

---

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**January 23, 2014  
12:45 P.M. in SKH 369**

***Present: Richard Miller, Mitch Berbrier, Wai Mok, Phillip Bitzer, Charles Hickman, Fan Tseng,  
Debra Moriarity, Peggy Hays, James Blackmon***

***Guests: President Altenkirch, Brent Wren***

- Dr. Mitch Berbrier called meeting to order at 12:50 pm
  
  - Report from President Altenkirch
    - ❖ I'll have the BETA Policy back to you by February 10th. I'm finishing that up. Moving on to the Handbook, I notice that there is one thing from the Handbook draft to implement and I've looked at it. Generally, it looks okay to me.
      - Mitch Berbrier: Talking about the Family Policy?
      - President: Yes.
    - ❖ One thing that we've looked at at the VP level is going to a 4-day work-week in the summer. We will save about \$200,000 total for the summer. Mostly utilities costs and a little bit on cleaning materials. It's a money saver. Not a lot goes on on Fridays in the summer because there are basically no classes. Can shut down the buildings on Thursday evening and open them back on Sunday night or Monday morning. I have been places where this was done before. You basically set up a system where if someone wants to be in their office or lab, there is a call-in system and you say, "Can you turn this on?" and the needed utilities are turned on. My experience is that with a system like that put in place, we won't have a lot of people who will use it so we get a lot of savings from shutting down. Basically take 40 hours a week and spread it over 4 days. Right now the schedule is 8:15am to 5:00pm with a 45 minute lunch. If you go to 10 hours, one possibility is 7:15am to 5:45pm with a 30 minute lunch.
      - Mitch Berbrier: So the staff will get 40 hours in that way.
      - Richard Miller: Is there any reason why that wouldn't be done in the academic year?
      - Mitch Berbrier: There are lots of classes on Fridays.
      - Richard Miller: This came up a few years ago about consolidating lecture classes to Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday, Fridays would be labs and research days. But I'm not sure if that would save money because would still be open.
- For example, orientation sessions for new students are scheduled for Thursday/Friday. You can't really do that because orientation sessions want academic buildings open. So we'd be looking at moving those to Wednesday/Thursday. There are some minor adjustments that need to be made. I think the academic year would be more difficult, but the summer is easier. There is a detailed analysis of the savings. One thing that is difficult is with the way

our utility rate structure is; it isn't a flat rate. We have to take into account more than just saying we will be shut down for x hours at so many cents per hour, and we will save this much. Pinner has an analysis of the overall savings that are on the order of around \$200,000. I guarantee the staff would like it.

- Mitch Berbrier: Would the staff have the option to work 32 hours per week? Instead of working an extra 2 hours, get paid for 32 hours over the summer. There might be some people, for whatever reason, who can't be here that early.
- President: Yeah, I think that might work. What I would avoid is someone saying they want to come in later and leave later.
- Mitch Berbrier: It also might have to go through the department or unit because they might need the workers to get 40 hours a week. Things are much slower in the summer, but there are some departments who might want to have that option.
- Deb Moriarity: What about people with daycare issues?
- President: I can tell you from experience that miraculously they all find a way to deal with it because the benefit of a 4 day-schedule compared to a 5-day schedule outweighs. So people might have to adjust their schedules, but the staff would like it.
- Deb Moriarity: In my department many people will still need to be in there working because we have many things going on, like experiments. So it's basically going to be like us working on a weekend, with no heating or cooling.
- President: No, that's not right. You can call in and have it turned on. In the summertime if I work on Saturday or Sundays, I ask Faye to call the facilities people and ask them to turn on the AC or heat within these hours and they will do it.
- Deb Moriarity: That works for faculty?
- President: Let me check on it.
- Deb Moriarity: Part of the reason I think is because we aren't on individual office units, we have a whole suite of offices that are turned on or off.
- Mitch Berbrier: Morton Hall is a whole building.
- Charles Hickman: There is a handful of Business faculty who show up during the breaks.
- President: I'll check into it.
- Mitch Berbrier: My personal philosophy is that the University should be open 7 days a week and that faculty should be encouraged to be in their office as much as possible, and students. We are given a privilege of having flexible schedules, and with that privilege comes responsibility to do your work. I know that almost all universities close down on the weekends now-a-days, but I think that saving \$200,000 isn't that much given our size.
- President: Two things. One, observe the parking lots during the summer on a Friday. Two, elsewhere where there was a movement from a 4 to 5 day work week summer that argument was made. I can tell you that although the argument was made and people had an opportunity to come on campus and have AC or heat, people didn't come.

