THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

FACULTY SENATE
MEETING #601 AGENDA
LIB 111
THURSDAY, October 17, 2019
12:50 PM to 2:20 PM

Call to Order

1. **Approve Faculty Senate Meeting #5600 Minutes from September 19, 2019**

2. **Accept FSEC Report from October 3, 2019**

3. **Administrative Reports**

4. **Officer and Committee Reports**

   - **Online Course Policy**
   - **Bill 436**

5. **Miscellaneous/Additional business**

Adjourn

History: At FSEC Oct. 3, 2019

WHEREAS, Faculty associated with the UAH Faculty Senate desire to have a formal policy governing the Salmon Library Makerspace Lab,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the below proposed policy 02.01.68 be enacted at UAH:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

Salmon Library Makerspace Lab Policy (Proposed Policy)

Number   02.01.68

Division   Library

Date   ~~December 10, 2018~~September 17, 2019

Purpose   At UAH, the M. Louis Salmon Library supports the instructional, research, and outreach programs of the students, faculty, and staff. The Makerspace Lab enhances this support by providing the opportunity for the exploration, design and creation of new technologies, concepts, and objects.

Policy   The following policy ensures that the Makerspace Lab best meets the educational needs and promotes the success of the students, faculty, and researchers at UAH.

   A. **3D Printing Policies** The Library's 3D printing services are available for use by all current UAH faculty, staff, and students.
      1. Restrictions
         i. Patrons may print any object for research and education with the following exceptions:
            1. No weapons, weapon accessories, or weapon components;

2. No objects that resemble weapons or weapon accessories;
3. No illegal objects;
4. No copyrighted objects or any other objects that violate patents and trademarks;
5. No items involving the UAH logo and other identity graphics printed without written approval of the UAH Office of Marketing and Communications;
6. No items printed for commercial purposes.

2. **Copyright, Patent, and Intellectual Property**

7. *i.* *Items created in the Library Makerspace Lab and the user's individual rights extended to those items may be subject to the University Copyright Policy, the University Patent Policy, and/or the University Intellectual Property Policy. These policies may be found at https://www.uah.edu/policies.*

2.3. Submitting a Print Job
   i. Patrons must submit a printing request to Makerspace Lab personnel. The request must include the file to be printed and a print request form (see appendix).
   ii. Makerspace Lab personnel will work with patrons to schedule a time at the printer. Personnel will also verify the patron's level of experience with the equipment to determine the level of supervision the patron will require during the print job.

3.4. Payment and Fees
   i. Fees are collected at the point of print job approval.
   ii. Fees apply to all print jobs and all patrons; there are no educational or academic waivers or discounts.
   iii. Payments can be made using FLEX, cash, check, or credit or debit card at the User Services Desk.
   iv. Refunds for failed print jobs will be considered based on equipment failure. Refunds will not be given for failed print jobs caused by file errors.

4.5. Scheduling a Print Job
   i. Once a print job is submitted, Makerspace Lab personnel will provide the patron access to the printer for the length of time necessary to set up the print, stay with the print, and retrieve the print.
   ii. Patrons must undergo training prior to printing.
   iii. If the print job is scheduled for a later date and time, the patron should be at the printer within fifteen minutes of the scheduled start time or risk forfeiting their scheduled block.
   iv. Printing is suspended whenever the University suspends normal operations.

Commented [RLS1]: Library leadership felt that, in order to address concerns of the FS president, then this item should be more prominent than being item #7 on the list of restrictions.
However, moving this down does affect the numbering for subsequent items.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted

Commented [RLS2]: Library leadership felt that, when students review & sign the form that they will submit with their 3D print job, then those same restrictions and policies will be noted on that form.
If a student does not agree with those restrictions and policies, they can still choose to not use the Makerspace.
So that this wording is more clear, that print request form will be attached to this policy as an appendix.

Commented [RLS3]: I'm uncertain if an appendix to a policy should be above the "reviewed by / approved by" signature sheet, or after that. For this draft, I have inserted it before the signature sheet. If it should be moved below (or removed), we can do so.

- v. The amount of time required to complete a print job will vary based on the complexity and size of the object(s), current number of print jobs in the queue, and printer availability.
- vi. Print jobs are processed first in, first out.
5.6. Communication
  - i. The patron can expect to receive communication from the Library through his or her official UAH email account at the following points in the process:
    1. Acknowledgment of the original email containing the file;
    2. Notification of approval and need to sign and pay; and
    3. Notification of job completion.
6.7. Damage to Equipment or Supplies
  - i. If the printer, equipment, or any part of the Makerspace Lab is damaged during a print job, the patron will be held liable for damages if his or her negligence or intentional action causes the damage. Necessary action may be taken according to the procedures outlined in the UAH Student Handbook at the discretion of the Multimedia Lab Assistant.
  - ii. The patron will agree to pay for any damage or loss of items or equipment and will accept the Library staff's assessment of fair restitution for damage, delinquency, and/or loss of items in part or total. The exact amount of restitution may vary depending on the extent of the damage.
  - iii. If a malfunction occurs, patrons should contact Makerspace Lab staff promptly.
  - iv. Patrons will not be held accountable for routine errors such as printer jams or breakdowns caused by expected wear and tear or equipment malfunction. However, if a patron pushes past an error that results in more extensive damage, such as forcibly removing a piece of equipment or material and causing greater damage, the patron will be held liable for damages. Necessary action may be taken according to the procedures outlined in the UAH Student Handbook at the discretion of the Multimedia Lab Assistant.
7.8. Hours, Location, Access, and Staffing
  - i. Patrons may use the Library Multimedia Lab located in LIB210 to design, edit, and submit print jobs.
  - ii. The Makerspace Lab, located in LIB233, is staffed and maintained by Library personnel and student workers as designated by the Salmon Library. Daily operations are managed by the Multimedia Lab Assistant.
  - iii. Makerspace Lab personnel will be available at all times during open hours.

8.9.　Assessment and Adjustment of Policies

　　i.　Makerspace Lab personnel will routinely evaluate practices, costs, and capabilities. This evaluation process will be used to adjust prices and policies to reflect actual use and costs of materials and equipment and to identify future services and equipment for the Makerspace Lab.

　　ii.　At any point when the 3D Printing Policies are revised, any outstanding print jobs will be subject to the policies that were in effect at the time the print jobs were submitted. Exceptions may be made in special circumstances as determined by the Multimedia Lab Assistant.

9.10.　Administration and Compliance

　　i.　Violations of the use of the Makerspace Lab that constitute a breach of the Student Code of Conduct, the Faculty Handbook, the Staff Handbook, or University policies will be referred to appropriate University authorities.

Appendix:　　　**3D Print Request Form**

UAH Salmon Library Makerspace

Patron Name: _____ A#: _____

Email: _____

Requested Dates/Times to Print:

How many parts/files?	
File Name(s):	
Part Description(s):	
Print Settings: (Support, Infill, Speed, Etc.)	
Estimated Weight:	
Estimated Print Time:	

Other Notes:	

For jobs expected to exceed 2 hours (check box, patron and staff initial & date):
- **Approval for staff to oversee printing?** ❑
- **Approval for staff to complete job (remove it from the printer and store it)?** ❑
- **Approval for overnight?** ❑

By accepting this form and the terms below, you accept full responsibility for the equipment checked out. Misuse of the printer and its parts resulting in damaged equipment will be subject to damage fees, dependent on item and extent of damage. *You also acknowledge that your print is in accordance with the Makerspace Policy and does not violate copyright; federal, state, and local laws; or UAH policies.*

If a longer print job is scheduled (more than two hours) and you and staff have both acknowledged that staff will oversee and/or complete the print job, your print job will be stored on site until you retrieve it. Failure to retrieve it does not constitute cause for a refund. Other library circulation policies apply. Any issues about this process should be directed to Dr. Belinda Ong (belinda.ong@uah.edu).

Patrons may print any object for research and education with the following exceptions:
1. No weapons, weapon accessories, or weapon components;
2. No objects that resemble weapons or weapon accessories;
3. No illegal objects;
4. No copyrighted objects or any other objects that violate patents or trademarks;
5. No items involving the UAH logo and other identity graphics printed without written approval of the UAH Office of Marketing and Communications;
6. No items printed for commercial purposes.

Copyright, Patent, and Intellectual Property:
Items created in the Library Makerspace Lab and the user's individual rights extended to those items may be subject to the University Copyright Policy, the University Patent Policy, and/or the University Intellectual Property Policy. These policies may be found at https://www.uah.edu/policies.

