
**JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
VOLUME XXI
MINUTES FOR MEETING 571, 29 SEPTEMBER 2016
APPROVED 20 OCTOBER 2016**

Present: David Stewart, Ryan Weber, Joseph Taylor, Christine Sears, Carolyn Sanders, Anne Marie Choup, Eric Seeman, Kyle Knight, Ramon Cerro, Ting-Ting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Fat Duen Ho, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Ann Bianchi, Maria Steele, Mary Bonilla, Roy Magnuson, Debra Moriarity, Michael George, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathi, Sophia Marinova, Michael Banish

Absent With Proxy: Irena Buksa, Dianhan Zheng, Christina Carmen, Casey Norris, Marlana Primeau, Amy Hunter,

Absent Without Proxy: Xuejing Xing, John Schnell, Laird Burns, Yongchuan Bao, David Harwell, Jeremy Fischer, Earl Wells, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Tracy Durm, Qingyuan Han, Shanhu Lee, Carmen Scholz, Ming Sun

Ex-Officio : Provost Christine Curtis

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.
- This meeting has been called to discuss the faculty senate ad-hoc scheduling committee. Before we begin, I realize this is out of order, Dr. Slater passed away earlier this week. I would like to take a few minutes of silence to reflect upon this.
- Approve faculty senate meeting minutes from #570, September 15, 2016. All in favor. Debra Moriarity motions to approve. Eric Seeman seconds. Ayes carry.
- Accept FSEC report from last Tuesday. We did make some changes to verbiage. Debra Moriarity motions to approve. Member seconds. Ayes carry.
- Before the scheduling report, you have in front of you the UAH graduation retention data. Let me point out something to you for your explanation. If you look at the colleges, for example ENG, the first set of numbers is at the university and second set is within the college. These are not cumulative totals. The graduation rate goes with 2012. The 39% rate goes with 2011, and the six year rate goes with 2010.
 - Harry – The second group is the number of students that graduated in their original college?
 - Mike – Yes, in their original college.
 - Provost – The only thing I am wondering is if we are shifted back one year.
 - Mike – They do go with years.
- Scheduling Report, Dr. Roy Magnuson
 - Mike – Before we begin, I want to thank Dr. Magnuson and the committee for taking on this task.

- We have been working on this for less than two weeks. The committee represented someone from each college. We did end up with a report that was endorsed by everyone. The problem is too much distance too little time. I surveyed students to see what the rate of the problem is. I gathered that 25% of the students are saying they have a tight transition. That is in biology and that is a central location. If you want to walk from Tech to Morton that takes a long time. First problem, too much distance too little time. We don't know who has a problem, where, or how many. The survey was a preliminary attempt to get a feel. We feel that Tech and Morton are places involved. Freshman composition may cause a problem. Courses located in Tech may cause issues. We should be able to obtain data. One solution is to go faster. The second is take more time and change schedule. Clever scheduling doesn't involve changing the scheduling. You could do something from each category at once to help alleviate the problem.
- The first solution is to go faster. One source to be able to do that is bicycles. You can use them and get across campus quickly. There is no reason to give additional support to charger cycle. This allows students to check out a bicycle per semester at no charge. Within that there are related problems not enough bike racks, safety issue, etc. One problem would be we don't know how many bikes we need additionally. A related idea is priority parking. Maybe the computer would notice the tight transit and give priority spots. We have parking reform on the way and maybe this could be integrated.
- Another solution is more time. This would require us altering the schedule. Here I give you a solution that could create several more problems. Option A subtracts five minutes from classes and adds five minutes between class and preserve start times. That is a minimal change to the schedule. You have a cumulative loss over the semester. If this is doable, that can be done tomorrow. If not, you have to add days. That will take much more time.
 - Sophia – This is more doable with MWF classes.
 - Roy – Yes, the loss time depends on the number of meeting times. My suggestion isn't go down this road. If you do, you have to accept loss of meeting time.
- We could add five minutes and shift start time. This is the President's proposal to shift everything out. It starts out beautiful. As you get to the end of the day, everything gets awkward. You could double schedule classes. You have a reform and there are issues at the beginning. It isn't an attractive option. Starting at 8 in the morning and ending at 9 at night is just too much.
- Align short and long classes. We did have this and started to incorporate longer days. Already in the afternoon we have shifted the start times of short classes, you have 40 minute gaps between classes. In the morning, you are still stacked incompatibly. There are several clashes with this. There is room in the schedule to take out a class and spread them out over the afternoon. You can have 40 minutes intervals, and 15 minutes between others. It would cause rearranging.
 - Ramon – The fact that we have long classes on MW is not a good reason. There are two big reasons, students ask for two classes so they can work. Many have to commute and don't want to do this five days a week. Second, we teach at least four classes a year. If you are doing research, you are allowed one day a week to devote to research.
 - Roy – Sorry for categorizing it. I was criticizing the current schedule set up. Putting a couple of these ideas together you can alter short and long classes. That is pretty and it does anticipate problems that could arise with MW classes. This would keep the day from getting out of control. It is a vision for the future, but no clear way to