- Mitch Berbrier: It doesn't work such that if you build it and keep it open, they will come. But if you close it down, they're less likely to come.
- Deb Moriarity: Graduate students will probably love it because they get an extra day for research in their labs.
- President: There are some issues with it, but overall my experience is at institutions like this, it is a monetary issue and also a moral issue.
- James Blackmon: Over Christmas I wanted to come in because I'm working 4 proposals. So I called the campus police, but I couldn't get in. I didn't care about AC or anything; I just needed in to get to my computer. But I couldn't get in.
- President: Why couldn't you get in?
- James Blackmon: They wouldn't let me. I called campus police and they said basically they weren't authorized to let anyone into a building.
- President: Don't you have access to the building?
- James Blackmon: It's locked.
- Richard Miller: There is a history behind it that predates you (President Altenkirch). This has been an issue for some time and a significant number of buildings across campus. Faculty Senate passed some resolutions asking for access (whatever that means, whether it be a card reader or something) that never got a response. There has never been any follow through with it.
- Mitch Berbrier: It's only certain buildings.
- James Blackmon: There was a brief period that you could get permission through MAE and then the campus police would let you in, and I did that, but that disappeared.
- Richard Miller: That has changed because I've been denied access to my building as well. And my ID card isn't sufficient.
- Deb Moriarity: They tell you that they will only accept authorization from a dean.
- President: I will look into the building access. This issue is whether to move to a 4 day work-week. If we are going to do that, we need to do it soon so people can make arrangements.
- Deb Moriarity: We actually have classes scheduled on Fridays.
- Brent Wren: There is one department that has a Friday class during the summer. Almost no one else does. I know it was in Science.
- Richard Miller: Have you presented this to Staff Senate?
- President: Not yet. I will run it by them and get their opinion. I suspect they'll be happy with it as long as we don't get screwy schedules. So does that make sense to move in that direction? Sound reasonable?
- Deb Moriarity: Yeah, although I think there are a few issues because I think Biology has a few MWF classes.
- Brent Wren: When I looked it was one department that has Friday classes, and it may very well be Biology.
- Mitch Berbrier: This is easily reversible. If it doesn't work, we don't have to do it the next year.

- President: I will let you know what the Staff Senate thinks. If they're favorable, we will take a look at it seriously.
- ❖ Summer school (See Appendix A). Explanation of the top sheet: This is an analysis for summer 2013 with some comparison to 2012. Revenue comes in from tuition. The instructors are paid, so there is a net revenue in that box and it is split in thirds. One third is split in half. So for 2013, by college there is the income; by college there is instructor cost which is salary and benefits. Using the formula at the top, the third split is 50/50, there is money sent to the colleges. That is college funding on the right hand side. From going from summer 2012 to summer 2013, there is a decline in the revenue which is why there is a decline in the distribution. There was a rule in place that said your cost to income couldn't be more than 35%. If cost to income is worth 35%, then somehow there was a redistribution of funds to account for that. Another element, the way the funding was distributed, it was distributed on the estimated basis before the fact. If that estimate is not correct, then when the books are to be balanced, there is money shuffled around and some colleges would have to give back some of that money and some colleges would get that money. In the end, the right amount of money was distributed, but psychologically it's not good to give someone money but then take it away later 10-11 months later. So two things we've settled on. First, forget about the 35%, it is what it is. Second thing is not to distribute the fictitious money before, but to distribute the money after. If we run the budget from October 1, 2013 to 2014 year. In that budget, each college got summer school money but that was an estimate. In the future, we are looking at: we make the budget in the spring and it has to balance, but we don't have to give the colleges the money at that point. Budget summer school is a pool and you have to make it balance. Then the Board approves the budget preliminary in June, but really in September. Summer school is in a central pool. College doesn't see summer school in the proposed budget. Then you run summer school. Then, you adjust the pool, the central pool, then put the money in the college budget. Once the money is in budget, that is the money because it came from a direct allocation from the revenues.
  - Mitch Berbrier: Does that apply to all revenues?
  - President: Yes.
  - Charles Hickman: Does that leave a gap?
  - Mitch Berbrier: Is there going to be a year where, if you're getting the money every April, and now you're saying you're not getting it until next year, there's going to be a year where you don't get it for 23 months or something.
  - President: No. You never get the money until October 1<sup>st</sup>. That's when the budget is established. The question is, October 1<sup>st</sup>, do you want to guess what it's going to be or do you want to actually set it? Right now we are guessing. What we are saying is, you had a budget set up last October. The way it has been working is in the spring we would have made another estimate of the money. Well we aren't going to do that. We will make an estimate of the summer school and put it in a pool. Then, come the end of summer school, when we have the money in, but you won't know about it, we will set the October 1<sup>st</sup> budget. When we set the October 1, 2014-15 budget, come October 1<sup>st</sup> that is last year's money. So it's forward.
  - Deb Moriarity: So in the past, having run the summer budget, there was a lot of incentive for us to keep the costs down while maximizing the number of students. And you were rewarded for doing better. Is that still going to be part of the calculation when figuring budgets or will it be just based on what we actually