Patron Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Library Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

For Makerspace Staff:

Files Received? ❑ _____
Files Approved? ❑ _____ **By:**

(Price = $1.00 + $0.20/gram, $3.00 minimum per job)
Total weight: _____ Payment Status:
Total Print Cost: _____ Verified By:
_____ Date:

Scheduled Print Time(s):

Printers Assigned:

Time of Actual Start: _____ Estimated Time of Finish:

Job Completed (Date and Time):
Print Removed by: _____ Patron Alerted? ❑
(if not Patron) _____ By:

Job Retrieved by Patron (Date and Time):

Patron acknowledgement of job received: _____ **Date:** _____

Review

Approval

_____   _____
Campus Designee   Date

_____   _____
Chief University Counsel   Date

_____   _____
Provost and Executive Vice President for   Date
Academic Affairs

APPROVED:

_____   _____
President   Date

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

ONLINE/DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY

Number   02.01.35

Division   Academic Affairs

Date   August _, 2019

Purpose   This policy addresses the unique circumstances associated with technology-enabled course delivery (herein, "online"), building on the existing academic policies, processes, and procedures of the University.

Policy   This policy establishes an academic environment that allows students in hybrid/flipped and fully online courses and programs to experience, to the extent reasonably practicable, the same level of quality and service as those students who receive face-to-face instruction from an instructor in a classroom on the campus of the University (herein, "on-campus students"). This policy is organized to address the general organization of the SACSCOC Guidelines and Principles for Distance Learning.

Procedure

General Administrative Principles

 Policy on privacy protection. Students who enroll in online courses will be afforded the same level of privacy protection as on-campus students. The University's policy on student records privacy protection is a Student Records Policy which can be found at: http://www.uah.edu/registrar/ferpa. The University's Online Privacy Statement is given in Appendix I.

1. **Reporting of accurate headcount enrollment.** The University has a clear, specific method for coding/classifying online and hybrid delivery courses and will report as required.

2. **Identity verification**. The University will ensure that a student who registers for a course is the same student who participates in and completes course assignments. The University provides a method for secure log-in for submission of assignments and for online test-taking through the Learning Management System (LMS). This level of identity verification is equivalent to that required for on-campus students.

   Within each college, faculty will set a policy for managing online/remote test administration, which may include proctors, remote recording of the test-taking in

progress, or other methods. The University is committed to adopting new technologies to aid in this process. The University will include this cost in the tuition and fees for the course.

3. **Intellectual property**. Intellectual property matters for online courses are described in Policy 07.03.02: UAH Copyright Policy (see Addendum A).

4. **Accommodations.** Accommodations required under federal disability laws are made for online students in the same manner as for on-campus students. The Disability Support Services (DSS) office provides a broad range of services to make academic life as accessible as reasonably practicable for students with disabilities. The University's Quality Education Practices Online (QEPO) Certification Program provides additional guidance on creating accessible online courses.

Academic and Accreditation Principles. All online courses and programs will be subject to the same curriculum development, approval, and assessment processes as courses and programs serving on-campus students, thereby assuring that relevant accreditation standards are met. Online courses and programs are not handled differently and are expected to meet all of the same standards in this regard established for programs serving on-campus students (**see Addendum B-Procedure for Establishing an Online Degree Program/Courses and Addendum B-Course Quality Review and Approval Process)**. The specifics about these matters are detailed below.

1. **Mission.** At this time, online courses and programs at the University are embedded in the existing programs of the University. UAH's online education programs are not so expansive that they warrant specific highlighting in the mission statement, but they are included in the Board-approved degree program mission of the University. Online educational opportunities are typically offered in a comprehensive technological university, and that characteristic of UAH is explicit in the mission statement.

2. **Curriculum & Instruction.**

   A. **Faculty Oversight.** As with all University courses, faculty will be primarily responsible for oversight of online course and program rigor and quality. All online courses and programs will follow the same processes for approval as those courses and programs serving on-campus students. All online courses and programs will adhere to the same general guidelines about content, rigor, mission-fit, time commitment, and credit hours used for those programs serving on-campus students. Online courses must also meet quality standards for online course approval. The quality standards are adapted from the [Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) instrument](#) developed by California State University, Quality Assurance program under the Creative Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike (CC BY-NC-SA) license. The

instrument [closely aligns with the Quality Matters™ rubric](). The standards are used to evaluate the quality of online and hybrid courses, as a guide to design online and hybrid courses, and as a self-evaluation tool to assist instructors with course redesign and improvement. The University's Quality Education Practices Online (QEPO) Certification Program describes and provides guidance on the application of the standards to course design (p. 2).

Existing courses that are proposed to be offered online will be reviewed and approved by the department chair, in consultation with department faculty and an instructional designer, to determine if the course can be offered online without sacrificing quality or access to essential materials or experiences. If a course requires access to a laboratory or other unique University assets and the course cannot be redesigned to provide the same level of rigor and relevance as the on-campus version, the course will not be approved for online delivery **(see Addendum C- Course Quality Review and Approval Procedure).**

B. Support Services. To support online instruction**,** the University will provide appropriate and relevant technology and support services to faculty and students in the following areas.

1. **Technology.** The University will maintain an appropriate investment in technology to support online courses and programs. To facilitate consistent communications with online students about the technology, the University will maintain a common template in the LMS for use with all University online courses. The template will include easy-to-access technology tutorials and access to information technology assistance for both students and faculty.

2. **Instructional Design.** Numerous resources are available to assist faculty with the design of online courses. To insure quality during the course development process, faculty members are required to work with the Instructional Designer to create learning modules, interactive student activities, and other assignments within their online courses. In addition to real-time consultation with the Instructional Designer, faculty who are teaching online also have access to the QEPO Instructional Design course, which outlines best practices in teaching online, in designing courses online, and in supporting online students. As well, faculty members are encouraged to join the Online Learning and Educational Outreach Facebook page in order to receive frequent updates on best practices in the field.

   Faculty members are provided with the quality standards from the [Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) instrument]() during the required QEPO training, on the Online Learning resource portal, and through a shared Course Review and Approval Tool (CRAT) used for tracking progress,

confirming best practice applied through course design, and quality reviews.

3. **Academic Success Support.** When tutoring is available for on-campus students, tutoring will, to the extent reasonably practicable, also be available to online students through appropriate staffing and use of enabling technologies. Responsibility for this support will reside within the Student Success Center. These resources will be linked through the common LMS template.

4. **Library Resources.** The University maintains a designated online learning librarian, who provides in-line chat support and online training for students who are engaged in online searches. Online training modules may also be made available by faculty through Canvas, our Learning Management System, to coach students through online search methods. These resources are linked through the common LMS template.

5. **Dispute Resolution.**   Students who have concerns or complaints will follow the same processes and policies as on-campus students. A link to general student support resources for students at the University is provided in the common LMS template.

C. **Consortial Arrangements.** In entering into consortial arrangements for online delivery, all proposed courses and programs developed by consortium partners will be subjected to curriculum review and approval by the relevant University faculty domain experts.

3. Faculty

A. **Qualifications.** In support of online courses and programs, the University will determine the qualifications of faculty in two areas: (1) expertise in the content domain, and (2) ability to deliver a high quality online educational experience. Content expertise is determined within departments following current methods employed for courses and programs serving on-campus students. The quality of the online education teaching experience will be assessed by a faculty certification process, if applicable. Faculty who teach online courses must be certified through the University's QEPO Certification Program unless they otherwise demonstrate mastery of online best practices. Exemptions shall be granted on a case by case basis by the Provost or designee. The QEPO Certification Program will be administered in connection with the University's Enhanced Teaching and Learning.

B. **Assessment:** Faculty teaching online courses will be evaluated using the same methods as for faculty teaching on-campus students. Student evaluations and, when appropriate, pre-test/post-test or assurance of learning assessments will be used to evaluate instructor effectiveness. The Student Instructor

Evaluation (SIE) forms for online courses will include questions that pertain directly to the online experience, when appropriate. The SIE Committee and the Instructional Designer will adopt best practices in online course evaluation as part of the SIE development process. Additionally, student and instructor surveys to evaluate online learning student engagement and technologies will be conducted separately from the SIE. Data collected will be used for improving services to students. Data collected will also be collated and reported through University reports and for accreditation review where appropriate.

