the senate in regards to the handbook. This says that we will not receive any more revisions until we know why chapter 5 was not accepted. We are over 10 years on the process. The senate acted to send chapter 7 and 9 in 2013. I think it is out of line for there to be a deadline on any response.
    - Laird – When we met with the President and Provost, they mentioned it usually takes 10 years to move forward with a handbook.
    - Tim – I propose this standing order for the senate. I do not want it as a bill. We do need to vote for it on the agenda.

- **Officer/Committee Reports**
    - Christina Carmen, Ombudsperson
        - No report.
    - Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
        - We've had 40-41 approvals for RCEU. The student list is sent and they will be employees. There is a whole new process for them to have background checks. All faculty will receive notifications. Faculty will also receive notification about a shadowing process. The Distinguished Speaker series is our new order of business.
    - Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
        - No report.
        - Laird – When are elections done?
        - Monica – Next meeting. Lori is doing that.
    - David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
        - This morning I sent out the department chair survey. I have received 6 responses. There is some substance to the responses.
    - Vladimir Florinksi, Personnel Committee Chair
        - We had the initial meeting on the discrimination policy. I will share more when there is more.
    - Mike -Jeff, have you heard anything on the overhead committee? Can you contact Todd?
        - Provost – There was a meeting on 2/28.
    - Carmen – I don't have a report. I have a question for the Provost. Students are aware of Executive Plaza. The students were not enthusiastic about housing prices. There apparently was something in there about the prices. Very much to my surprise, she spent the night moping the floors in the residence hall. CCRH next to Wilson Hall. The roof is leaking. This is a severe problem.
        - Mike – We seem to have things that are affecting students that aren't being made known across campus.

- Agenda for Thursday:
    - Modification to Chapter 8. Ron made a suggestion to Chapter 8. Under 8.1.3, we break into three parts. He wanted undergraduate and graduate in each part. I would like to put this on the agenda.
        - Tim – I move that this modification be put forward as Bill 433. Laird seconds. Ayes carry.
- Bill 431:
    - Tim – I have received a lot of concerns in regards to Shelby Center. This bill states that a report done on the building. Then the full contents of the report be released to all the UAH community. There is a lot of concern of the structure of the building. There is also a point in there that discussion on the campus is funded by proration. Carmen seconds. Ayes carry.
- Bill 432:
    - Tim – Tech Hall has been in a deplorable situation for a long time. Over 25% of undergraduates that haven't declared a major reside in this building. It is a horrible welcome to them and horrible workplace for our faculty. The points I am making today have been addressed multiple times. We are lucky that Olan King isn't on the BOT anymore. If the BOT members who knew him, knew the condition of his building would be angry at this university. I move the acceptance for Bill 432. Carmen seconds. Ayes carry.
- Telecommunications Policy:
    - Mike – My comment is it seems to be a list of possible ways that faculty can be naughty and the penalties. It doesn't say what telecommunications should do. There is no guarantee that it will work or have it work. You can disagree or agree with it.
    - Carmen – I am with you on this. It is a list of what we shouldn't do. What is the commitment from OIT to us? I have brought up the annoying calls we receive now that we have switched. Can't something be done?
    - Provost – They are working, but there is little they can do.
    - Jeff – This is brought forward so what do we do now?
    - Mike – We can approve it here. We aren't supposed to make personal, long distance call.
    - Jeff – It is to provide efficient and accurate information. It tells us what to do. IT doesn't tell us what OIT's responsibility is to us. I recommend that it go to committee.
    - Laird – I second Jeff's motion.
    - Mike – Let's assign it to personnel and finance. Ayes carry.
- Appendix B:
    - Tim – In light of the standing order, I move that we table appendix B.
    - Mike – Can I say no for now?
    - Tim – I will move. Jeff seconds. I will also speak to it. This process has gone on too long. Too much of our time has went into it. The handbook is a black hole. It is a misuse of tax payer's dollars to spend another minute on it. The senate is entitled to a prompt response. Let's stop the process now. Let's wait until we receive a response from other chapters.
    - Mike – Ayes carry to Tim's motion.
- Bill 430 – start up.
    - Carmen – This is about extending the period of startup plans. The main focus is we expect vigorous research be put into place. There are some disciplines that need consumables throughout. They need the money between the end of three years and tenure.
    - Mike – If you are an aggressive faculty member, you may have put in full price for a particular piece of equipment but they give an discount. In order to help those heavily reliable on consumables, we have put together this policy.

