



FACULTY SENATE MEETING #517 MINUTES

September 1, 2011

12:45 P.M. SC 107

Present: Wai Mok, Charles Hickman, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Eletra Gilchrist, Derrick Smith, Laurel Bollinger, Kwaku Gyasi, Sam Thomas, Carolyn Sanders, Deborah Heikes, Kathy Hawk, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Ramon Cerro, Jeff Kulick, Jennifer English, Paul Componation, Jason Cassibry, Nathan Slegers, Louise O'Keefe, Ina Warboys, Brenda Talley, Marlena Primeau, Kristen Herrin, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Ramazan Aygun, Timothy Newman, Peter Slater, Claudio Morales, Dongsheng Wu, Richard Miller, Max Bonamente, Provost Karbhari

Guest: Dr. Brent Wren

Absent with Proxy: David Neff, Mohamed Ashour

Absent without Proxy: Seong Moo Yoo, David Pan, James Baird

Meeting #517 called to order at 12:45 p.m.

Agenda and Supplemental information sent electronically per Dr. Timothy Newman.

One Committee Report was left out, hard copies are available here.

Dr. Timothy Newman stated there are peculiarities in the Senate Bylaws. If we run out of a quorum during the discussion of an item it must be placed on the agenda for the next meeting as the first item of unfinished business.

- ❖ Senate Bill 352: Mid-Term Grading Policy was passed at first reading by the Executive Committee and was on the agenda at the last meeting. It was being discussed at the last meeting when we lost a quorum. It is the first order of business for today.
- ❖ Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman pointed out there is an issue that was not resolved in the last meeting and it has to do with Senators whose status is ambiguous because election procedures were not followed.
- ❖ Dr. Timothy Newman stated a member has made a motion and raised the question of a privilege of this body. This supersedes all other business. According to the Bylaws the Presiding Officer

decides if this is a question of privilege. If you do not approve of the decision, you can appeal the decision, but there is no debate.

- ❖ Dr. Bhavani Sitaraman stated the issue is with the election of the Senator from Physics. Proper procedures were not followed according to the Bylaws for the election from the tenure and tenure-earning faculty from the Department. A follow-up was requested and no follow up happened. The person was selected arbitrarily, missing the Bylaws and procedures. We had ideas of how to proceed. We would like the Governance and Operations Committee or other party to conduct the election of the Senator. There was some disagreement on whether the seating of the Senator and the election should be handled separately.
- ❖ Dr. Timothy Newman stated this is a question of privilege. He outlined and stated how to handle it including Roberts rules. This is a question to consider. It is the responsibility of this body to act as judicial board to decide how to deal with this. The Senate can manage its own affairs. This is suitable for this body to act on as a whole. It is in order to entertain an executive session and this is not open to debate.
- ❖ Paul Componation moved seconded by Peter Slater to move to executive session. There were no objections. All visitors (Dr. Wren) were asked to leave and did. Dr. Karbhari is an ex-officio member but decided to leave as well so that there would be no hindrance for discussion. Dr. Paul Componation was appointed Sergeant at Arms. Executive Session—Names and details kept only in this room. Minutes can be recorded and only read here. The Senate voted for no minutes.
- ❖ The Senate voted not to seat Dr. Pogorelov by secret ballot vote.
- ❖ The group proceeded to a remedy Brenda Talley moved seconded by Carolyn Sanders to fill the Physics' seat with nominations and an election procedure overseen by the Governance and Operations Committee using the same procedure as that used for the election of officers. The Lime survey method was used. An email was sent with a token to nominate. Elections by the same procedure. Amend the timeline to seat by next month's meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
- ❖ Sam Thomas moved seconded by Eric Seemann to end the executive session.
- ❖ Senate Bill 352: Mid-Term Grading Policy. This bill is in your packet. It was produced by UGSA and has gone through work and rework and came to the floor last time but we lost the quorum. The bill is here at second reading. Max Bonamente moved seconded by Peter Slater the bill for debate. There was a question of whether SGA approved or talked about this bill. The thought was that students liked grades not "S" and "U". Eric Seemann reported the Committee did not talk to anyone in SGA. Jeffrey Kulick asked what input was given to prompt this. The response was that midterm grades were arbitrary and there needs to be quicker feedback to intervene for students in trouble. Eric Seemann reported that the SSC and Janet came and there are only 20% of the faculty reporting and giving feedback. The thought was it was too

