



Faculty Senate Meeting 526

May 10, 2012

12:45 p.m. in BAB 121

Present: *Chris Allport, Charles Hickman, David Stewart, Eletra Gilchrist, Derrick Smith, Carolyn Sanders, Deborah Heikes, Kathy Hawk, Anne Marie Choup, Mitch Berbrier, Ramon Cerro, Mohamed Ashour, Jeffrey Kulick, David Pan, Jennifer English, Paul Componation, David Moore, Louise O'Keefe, Marta Browning, Ina Warboys, Anna Benton, Marlena Premeau, Kristen Herrin, Peggy Hays, Philip Bitzer, Luciano Matzkin, James Baird, Ramazan Aygun, Tim Newman, Dongsheng Wu, Richard Miller, Nick Pogorelov, Jakobus le Roux, Vistasp Karbhari*

Guests: *Robert Altenkirch, Brent Wren*

Absent with Proxy: *Eric Fong, Angela Balla, Molly Johnson, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Sherri Messimer, Brenda Talley, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Peter Slater, Claudio Morales, Max Bonamente*

Absent without Proxy: *Wai Mok, Laurel Bollinger, David Neff, Kwaku Gyasi, Christine Sears, Seong Moo Yoo, Jason Cassibry, Kader Frendi, James Blackmon, Nathan Slegers, Jeff Evans, Leonard Choup*

- ❖ Dr. Tim Newman called the meeting to order at 12:50 p.m.
- ❖ **Approval of minutes**—Derrick Smith moved, seconded by Paul Componation to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.
- ❖ **Overview by Dr. Tim Newman**—This is referred to as the combined meeting of outgoing and incoming senators—outgoing are those whose term expires this academic year—if you are such a person, your term continues through the end of summer term—new senators begin in August on the first day of class—the incoming senators get no votes today. The current senators make a mental note we are likely to have a called meeting during the summer. We need to finish the Handbook and Bylaws-the process has lagged many years with turnover and we need to have the same Senate that started it to finish it.

- ❖ **Dr. Robert Altenkirch—Updates**—UAHuntsville Board Committee is meeting May 30, the Board set up a Committee to only focus on this campus—there is one in Birmingham focused on UAB but they are more of a medical liaison—This Board Committee is focused on Huntsville. They will meet 4 times a year with public meetings –the University will provide updates to the Committee and hopefully the community will come get information but see the Board is focused. Chairs of Board Committees make up this Committee. Good from point of view the Community will get information. It will probably be in Shelby Center –10 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Is it advertised—question from Dr. Richard Miller—Provost Karbhari will find out—it is on the web site –but I will find out. The group of folks in Huntsville formed by the Mayor is not this Committee. This is a Board of Trustees Committee. The regular Board Meeting will take place June 14 and 15.

The System opened an office on campus in SKH 306 and 307.

FY 13 Budget—step by step summary of status of budget. Started \$43+M—Governor proposed 4% reduction. Senate proposed 5% reduction. Put in \$95,000 for climatology and nothing for nursing Ways and Means Committee came with 4% and bumped climatology \$200,000 and \$1M for Nursing. House passed 4% with \$200,000 and \$1M—has to go to Senate and if passes done and if not has to go to conference. Lines in budget for each campus.

Project list for FY 13—about \$5.5M—maintenance upkeep etc. Pre School—preliminary location don't like so asked Ray to find another. Will not go away. Will post on line and if have questions can ask. Pretty typical.

Nursing construction February 2013 and open Fall 2014. Second view extra story to move from WH. Architects give two plans. \$13M comfortable with that—addition is additional \$4M don't know if can raise the other \$4M and if not fall back to original. Is there a date you have to know-per Richard Miller—President Altenkirch responded July.

Greenway and Student center July time and open spring 2014. Bids come back with and without fountain. If fountain fits in bid will have to make decision. If go with option 1 on Nursing will be that way for a while.

I appreciate what you did this year; Tim Newman did a good job and is on track.

- ❖ **Provost Karbhari**—registration going on for summer up by a few percent. Thank you for turning up at commencement. Thought went well positive feedback from students and parents and important to have faculty there. Meet to modify what do going forward. Thank you for what did handing in grades, only a few not in. Thanked Senate for all the work done. This is in addition to all the other things you do. Look forward to next year. Jim Baird—asked a question regarding a student killed in a car accident and he had to give a grade. The student was not withdrawn. Provost Karbhari will look into it.
- ❖ Moved by Charles Hickman and seconded by Kristen Herrin for acceptance of **Executive Committee Minutes**. Minutes were accepted.