netted?

- President: No, we will still do estimating, but we will hold it centrally.
- Deb Moriarity: So when the college tries to balance their budget, like you said this year you estimated some amount and put it in, if that estimate turns out to be wrong for the college, for any of it, and so they're bringing in a lot but it's costing them more than what you had allocated. Suppose they offered more courses or something. Will that be covered for them still or will they end up in the hole for that fiscal year?
- President: If we put this in place, we won't reshuffle any money.
- Deb Moriarity: So the colleges in this summer would be better off hedging their bets and saying don't offer much, don't cost money beyond what we think we've got. Suppose you gave them \$200,000 for the summer, but they get some eager faculty members who want to teach extra courses that aren't usually taught in the summer. So now you've got extra people to pay. They bring in the money for it, but that money isn't going into this year's budget, it's going to be in the following year's. So now at the end of the year when the college tries to add up their entire year's budget, and they've paid out those faculty for the summer, will the college be in the red in the summer of 2014 because they had to pay for that extra teaching for the summer but they don't get the money for it until next year's budget?
- President: The teaching is paid by the revenue.
- Deb Moriarity: But when does it get transferred? My point is the transfer.
- President: Summer school is a stand-alone business. People who are paid in the summer are paid from the tuition. We are talking about is how much money to send out to the units.
- Deb Moriarity: So you're not going to just take all the money in and essentially hold that?
- President: No. When I say a central pool, I mean an estimate. We are establishing the budget this spring. So we are going to say, okay we will take in \$5.3 million and we are going to spend \$1.5 million. We will put that in the central budgeting pool. You won't know that. The question is at what point in time do you get told, "here's your budget October 1<sup>st</sup>"? Well, if we are estimating it, we can tell you anytime, but it may not be right. But if we go through summer school and bring in the revenue to pay the people then we know how much money to put in the budget so that's what we put in there. For the exiting budget, is there any messing around with it? We can address that if we have to, but we aren't talking about big numbers here. We are talking about \$10,000 here and \$10,000 there. So we will fix that so you don't get messed up. But to me, the good thing is we won't be in a situation where you got money and you're wondering if you really have that money. The situation we are in now is you won't know for 10-11 months.
- Deb Moriarity: What were the Deans' responses to this?
- President: They were fine.
- Charles Hickman: So the '14-'15 budget based on the summer '14 performance?
- President: Yes. The idea is that you have incentive to generate as much net revenue. That's why you don't need a 35% rule. We aren't trying to minimize expenditures, we are trying to maximize net revenue.

If you look at summer '13 at the bottom where it looks at the cost income, everyone made their load, everybody stayed under 35%, so there isn't any redistribution. As long as you made your 35% then there wasn't this business of taking money back to give elsewhere. The