get there easily. If you are ready to do something tomorrow, the first solution is the only option.

- Clever scheduling: Provost task force suggested cluster scheduling. This is combining advising and scheduling together. Allowing taking classes together and making sure that the internal and location makes sense. We can direct people into that. An idea we came up with is registration clarity or warning. It is allowing the computer to warn you if you scheduled classes back to back with a hard transit. This would let them know they need a bike or reconsider their schedule. When they sign up for classes, freshman for example, may not be familiar with the campus set up. If we start having that ability, we could collect data. We can do micro scale tinkering to fix problems. For example, if we find that tech students need to take a freshman class in Morton, move one into the general science building. This is speculation; we don't have data to know where the problem is.
- Those are our three general solutions. We probably should do all of them. We need to work on the schedule. Reform will need to be necessary at some point. Our recommendation is better access the problem. If you add five minutes, subtract five minutes would that work? If you don't know the true problem, would five additional minutes work? We need to better characterize the problem. We don't need to be hasty in making a decision.
- Mike – Before Roy ends, I want to thank him again. I want to read a section directly from the report and then we will open this for discussion.
 - James – You talked about the improvements to scheduling that may help. One point I want to make is I suggested investing into more bikes. The President has said it would be too expensive to pay for a bus long-term. Bikes wouldn't be that much. One of the scheduling ideas is shortening contact time that should be addressed directly. Since it is very difficult to undo things, if we adopt a schedule that cuts off fifty minutes of contact time that would probably not be undone. The faculty and administration need to talk about this.
 - Roy – I concur. I love bikes, and do understand they aren't suitable for everyone. Since they are suitable for some, they are wonderful.
 - Sophia - Do we lend helmets as well?
 - Roy – We do not.
 - Sophia -Is that a safety issue since we have so many biking across campus?
 - Roy – I actually know an interesting fact on helmets. It was suspected that they would be helpful. When the stats came out, they realized that when you put the helmet on you feel invulnerable. That then makes you do things that you shouldn't do. They didn't help much as they thought they would.
 - Sophia – Yes, but it is still a liability issue.
 - Carolyn – I was a proponent to maintaining 55 minutes. I oversee classes that time is critical. I have been here a long time; the issue of breaks between class times has been ongoing. I feel strongly that students need twenty minutes between classes. From there we have created more complex issues. Sometimes students need the mental break. I want to see the students come into my class ready to go. Maybe the student needs the additional time for a mental break rather than transit time. I was on the first task force last year, what are other universities doing? Why reinvent the wheel and create something complicated? Most other universities have twenty minute class breaks, 50/75 minutes class time. Then add another day or two. This seems a lot simpler than a complicated set of solutions that could stall the decision.