- Jeff – I want to comment on those who face situations who are restricted, petition, and potentially hear no.
- Mike – Carmen seconds. Ayes carry.
- Provost – How long does this suggest?
- Carmen – 5.

- Meeting adjourned at 3:11.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 21, 2019
12:50 P.M. SST 103

Present: ***Chris Allport, Milton Shen, Sophia Marinova, Kevin Bao, Amy Guerin, David Johnson, Andrei Gandila, Melody Ng, Deborah Heikes, Jeff Neuschatz, Mike Banish, Yu Lei, Seong-Moo Yoo, Fat Ho, Sherri Messimer, Gabe Xu, Gang Wang, Christina Carmen, Elizabeth Barnby, Katherine Morrison, Eric Mendenhall, Carmen Scholz, Jeff Weimer, Tim Newman, Seyed Sadeghi, Monica Dillihunt, Paul Whitehead, Ron Schwertfeger, Harry Delugach***

Absent with Proxy: Dilcu Barnes, David Stewart, Holly Jones, Joe Conway, Francis Wessling, Angela Hollingsworth, Ron Bolen, Jennifer, Palmer, Lori Lioce, Robert McFeeters, Vladimir Florinski

Absent without Proxy: Shuang Zhao, Christina Steidl, Kirolos Harleem, Earl Wells, Robert Griffin, Thomas Sever

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:51 pm.
- **Meeting Review:**
  - **Chapter 8 of the Faculty Handbook passed second reading unanimously.**
- **Approve FS meeting minutes from January. Tim moves. Carmen seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry. 1 abstains.**
- **Accept the special FSEC from the 7th and FSEC on the 14th. Tim moves. Monica seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry.**

- **Administrative Reports:**
  - Provost Christine Curtis
    - Morton Hall is behind schedule. One reason for this is all the rain. There was also rock in the area of the addition. It wasn't consistent so it wasn't found initially, so now they are dealing with that. Lastly, there were structural issues that they were not aware of and had to fix. They are trying to work diligently to catch up. It looks like it will be end of January/February. There are rain days in the contract. They are also given an extension in the contract to cover this. The good news is that it is continuing. This gives us more time to move in before the start of summer. We will keep you posted.
    - The Executive Plaza planners have been here. There is a survey out to all faculty and staff. If you have any thoughts for the plaza, please utilize the survey. There will also be some town hall meetings. The times will be announced.
      - Harry – When I replied to the survey, it bounced. Who do we email comments?

- Provost - I will have to find that out, but in the meantime send them to the President.

- The next thing is a new insurance plan that is coming up. The UA System is the holder of the insurance for the university. They are responsible for the international travel insurance. We have had two types of insurances in the past one for us and for the students. On May 1, we will both be covered by International SOS. It is abbreviated as ISOS. There is cost savings of about $90,000 by combining. All faculty, staff, students, and chaperones on sanctioned travel are covered. It will not cover your spouse, child, or a friend on these trips. It only covers UAH employees or designated chaperones. We won't see any charges to our colleges or departments. The students will pay as part of their study abroad fee. It covers medical expenses for accident and injury, emergency medical, security evacuation, trip coverage cancellation, and accidental death. BCBS does cover us out of the US, but only some countries. You would need to contact BCBS before traveling to see what coverage they offer for that country. ISOS provides travel assistance and pretravel planning. Everyone will get a card and can download an app. You can contact them when on travel. It also has a way for them to contact us if we have someone in a country where issues have arose. I have received emails from David Burkowitz stating that students were in a certain place, and we contacted the students to ensure safety. This service will alert us of any issues and if we have anyone in that location. There was a question in the FSEC pertaining to those with clearances. Neither of the other two universities asked that question, David did ask, nor will it not go into the regular database. We receive the information in our office. As we receive it and approve it, it will be put in the database. There will most likely be additional information you can provide. We would also change the form and ask for contact information. If you want to put in additional information you can. If you are going to Paris, but wanted to take an additional time to visit other places, you could place that on the form. Kevin Bennett is the expert. Kevin has an excellent presentation and would be glad to come speak with you about it.
- The faculty searches are going well. There are a couple of searches that are a hot topic. The number of PhD's being produce are not meeting the demand for the job. A couple are struggling to get candidates that haven't already accepted a job. I am grateful for the search committees. You all have done a great job.
- URB has turned over all the files to me last Friday. I am in the review process. The letters will be out by March 15th.
- The lecturers are undergoing the review processes by the URB. There are 11 files. Those letters are due by April 15th. In the future, the letters will run simultaneously. Since this was the first time for lecturers, they asked for them to be separate. We had 24 files this time and the URB did a great job reviewing them.
    - Carmen – I would like you to look into an issue brought to me by a faculty member. Apparently, if you google military science at UAH, it is a regular webpage. If you google the faculty, all UAH faculty show up. The problem that was voiced is that some faculty members do not want to appear under military. I think it is a glitch.
    - Provost – We will fix it.