fundamental problem with summer school is during the academic year, 40% of the money from running an educational enterprise comes from the state (page 3). In the summertime there isn't any. So you don't have enough of a revenue stream to pay people. If you look at the current salary, that 10% of the academic year salary up to a cap of \$5,775. In summer '13 the salary that was paid was \$737,385. If you were to pay the full 10%, it would have been \$971,669. If paid 12.5%, it would be \$1,214,586. Where did the 12.5% come from? Suppose a full-time teaching load is 4 courses a semester. That's 8 courses in one academic year. So 1/8 would be what's being paid for a course. The summer salary that was paid out with a cap divided by 12.5% it's 60.7%. That's because you're missing the 40% of the state. So the reason you can't pay people what you pay them in an academic year is you don't have that revenue stream. So if you look at the net revenue sharing, it's 33% for administrative overhead, 33% for direct overhead, 17% provost, and 17% college, but if you look at the load factors on the previous page, about 29% of the revenue goes to pay salaries. So the real distribution after you take salary into account is (back to page 3) 23.5% administration, 23.5% direct overhead, 12% provost, 12% college, 29% salary. The next bullet shows the average class revenue, average class size. If you take the 17 students and \$19,700 and apply these formulas, the average pay was \$5,713. So these economics were with the class size, formula, etc. So the only way to generate more revenue is to generate larger classes. If you generate a lot of small classes, you will shoot yourself in foot.

- Mitch Berbrier: Where does the formula for the distribution of sharing of net revenue come from?
- President: It's always been there.
- Mitch Berbrier: So it's not based on any calculation?
- President: It's based on the fact that summer school should be a cash cow to generate revenue that's used by the university to run the academic year. Is there any semblance in reality of fact to that?
- Brent Wren: Probably not.
- Mitch Berbrier: But it might mean that it's a cash cow more to some than to others.
- President: Well, true. I mean if you are going to offer very small classes, you won't make a lot of money on it.
- Mitch Berbrier: Right, but I was referring to the distribution.
- Richard Miller: For instance, the direct overhead may actually be only 20% but 33% are being put in the pile.
- Mitch Berbrier: What you're saying is that money that they count on annually will comp them for the rest of the year.
- President: Yes, that's right.
- Richard Miller: So it sort of all works out.
- Deb Moriarity: One of issues with class size is offering graduate classes because very often either the faculty or the students themselves are teaching so much of the undergraduate programs during academic year, that in the summer sometimes is the only time to offer graduate classes, especially in some of the small programs. So we used to always say it's okay we'll go with a 5-person class there because you're teaching this large undergraduate class during the academic year.
- President: The figures here are undergraduate classes only. So the average is about 16/17.

If you go down to the next bullet. 14% of the undergraduate classes are fewer than 5 students. 32% are fewer than 10.

- Brent Wren: That doesn't include special topic, internship, etc.

- Mitch Berbrier: But this is just summer courses, right?
- Brent Wren: Yes, just summer classes.

So, if you want to increase your salary, because this is a closed system, you're going to increase the instructors' salary, and then decreased the distribution to other units. Unless you increase the number of classes and increase the enrollment. If you look at Tuscaloosa's formula, they pay 7.5% of the AY salary, with no cap. If we were to go to 7.5%, that would cause the lower paid faculty to receive less money and the higher paid faculty to receive more money, if there's no cap. The one conclusion is to forget the 35% business. Look at raising the cap and maybe look at limiting class size or average of class size, something to not get in a mode of operation where you're offering such small classes that it's costing you a lot of money.

- Deb Moriarity: If we put the class out there for students, they register for it, but we don't know the final enrollment until the day of class starts and then the class is cancelled. So now students don't have class. We have to contract sometimes and put in the paperwork before that first day of classes. So often we've already put all that through and signed a contract with them. It's a PR nightmare than to say there's not enough enrollment.
- President: Well, then you have to do it based on experiences and you just have to take your best estimate.
- Richard Miller: I think another area that would help here is at the department level or college level, looking at how the course curriculum is offered. For instance, we have some classes that are offered in the summer and offered in the fall that are not very large but they are these core undergraduate classes. And that is increasing the overall teaching load on faculty. But with modest changes, you can reduce one or two class offerings and reduce that teaching load or make faculty available to teach other courses. This minimum class size can be dealt with fairly easily and eliminate issues.
- Mitch Berbrier: In Liberal Arts we were saying we need 17 in each class to gain 35%. So the 10 doesn't sound bad, but the 5 certainly does.