- Harry – Twenty minutes between classes isn't just for students but for me as well. Students talk with me after class and hold me up. Fifteen minutes might be enough. We don't treat the students like human beings. I do echo her thought on 55 minutes. I think if we cut contact time, we lose quality. I know my commuter students would be willing to stay longer than adding additional days.
- Roy – I have come a long way on this issue. I want to step down as my role of chair to this committee and return to the body.
- Kader – I am going to add to the argument of the bikes. If you have bikes on campus, the number one danger is for pedestrians. You have to have bike lanes. You could cause danger for pedestrians.
- Roy – I did a beta test for bikes on our loop. It worked. It wasn't unsafe. I can still get anywhere on campus in a comfortable period of time.
- Sophia – One of the options we discussed is leaving the sections as is and just cut five minutes down on 80 minutes sections. In the spring, we cancel classes due to weather, by having that extra session we could also be hindered due to weather.
- Tim – We have talked about changing schedules at UAH before. Something has always been a constraint on us. The constraint is 40.5%. That is the maximum amount of time the faculty can charge during the summer. The problem is if we look at this chart. Here is the summer calendar for last summer. What has happened every other time here, the 40.5% has always been the going number? I don't know if faculty has been charging that much or it is a recruiting tool. I don't think no one in our department does that. In June and July, there is 20 and 22 working days time. We always have days off for holiday. Here the schedule for the summer. We had 20 days in June, 22 days in July, and 10 days in August. To get to 75, here it is. We start on May 2 and the last day is August 15. Finals ended April 29th, and fall classes started the 17th. To get 40.5%, we have to have 75 working days in the summer. That is the constraint to our schedule. If we want to add classes, we can start sooner or end later. What can we do? On this year, we have a slack. If you go longer in the spring, you have to go longer in December. If you go longer in spring, you have to go longer in fall. Here is the cost of keeping contact time. To add days, we would have to end as late as December 23. We aren't willing to do this and that is why we have this issue. That is why we are where we are.
 - Mike – I have asked OSP to give me a regular faculty member that charges 40.5%, they have never done that.
 - Provost – They count the 75 days by pay periods. They go from Tuesday to Wednesdays.
 - Sophia – That doesn't apply to 80 minute class times.
 - Ramon – I think that I am impressed and we are coming up with clever solutions. The problem with the solutions is no one knows the issue that needs to be solved. We really are working in the dark. One of the problems of solving a problem not well defined is the solutions could be counterproductive. Let's define the problem first.
- Debra – I want to address the issue of the warning at registration and smart advising. When I first came, we had people in the advising center, which is what we worked with students on. At this time, there were fewer buildings. We cautioned students on not backing certain classes. That can alleviate a big problem with classes that have multiple sections. But when you talk with students, they may only want classes on MW. The voluntarily put themselves in this situation.

- Mike – As we have gotten better computer systems, the problem has only gotten worse.
- Roy – I love the idea of defining the problem better and going slow. I would like to talk as a personal faculty member about my view point. Some things I thought were unacceptable, I have changed my thoughts. I went in and thought losing contact time was undoable. The scientist and ENG have a gut reaction of not wanting to lose contact time. I thought that wasn't an option. When I talked with the committee I found out that across the university more people were open to the idea. I have had more days to mull over this and think about it. I have come around to this idea. I am cutting five minutes off the back side. If I imagine cutting five off the middle, it seems much less traumatic. When I end my class early, as Dr. Delugach said, we get questions. Then once it's over, some students come up after to ask questions. If they aren't in too much rush to get out they are having peer contact time. I think about the beginning of my class, if I can get in a few minutes earlier to set up everything that is desirable. I haven't met a faculty member who wouldn't take the extra time to set up. If the students are ready to go at start time, that is a positive thing too. This idea for making it a little shorter, I think about it this way, it isn't as traumatic. If I think about making my teaching better, I make my lecture better. I rarely ever thought my class needs more sections. I have never had students ask for more lectures. There is a proposal to maintain contact hours. My first instinct is to do nothing. If you feel obligated to do something, trimming a little time off a class and add it to the interval isn't the worse thing. If you are willing to take the loss of contact time it's doable. If you want to add days back, I don't want to do that.
- Mike – There has been an override. One thing I want to say that has been misquoted and I think the President did something bad. There was a scheduling task force that considered two proposals. The President sensed push back and created another proposal. I think the President made a tactical error by pushing it out too far. I have a column for current and another column based on the President's proposal. We have fifteen minutes between. You scroll down and they come up pretty close, just a little stretch out. When you get to class period five, it starts stretching out. The committee said let's try to rematch the 55/80 minute class schedule. You then have a break that is half of a class period on the old schedule. This is just for MWF. If you go to the President's new schedule and not go until 9:00 pm. The class periods 6-8 end earlier than they did before and some by a significant amount of time. If you were stuck with class period 8 before, you went to 6:00; you now get out at 5:40. With the new schedule, long block 6 and short block 8, end at the same time. I think he set people off on the wrong track because he said lets go until 9:00 at night. We actually get more class time in the shorter part of the day.
 - Sophia – That doesn't speak to the issue of night classes.
 - Mike – No, but we do whatever we want at night.
 - Roy – The President's proposal isn't unworkable. When we were criticizing the MWF aspects were never a problem. What is the problem is TTH and stacking MW short classes on long classes. The TTH long stack starts to get into issues and shift later into the day. The President put in shorter classes than necessary.

