

Faculty Senate Agenda - Meeting #529

August 30, 2012 12:45-2:15 pm, SC 109

Agenda Items

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes, Senate Meeting #528
3. Consideration of Ongoing Senate Business
 - Will entertain motion to suspend rules and return to ongoing Senate business following President, Provost, and Internal (Senate) Reports.
4. Administration Reports
 - Dr. Robert Altenkirch, University President
 - Dr. Vistasp Karbhari, Provost
5. Internal (Senate) Reports & Discussion
 - Acceptance of 23 August 2012 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes
 - Senate Officer Reports
 - Senate President's Agenda for AY 2012-2013
 - Senate Committee Reports
 - University Committee Reports
6. Ongoing Senate Business
 - Consideration of Faculty Handbook Revision
 - Chapter 9 Remaining
 - Consideration of Faculty Senate By-laws Revision
 - Senate Bill 361: Disease Policy (2nd reading)
 - Senate Bill 363: Differential Tuition Analysis (3rd reading)
 - Senate Bill 365: Performance Criteria for Tuition Remission (2nd reading)
 - Senate Bill 367: Eligibility for Senate Officers Elections (2nd reading)
7. New Business
 - None
8. Adjournment

Proxies for Senate meetings must be a Senate-eligible individual from the same academic unit. No individual may carry more than one proxy.

PLEASE SEND PROXIES TO PEGGY BOWER: bowerp@uah.edu



Called Faculty Senate Meeting 528

July 3, 2012

12:45 p.m. in BAB 121

Present: *Wai Mok, Eric Fong, Charles Hickman, David Stewart, Laurel Bollinger, David Neff, Bhavani Sitaraman, Jeffrey Kulick, Ina Warboys, Marlena Primeau, Philip Bitzer, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Peter Slater, Tim Newman, Richard Miller*

Absent with Proxy: *Carolyn Sanders, Eric Seemann, Kathy Hawk, David Pan, Brenda Talley, Louise O'Keefe, Max Bonamente*

Absent without Proxy: *Eletra Gilchrist, Derrick Smith, Kwaku Gyasi, Deborah Heikes, Ramon Cerro, Mohamed Ashour, Jason Cassibry, Kristen Herrin, Nathan Slegers, James Baird, Ramazan Aygun, Claudio Morales, Dongsheng Wu, Nikolai Pogorelov*

- ❖ Approve **Agenda**—No quorum in Executive Committee.

The desired agenda is before you. David Neff moved, seconded by Charles Hickman to approve agenda. Ayes have it.

- ❖ **Minutes** approval for 526 and 527. Minutes 526 Laurel Bollinger moved, seconded by David Neff to approve the minutes. The ayes have it.

Minutes 527—Bhavani Sitaraman moved, seconded by Marlena Primeau to approve the minutes. The ayes have it.

- ❖ **Senate Executive Notes**— no approval needed.

- ❖ **Faculty Handbook**—on the floor for approval of **Chapter 7**—amendments and back to main motion. Roy Magnuson proposed an amendment regarding the qualifications for the peer reviewers—**7.10.3.1**—there is a problem with this section. Some people work on books with many contributors, I wrote a paper with many contributors. This is a technicality—I have several examples from Biological Sciences with 700 signers. All these people should not be barred for reviewers. “Ideally peer reviewers should be both expert and objective, should have outstanding qualifications. Any significant relationship (supervisory, collaborative, and social) between peer reviewer and candidate should be disclosed in nomination of the peer reviewer

and in the letter from the peer reviewer. “Richard Miller seconded. Disclose rather than prohibit. Peter Slater asked will the paper appear in the CV. Wai Mok asked does this open up who makes the decision to say yes or no. Is it the Chair and the candidate? If the burden is on the Chair then you open another can of worms. Jeff Kulick stated they anticipated in discussions and 10.4.1 allows other materials. Richard Miller stated there are some fields where there is never a single author for a paper. This should not count against the candidate. All of this is a judgment call—simply disclose rather than prohibit. Laurel Bollinger—proposes “ordinarily would not serve.” Accepted as a friendly amendment—amending an amendment is not allowed—this is out of order but if there is unanimous consent then you can change to a new statement.