If you look at the second page, for 2013 using the current formula, the first column is the loaded salary that was paid. If you paid 10% of AY salary, forget the cap, it would have been \$234,284 more. That means that of the revenue that came in, \$234,284 would be shifted to faculty from those other units. The question is do you want to do that? You can see that on that sheet, you have a fair percentage of faculty who will teach. It's not surprising that the smallest percentages are in Engineering and Science. We would want them to be the smallest percent because we want faculty of Engineering and Science to bring in the search grants and pay themselves in the summertime. So the distribution here is not surprising. If you take the 10% salary and then you say, okay in the summer of '13 let's suppose we look at that 10% salary, if you look at this sheet (Appendix B), it shows you how the distributions change within the various units. For example, Liberal Arts would be different by, on the distribution going from the current formula just to the straight 10%, a couple thousand dollars. Engineering would be different by \$13,000. So these are huge differences. Obviously the biggest difference is in the biggest numbers. But if you're able to increase enrollment, then you can make it up.

- Richard Miller: Which is a different challenge.
- President: So I think it's probably reasonable to raise the cap because it doesn't change things that drastically.
- Fan Tseng: Does this include salary for part-time instructors?

- President: Yes it does, because this is fact. Chi Liu went through and said this is part-time, that person is not affected. This is a faculty member, increase the salary. So this is what would have been paid if any faculty would have been paid the 10%. But you've also got part-time people and they aren't going to change. So this is a true analysis of what happened last summer.
- Brent Wren: I thought you were asking if the salary for part-time faculty was going to go up, and that's no.
- Fan Tseng: If we make any changes, that will change the ratio of part-time to full-time. So that would affect the numbers there a great deal.
- President: The other thing I have Chi Liu doing an analysis of last summer and removing all classes for undergraduates less than 8 and graduates less than 5 and we will see what happens. That will take some more time.
- Mitch Berbrier: So you're still in the middle of figuring this out?
- President: I think so far what we've concluded is to forget the 35% and go to the distribution where you're never in a situation where you're given a budget but it's later taken back. Those two things are easy to implement.
- Mitch Berbrier: So the decision at this point is whether you simply raise the salary and perhaps deal with a unit decrease and/or place a minimum class size and what that minimum would be?
- President: I think the question right now is, do we increase the salary to academic faculty? If we do that, do we need to increase it for adjunct, part-time, etc.? Second, do we want to implement a class size minimum?
- Deb Moriarity: Would there be some discretion at the Dean's level for classes that didn't meet that minimum but there was a specific reason why it needed to be taught?
- President: Yes, I suspect so. I think about raising the cap salary and class sizes.
- Wai Mok: Are you going to go through this next week with the full Senate?
- President: Yes but in less detail.

I want to get rid of the 35%. And change the distribution to the system based on real revenue.

- Richard Miller: If the salary for summer instruction was raised, that money has to come out of one of the other units that you talked about. Is it most likely that money would come out of the funds given to the colleges? So that's something deans need to be concerned about if they're expecting that money to be used for something else?
- President: That's what this distribution shows.
- ❖ In-State vs. Out-of-State Credit Hours (Appendix C). The first page is a histogram of the number of students enrolled and the number of hours. For in-state undergraduates, the biggest enrollments is 12 hours. For out-of-state it is 15 hours. Graduate students in-state have a lot of 3 hours. Graduate students out-of-state is 9 hours.
- ❖ Tuition Structure (Appendix D). This is a tuition structure for us, which is the blue line. The increment dollar wise per credit hour up to 12 is fixed, then there's a kink, where the dollar per credit hour drops, and then it is steady again. You can see Tuscaloosa has block tuition. They have a hump in there. UAB is strict, dollar to credit hour. Auburn is block tuition at 12 hours, and then it's frozen forever. So if you look at our tuition compared to Tuscaloosa's and Auburn's, if we were to apply their tuition to our enrollment pattern, we would have gotten more money. If you apply UAB's tuition to our enrollment pattern, we will get less money.



❖ Block Tuition (Appendix E): So we tried to take Fall '13 enrollment pattern and we had in place block tuition this past fall, what would it need to look like in order to generate more revenue? This shows the blue line, the one last year's revenue was based on. And the fact that there are a lot of students who are in-state undergraduate and take 3 hours and 6 hours, we don't want to damage that enrollment because it's not likely they will become 12 or 15 hour students. So notice that the lower end, the orange line overlaps the blue line. Then at 6 hours it starts to increase so that at 12 hours a student would have been paying more than they did pay, but if they had taken 15 hours they would be paying less overall. (Page 2) Look at the column that says just UAH, that's what the actual current rate is (\$21,483,527). The final column is block (\$21,483,791), applying the orange curve, and the difference is very small. If you look at the percent increment per credit hour, that says, if we had in place that orange line, what would the difference be percentage wise between what a student actually paid this past fall and what they would have to pay. So they said we tried to protect 3-6 hour students, which is no change. But then it rises to 8.2% for 12 hours, but then it starts to drop and is -5% for 15 hours. Then it's negative all the way to 23 hours. The next column is the weighted percent change over all the students. So you've got 140 students who have 2.3% increase and multiply those and add them all up and divide by the number of students, the total increase system was 0.54%.