C. **Training.** Faculty who teach online courses must consult with the University's Instructional Designer and receive certification through the University's QEPO Certification Program, if applicable. This certification program will familiarize faculty with the SREB Principles of Good Practice and the Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) instrument, and provide best practices for maintaining online learning objectives and outcomes consistent with courses serving on-campus students. Additional faculty training resources, available through online resources and in association with Enhanced Teaching and Learning will provide models for excellence in delivery of online, hybrid, and on-campus instruction.

4. **Institutional Effectiveness**

A. **Student Outcomes**.   As part of its ongoing program assessments, the University will compare online courses and programs with courses and programs serving on-campus students in the following areas each assessment cycle: student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction. These assessments will be compared to the University's metrics over time and to peer institutions and/or national benchmarks.   These comparisons will be used to make adjustments in methods to ensure that online and in-person educational experiences are comparable.

B. **Support Services**. As part of its ongoing program assessments, the University will compare online courses and programs with courses serving on-campus students in the following areas each assessment cycle: student support services (para. 3b, 1-5), library resources, and technology support. As with student outcomes, the University will compare the University to peer institutions and national benchmarks in drawing conclusions and making recommendations about changes.

<u>Review</u>   Academic Affairs will review this policy every five years or sooner as needed.

<u>Approval</u>

_____
Campus Designee   Date

_____   _____
University Counsel   Date

_____   _____
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs   Date

APPROVED:

_____   _____
President   Date

Appendix I: Online Privacy Statement

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

ONLINE PRIVACY STATEMENT

The University of Alabama in Huntsville respects student privacy and collects no personally identifiable information about a student unless the student affirmatively chooses to make such information available to the University. The University does not actively share personal information about Web site visitors. Personal information provided by visitors, such as e-mail addresses or information submitted via online forms, is used by the University to assist individual visitors as necessary. This assistance may involve redirecting an inquiry or comment to another University individual or unit better suited to provide resolution.

The University analyzes Web server log files to collect summary information about visitors to its Web sites. The University also subscribes to Google Analytics, which uses cookies to collect anonymous traffic data. This information is analyzed by the University and by Google Analytics to generate summary statistics for purposes such as guiding design considerations, determining successful site segments, and determining problem areas. Because the University is a public institution, some information collected on the University's Web sites may be subject to the Alabama Open Records Act, and in some instances the University may be compelled by law to release information gathered on the University's Web servers. Some Web servers at the University may adopt different privacy statements as their specific needs require that they differ from this statement.

The University is a research institution. At any time, online surveys may be conducted on the University's Web sites. Confidential information gathered in these online surveys is used only for the research purpose indicated in the survey. Unless otherwise noted on the specified survey, the students' answers are confidential and individual responses will not be shared with other parties unless required by law. Aggregate data from surveys may be shared with external third parties.

The University complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), which generally prohibits the release of educational records without student permission. For more details on FERPA, students should consult http://www.uah.edu/registrar/ferpa.

ADDENDUM A: UAH COPYRIGHT POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

DETERMINATION OF RIGHTS IN COPYRIGHTABLE MATERIALS POLICY

Number   02.01.68

Division   Academic Affairs

Date   February 2019

Purpose   A clear and up-to-date Rights in Copyrightable Materials Policy is important for the dissemination of creative research; for faculty, staff, and students to receive proper credit and remuneration; and consistency with the University of Alabama system is important so individuals from the three campuses are working within common standards.

Policy   It is the policy of The University of Alabama in Huntsville to encourage the creation of copyrightable works by its faculty and employees. Such works are an important contribution to the University's pedagogical, scholarly, and public service missions.

Procedures

A. Ownership of Copyright

1. Except as provided below, faculty and employees of the University who are the authors of copyrightable works shall own the copyrights in those works, regardless of whether those works constitute "works for hire" as defined in the Copyright Act. "Employees" include students who receive salaries, grants, or other compensation from the University.
2. "Copyrightable works" includes, without limitation, computer software, online course materials, multimedia, films and videotapes, in so far as they fall within the subject matter of copyright. To the extent that such works embody patentable inventions, rights to those inventions shall be determined by The University of Alabama in Huntsville Patent Policy (*Faculty Handbook*, Appendix G).

B. Exceptions

1. If the University contributes extraordinary resources to the creation of a copyrightable work, the respective rights of the author and University to that work shall be negotiated at the time such resources are provided. "Extraordinary resources" means facilities, equipment, funding, release or re-assigned time or

other assistance exceeding the resources normally provided to faculty or employees in a particular department. It shall be the responsibility of the dean at the time such "extraordinary resources" are provided, to notify the faculty member and negotiate the terms. The faculty member's dean (or non-faculty employee's supervisor or designee) must reasonably schedule negotiations. Negotiated terms will be noted on the appropriate university form, with all terms noted, including compensation. Those terms may include assignment of copyright, license of rights, or division of royalties. If negotiations do not occur after being initiated, in writing, by the responsible parties or if the negotiations do not come to a mutually agreeable resolution, then the copyright shall be jointly owned by the University and the authors, and the same division of royalties as utilized for patent income shall be used.

2. If a copyrightable work is funded, in whole or in part, by a contract or grant from an agency outside the University, copyright shall be assigned in accordance with the terms of the contract or grant. The individual faculty member or employee who is working on the contract or grant and who is developing the copyrightable works is required to execute any documents necessary to assign copyright ownership in accordance with the contract or grant.

3. If a copyrightable work is commissioned by the University, meaning that a faculty member or employee receives supplemental compensation from the University to prepare a specific copyrightable work, rights to that work shall be according to terms negotiated at the time of the commission. The faculty member's dean (or non-faculty employee's supervisor or designee) must reasonably schedule negotiations. Negotiated terms will be noted on the appropriate university form, with all terms noted, including compensation. Those terms may include assignment of copyright, license of rights, or division of royalties. If negotiations do not occur after being initiated, in writing, by the responsible parties or if the negotiations do not come to a mutually agreeable resolution, then the copyright shall be jointly owned by the University and the authors, and the same division of royalties as utilized for patent income shall be used.

4. Copyright in "institutional works" shall be owned by the University. An "institutional work" means either (a) a work prepared at the direction of the University for the use of the University in conducting its own affairs (for example, University handbooks, press releases, and software tools); or (b) a work that cannot be reasonably attributed to a single author or group of authors because it is the result of contributions or revisions by numerous faculty members, employees, or students of the University. Textbooks and other course materials prepared by a faculty member shall not be considered "institutional works".

5. Video or online courses shall not be sold, leased, rented or otherwise used by a current University employee in a manner that competes with the offerings of the University, unless the transaction has received the prior approval of the Provost or his/her designee.

6. When the University assigns one or more faculty members to create electronic course materials, rights to those materials shall be negotiated at the time of such assignment. Negotiations shall include the faculty member(s), the appropriate dean(s) and any employee who will make a significant contribution of ideas or

expression to the materials. The dean must reasonably schedule negotiations. Negotiated terms will be noted on the appropriate university form, with all terms noted, including compensation Terms to be negotiated may include assignment of copyright, license of rights, and division of royalties. If negotiations with all of the individuals who made significant contributions of ideas or expression to the materials do not occur, or if the negotiations do not come to a mutually agreeable resolution with all of the individuals who have made a significant contribution, then the copyright, license of rights, and royalties shall be owned by the University and the same division of royalties as utilized for patent income shall be used.

7. Any copyrightable work of potential commercial value shall be disclosed at the earliest practicable time by the author to the author's department chair or immediate administrative supervisor. For those works that are owned by the University or in which the University has an interest, the author shall cooperate with officials of the University and of any organization to whom the University assigns rights to such works in the registering of copyrights as well as in licensing the works.

C. Administration

1. Except as otherwise set forth, the administration of these policies shall be the responsibility of the Office for Academic Affairs.
2. The Rights in Copyrightable Materials Committee shall be a standing committee composed of six members, equally apportioned between faculty (chosen by the Faculty Senate) and administration (appointed by the President or his/her designee). The committee shall serve as a forum for discussion of University copyright policy and recommend changes as appropriate.
3. Disputes over copyrightable material or agreements dealing with copyright issues should be resolved using the General Grievance Policy given in Appendix E of the Faculty Handbook.

Review   Academic Affairs will review this policy every five years or sooner as needed.

Determination of Rights in Copyrightable Materials Policy Negotiation Form

Faculty Member's Name:

College/Department:

Title/Rank:

Date:

Title of Copyrightable Material:

Statement of Negotiated Terms for extraordinary resources for the creation of copyrightable work:

Type of Negotiated Terms:

Statement of Negotiated Terms for copyrightable material commissioned by the University:

Type of Negotiated Terms:

Statement of Negotiated Terms for creation of electronic course materials:

Type of Negotiated Terms:

Period of Negotiated Terms:

CERTIFICATION: This request is made pursuant to the Determination of Rights in Copyrightable Materials Policy. I certify that I have read and understand the policy and will abide by it. I understand that it is my responsibility to insure that I comply with the policy with regard to all copyrightable materials and negotiations.