- ❖ **Tim Newman**—have a timetable: Senate Committee election process—act on that today. End of this meeting elect Committee Chairs—for that, we have a list of Committee members that we will read and each committee will caucus at the end and elect their '12-13 Chair—quorum is 4 for each committee, 5 for Finance. Send email with election results to Tim. Again, caucus is only for continuing Senators for fall—new Senators do vote for that. University Committees – distribute ballot for—current Senators take one or proxy take one for proxy. Fill out and will take later and have someone count. Peggy Hays nominated for Intercollegiate Athletics, Phil Bitzer self-nominated for Intercollegiate Athletics. Deborah Heikes self-nominated for Intercollegiate Athletics. Slate closed. Teller –someone not on the ballot—Dr. Jim Baird and Dr. Eletra Gilchrist will be tellers—when finished give to them and at the end of Senate meeting will tally.

Strategic planning continues and getting close and task forces will be formed may happen this summer or early fall. Many may be asked. Kathy Hawk, Carmen Scholz, Ina Warboys, and Tim Newman are senators who've served on strategic planning.

President asked for list of Senate items that might have been well-addressed, have supplied him with that.

Senate passed a bill asking the university to change the BETA policy. The Provost shared the process and shared concerns about that. Policy to affect academic freedom and employment policy. Should require faculty approval and be in the Handbook. Advocated Senate be involved in approval in any rework of the BETA policy. The Senate called for an ad hoc committee to form a new policy. What the Provost called for was an ad hoc committee formed to report to BETA and EMOG. Ramon Cerro—should we involve AAUP in this. There is a National chapter of AAUP.

- ❖ **Governance and Operations**: Paul Componation—have gotten nominations for officers—one person still trying to confirm—ballots should go out this afternoon.
- ❖ **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs**—Deborah Heikes--meeting with Janet and programmer regarding pre-requisites.
- ❖ **Undergraduate Curriculum**: Kristen Herrin—nothing now but still approving courses through summer.
- ❖ **Personnel**: Ramon Cerro-no report
- ❖ **Faculty and Student Development**—Ina Warboys--submitted year-end report—Consultant and speaker for Teaching Excellence.

- ❖ **Senate Committee Assignment**—Motion to approve with understanding that those highlighted in yellow up for replacement. Mohamed Ashour moved, seconded by Louise O’Keefe to adopt. Committee slate adopted.
- ❖ **Chapter 5 Handbook**—standing rule is that we’re approving chapter by chapter- discussed the way the chapter by chapter amends go, with discussion 1 minute per speaker on amendments—when each chapter has been approved, we’ll then have a final, overall approval and then it will go to administration. If there are changes there, it will come back to us and then when all that is through, it will go to the President and if he approves then to the Board. The moral is nothing goes to the Board until the Faculty Senate approves. Motion to approve Chapter 5—Charles Hickman moved, seconded by Paul Componation –on subsequent vote, ayes have it. Chapter 5 is adopted.
- ❖ **Chapter 6 Handbook**---motion to approve—Paul Componation moved, seconded by Ramon Cerro—on subsequent vote, ayes have it, Chapter 6 is adopted.
- ❖ **Chapter 7 Handbook**—motion to approve—Nick Pogorelov moved, seconded by Ramon Cerro to approve.

Derrick Smith—are we going from annual to every two years on reappointment. In effect after Board approval—rationale for change—Jennifer English was on the Handbook Committee they were concerned about having a review after review after review in a constant cycle of review. Still have to do annual reports—people up for reappointment would not have to do dossier for review. Reappointment review every other year. Why doing—supposed to be easier and help faculty but believe still get grace year. Needs to say that. Carolyn Sanders—had considerable discussion in Personnel Committee that annual review is needed. Deborah Heikes—agree first year review is stupid but it gives feedback and allows making mistakes before it matters. Ramon Cerro—first review happens when the faculty is not even here a year so the important one is the 2nd full year but in no way to take away responsibility of senior faculty to mentor young faculty. Mitch Berbrier—advisory review—third year but not fifth year. David Stewart—concern faculty coming up need feedback and not tied to renewal. Is it defined anywhere – Mitch Berbrier. Richard Miller—concern not defining advisory and it not take place and be confusing. Mitch Berbrier—confusing and if it does not mean anything should not be there. It is a good thing. David Stewart—maybe this is not the language to use but we want a review that is advisory. Deborah Heikes—why no review before tenure, nothing in fifth year. What is the rationale? Jeff Kulick replacing reappointment review with something of lighter weight. Deborah Heikes—substantial information to faculty before tenure review. David Stewart lot of discussion on committee and agreeing with your view. Two large reviews produce better feedback taken more seriously rather than small ones. Two high hurdles more intimidating rather than nurturing. Majority for 2 really rigorous reviews and then tenure. Richard Miller—mentorship—why not in fifth year rather than having none, have another advisory that provides last minute check. Paul Componation—very concerned on this—our department has a large formal review that provides specific guidance. Over the course of year to year change wording.