complicated or too much trouble especially in larger classes, and not enough graded material. Janet proposed the "S" "U" using a radio button to make it simple and the grades are directed to SSC. If it is easier then compliance is better. Bhavani Sitaraman stated this is weak and vague and who is encouraging and what is meant by encouraging. People should be reminded and make it mandatory. It is unclear. Carolyn Sanders stated a few faculty are using the early alert and it means students assigned a "U" get early referrals. It appears vague and not beyond what have now. How will it be very binding. Eric Seemann stated that how "S" and "U" will help is that it is hard to come up with letter grades but we can decide quickly if it is an "S" and "U" and hit a radio button to report. Richard Miller asked is it a banner issue? Is there an auto notify for follow up by SSC? Eric Seemann stated Janet is working on that to generate auto referrals. Faculty need a kick to submit the grades in the first place. Jeffrey Kulick asked is it a problem of difficulty or just so many part-timers and information is not communicated to them well? Eric Seemann stated he is not sure. Ultimately make everyone aware of one simple standard procedure and get more to do it. Most would do it if it were easier and if it was guaranteed to go and help people. Kathy Hawk stated if someone could remind faculty at the beginning of the term that it will be due so they will get graded work it would help. Peter Slater moved seconded by Max Bonamente to call the question. The "ayes" ruled. **In Favor of bill—29 in favor, 2 opposed, passed at second reading.** Paul Compton stated this is targeting 100 and 200 level courses but he teaches a 300 level course and 70% in the class are first time students and we may be missing some maybe we should not stop at 100-200 level courses. **P-2nd**

- ❖ Timothy Newman stated the notes the Provost put together speak for themselves and we look forward to having him present at the next meeting.
- ❖ Approval of Minutes of Meeting 516. Eric Seemann moved, seconded by Ina Warboys to approve the Minutes of Meeting 516. The vote was unanimous.
- ❖ Senate Executive Committee Reports—Bhavani Sitaraman moved seconded by Louise O'Keefe to accept the reports. There was no opposition.
- ❖ Senate President Timothy Newman's Report. Dr. Newman stated you have the report in writing. I will hit the highlights. Search Committee for the President—no members here—missed the first deadline of having someone in place for the beginning of the semester. Highlighted the Chancellors comments. Raise pool 4.5% to college ½ of 1 percent held centrally to correct equity situations. October 14 paychecks reflect the increase. Contributions to Teachers Retirement increasing 2.25 percent. Other details on benefits in the notes. Acceptance of bills not great by Administration. Senate consider opinion on resolutions passed and sent to Administration. Each bill goes through 3 readings and is looked at carefully. The Senate has been remiss. A summary is in the report and on the website. In committee discuss how we want to proceed. Would like to go to the Provost and give input. Timothy Newman and Richard Miller will send information about bills. Richard Miller will send a link to the website and you can review. Three bills were submitted for review—2 were sent to committees for consideration. Another was on deck but

there was not enough time to deal with it in Executive Committee. If you have bills send them to Richard Miller at millerr@uah.edu. Some we have been considering for a long time and we need to get them off the deck. There were 3 committee reports in the packet and one hardcopy report that was left out of the packet.

- ❖ Carmen Scholz—announced that she was asked by G. Greene to take a message to colleagues that there are training sessions in "conduct in research" please take these seriously.
- ❖ There are a number of University Committees listed in the Handbook and they should report to the Senate once a year—they are required to report and if the Committee does not meet contact the Chair because the Committees should meet once a semester.
- ❖ Bill 354: Full Refunds for Students in the Military who are Deployed—Deborah Heikes moved seconded by Eric Seemann to move this bill to second reading. Eric Seemann reported he put this together because right now the University is not in compliance with the relief act. Came to mind on Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee and students left and asked for retro withdrawal. Gone through a number of tightening of language. Up to and including last day of class they are allowed to withdraw. This is honoring service members. The statement was made that compliance could be decided at the administrative level. Eric Seemann talked to the Provost and he said send it through the Senate. **The bill passed unanimously and is adopted as Resolution 11-12-1.**
- ❖ Senate Bill 350: Conflict of Interest—This bill has been on the floor before and was placed back on the Agenda by the Executive Committee. Eric Seemann moved seconded by Carolyn Sanders to bring it to the floor for debate. The questions was asked "Should it be part of the Faculty Handbook revision---how is it supposed to fix anything?" Jeffrey Kulick moved seconded by Eric Seemann to replace the first motion and send the bill to Personnel Committee to see if what is in the Handbook already has this there or should it be included. "Ayes" were the majority and **it goes to committee.**
- ❖ There was some discussion regarding bills for the Handbook and having information early and how long it will take to get the Handbook approved once it is completed.
- ❖ Ramon Cerro stated that saying a seated president or provost would not come to campus for faculty due to confidentiality is not acceptable. Let the Committee know that faculty would not like to find out through the newspaper that we have a new president. Faculty would like to have a chance to interview and have a say in that. Senate Body should direct Chairs and the President and President-Elect. **Ramon Cerro moved seconded by David Stewart to have the Executive Committee direct the Administration that faculty want to talk to the candidates.** Paul Componation stated that we will lose good candidates if we require them to come while they are seated. Carolyn Sanders agreed. Ramon Cerro stated we want someone proven to be great and we are willing to forego some because it will put them at risk. Maybe there is another way—

maybe they could appear in executive session—secret—split the difference. Ramon Cerro stated if they are willing to be president they should be willing to take that risk. That works in a nice world but there are ramifications in the real world. Bhavani Sitaraman stated we should not treat this like it is a corporate executive. This person will be working with faculty so they should be talking to faculty. Louise O'Keefe asked if we could argue on the public university idea. Others stated we want transparency. **In favor of motion: 9 in favor, 8 against. Carries.**

- ❖ Sam Thomas moved seconded by Paul Compton to adjourn at 2:05 p.m.