Faculty Member/Employee Signature   Date

Dean/Supervisor Signature   Date

ADDENDUM B: PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING AN ONLINE DEGREE PROGRAM/COURSES

The development of an online degree program/course will follow a standard process to ensure the program/course meets best practices for online learning. Under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, the Office of Online Learning (OL) will work with the Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty of each college to create and maintain high quality online programs/courses.

According to the [Online/Distance Education Policy](#), all online courses and programs will be subject to the same curriculum development, approval, and assessment processes as course and programs serving on-campus students, thereby assuring that relevant accreditation standards are met. Online programs and courses at UAH are programs/courses in which 100% of the direct instruction of the course is delivered with no on-campus meeting typically required. Further, hybrid programs/courses are defined as those where 51% to 99% percent of the course material is delivered online with a combination of standard on-campus class meetings.

Procedure

1. Deans and Department Chairs will determine online learning needs for the academic year including which programs need to be online and what courses need to be developed. The Office of Online Learning Instructional Designers will meet with the deans and department chairs to provide guidance in the development of the online programs and courses. Factors to be considered include:
   a. Student need, demand for the program, and/or strategic rationale;
   b. Key courses to be offered in an online learning format with credit hour requirements and course objectives.
   c. Resources required (faculty, facilities, equipment) to deliver the course at the required level of quality are sufficient.
   d. Faculty are able to meet current commitments in addition to commitments to develop a course, or appropriate arrangements are provided to release faculty from these duties.
   e. Faculty (i.e., "subject matter expert" and "course developer") are available and committed to develop each assigned online learning course.
   f. Faculty assigned an online or hybrid course have completed technical training and the QEPO certification program unless otherwise demonstrates mastery of online best practices.
2. A [timeline with key dates](#) for course development will be updated yearly and posted on the OL resource portal. (See attached timeline.)
3. After the appropriate needs and resources have been assessed, an interested individual or department seeking OL support to deliver an online course or program must first work through the department approval process and submit a [course development form](#) to the Office of Online Learning. (Form includes course developer/instructor, contact information, syllabus.)
4. When a course has been approved by the College authority, online course design & development should be coordinated through OL.
5. To give Online Learning time to prepare, plan, and coordinate resources, the initial [course development form](#) must be submitted 4 weeks before course development

begins. (See timeline for course development for deadlines.) Exceptions will be made for special circumstances where the timeline must be adjusted.

6. Online course development begins 15 weeks or one semester before the first course is to be offered to allow time for final course review and approval by an Instructional Designer.

A. An initial consultation with an OL Instructional Designer will involve the creation of a Master Course Shell, a review of the online course syllabus and current course content, technical requirements, and development of a time table for online course completion.

7. Instructional Designers are responsible for managing the course development process and reporting the status of each course to the College Dean or designee.

8. The faculty member and Instructional Designer using a team approach are responsible for applying quality standards throughout the course development process.

The course design and development process consist of the following six interrelated phases.

1. **Analysis**

   The course analysis phase is an opportunity for faculty to explore the needs of the students in the class and consider the department curriculum and course content expectations.
   - **Faculty member** gets course approved for online delivery format by College Dean or designee makes certain the course is listed as an "O" (Online) in Banner.
   - **Faculty member** collects existing course materials: syllabus, textbooks, etc.
   - **Faculty member** and **Instructional Designer** review the Online Learning Policies and Course Evaluation Rubric.
   - **Faculty member** with help from **Instructional Designer** prepares course syllabus and modules.

2. **Design**

   The course design plan is created during the design phase. The course design plan provides a working draft of the course's learning objectives, assessments, and learning activities. During the course design phase, the Instructional Designer will guide faculty through planning their online course and document it using UAH's *course design planning template*. This template allows the faculty member to define critical information.
   - **Faculty member** and **Instructional Designer** collaborate to review course goal(s), major course topics, and learning objectives.
   - **Instructional Designer** shares the Bloom's taxonomy table and makes suggestions about types of effective online assessments that measure and match the rigor of each module learning objectives.
   - **Faculty member** drafts assessments and assessment rubrics (if applicable) for the course.

- **Faculty member**, with help from Instructional Designer, plans weekly supporting materials (reading, videos, multimedia, simulations, etc. and types of effective online activities).

3. **Development**

   During the course development phase, the faculty member and the Instructional Designer will gather and create material, finalize and test activities and assignments.
   - **Faculty member**, with help from Instructional Designer, produces or acquires content for the activities, supporting materials, and assessments.
   - **Faculty member** creates welcome message introduction video.
   - **Faculty member**, with help from Instructional Designer, plans and records lecture capture videos (with transcripts).
   - **Faculty member**, with help from Instructional Designer, reviews the course development survey and existing materials including course syllabus, program objectives, course objectives, textbooks, etc.

4. **Implementation/Course Delivery**

   - Course implementation is the phase in which the course is actually delivered or taught.
   - **Faculty member** imports pre-built course shell into the new semester's section in Canvas.
   - The process after importing is the following:
     - Click the Course Setup Checklist
     - Click the Publish Course link
   - When the class begins, **faculty members** are strongly encouraged to use some of the following best practices:
     - Enable Panopto (if necessary).
     - Arrange navigation.
     - Hide class materials from student view (if necessary).
     - Create a personal information message/announcement and post the first week of class.
     - Monitor and respond to class discussion postings.
     - Monitor the class e-mail for new messages.
     - Send weekly announcements.
     - Post information about office hours.
     - Grade assignments.
     - Update the class schedule, as needed.

5. **Evaluation**

   To evaluate course development process:
   - **Instructional Designer** sends course development survey to **faculty member**.
   - **Faculty member** completes course development process survey.

   For academic course evaluation:
   - **Faculty member** sends out course evaluation survey to students.
   - **Instructional Designer** collects course survey data.

6. **Maintenance & Revision**

   The course analysis phase is an opportunity for the faculty member to improve the course based on formal and informal feedback.
   - **Faculty member** (with assistance from Instructional Designer, if needed) will fix any broken links, replace outdated articles and videos, and review navigation.
   - **Faculty member** submits a request for meeting with **Instructional Designer** if course goals change to reevaluate course learning outcomes and assessment alignment.
   - **Instructional Designer** reviews course learning outcomes and assessment alignment in the event course goals change based on availability.

   Three Year Periodic Review and Beta Test
   - A review of online programs should be conducted every 3 years and is coordinated with OL, department chair, and the department faculty.

Timeline for Course Development

Example Dates 2019		
8/12/2019		<-- TO START: Double click yellow date cell; Choose a date from the calendar for 1ST DAY of Course Offering
End DATE		**Modules/topics**
3/25/2019	4 weeks before course development	Last day for Department Chairs/Course Developers to submit course development form (Form includes course developer/instructor, contact information, syllabus)
4/8/2019	2 weeks before course development	Online Learning Department Contacts Course Developers With Welcome and Instructions for Getting Started
4/22/2019	Course development begins (Weeks 1,2, and 3)	Course Development Begins: Kickoff Meetings/Orientations for New Course Developers
5/13/2019	Weeks 4,5, and 6	1st check-in (25% of course developed)/report completed
6/3/2019	Weeks 7, 8 and 9	2nd check-in (50% of course developed)/report completed
6/24/2019	Weeks 10,11, and 12	3rd check-in (75% of course developed)/report completed
7/15/2019	Weeks 13, 14, and 15	Final check-in (100% of course developed/course published)/report completed
7/22/2019	Week 16	Self-review Report Completed
7/29/2019	Week 17	ID Course Review/Final Approval from Department Chair-if a course is conditionally approved, faculty will address the feedback and make necessary changes.
8/12/2019	Week 18	Course Published and Ready for the Semester

Addendum C: COURSE QUALITY REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCEDURE

The Course Quality Review and Approval process for online programs and courses establishes a university-wide procedure to ensure online courses meet best practices for online learning and quality standards for online course approval. The Office of the Provost is responsible for ensuring the quality of online courses and their compliance with SACSCOC standards and designates the Office of Online Learning (OL) as the office responsible for overseeing the process. OL will work closely with the deans, department chairs, and faculty of each college to create and maintain high quality online programs/courses through training, communication channels for reporting and monitoring, and direct support to faculty course developers and instructors.