Have series—for dismissal work through those. If dean and have only two of those—would be extremely harsh. Covering self in both directions. Harsher than usual because no other means to tell. Ina Warboys—did the committee look at any comparable institutions to pattern this or did we just make it up. Handbook Committee—look at third year comprehensive reviews and 5 too many. Help do better job but not truly evaluating. Two reviews harsher. Ramon Cerro—the way we looked at it give people in pipeline more stability—what needed to pursue without having to put together a dossier. Some departments where 5 letters first 2 or 3 meaningless and if have only two will be more careful. Gives idea everything is ok. Marlena Primeau—advisory review—different things to different people—confusion—what do they mean by advisory review—Ramon Cerro—not review to terminate on basis of annual report. Who is assigned for responsibility—Mitch Berbrier—department chair? Definition of parameters and who is responsible. Richard Miller—great discussion and said burden but maybe take burden part out and figure out scheme of what leads to success of faculty—motivation for how it is laid out. Deborah Heikes—leave reappointment way it is—3rd year don't tie to reappointment. Not getting reappointed but getting feedback. David Stewart agreed. Deborah Heikes—make motion—**In spring of 3rd full academic year faculty member shall be reviewed in accordance with procedures described in 7.8.2.2 This review requires no reappointment recommendation.** (Replace Advisory review). David Stewart seconded—Ramon Cerro states this defeats the purpose—free faculty from putting dossier together. Paul Compton—template given and updates through year. Something keeping all the time and not that much work at the time. Feedback without Fear. Derrick Smith—do every December and takes couple of hours. Issue—advisory review fine just didn't know what it was. Some departments are better at mentoring than others. Kathy Hawk as a chair the first year is useless—2nd, 3rd and 4th gives solid record of showing on track. Some do better than others and get hard feedback. Jeff Kulick—heavy duty procedure with a lot of reporting. Ramon Cerro—diluting importance of review by making it a non reappointment review. Rationale faculty activity report and chair do whatever wants—ask for committee—write letter, etc. relieve candidate from having a review every year. Carolyn Sanders—with all due respect—this is dependent on each department and some do a better job than others on mentoring. Amendment—vote—24 in favor, 5 opposed—passed.

Comprehensive digital file—Derrick Smith—7.8.1.2—Clarify going paperless—Jeff Kulick—file large trouble getting to all so digital file will make it easier and available and share in real time. Rating form—what is difference in categories, Ramon Cerro—it means different things to different people. Faculty activity report same wording—different for department "a" and department "b". 5 grades, Charles Hickman—any rating scale is inherently subjective. Richard Miller—Promotion and Tenure manual lays out what tenured and promoted—not always followed but college attempted to draft something that addresses some of this. Jeff Kulick—comes from FAR—each college and each department set own standards—minimum standards to follow. Can set own. Luciano Matzkin—once goes to Board and approved grandfathered in to old or go to new. Everyone switches to this one per Tim Newman.

- ❖ Dr. Tim Neman stated we have to make some decisions now about what we want to spend our remaining time on, **proposed a few possibilities**—could vote on amendment—suspend rules

and go beyond time limit, could suspend rules and go to committee chair elections within caucuses.

- ❖ David Stewart—**moved to go to Committee Chairs**, Louise O’Keefe seconded. Motion is to set debate on Handbook aside for a moment and go to Committee elections. Ayes have it. Set aside for moment and go to Committee Chairs. Faculty and Student Development no quorum. Finance and resources no quorum. Governance and Operations no quorum. Personnel quorum. Curriculum—has quorum. Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs—quorum—meet. Faculty and Student Development- had Quorum in theory but couldn’t get everyone together before someone left removing quorum. Undergrad Curriculum-- Derrick Smith, Chair. Personnel- Ramon Cerro, Chair. Scholastic Affairs—Deborah Heikes, Chair.
- ❖ Motion to **extend session** Marlena Premeau moved, seconded by Kristen Herrin, to extend 5 minutes passed.
- ❖ Motion to **suspend rules and readdress university committees**, Marlena Premeau moved seconded by Charles Hickman. Campus Planning—Louise O’Keefe. Moriarity 3rd, tie--Derrick Smith moved, seconded by Louise O’Keefe to accept Jennifer English on campus planning (vote was 8 Reeves, English 10, so English wins). Dr. Tim Newman will email others.
- ❖ Derrick Smith moved, seconded by Louise O’Keefe to **adjourn**.