- **Officer/Committee Reports**
    - Mike Banish, President

        - The Presidential search will kick off next week. We have an all-day meeting. I haven't received a lot of input from you about the next President.
        - We were just at the BOT meeting. It will be here in April. I had a chance to talk with a couple of BOT members. Other campuses has had as many problems with Science Direct as we have. They are going to look into the bill to talk with other. We talked about our pharmacy managers. Both UA and UAB recently changed their managers due to problems. At UAB, It really has made the difference. They said their manager is now giving back their rebates resulting in lower cost. The FSEC has invited the VP of Finance and Administration to our next meeting. This will be our topic of discussion.
        - Laird is off at an all-day review.
    - Carmen Scholz, Past President
        - No report.
    - Christina Carmen, Ombudsperson
        - No report.
    - Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
        - The senate will note that handbook chapter 8 is on the agenda. We should have other handbooks or appendices soon. We stared this process 12 years ago. I have expressed the concerns the faculty had under previous administration that the handbook could be waived at any time. I expressed to Dr. Altenkirch those issues and were reassured on those issues. He agreed to go forward with our current process. We have three readings. The first in the FSEC, the second here, and if it is passed, the third reading would happen. When those pass they go to the President and he agrees or disagrees. It has been a very long process. I think we have an opportunity to express the position of the faculty today.
    - Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
        - Please remind your departments if you have senators that their term is expiring, you should prepare for another election. It doesn't have to be new faculty. For FSEC members, we need President-Elect and Ombudsperson. We have one nomination for each. If you would like to run contact Dr. Lioce.
    - Gang Wang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
        - We are working.
    - Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
        - I thought I would be able to report that we were done with our reviews for RCEU proposals. I will have those done next week. We anticipate 35 that will be awarded. We are grateful for all those that have contributed funds. I must thank my committee for going through those.
    - Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
        - No report.
    - David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
        - We are preparing Department Chair surveys for retention.
    - Vladimir Florinksi, Personnel Committee Chair
        - No report.
    - Mike – I would like to have a motion to bring Chapter 8. Monica moves. Carmen seconds.
        - Tim – 8.1.3, one thing I noticed on both graduate and undergraduate, I think it should be made clear that it should be made by the faculty. I would propose that line 4, that faculty be added there.