Background   According to the Online/Distance Education Policy, "faculty will be primarily responsible for oversight of online course and program rigor and quality. All online courses and programs will follow the same processes for approval as those courses and programs serving on-campus students. All online courses and programs will adhere to the same general guidelines about content, rigor, mission-fit, time commitment, and credit hours used for those programs serving on-campus students. Online courses must also meet quality standards for online course approval. The quality standards are adapted from the Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) instrument developed by California State University, Quality Assurance program under the Creative Commons, Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA) license. The instrument closely aligns with the Quality Matters™ rubric. The standards are used to evaluate the quality of online and hybrid courses, as a guide to design online and hybrid courses, and as a self-evaluation tool to assist instructors with course redesign and improvement. The University's Quality Education Practices Online (QEPO) Certification Program describes and provides guidance on the application of the standards to course design (p. 2)."

Scope   This procedure applies to courses developed after MONTH 00, 2019. Initially, all existing courses will be reviewed for conformance to quality standards within two years and then all courses will be placed on a review cycle of every three years.

Procedures
1. Online course development is coordinated through the Office of Online Learning. Faculty will contact the Office of Online Learning to begin course development.
2. Instructional Designers in the Office of Online Learning are responsible for managing the course development process and reporting the status of each course, see the process for establishing an online degree program/courses.
3. The faculty member and Instructional Designer using a team approach are responsible for applying quality standards throughout the course development process.

a. Quality standards are identified during the QEPO trainings, if applicable, and are located on the OL resource portal, and through a shared [Course Review and Approval Tool (CRAT)](#) used for tracking progress, confirming best practice applied through course design, and quality reviews.
b. UAH master course template incorporates quality standards and is the preferred format for course development. Colleges and departments may customize course templates with additional College/Department specific standards, but are required to ensure that UAH specific standards are incorporated into the course design.
c. Each course will be subject to a quality review and approval.
   - A record of reviewed and approved courses shall be maintained by OL, posted online, and shared with the registrar and relevant administrators, as needed.
   - A schedule for course review will be maintained by OL and posted on the OL website. Deans are responsible for ensuring that courses within their colleges are reviewed according to the schedule.
   - Special circumstances (e.g., late hires, courses added after the deadline) may exist that require exceptions to this procedure. Exceptions shall be granted on a case-by-case basis for a limited time period of typically one semester by the Provost or the Provost's designee.

4. The course review and approval process includes a self-review and a review by an UAH Instructional Designer.
   a. Course will be reviewed for the following standards:
      - Course overview and introductory information
      - Learning objectives
      - Assessment and measurement
      - Learning activities and learner interaction
      - Learner support
      - Accessibility and usability
      - Content, rigor, and workload
   b. **Faculty Self-Review** will be conducted using the Course Review and Approval Tool (CRAT).
   c. **Internal Review by Instructional Designers in OL:** An Instructional Designer will track course development and review of course materials throughout the process. This includes conducting a quality review via the CRAT and confirming the course reflects the adopted course quality standards in course design.
   d. **External Reviews** from an outside source may be conducted as requested by and approved by the department chair and/or college dean. This report should be managed by and reside in the academic college.
   e. If a course is conditionally approved faculty will address feedback from the course review, making suggested changes to the course.
5. A master list of reviewed and approved courses dates will be maintained by OL.

6. Each course on the master list will be subject to review and approval every three (3) years. OL will maintain a course review schedule with review and approval deadlines calculated from the date listed on the master list.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING
October 3, 2019
12:50 P.M. BAB 103

Present: Laird Burns, Monica Dillihunt, Jeff Weimer, Mike Banish, Tim Newman, Lori Lioce, Carmen Scholz, Seyed Sadeghi, Carolyn Sanders, Laurel Bollinger

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: President Darren Dawson

➢ **Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:55 pm.**
➢ **Meeting Review:**
   o **Online Couse Policy was passed to be placed on agenda.**
   o **Bill 436 was passed to be placed on agenda.**
➢ **Administrative Reports**
   o **President Darren Dawson**
      ▪ We started college visits. We have done seven and have two more tomorrow.
      ▪ We are on schedule again with Morton renovation. I am receiving weekly updates. We are still evaluating the feasibility of Roberts Hall and the engineering building. It will depend on us financially and if the state will do a bond. We are preparing our list for federal request.
         • Tim – At the last senate meeting, we asked for the report from the Shelby Center.
         • President – Todd is working on that still.
         • Provost – I talked with him this morning. He is still compiling the data to make one report. The minutes of the meetings with the team is what he is gathering.
         • Tim – I came across an announcement from ten days ago that we have refinanced out 2010 bonds.
         • President – We have a large bond payment and we are refinancing it. We can obtain a savings of $2.5M. We can get this money. We will still make the payment.
         • Tim – How much do you save annually?
         • President – You don't save. The money will be used for Roberts Hall.
         • Mike – You give them the money and they give you a discount coupon. You are borrowing the same amount and paying the same a year.
         • Tim – Did you extend the term?
         • President – No, but the rate is lower.
         • Tim – The bond curricular says that the part being borrowed is for Roberts Hall renovation.
         • President – The money we get back, we will use for Roberts Hall. We aren't borrowing any money.

- Tim – The language from the announcement makes it appear that way.
- President – We aren't borrowing. To get the money back, we had to have a project to use the money for.
- Provost – It is the 2009 and a small part of 2010. It is two bonds.
- Tim – Have you announced the health plans going forward will be? In two weeks, we will have open enrollment. Every year, that I have been on board, the President came to us and gave the parameters and the break out per income. That didn't happen last year and we had a surprise. I haven't heard anything about that this year and we are two weeks out.
- Provost – From my understanding, nothing official, the health plans have stayed the same. One thing I know for certain, like last year, everyone has to reenroll. This is new for us. Each year we have to reenroll in our health plan.
- Laird – Last year we were at UAB and they changed prescription manager that saved them a large amount on rebates. They would push these rebates back to UAB. Dr. Altenkirch mentioned he would look into that.
- Tim – Todd Barre came to us last year and told us we would receive a kick back.
- Mike – It appears the benefits committee hasn't met. It seems that we need to have a meeting with this committee. Yes, the President met with a subset, and went through the plans then we made recommendations. We worked to minimize cost increases for lower level employees.
- Monica – It was all of us that met.
- Provost – He didn't do that last year. From my understanding, there was a reason for that.
- Tim – It appears that the health plan is mostly governed by the system rather than the institution. Do you have a sense that any additional functions will go to the system, like our retirement plan?
- President – I haven't heard of anything new. I think the idea, for health plans and retirements, they get better value.
- Tim – With health plans, there is little faculty involvement and that dropped even more.
- Provost - I know when HR worked with TIAA, they worked with the benefits committee. They told me they would contact the faculty senate. The fact that we haven't heard anything about the health plan, makes me think there wouldn't be any major changes.
- Seyed – From my approach, they say what they are going to do. For someone wanting health care, this is what we do, the plan we have. I am not in the benefit committee. I hear them say they want to keep the same plans with little change. They want to arrange it a little better for those who receive smaller raises so they aren't penalized.
- Laird – Is it possible to get a summary of those changes sent out? When we had this plan, the higher paying faculty were willing to absorb the impact.
- Carmen – I think we hit the limit on what they could hold. It was a federal issue that we came up against.
- President – This goes back to the fact, that when committees meet they need to submit a report.

- Lori – Jeff, it states that you are the committee, maybe you can report back to us.
- Monica – An incident happened Monday, a student emailed a faculty member about not coming to class. The student couldn't eat or drink and keep it down all weekend. They couldn't afford to go to the ER or the health center. That student could have been in a crisis and dehydrated. She called health services and stated she needed to pay. Is there something that can be done to help these students?
- Provost – The charge is $10. We have the safe fund.
- Monica – Is that known?
- Laird – We also need that known so the students can be made aware there are avenues for them.
- President – We need to tell the people at the clinic to find the financial money. Faculty and staff then direct them to the clinic.
- Laird – Should there be something on the clinic website?
- Laurel – The students aren't going to know they aren't going to have to pay.
- Laird – Maybe it can state there is an option if you aren't able to pay.
- Provost – Student Affairs helps too. They may need to be sent to Dean of Students.
- Monica – I had a student in the hallway, who experienced a tragedy. I was able to dig deeper through my psychology background. I called counseling services to walk her over. I was told they couldn't see her until today, Thursday. They stated it cost $15 and they only received eight sessions.
- Carmen – I have heard of this before. If there is a crisis, they shouldn't have to wait.
- Laird – Can we set this with the benefits or student affairs committee to have this as an agenda item?
- Lori – They may need to get them connected to services through the hospital.
- Laird – Seyed, if you could send an email out asking for examples or options available. When you are in crisis, you can't always think.
- Provost – Is there a university committee directly involved with student affairs?
- Lori – Student Affairs Advisory.
- Carmen – I have an undergraduate student that doesn't have health insurance.
- Provost - We have United Health plan, but they have to pay.
  - o Provost Christine Curtis:
    - Faculty 180 – On November 5th, Chris Branaman will be on campus providing training sessions. The approach that has been decided upon is train the trainer. Each college designates faculty to come to training and help their colleagues. No one is excluded. There will be a session for academic and administrators. The software administrators will receive a training session.
      - Laird – When you do the training, can you do a recording of the session?
      - Provost – They will make a canvas course.