- ❖ Chair objects. I would like to step aside and I wish to speak.
- ❖ David Neff presides.
- ❖ Tim Newman requests to speak. There is a minor flaw—and that is the dissertation advisor. The dissertation advisor should never serve as a letter writer. NSF will not allow it. Co-authors can. We need to revisit this with different language. Bhavani Sitaraman proposed a change to remove “dissertation advisors” and make it two sentences. “Dissertation advisors may not serve as external reviewers.” “Co-authors of the candidates would not ordinarily serve as external peer reviewers.” Peter Slater stated “co-authors and dissertation committee members of the candidates would not ordinarily...” Laurel Bollinger stated “Ideally reviewers will not have relationships with the candidate”.
- ❖ David Neff turned the gavel over to Wai Mok so that he and Tim Newman could continue in the discussions.
- ❖ David Neff stated there was discussion regarding disclosure and cooperation and that the group was mixing the two. Roy Magnuson read language from the Science Promotion and Tenure manual. Peter Slater stated he would like to include someone who says they have co-authored several papers and I am good with what you are saying. We could include it and make it clear they are a co-author but would like to see others included that are not co-authors. Tim Newman supports Peter Slater’s statements. “Whenever feasible the set of peer reviewers should include members with no significant relationships with the candidate.” David Stewart commented on a contradiction in language. It was found to be ok. Peter Slater moved to remove next to the last sentence. There was unanimous consent to replace this with the original amendment. It is replaced. Vote on amendment: Vote: **2 nays. Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Tim Newman took the gavel back as presiding officer at this point.
- ❖ Amendment to “Additional Information **7.10.4.2**”—Permit additions—may have folder entitled updates. “Any documents added to comprehensive digital file after the review by department committee or equivalent shall be placed within subfolders, indicating date of placement, within

this update folder. Nothing shall be added to the file however without the written consent of the candidate.” Charles Hickman and Jeff Kulick are concerned about adding without a process. The way it is written it is not clear when or where it is added. Roy Magnuson stated the administrator that is in possession of the document can add. Carmen Scholz spoke against this. There is a point when the review process ends and the candidate is reviewed at that point. There should be a fixed point in the timeline at which this ends. Laurel Bollinger stated I would rather default in favor of the candidate---no negative material added. Peter Slater stated the department made the decision and the candidate knows what the vote was and if material will come. Roy Magnuson stated there is confidentiality. Peter Slater stated confidentiality does not cover this. The Candidate may decide not to put in a document because a department member does not like them. This keeps it out and then when it gets passed the department someone can put it in. The Department should vote on the material there and then add. Carmen Scholz was referring to things the candidate nor the committee influenced. If it is not on the tenure clock it is not there. David Neff stated if publications get published and are added that should be ok. It is legitimate. Peter Slater stated updates on documents already submitted are allowed. Roy Magnuson stated I don’t have a problem with language. Peter Slater stated he defeats this amendment. Propose other language. Vote: **The nays have it. Amendment fails.**

- ❖ Laurel Bollinger proposed that after “equivalent”, “other than updates on the status of existing publications, creative works, grant proposals, etc.” David Stewart seconded. Peter Slater asked who does the updating. Jeff Kulick asked what time is it added. Need clarification of when we have to stop. Roy Magnuson stated the way it used to be is the candidate would request to have material included—the Chair, Dean and Provost, could at their discretion do or not. It did not stop until the final decision. Vote: **Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Laurel Bollinger stated that section 7.14.2 regarding dismissal for the conviction of a crime needs to be modified to at least serious crime. Marlena Primeau seconded. Vote: **Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Richard Miller stated that 7.10.5.1 needs a wording change in the second sentence. Administrators may not serve on these faculty promotion and tenure committees.” Bhavani Sitaraman has an objection because if you are in a place you do not have a significant number of faculty members, the chair can write. State "university administrators". The motion fails for lack of a second. Laurel Bollinger suggested “except in situations where small departments requires their participation as specified in Section 7.10.5.2” David Stewart seconded. Punctuation change. Vote: **Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Laurel Bollinger stated in Section 7.14.2.3 we have the same problem with the word “crime” and we need to amend to say “serious crime.” Marlena Primeau seconded. Vote: **Ayes have it.**
- ❖ The appeal process is in Appendix E.