- Provost – I think that means the whole department has agreed to it. Would it be recommended by a vote from the academic program or department?
- Tim – I think all the revisions have had the department votes.
- Harry – Different departments have procedures on how they do this.
- Tim – I would like to see the amendment and the comparable change be made in the graduate program. That is my motion to amend. Carmen seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry.
- Tim – At the end of 8.1.3, it sounds like if I want to change the chemistry program, I can just talk with Gang and it is done. I don't know how to change this, but I think the language needs to be adjusted.
- Provost – I don't think that is what it means.
- Mike – It says just that.
- Tim – Maybe it needs to say that do not affect. The Undergraduate Degree requirements may need to read different.
- Laurel – I think it needs to be general undergraduate degree.
- Jeff – I wonder now, changes that do not affect the degree requirements within an academic department or program but do affect general undergraduate. I also second Tim's motion. All those in favor with this motion. Ayes carry.
- Tim – I think the same issue is in 8.1.4. Maybe you need parallel language initiated by the department or program. Undergraduate and graduate are both there.
- Laurel - It is wordy, but it is doing what it wants to do.
- Mike – Do I have a second? Carmen seconds. Ayes carry.
- Tim – In 8.1.5, I think this can be read to mean that someone outside of the unity can make an override to a prerequisite to the course.
- Jeff- I am trying to see language that is specific to students wanting to get overrides to prerequisites.
- Tim - Say I have CS 200 and has MTH 120 has a prerequisite. Then math can override that prerequisite.
- Jeff – Where in here does it say that?
- Tim – For my unit, this practice has been a heartbreak for our faculty. I would like it to mandate the involvement of the unit.
- Provost – Is Department Chair sufficient without the word or?
- Harry – Yes, include the Department Chair.
- Carmen - I would say the Department Chair or instructor of record.
- Jeff- I am asking that it not be "or", then that leaves situations where the chair could override the instructor. I would like to say "and".
- Member – Are we requiring this chain of approval for every override?
- Mike – No. We have on the books for some courses certain prerequisites that get waived a lot of times by professional advisors. If a student is going to have a class waived, then that professor will be waived.
- Member – I think the spirit is the instructor gives the override. It isn't necessary to go through this whole chain. To me it is, who has access to overrides in banner.
- Jeff – Actually the chain by the time you are done, the Dean has the final say.
- Member – I don't think the Dean wants to do every override.
- Mike – Do we want to take out the last sentence?
- Carmen – For all practical purposes, the instructor of record is the key person. If I have a student that goes around me to the Department Chair, they aren't all knowledgeable of the courses. I would stop it after the instructor of record.

- Laurel - It seems that someone needs to be keeping track just to make sure that this is okay.
- Jeff – I would hope that I treat all students fairly. I really also say that there should be one other oversight level.
- Provost – I would like to point out that the instructor may not be a full time faculty member. I think to have a Department Chair or another level should be reviewing these.
- Mike – Am I hearing the opinion to leave it as is?
- Laurel – I thought were pulling the Dean off.
- Provost – I am arguing for the Department Chair or Associate Dean. In some cases, it would be the Dean.
- Mike – Is this good?
- Ron – By taking out the last sentence, do you want to add for approval?
- Tim – I formally move that we amend this language. Member seconds. Ayes carry.
- Tim – I have a question about putting banner in there. We may change that program in the future. Would we want to put a generic word instead?
- Harry – Course management system.
- Tim – Yes, designated course management system. I move to amend with these changes. Jeff seconds. Ayes carry.
- Mike – My comments that have been floating around is that one of the retention problems is I see cases where students have four exams in two days. Or the students may have three exams in one day, then one the next day. The middle instructor doesn't move their exam. We have the same issue this spring.
- Harry – I have given this a lot of thought. My real feeling is to say to the students – deal. With all respect, I would like to skip your amendment.
- Mike – By skipping we are losing 50% of our students.
- Harry – I hope they aren't given a job with deadlines.
- Member – Is there data to prove that exam times are affecting retention?
- Mike – No, but we have crept up 1.5 points in retention. Our ACT scores are up, but we are losing more students.
- Member- I think we need data to see what the reports say.
- Harry – Have we seen SIE comments?
- Mike – Most are done by them. Nobody knows the answer. No one knows how many exams are given each day. We haven't bothered to generate data.
- Eric – It isn't going to make it worse. It will make us faculty work more. We will have to write up a makeup exam. I am supportive that it won't make retention worse. It may not make it that much better.
- Mike – Who has had a middle exam recently?
- Carmen – You and I conflicted on that.
- Sophia – I know about the policy. I always announce that to the students. I think we can go a long with knowing the policy and letting the students decide.
- Member – It is almost impossible to schedule a makeup test in the testing center.
- Carmen – I think if we apply the rules as they stand, we move the middle exam. I think that is fine. Everyone has to adhere to that.
- Member – In nursing, one person controls it all and spaces them out.
- Christina – Maybe that is the key.
- Member – If the problem is that people aren't living by it, how does your solution change that?