- Richard Miller: So you're incentivizing the people who are part-time or at the low end of full-time and encouraging them that from a financial point of view, the difficulty is how to communicate that in a few sentences to a student and a family.
- Deb Moriarity: It looks like you've started penalizing the 6 to 12 hour student, that's what they'll see.
- Richard Miller: It's a good thing because it also benefits our graduation rate. But the challenge will be communicating this. They're going to look at what's my cost now compared to before.
- President: So here's the good news. If we want to do this, we want to get it settled so that come pre-registration, if a student comes in and says I want to take 12 hours, now we are changing the way we do this and we can say, well you can take another course free. When this is reported, what you report is 15 hours and decreased tuition. This includes fees too.
- Deb Moriarity: Would you think about doing something similar at the graduate level?
- President: Yes, it turns out that Tuscaloosa has block tuition for graduate students from 1 to 9 is per credit hour and then it's flat. I don't think it will have a big effect. In order to make it similar, we would do it, but I don't think it would have an effect there.

Take a look at it and see what you think. The idea is: (1) to push the student beyond 12 hours, which helps graduation rate, (2) to not damage the 3 to 6 hour person, and (3) to reduce the number of students that bounce over to Calhoun. We might have a few rough spots in the transition, but once you get through the transition, it will be good thing.

- Brent Wren: The second bill that concerns checking for pre-requisites, we already have that mechanism in place. We have two things: You've got the pre-requisites that are pre-coded into Banner that, unless a person has taken them, and Banner searches our system, it requires an override on behalf of the advisor for the person to get in.
  - Richard Miller: I've had a problem with this. It isn't overriding anything and the Chair has told me he's not overriding it.
  - Brent Wren: Well it requires an override.

- Deb Moriarity: It may not be coded right.
- Brent Wren: The second thing that happens is, after spring registration, between the semesters, a pre-requisite report is run which looks at every student enrolled in every section and anyone not meeting the pre-requisites is flagged, and that report is sent to the deans and the advisors. They can choose to ignore them, override them, whatever they want to do.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think that what happens is it can be overridden by some people who aren't chairs.
- Richard Miller: Students are telling me that they haven't even asked anyone to override.
- Brent Wren: Then it could be a setup in banner then.
- Mitch Berbrier: Because the system is there.
- Brent Wren: That would be a starting point- to see if the course is properly coded.

➤ Discussion Items

Mitch Berbrier: Let's quickly go through the bills and decide to move them to Faculty Senate or to send them back to a committee.

❖ Bill 373: Definition of Faculty Representation on University-level Committees

Mitch Berbrier: Bill that came from Phillip's committee that we asked them to revise so that it fit better with by-laws and rules of the senate.

- Phillip Bitzer: Correct.
- Mitch Berbrier: Discussion?
- Richard Miller: With respect to the authors and the committee, I think the bill is seriously flawed and I think it should go to the Senate floor. It is a bill and it's written. I will speak out against it because I think it deludes the independence and shared governance of the Senate, but I think it should go to Senate.
- Mitch Berbrier: Bill moved forward to the Faculty Senate for a second reading.

❖ Bill 375: Academic Residency & Voting Rights

Mitch Berbrier: Rich submitted suggesting that if somebody is not on campus for at least one semester and three academic years, and hasn't taught at least one lecture course in the preceding three years, that their voting rights at departmental and college level have been suspended.

- James Blackmon: I'm not sure what "lecture course" means. I've been here 12 years, I've never taught what I think is a "lecture course", but I've had students, and grad students, but it says "and," so according to this I could never vote.
- Richard Miller: I can tell you what my intention here is and then suggest that if this committee decides to send it to the full Senate I would be open to a friendly amendment to change the language. What I mean by a "lecture course" is there are faculty members who have not set foot in a classroom and/or mentored students for significant periods of time and have no residency in academic departments who have the potential and are voting on academic issues, like department chairs and curricula. I don't believe that for a dynamic faculty who care about curriculum and those kinds of things, somebody like that should have the same power of vote as I

do.