- The governing committee co-chairs will be Associate Dean and Suzanne Simpson. This office will be the housing for Faculty 180. ETL will be the trainers. They are located in SST 129.
  - Laird – For those going up for tenure and promotion, can they be scheduled earlier for training?
  - Carmen – A year ago, this didn't seem to work well.
  - Provost – They have cleaned it up very well.
  - Carmen – I was a guinea pig and my data wasn't transcribed correctly.
- There will be a faculty leader or associate dean, from each college on the governing committee. I am asking for two faculty representatives. Please send those names to me. We need to make this work.
- Education has served as a guinea pig this last year. They have a template that they will share with all the Deans. It will describe what all the questions mean. The timeline we are working for is annual reviews for this year. This will be all colleges and reappointments for new faculty. In 2020-2021, it will be reappointments for tenure track, clinical, and research. In 2021-2022, we will have education, nursing, business and AHSS. In 2022-2023, engineering and science. We are splitting the university in half in terms of the number of faculty.

➢ Officer/Committee Reports:
  o Laird Burns, President
    - I know Lori is working on the schedules for her committees.
    - I take it that the norovirus is calmed down?
    - In the memo for international visitors – this is a compliance document. The Provost is drafting a form to fill out so we can process it. We will have a single point we can send it.
      - Provost – Yes, International Services Office.
      - Monica – If a student has been admitted through the federal government international services, does she need to report it?
      - Provost – Yes.
  o Tim Newman, President-Elect
    - No report.
    - Provost – Makerspace would be number 68 on the policy that would be copyright policy.
    - Tim – I have a comment when we get there.
  o Mike Banish, Past President/Personnel Committee Chair
    - As past president, nothing.
    - As personnel chair, I failed at taking existing Chapter 9 and correct it to submitted Chapter 9.
  o Monica Dillihunt, Parliamentarian
    - No report.
  o Carmen Scholz, Ombudsperson
    - There are two cases before the ombudsperson.
  o Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
    - These are drafts. We have met two or three times. We have taken Appendix L and compared to posted bylaws. We are tracking changes. We are expected to submit to faculty senate next month. There haven't been changes in 20 years. There is a list of committees that doesn't exist and the rationale of why. We are attempting to

make a governance annual calendar. This is based off of the bylaws. We are moving everything to electronic ballots. We are going to have the college elections in January. We have to have four elections in the spring. We want to vote on this in December by the full faculty senate. We would like for those assigned committee to stay for two years instead of one. That is the biggest change. I have asked Laird if we could have a zoom meeting. I don't know how to bring forth the change to bylaws. It states to bring this as a resolution, but shouldn't it be a bill?

- Tim – All senate business comes through the President-Elect. All the President-Elect does is assign it a number. It goes to Lauren who distributes it to us. If it is passed through senate, it is assigned a resolution number.
- Mike – When it goes through senate, it is a resolution that goes to the Provost and President.
- Lori – The bylaws says it should be submitted as a resolution.
- Tim – You have to read that as a generic state. None of us are new comers, we know how senate business works. Today we have a bill. Just submit a bill.
- Laurel – Do the bylaws need to be revised?
- Tim – You might want to correct that language. You have to read carefully in the bylaws. We want to figure out what was said in the bylaws and how we are doing our business.
- Laurel – I would suggest we add "proposed resolution."
- Monica – Because the bylaws are not bills or resolutions, does it have to come as a resolution?
- Tim – It needs to come in the form of a bill. Any change has to be distributed in writing. You want to have one whereas and there is a now therefore it be resolved.
- Jeff – I would like to get together with you and how we distribute the resources. I am getting emails. I would like to propose we do a google share.

o Laurel Bollinger, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  ▪ We have received two proposals that I will be distributing to committee.
o Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
  ▪ No report.
o Carolyn Sanders, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  ▪ Our committee is actively working on revised academic misconduct policy.
o Seyed Sadeghi, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
  ▪ We have met once on September 17. We would like to have any bill that was related to our job outstanding? There was some technical issue in classroom. We suggested putting an icon on the monitor and state a few words and a ticket is generated.
    - Laird – I would support that.
    - Seyed – Is there anyone responsible for checking the classes routinely?
    - Provost – Yes, they check them at the start and throughout the semester.
    - Seyed – Tenure track requirement, we are interested to see when it goes to teaching requirement. Can we make a more unified standard? There was a concern if some colleges put more emphasis on SIE score than others it could hurt those going for tenure.

- Laurel – We do know that SIE's are biased. There are institutions in California and Oregon that know they can't make these decisions based on these evaluations.
- Carmen – This is difficult because if you want to generalize it, some classes are restricted to their class size. There is a notion that has been told to me by faculty that the number doesn't matter, it does matter.
- Carolyn – I was in a Chairs meeting in our college. It was indicated that grade distribution wasn't going to be included in that. Chairs were surprised by that. They thought it would be easy to be added.

➢ Motion to Approve Faculty Senate Agenda
  o Jeff moves. Carolyn seconds. Ayes carry.
  o Faculty Senate minutes passed with amendments.
➢ Online Course Policy:
  o Tim – Imbedded in this policy is 07.03.02 that is not on our policy and procedure website. Does this need to be two policies?
    ▪ Provost – Copyright got stuck in an office. I have checked with Peggy. I received more on this. We have a new procedure. I apologize.
    ▪ Tim – When we go to the Makerspace Policy we need to change the number.
    ▪ Laird – Motion to put on the agenda?
    ▪ Tim – Can we discuss? Is this ready to go to senate?
    ▪ Mike motions for discussion. Ayes carry.
    ▪ Tim – The first time it came to us, there was an issue with the responsibility to initiate a negotiation. We should salute the language is better. The Dean has to initiate and do that in writing. I think we want to discuss some points. In the motherhood statement of the policy, the same level of quality and service. Does this get us in a box? Are the students seeing it as the same resolution as the students in the class? If we want the same level of quality and service, can they argue they need a certain TV to receive this quality?
    ▪ Laurel – "Same level of educational quality."
    ▪ Laird – I think we want to continue improving this quality.
    ▪ Jeff – Have we defined for ourselves, before we put this out, in some reasonable framework as what constitutes as same level of educational quality? I am concerned we put this upfront, we better know what we are saying.
    ▪ Lori – We have a department that does these spot checks. I think that is the educational level we are talking about. They are making online education is meeting standards.
    ▪ Jeff – At the very end, is it important that we formalize it in code in this policy of things being done as assessment outcomes?
    ▪ Provost – If you look at addendum C, that is where they are trying to do what you are asking. It was suggested to us strongly that we make these addendums rather than separate policies. This was suggested by the system and legal office.
    ▪ Monica – It says in the policy that faculty have to go through certification.
    ▪ Jeff – I am asking about the course itself. We may need to reference that the courses will be assessed to be at the quality level it should be.
    ▪ Laird – We don't want to assume that online is achieving the same SIE's scores as regular courses.
    ▪ Tim – What are required legally to do? Are we required to accommodate students the same online as in class? I want to think about what we do to accommodate for

students here. Are we committing to change their abode at a distance for what they need?
- Monica – If they are taking it at home, they are in their needs specific home.
- Tim – I think you want to state "according to ADA."
- Tim – In support services, we had a training on sexual violence and sexual harassment trainings, etc. In my department, I am not receiving a lesser workload to compensate for the time that is required for all these trainings. I think we need to make a decision, if we are going to do this are we going to give releases? Or are we going to provide supplemental salary to come in the summer to do this? We had a situation that the Deans have the opinion you do those on your own time.
- Laurel – QEPO training is excessive in time.
- Laird – Are we saying to move this to committee?
- Provost – We have been working to streamline that course. We are making progress.
- Laurel – I think the timeline needs to be looked over. It is stating that will happen over summer. It should at least be "proposed."
- Provost – I think it says example dates, but it can be changed. I will change it.
- Laird – What needs to be done for it to be ready for faculty senate?
- Tim – I move that we place this on agenda for senate with the understanding that some floor amendments will be brought forward.
- Laird – I will redline it.
- Tim – It will be on the agenda as is.
- Provost – Would be acceptable to you to strike the example dates?
- Laird – I think that would be simpler.
- Laird – All in favor. Ayes carry