- ❖ Vote on Chapter 7 and clean up questions—Tim Newman or Richard Miller will harmonize everything.
- ❖ Roy Magnuson stated section **7.10.3.1** needs to be copied to **7.11.4.1**. Replace the first two sentences of the current language with new language. David Neff seconded. Vote: **Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Confidentiality sections—letters are kept confidential but let the candidate know the outcome but letters are not given to the candidate. The current document suggested the documents are provided to the candidate in redacted form. **7.7.1**—full and frank disclosure without fear of being hurt or fingers pointed. Noted documents—Carbondale—signed statement from candidate with exception of confidential letters. John Shriver stated we need strict confidentiality and the candidate signs a waiver. May make letters of little value. This is involved—it involves 4 sections—move to reconstitute the Handbook committee and send it back or send it to the Personnel Committee—send back to personnel to address confidentiality. The document is procedural and would like to see more values. Tim Newman stated in light of time and this body’s time spent many things could be reopened and renegotiated. We would be best served if we give very specific directions on what we want the Committee to do. If we send it to personnel it would be to address confidentiality only. The Personnel Committee has been involved throughout the review process. **The motion fails.**
- ❖ Peter Slater stated he would be in support of the confidentiality for external letters. Find out at each step. Jeff Kulick—comments on discussion—if it goes to court everything is out. Charles Hickman stated if it goes to legal the person has a right to see everything. The reviewers could be concerned about what is in the letter. They should be willing to stand behind what they say. Bhavani Sitaraman—how does this affect appeals? Eric Fong stated if the person appeals is there no right to see anything. No it means they have a right to whatever they need to defend their position. Carmen Scholz—when you write a letter for someone in another university and when it gets back to that person what is the retaliation. Roy Magnuson stated this is a controversial issue. I understand redaction, understand disclosure, understand confidentiality. Charles Hickman stated full and frank are false. We need complete discretion. It could torpedo because of a grudge—there needs to be disclosure and the process should be transparent—everyone knows the cards that on the table. Need to be careful writing letters. Put in letter “in my opinion” or have facts to back it up. Do not rely on confidentiality to make assumptions. We can have an opinion but be ready to share the facts. Carmen Scholz—could be the reason why reviews are not public. Charles Hickman stated you can argue both sides—society benefits from disclosure and transparency. Ina Warboys stated transparency is better because the torpedo occurs because it is under cover—this can ruin a life.
- ❖ **Ayes have it. Chapter 7 is adopted.**
- ❖ **Chapter 8:** David Neff moved, seconded by Peter Slater to adopt Chapter 8. Bhavani Sitaraman moved to delete **8.4** because it is out of context. David Neff seconded. This allows policy to be

implemented anywhere anytime without shared governance. It allows lot of power to the President's cabinet and allows them to seek input. This is very vague. They could say we sought input and here is the policy. Ina Warboys stated she sees the opposite. This protects the unit. I see as the opposite. Tim Newman asked does this give up rights of the Faculty Senate on the Handbook, etc. Charles Hickman asked do they already have that power and these things are not relevant. Bhavani Sitaraman stated it creates a very general policy on policies. This is a general statement overriding those sections coming under shared governance. Worried this is a rubber stamp and any policy can be established anywhere. Laurel Bollinger stated this is a description of what is currently going on. Might be appropriate to add a statement to make it clear this does not abdicate shared governance. David Stewart stated he is agreeing with Bhavani Sitaraman because Bylaws and things have to go by the Senate end this just says tell the Faculty Senate. David Neff stated some things are in the purview of students living on campus, etc., things like an open door does not have to do with the Faculty Senate. Richard Miller spoke in favor of the motion and the idea for substitution. Charles Hickman—amend to include “Consistent with support of shared governance” add wording. **Vote on amendment—9 in favor 8 against. Amendment adopted. 8.4 deleted.**

- ❖ Richard Miller—motion to incorporate values—The University must preserve the primacy of shared academic governance in planning development and implementation of policies. Faculty should have direct influence and control over departmental and institutional priorities as well as the institutional mission, including curriculum planning, faculty hiring and scholarly activities. Hope to grab back ability to influence certain things while not having to separate out forms. David Neff seconded. **Ayes have it. Change title to Policy Formation.**
- ❖ **Chapter 8 adopted: Ayes have it.**
- ❖ Laurel Bollinger moved, seconded by Eric Fong to adopt **Chapter 9**. Laurel Bollinger is in favor of editing section **9.16**—there is no clarity for summer obligations with regard to service. Insert “In principle while there are minor service obligations, officially we are not required to be here.” David Neff seconded. Carmen Scholz—is there something about we have benefits and therefore administration considers these obligations. The Provost agrees faculty are on leave and do not have obligations. Vote—**ayes have it.**
- ❖ **Section 9.15:** Summer Teaching, move out of **9.16.1** and add new paragraph. David Neff seconded. Wai Mok-- why have number changes—strike the number—this is a maximum number as established by university policy.
- ❖ **Lost Quorum and adjourned at 2:20.**
- ❖ Note: Tim Newman and Wai Mok made all changes to the Handbook on the screen during the meeting.



SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
August 23, 2012
12:45 P.M. in SKH 369

Present : Richard Miller, Ramon Cerro, Deborah Heikes, Ina Warboys, Timothy Newman, Mitch Berbrier, David Neff, Jeet Gupta, Derrick Smith, Brent Wren, Vistasp Karbhari, Wai Mok

- ❖ Dr. Richard Miller stated there are many changes on campus—there are lots of opportunities. I am optimistic that we will be able to serve faculty and students to give our input on changes being made now. The President is out of town in Birmingham at a Board Meeting about Athletics.
- ❖ **Provost Vistasp Karbhari**—distributed WOW brochures. The President is in Birmingham for a meeting and he is the senior President in the System now. Welcome to a new semester. We had the Installation, Convocation, Groundbreaking and picnic on Tuesday. It was good to see you there. Many events have already taken place. There are over 70 activities. I had an opportunity to visit welcome tents. Alumni activity this evening starts at 5.

Added over 32 faculty in all five colleges. A couple were converted from research to tenure track. Others were brought in.

We are well on our way for the search for the Director of International Engagement. The Committee worked over the summer, completed round one with phone and Skype. They will present a short list this week—there will be 3 or 4 to bring on campus and there will be opportunity to talk by all. Used to be Director of ISSO. Hope to have those interviews in early September after Labor Day.

New CIO joined August 13—Dee Childs is coming up to speed. Like to afford her opportunity to meet with you.

Enrollment today about flat -- 7641 now compared to 7637 last year-- up at graduate level and down in undergraduate. Up in Nursing. Credit hours down in undergraduate and up graduate level.

Dean Smith interim VPR—transition phase now join formally after Labor Day. Here this week out next week back after that. He is from Texas Tech. Good Experience in Biological Sciences and solar telescope Starting search.

Department of Health has a new requirement—it requires disclosure similar to the ethics commission. There is an interim policy in place and it will be discussed further and we will put in place something permanent –over a period it will probably become applicable to all funding. Now NIH or NEH. Financial conflict. Most rules and policies mirror those of the ethics commission. NIH says every time we get a new contract we will have to update the disclosure.

We will start the review for the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts—it is a standard review—I met with the College and I was given names—it will be chaired by Dean Raines. We will announce more as we put it in place.

Director SSC search ongoing—fairly close to naming a person in the next few days.

Hope to start search for Director of Library in near future. Have a meeting with Mitch Berbrier and Rich Miller to start. Named David Moore as interim after Wilson Luquire left. Was Director before Wilson Luquire and going back to previous title. Faculty in Library on Lecturer status—common to other Libraries.

Timothy Newman—stated enrollment is up by 4—That is baffling—had good headlines—good positive coverage—any guesses? Provost Karbhari state he is trying to do an analysis—there are challenges with the economy both Freshmen and Transfers—holding on to see if we need to work on something—change in tuition could have affected. As we had drops in previous year's cycle it continues. Trying to do a lot with Community Colleges—getting close to signing contracts to get students. Need to market ourselves a lot more. Let people know what we have on campus. It takes some time to catch on. Community college had drop in enrollment in summer. Have not seen numbers from others right now. There is a significant amount we need to do to increase the numbers. Tim Newman—asked if there is a difference in Freshmen—Provost Karbhari stated retention is actually very good. We have been running a comparison daily for the last 7 years. Numbers are up—in Nursing—Business has grown at the graduate level—Liberal Arts has come down both n lower and upper levels. Engineering is about flat. Science is up by 3% overall. Mitch Berbrier—in Liberal Arts enrollments for transfers are up and freshmen are lower—this affects Liberal Arts. We are up in some areas and down in others so the numbers are flat. Tim Newman—differential tuition—Provost Karbhari stated he talked with the President this morning and we are going to get numbers and determine whether we can do that being the only university in the System that

does that. The term differential tuition is not liked by ACHE. Have to be careful with that.

Something came up this morning based on the opinion of the Attorney General—Distance Education—a concerned citizen asked the Attorney General—Should DL tuition be at the same level as in-state and out-of-state—yes according to the constitution there should be no difference in tuition except for military and the common market—it could cause concern if we go in with different forms of tuition. Auburn has certain courses and it is different from in-house. Mitch Berbrier—already has differential tuition in the sense that if someone takes 15 credits then it is one cost. If they take 120 here it is different. Looking at that and block tuition per Provost Karbhari. Explained block tuition. Also looking at what if we give a guarantee. Some concern because of PAC. Looking at a variety of options. Through this year we will have a lot of those on the table. We will have some things to present and we will try to get something in place before the tuition rates are set for next year.