- Mitch Berbrier: I don't think this would apply to you (Jim) because you have business here.
- James Blackmon: No, because it says residency "and" have taught at least one lecture course. I've never taught a lecture course, but I've had a lot of students.
- Richard Miller: I intended an "and," but lecture course may be the wrong terminology. My motivation was, yes, to disenfranchise people who are not present at the University and involved, and trying to encourage those who are local to participate in the livelihood of departments.
- Deb Moriarity: I find this flawed. "Residency" is not defined here. What does that mean? Living here, having an office here? And again, lecture course, distance learning, distance courses, other courses that aren't necessarily lecture courses, but are more direct interaction, and it sounds like a punitive than an encouraging type of situation, where it was specifically addressed to situations that might not occur all that often on campus.
- Richard Miller: This issue was taken by our department who had no choice but to bring it to the Faculty Senate.
- Deb Moriarity: The other thing is that research faculty aren't required to teach, but they should be allowed to vote.
- Richard Miller: Yes, that is a flaw.
- Fan Tseng: You have a disenfranchised from this department causing issues with voting rights. Then in the next paragraph, you have that these voting rights be suspended at the department and college level. I don't see the difference for each. He has three levels above, but below he has only one.
- Richard Miller: That's because the Faculty Handbook only specifies what your voting rights are at the university level, not within the department or college level. I'm happy to withdraw this, but I think it's an issue at the University. If there's another way to resolve it, for the Faculty Senate to resolve the issue of people who are designated as faculty members but haven't set foot on campus in many years but are influencing the curriculum, personnel decisions, etc. of the campus, I think that is a problem. That is my goal here.  
Peggy Hays: Do they come to faculty meetings and sit on committees?
- Richard Miller: No, they've never been here during the last decade. They haven't mentored students, taught a course, or sat on committees.
- Mitch Berbrier: Have they voted?
- Richard Miller: Yes.
- James Blackmon: I thought we couldn't vote on anything that was academic, like tenure or something. Our understanding, unofficially, is that we can't vote on stuff.
- Mitch Berbrier: We have a choice. Either remand to the Personnel Committee to look into this more closely, or to send it to the Faculty Senate.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think it should go to personnel committee.
- Peggy Hays: What would be the difference?

- Mitch Berbrier: I think there is enough there that it is confusing to all of us and at the same time the underlying problem is something worthy of examining, so we send it to the Personnel Committee and they can work with Rich to clarify.
  - Richard Miller: It could die in the committee as well.
    - Consensus is to send to Personnel Committee.
- ❖ **Bill 376: Implementation of Updated Parental Leave Policy**
- Mitch Berbrier: Rich is suggesting that there is a policy that exists but it isn't being implemented and that we have an agreed upon wording from the Senate from the new Faculty Senate Handbook, but until it's approved, we go ahead with this.
- Richard Miller: There is no formal policy on the parental, maternal, leave. Three different resolutions were brought about but there is no formal policy.
  - Charles Hickman: It's tangential, where are we on the Handbook?
  - Richard Miller: I suspect it's another year because it still has to go to the Board.
  - Fan Tseng: The last paragraph, you did not mention in case both parents are faculty members.
  - Richard Miller: I don't know.
  - Mitch Berbrier: Consensus is to move forward to Faculty Senate next week.
- ❖ **Bill 374: Validation and Enforcement of Prerequisites During the Student Registration Process**
- Mitch Berbrier: Suggestion: the problem here is that things aren't being put into Banner properly, sometimes Banner doesn't work as expected, and sometimes there are people who go ahead and approve without consulting with the faculty member and chair. I suggest to move this to a committee and reword the bill to somehow encourage and to suggest to the appropriate individuals.
- Phillip Bitzer: I think it goes to Scholastic Affairs.
  - Mitch: Move bill to scholastic affairs.
- ❖ **Lecturer Ladder proposal from the Faculty and Student Development Committee**
- Mitch Berbrier: The question is should this be a bill or should this be—which I was thinking—we would have our committee look at it and give a report to the President? Then ultimately we work with the administration, because something will need to be put in the Faculty Senate Handbook. Is it appropriate for us to send it directly to the President?
- Richard Miller: I don't think you can give it to the President directly from here because we, the Executive Committee, are representing the Senate. And the senate is the decision-making body. So it has to go to the Senate, I think.
  - Mitch Berbrier: Well, for example, we had the Ad Hoc Realignment Committee and they sent a report to the President. So can't this committee, not us, send it to the President? I don't see anything that contradicts that. I don't think that I want to move it to a bill yet since the President is who asked us to do this.
  - Richard Miller: The assumption is that everybody that is represented by the Senate agrees with this. That's probably a problem. I think you're right, going from a committee, but I don't think we can act on behalf of the entire Senate without some commentary about the content.
  - Charles Hickman: (to Mitch) I don't see any problem with you, as Faculty Senate President, saying, "what do you think?"
  - Richard Miller: Are you interested in comments?