- Ramon – What is going to happen when we change the schedule that we have been taking years to fix?
- Mary – I don't want to go through the bunny trail, I would like to call for a vote.
- Tim – There isn't anything to vote on. Someone needs to bring forward the two bills.
- Mike – I am sorry I lied; I thought it would be shorter. I would like to have a motion to bring bill 393 for a vote. Tim Newman motions to accept bill 393. Kader Frendi seconds.
- Roy – Is this the current version?
- Joseph – I thought it was made known that the President is going to do something no matter what.
- Mike – No, there is the assumption that he will do something.
- Provost – No, you asked what he would like to do. He would like to have twenty minutes between classes.
- Tim – I think we have a timing issue. We have a very short time to get it done.
- Harry – Tomorrow?
- Tim – I think the President said next week.
- Provost – He said the 7th.
- Roy – I would like to make a motion to adjourn.
- Mike – You can't.
- Roy – I believe I can make a motion to adjourn and suggest we do nothing at this point. No one has asked for our advice we are just running around worried about it.
- Mike – The President gave us time to create the task force and consider this.
- Roy – Motion to adjourn.
- Mike – All in favor. Motion fails.
- Mike – The President said I would like your opinion on this matter. The executive committee could have just said this is our opinion. Our choice was to take it to the full senate.
- Roy – Motion to introduce an emergency solution.
- Tim – That is out of order. There is a bill on the table.
- Mike – 393 follows the end of the recommendations from the ad-hoc committee also with an amendment from Dr. Cerro. Dr. Dillihunt has a recommendation that whatever is done is a pilot study.
- James – I don't know if this is in order. I feel cheated. We have 365 days in the year and we have two semesters. Is 40.5% in the same category?
- Mike – That is such an unknown. I can't find anyone that does that. Here is bill 393, black was the original text. The blue and red are changes.
- Roy – Motion to amend to strike new changes and revert back to old changes. Sophia Marinova seconds.
- Roy – The nature of the discussion is to say what the ad-hoc says. It is a nasty problem and needs to be better understood before making changes. The senate recommends that no changes be made at this time. Go back to the original text.
- Harry – I read the bill and the report last night. There is so much we don't know. There are several people on campus that could be working on researching the problem. I don't like having only 24 hours to make a drastic decision that will affect all faculty and students. I am in favor of the amendment.
- Vladimir – What is the definition of this time?
- Mike – Today.

- Roy – We are saying study it, create a solution, then implement the change.
 - Mike – All in favor of the amendment. 27 in favor. 1 opposed. 3 abstain. Amendment passes.
 - Tim – The bill has been amended and is now in order for anymore amendments.
 - Sophia – It seems like that faculty senate recommends finding a cross section. I am not saying it's a bad suggestion.
 - Roy – It complicates it. I motion to strike the bottom section out about funding students to research.
 - Sophia – I second the amendment.
 - Ramon – What the last line says is we need to do a serious study. You don't think we need to do a study?
 - Sophia – No, we do but not this way.
 - Roy – It's not a bad idea, it just complicates the bill. It needs to be separate.
 - Ramon – There isn't anything in the top lines that says what the red does.
 - Harry – I don't want anything in the bill that states how it should be studied at this point.
 - Mike – All in favor of striking the second red portion from bill. 18 in favor. 8 opposed. 2 abstain.
 - Debra – I propose an amendment in place of that. I would like for it to say that, "The faculty senate recommends further study of this problem by methods determined by experts available on campus."
 - Joseph – Can I suggest just putting that in the first paragraph?
 - Mike – Ok, we change believes to recommends.
 - Debra – No. That's ok but also says, by using experts in the area.
 - Debra – The senate believes that this is an important problem recommends that further study be done to determine the problem by using experts in the area.
 - Ramon – Who will decide who does the research?
 - Tim – I would like to piggy back to that. There is a parking study done and I wouldn't want administration to say that the parking study studied what needs to be done and this is the solution. I think it needs to be more specified.
 - Sophia – We want to first analyze what kind of experts.
 - Mike – We will make a friendly amendment to say overseen by the faculty senate.
 - Ramon – Can we task the President of the faculty senate to oversee this?
 - Mike – Sure.
 - Mike – There is an amendment. All in favor. The bill is back to its original format. 26 in favor.
 - Roy – Can you call the bill?
 - Mike – Final vote on bill 393 as amended. Ayes carry.
- Roy Magnuson motions to adjourn. Debra Moriarity seconds. All in favor. 3 opposed. Meeting adjourned at 1:49 p.m.