- Harry – I would like to move that we table this. Jeff seconds.
- Jeff – I agree with the colleague about data. We don't have statistics. This isn't a policy that we can come back on. I don't think we have reached census. There was a bill put forward to change the time exams were put on the schedule. That would give us a more coherent approach to the exam schedules. I agree, table this motion.
- Provost – What data do you want?
- Mike – I would like to know what other institutions are doing right now. How many students are schedule for two exams in one day, four exams in two day, five exams in three days. Why is the common statics exams on the schedule?
- Melody – Working with the registration side, maybe there is a committee that oversees the schedule and exam schedules. To increase the student body, the exam schedule follows. Wouldn't rescheduling the exams create the same problem?
- Harry – My feeling is that you will find no correlation with the exam.
- Laurel – Some additional discussion on how they are scheduled would be good. In the summer, some students have to miss review day in some classes because they have an exam.
- Mike – All those in favor of Chapter 8 as amended. Ayes carry. Passes second reading unanimously.

➢ Tim motions to adjourn. Member seconds. Meeting adjourned at 2:08 pm.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
FACULTY SENATE

Establishment of a Defined Period for Start-up Awards at UAH

History: Bill XXX was submitted to FSEC for first reading on xx/xx/2019
Bill XXX passed first reading on FSEC on xx/xx/2019
Bill XXX passed second reading in Faculty Senate on xx/xx/2019
Bill XXX passed third reading in Faculty Senate on xx/xx/2019

Whereas The University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH) has an obligation to sustain and promote an environment that is commensurate with and arguably not counter to its Mission Statement; and

Whereas The Mission Statement defines UAH as a research-intensive university; and

Whereas UAH has been downgraded from a Tier 1 to a Tier 2 research university by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education; and

Whereas This report is one indication of failure by UAH to sustain the research goal of its Mission Statement; and

Whereas Assistant Professors at UAH are required by Section 4.9.2 of the Faculty Handbook to establish programs that demonstrate evidence of substantial growth and future promise in the area of research or creative achievements; and

Whereas These requirements are established to promote and sustain the research-intensive goal of the Mission Statement of UAH; and

Whereas In hiring an Assistant Professor to support the Mission Statement, UAH must be prepared to invest fully in his or her career over the span of the probation period toward a positive tenure decision; and

Whereas Absent evidence of programs with the requisite evidence in research or creative achievements, an Assistant Professor at UAH is not awarded tenure, amounting to a direct loss to UAH of its investment toward success in its research mission; and

Whereas An Assistant Professor starting at UAH typically has a period of four to five years to develop the requisite evidence in research or creative achievements to support a positive decision in his or her tenure review; and

Whereas UAH has recently established a policy that start-up funds awarded to Assistant Professors must be expended within two years, with an option by permission for three years; and

Whereas Unexpended funds are taken away after the two or three year period with little or no appeal being sustained; and

Whereas Assistant Professors could receive other awards in the two to three year period that are especially designed for new investigators and that must be expended with priority, meaning that expending of the start-up funds must be put on hold; and

Whereas Some consumables that support research and creative efforts may not be stored for long periods, meaning that longer-term funding is needed for them; and

Whereas The newly established practice does not demonstrate a sincere interest by UAH to invest in newly hired faculty to the fullest extent possible over the entire period of their probationary period toward a successful, positive tenure decision; and

Whereas The newly established practice is therefore incommensurate with if not counter to the underlying obligations of UAH to support new faculty to the fullest extent possible in order for them to sustain and promote the research mission of the university to the fullest extent possible; and

Whereas The newly established practice is therefore incommensurate with if not counter to the Mission Statement of UAH.

Therefore, b**e it resolved that**

Henceforth, Assistant Professors who start at UAH will be permitted to use the full amount of start-up funds that they negotiate in writing at the start of their appointment throughout all years of their academic appointment up to the time of the submission of their tenure and promotion dossier without any reservations over that period that changes will be made in the amount of the start-up funds or to the time when the start-up funds must be expended.

Be it further resolved that

Henceforth, all Assistant Professors at UAH who are still in their probation period toward tenure, who have not yet submitted their tenure and promotion dossiers, who had negotiated amounts of start-up funds when they first entered UAH, and who subsequently had any portion of those initial start-up funds taken from them for whatever reason will have all such funds returned to them by the start of the Fall semester of 2019 and will be allowed to expend those funds under the same terms as the above clause.