- Fan Tseng: Yes. For our committee, this is informal. So I would like feedback.
- Mitch Berbrier: Oh, I misunderstood and thought this was a bill.
- Fan Tseng: No. This just shows where we are, we want to know where to go from here.
- Mitch Berbrier: Can I send it to the whole Faculty Senate and have them look it over and they can send comments to you (Fan)? Not to vote on it, but just for comments. That way everybody has an opportunity to comment on it.
- Fan Tseng: I have no problem with that.
- Richard Miller: That precludes the objection that some who are no longer in the Senate have had that a small group is acting on behalf of a larger group.
- Wai Mok: What about the issue of technicalities? Because if you want to discuss anything in the full Senate, then it needs to be in the form of a bill.
- Mitch Berbrier: We aren't discussing it in the full Senate. We are just sending this out to senators from a committee.
- Richard Miller: Our job, as Executive Committee, is to advise the President and the Senate does the same thing. You aren't just the manager of the Senate, you're the leader of the Senate, and so you have to have some advising from the members and I think that's what you're looking for.
- Mitch Berbrier: So if that's okay with you, we will send it out for comments.
- Deb Moriarity: There are only 2 levels, and not 3.
- Mitch Berbrier: (to Fan) That might be the primary question you get, is why did you decide on 2 levels and not 3? Maybe you can add to this some kind of commentary.
- Richard Miller: I think the criteria might be more problematic. It has a lot of professional development, and developing curriculum, and stuff like that and that isn't typically the role of lecturers. Their job is to lecture.
- Mitch Berbrier: I assume the wording came from other institutions?
- Fan Tseng: Right. It is very inclusive.
- Richard Miller: But I think this is a great idea.
- Mitch Berbrier: I think what needs to be done to prevent you (Fan) from getting questions you've already answered in the committee discussions, is some way of explaining, using footnotes, your decisions, such as why 2 and not 3 levels?, these criteria were derived from benchmark comparison of other universities, etc.
- Deb Moriarity: The way it's worded," may be but not limited to," doesn't make it really clear.
- Mitch Berbrier: Maybe revise it some more as a report and then informally send it to me or us, the Executive Committee, or on to your committee, however you want.

❖ Parliamentary role

Mitch Berbrier: Filling it. Will talk via email.

❖ Budget

Mitch Berbrier: Will talk about budget another time. We had a meeting with Ray Vaughn about some concerns Rich and others raised about the faculty participation. I will send you a summary of that. He's waiting on information from somebody else and when he gets it I will talk to you.

- Wai Mok: He said he will make the names of the people of the committee known to us.
- Mitch Berbrier: There were a variety of other things we discussed.

- Richard Miller: Cost sharing?
- Mitch Berbrier: Yes. One thing about the budget, the opportunity came up about bringing a speaker in. The AAUP is discussing bringing a speaker in who will discuss higher education and academia. They were trying to find money for it. I thought maybe the Faculty Senate money that we don't make use of, not saying we should use it, but it's there to use. We use it to pay for presidents to go to BOT meetings. There is no process for it. We don't have the budget, it is the Provost's money. Basically we go to Peggy and she is very accommodating. I still think we want to have some kind of accountability and discuss it formally. I want to ask if it's okay if I discuss using some money for a speaker. I will discuss specifics.
  - Consensus says it's okay.
- Charles Hickman: How much are we talking? Is it possible to use for distinguished speaker?
- Mitch Berbrier: I think it has to do with the mission of the Faculty Senate for us to use the funds.

➤ Meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.