➢ Bill 436:
   o Tim – I would like to move the adoption of 436 but that the number of 68 is changed to 69.
- Laird – Motion to put on agenda. Carolyn seconds.
- Jeff – Is this the right way a policy is attached in the body of a bill?
- Tim – This is the first time this has happened.
- Laird – The library and Provost Office has worked to get this cleaned up.
- Seyed – It says for research and education, then it says no illegal objects. How can we screen what a person fabricates with their 3D printer?
- Laird – They should specify what they are going to make.
- Seyed- Who is screening this?
- Tim – Didn't we burden a library attendant to this?
- Provost - It has to be submitted to the technician.
- Laird – I don't know the answer to that.
- Seyed – My concern is that they are making one part at a time for a larger piece.
- Provost – You have to state what is not allowed. You do have to monitor.
- Jeff – If we vote on this we are voting on a bill and policy?
- Tim – This is the senate proposing that administration adopt this as a policy.
- Laird – All in favor. Ayes carry. Bill passed first reading.
➢ Meeting adjourned at 2:33 pm.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 19, 2019
12:50 P.M. LIB 111

Present: *Tobias Mendelson, Sophia Marinova, Laird Burns, Kevin Bao, David Allen, Dilcu Barnes, Jose Betancourt, Amy Guerin, Laurel Bollinger, Joey Taylor, Rolf Goebel, Andrei Gandila, Carolyn Sanders, Jeremy Fischer, Jeff, Neuschatz, Christina Steidl, Mike Banish, Abdullah Salman, Seong-Moo Yoo, Fat Ho, Christina Carmen, Kader Frendi, Elizabeth Barnby, Sheila Gentry, Darlene Showalter, Lori Lioce, Melissa Foster, Leiqui Hu, Jeff Weimer, Tim Newman, Huaming Zhang, Shangbing Ai, Seyed Sadeghi, Gang Li, Monica Dillihunt, Paul Whitehead*

Absent with Proxy: Harry Delugach, Shuang Zhao, Earl Wells, Carmen Scholz, Ron Schwertfeger, Katherine Morrison

Absent without Proxy: Gabe Xu, Ron Bolen

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: President Darren Dawson

➢ **Faculty Senate President Laird Burns called the meeting to order at 12:53 pm.**
➢ **Meeting Review:**
   o **Bill 434 passed second reading unanimously.**
   o **Bill 435 passed second reading unanimously.**
➢ **Approve Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes #599 from August 22, 2019. Member motions to approve. Lori seconds. Ayes carry.**
➢ **Accept FSEC Report from September 12, 2019. Tim motions to accept. Monica accept. Tim – Melissa Foster should be listed as a guest, not a proxy. In the last page, Melissa spoke as a guest. Another bullet for Bills 434 and 435 to state they passed unanimously on first reading. Carolyn seconds this amendment. Ayes carry. All in favor of amended minutes. Ayes carry.**

➢ **Administrative Reports**
   o Provost Christine Curtis
      ▪ I wanted to tell you where we are with our students. We are working to make sure our data is clean. These numbers should be close to perfect. We have 9,988 students. 1,999 are graduate students. Almost 8,000 undergraduates. Our out of state population is 27%. That includes domestic and international. 401 is our total international. Our graduation rate is up. Thank you all for that. Our retention rate holds steady at 83%. We want to get it up. This year we have 1,490 full time freshman. Their average ACT is 28.1. The number of new transfer students is 796. We have excellent GPA's and ACT scores. Our part time versus full time is around 73 – 74%. Our FTE is at 8,220.

- I wanted to breakdown who is composing our student body. We have 37 dual enrollment students. Our College Academy is now a full four years. We have junior and senior high school students here on our campus. We had hoped to have 120, but we have 93. Our largest class is the 4th, 5th, and 6th year seniors. Our masters is three times as many as PhD students.
- Our largest college is the college of engineering, followed by science. Business and nursing fall close after that.
- Honors College gained 304 incoming this year. Majority of the students are out of state. We have 1,042 total in Honors College. We had 86 graduate with honors this past year. We now have over 30 subjects that have honors classes. If you are interested in teaching an Honors seminar please contact Bill Wilkerson.
- The committee process is underway. The website is up and has the master spreadsheet. If you are interested to see what a committee does, please look on the website.
- I wanted to mention that campus planning and budget planning advisory committee have strong interest from the faculty senate. There will be a meeting called close to the end of October due to closing out our fiscal year.
- At the BOT meeting, the basement for the Shelby Center went before the board and they gave us the go ahead to keep moving on the renovation. The vivarium will be enlarged. It will double in space. The second change is there will be two additional classrooms. There will be a reassignment of space to open these spaces up. The physics lab will be going back to their regular setting.
- I wanted to mention to you an opportunity the university will have in Bulgaria. I mentioned this last year to you. This is a government led initiative on their part. The first thing that I can tell you is that Bulgaria has a major contract with Lockheed Martin. Through this contract, they have named UAH one of their partners. One thing they are interested in is sending PH students to us. A joint program with master students is in the talks right now. David Burkowitz is setting up a committee of four faculty members from four different departments. They have to talk with Chairs and Deans. As the committee develops ideas, I can pass that along to you.
  - Sherri – I have some international undergrad students in my class this year. They are struggling. One told me they have dyslexia and need assistance. I was told that other professors are giving her accommodations. I told her that I cannot do those things. I have a lab in the basement in Shelby Center. I have lost my technician and I am giving up. So the space and equipment is available.
- Sophia – I really like the idea of Bulgaria. I am from there. Have you talked about Prague?
  - Provost – They have an international program.
- Kader – If you look at US News and World Report, we have fallen below our sister campuses dramatically. When are we going to address that issue?
  - Provost – That is a concern to us all. We need to do a number of things to catch up with the growth. We need to rebalance the scholarship matrix with our needs. We also know that we are declining due to having to have a higher number of student success. These other institutions have higher graduation rates. Reports show that we should have a higher graduate rate with our ACT scores. We are shooting for that because that's what are

students are here for. There are a number of areas that we need to work on.
- Kader – Tim showed a very eye opening graph last meeting. The expenditure on education is flat compared to the revenue. That is showing the weakness there.
- Laird – We pushed Dr. Altenkirch, now Dr. Dawson, to reconstruct the budget committee. We want one standard set of data. We want to analyze and get better comparisons on that. We are hoping to start that in early October.
- The question came up last time about the sole provider for our benefits. Nationally there have been a number of lawsuits levied against private institutions because there benefit packages had varying rates of return. At this time we had 10 years of having TIAA, so we had to relook those. In late 2018, the RFP's were developed. They sought the best offers from companies. The TIAA had the lowest cost to each individual in terms of handling our investments. In the last ten years, TIAA has improved their services dramatically. They also allow multiple funds from others. I was presented with the offer to let a TIAA representative to come and speak.
  - Carolyn – Some of my music faculty have wondered the status of salary letters.
  - Provost – I haven't signed anything either. HR is working on them and I should see them soon.
- o President Darren Dawson
  - On the question in regards to ranking, that is based on undergraduate. It is the retention numbers that are hurting us. Our programs here are hard compared to other universities.
    - Mike – The other two numbers that are terrible is financial resources and alumni giving.
    - President – Yes, there are actually five in there that are bad. Alumni giving is a product of a young university. It will take years to turn that around. It took Clemson 35 years. You start now and continue. Faculty resources per faculty member, yes, because we have grown and have a large debt service. We have added a lot of debt in building. We are below 10% in tuition to our peers.
  - Member – We had a speaker come from USF. He said that they don't allow students to double major. Would that be a recommendation the administration would make?
    - President – Yes, they talked a lot of that at Clemson. Class size was also something they were meticulous about. We can discuss these things in our strategic planning.
  - We are working on our facilities plan. We will be completing the SST basement renovation. We will do the greenway project. That will cost $650K. When Morton is finished, we will finish the greenway out to Morton. We are looking at our IT data center. We are trying to harden the facility on Von Braun. We are vulnerable there. We do have backups in Atlanta. We definitely need to look at that. There will be a plan developed this year. We are putting the federal request book together. Every university does this. We have had some success on our research. The Provost will distribute that book and get ideas back.

- Tim – You may remember at the last FSEC meeting, I asked for the complete report from Shelby Center. I didn't hear that today. What is the standing?
  - President – I thought they were distributed. I will follow up.
  - Tim – The last time you were here, you mentioned retention was important. You may need to look at our enterprise here. I raise this because two of our largest colleges, I understand there are scoring systems in those colleges. In both of those colleges, I understand that if they want to do well, they wouldn't advise, not assign homework, not reach out via email. In those colleges, there are recommendations to faculty that they should do that. I don't think our enterprise is in line with that. These were pushed to us as faculty members. It seems ironic that there were Deans on the committee. The scoring schemes that are developed don't score what faculty members could do. They push us to not be engaged with our students. I think it is important at UAH, our culture is important. Some students I spoke with said that U of A is like my high school, Auburn the same as high school but I had to step up my game. UAH is a lot different from my high school, the students are a lot different. We have a different profile of students. We have to conscious of that. At our Dean and college level, we have to make practices that want us to approach the students. The students are sitting in the car, they aren't engaged with the university. We are falling flat on our giving rate.
    - President – We have to do strategic planning. It is important. The resources hasn't followed our goals. You need to tell me what college you want to be, then we can decide what university we want to be. Nursing may be different than engineering.
  - Sherri – There is a rumor going around engineering students in regards to the salaries of professor's salary being . There were several students who said they were writing advancement to never contact them about giving. We do have a problem.
- **Officer/Committee Reports**
  - Laird Burns, President
    - We have an election we are going to do for university committees. We have to do student traffic appeals.
      - Provost – The Student Traffic Appeals Committee, they had less than 10% appeals approved. Faculty had at least 60%. We are trying to level the playing field. There will be six students and three faculty/staff on the committee. It will be a lot more even handed.
      - Carolyn – That is great, thank you for that.
      - Mike – This may all be great but we are hearing about committees that have faculty and student involvement. There has been no discussion about changing the committee structure. It is great our VP is on board but they don't do the work. I don't see discussion about changing committee structure.
      - Laird – I need someone to volunteer for this committee. 10% does seem very low.
      - Sherri - How much time is involved?
      - Carolyn – It isn't a time sink. It is just discouraging feeling I was out voted.

- Sherri – I would be happy to serve as a pro student member.
- Laird – I would appreciate that because I want to nominate someone who will be.
  - Students Affair Advisory Board – we need three people.
    - Carolyn – I will nominate myself for that.
    - Laird – Lori, I will tentatively put you on there. I need one more.
  - ADA Advisory Committee – We need one more person.
    - Mike – Laird and I have had active discussion with President Dawson about getting these committees going. That falls on us engaging. If we don't want to have committees we want to engage in, we shouldn't say we want it.
    - Sophia – We don't know what the committees do. If we are told what the charge is, we may be interested.
    - Laird – I will put you down.
    - Sophia – I don't want to be chair.
    - Sherri – I will be happy to serve.
  - BOT meeting – We met with Clay Ryan. He met in regards to the library subscription cost. He is opening the door but we aren't going to get far until they establish the US budget. The Maker Space Policy, Ron was following up on this. We owe the Provost back a recommendation. Laura, could you please let him know we need final comments?
    - We have an associate of land grant – where is the faculty representation? As much as we love our Deans, we do most of the interface.
  - Tim Newman, President-Elect
    - Student Academic Misconduct Policy –
      - An interim policy has been put into place. My understanding is it was approved a few days before classes started. There are three new things in this placed policy. When we look at this, there are a few things that conflict with what was in our policy. Our prior policy listed you two options, you could do either or both. This says you have the authority to do that in your class. It is missing in this interim policy. I think that needs to be in this policy. The current policy includes coercive activity, IE bullying, we felt it should be in a separate policy for bullying.
        - Laird – I have had some international students come to them and pressure them for notes. Would that fall under this or bullying?
        - Tim – I won't say, but the committee tackling that would have to discuss that. I think that needs to be placed in another policy.
        - Sophia – I don't think we have a bullying policy per say. I think we need to define bullying but it may be broader charge.
        - Tim – I agree, but I think it is something that needs to be addressed. We have a misconduct policy that isn't your policy. It isn't from you, the faculty. We need a policy in place. We also need to be aware of this. The student has to agree with your penalty. That is the change from our current practice. I know that you don't like that and it needs to be removed. We need to move on this.
    - I want to also look at ACHE studies that was used for the basis of state appropriations for the universities. We received one of the smallest adjustments. Here are our peer institutions that we were compared against. We were really hurt on our T&F + Approp/FTE. We were really hurt on our Approp/FTE. That is what ACHE looked at. Because we didn't vary from our peers much, we didn't get as

much of an adjustment. I understand these numbers were from 2015-2016. Our institutions are bigger now and maybe the other institutions haven't had that growth. This chart shows our FTEs per FT Manager. I will say if you compare us against our peers, we are the worst. It appears UAH Is top heavy on administration. The state put line items in our budget to fund research centers. I think we faired so well in that number is because our money for research center was folded in our budget but now we are being penalized. I think the resources haven't matched the faculty's goals. I have ran numbers for all the four year schools in the state of Alabama. Every other school in Alabama has less administrative overhead than we have at UAH. The last President was asked by the FSEC what he would do about administrative overhead. He said that we wouldn't grow the administration overall but how the institution grows the ratio will reflect less administration. These numbers show that hasn't played out. We are feeling the pressure of our class sizes and are pushed to do more than we ever have. The resources have been spent on administration and research centers. I am happy to hear your comments on that.

- Laird – ACHE does this every year. This current year budget the Governor listened to ACHE and followed it. They went to outcome based as far as budget. We are stuck with them listening to ACHE until a better model is created.
- Tim – I think all this goes to show my theme for faculty equity.
- Jeff – I want to speak to the academic misconduct policy.
- Monica – We have a committee that will report on that. Can you hold on that?

o Mike Banish, Past President/Personnel Committee Chair
  - Mike – No report. You all received an information item from me, Chapter 9. This is the fifth copy. Our benefits are highlighted in this. Please look through this.
o Monica Dillihunt, Parliamentarian
  - No report.
o Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
  - We have had set an agenda for three meetings this fall. Everyone has a ballot for the standing committee.
o Laurel Bollinger, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  - No report.
o Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
  - We have had a successful 2019 RCEU Poster session. The Distinguished Speakers has started the process. The 2020 RCEU solicitations will be sent out ASAP.
o Carolyn Sanders, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  - We are working on the academic misconduct policy revision. Based on the last FSEC meeting, it was agreed upon that our committee would work from the interim policy as the starting process. The Provost stated it may speed up the process working with that one. One of our points of interest, is ensuring that after the first stage of the faculty member filing a formal complaint, there will be another unbiased party at that level as well.
    - Jeff – I will speak now to the statement Tim brought up. In the procedure of pulling the previous policy, we are taking out bullying. I might suggest it is an appropriate time to parallel an academic citizenship policy that would deal with behavioral issues.

- Joey – As far as plagiarism, the director of writing has been the plagiarism officer. We keep the cases filed. The misconduct policy, I was on the committee that generated the original policy. This interim does pull from that. It was faculty created. The student having to sign off. When investigating the cases, I thought the charge was extreme at times. There was a desire to put something in there to allow the student to push back.
- Laird- I think we should trust the committee to develop an appeal process.
- Carolyn – When was this? Part of this work on the committee is not to reinvent the wheel. I am looking at other universities policies.
- Joey – Fall. I haven't sat down with the policy we produced and compared to the interim.
  - o Seyed Sadeghi, Faculty and Student Development
    - ▪ We met this week. The committee wants to look at appeals under review related to this policy. We want to look at forming a mechanism that will address this issue. We want to create something that can be utilized campus wide.
- ➢ Bill 434
  - o Laird – We want it to be reinstated that we can have a second pass. Mike motions to bring this forward. Member seconds. All in favor of passing this bill. Ayes carry. Bill passes second reading unanimously.
- ➢ Bill 435
  - o Laird – This is for departmental college visitors. Sophia motions to bring this forward. Mike seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry. Bill passes second reading unanimously.
- ➢ Meeting adjourned at 2:15.