- ❖ Richard Miller—stated we need to revisit the Center for Teaching Excellence—any documents for budget analysis—what the center would be, status, resources, goals, concrete things to advertise to faculty. Ombuds Office—financial—has not heard about where going we are with that. Provost Karbhari stated we support the office—there are concerns with the finances to put it together. We still want to discuss this.
- ❖ Deborah Heikes— have we finished making the web easy to access—Provost Karbhari stated we have not completed the migration. Deborah Heikes had problems getting on the website. Library and email are under current students. Provost Karbhari stated please let me know if there are other little quirks. We hope to get it done quickly.
- ❖ **Richard Miller reminded the group** that the primary purpose is to form an agenda for the Senate meeting. Ask some of the same questions you ask here in open Senate as well. Move to more of a dialogue in Senate. Have always had purview to do that here but want to do it in Senate as well.
- ❖ Introductions—everyone introduced themselves. Richard Miller stated he needed to send all meetings, committees, members to everyone. He stated he will send after this meeting.
- ❖ **Reports from Committees**—Richard Miller stated he received information from most—most were about elections. No additional reports.

- ❖ Jeet Gupta asked where are and what is the status of the Bylaws document.
- ❖ University Committees—no report
- ❖ Senate Agenda—Richard Miller stated there are a number of carry over items.
- ❖ Faculty Handbook—passed all chapters through 8, 9 is the first order of business at the next meeting. Timothy Newman reminded the group that there is a standing rule that each chapter is reviewed one at a time. Each person is allowed 1 minute only. Passed last time. Once all 9 chapters are reviewed there will be a final vote on the document as whole and then the Bylaws and same rules apply to the Bylaws. The question was asked if someone has a copy of the changes. Richard Miller stated that Timothy Newman is the keeper of that and we can make it available for all to see. As move beyond and get remaining chapters amended and passed –there will be another opportunity to vote. None is secret and can make all that available. Difficult because now it is in flux. Faculty Senate has seen it. Chapter 8 has passed. Started Chapter 9. When all is covered then the entire document will come back and there will be an opportunity to amend then when it is passed it goes to the Provost, to Legal and the President and then back to the Senate and then to the Board. This has been hanging around a long time. This is important because it is effectively a contract per President Altenkirch. It needs to be done right. Need to move through Chapter 9 and the Bylaws as expeditiously as possible. Other work is being held up because of this.

There are **4 bills to carry over** from last year.

Bill 363 at 3rd reading

Bill 361 Disease Policy at 2nd reading

Bill 365 Tuition Remission at 2nd reading

Bill 367 at 2nd reading

There are **no new bills**—we did receive one over the summer—there is no way we will get to this bill at the next senate meeting given already pending business. Hence will be considered at the next Exec Comm meeting.

Richard Miller stated he will send the ones that are still under consideration.

There will be **items to turn into bills soon**. There will be a Bill eliminating the 64 hour rule—expect to see that.

Searches around campus—SSC—this was demoted to Director from Executive Director—what is the SSC and what is the vision. Maybe the appropriate Committee should have Brent Wren come and enlighten us on what it is. The appropriate Committee is probably the Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs.

Library search for new leader. The head of the Library was previously a Dean—now they want to make it a Director. This raised questions among the Library staff—this is a concern to them—they view themselves in the same vein as Clinical faculty. Highly trained and couple has PhD. Don't currently have opportunity for advancement. Resulted in loss of two recent hires. Richard Miller stated I don't know the right answer however I was provided a document and I will be happy to share it. The Library staff has done some research on peer institutions similar to ours and the faculty are similar to Clinical faculty. Paradigm at Tuscaloosa but not at Birmingham. Provost Karbhari is meeting with Mitch Berbrier and Rich Miller. What is the motivation for demoting the head of the Library and how it impacts the future ability to have Library faculty. Lecturers do not count toward Senate. Lecturers have no voting rights. There was some discussion regarding Lecturers and how it all works. We have no Library Science degree.

Center for Teaching Excellence—Ina Warboys stated she talked to the Provost and worked on this previously. Richard Miller stated we need to come up with ideas and work with Administration. If Administration comes up with ideas they need to provide some vision, goal and financial resources. Tim Newman stated it is a beginning of numeration of goals, etc. **Research Committee**—Jeet Gupta asked what happened with this. Richard Miller stated he found out he has the right to form ad hoc committees. The Research Committee was rejected as a Standing Committee. Because of important issues I intend to form the committee.

There are still some issues with **BETA Team**. We need to talk about it. We had some members serving as part of a BETA review. We still believe there are some issues. If recourse, we need to be sure there is oversight making sure it is not abused. We need to keep an eye on that and talk more about that.

Wai Mok and I are on the **Budget Planning Committee** and we should get some insight and we will communicate when possible.

Richard Miller met with the Interim VPR—he is a good guy—we know some of the same people. I will put in my report some of the things we talked about. He is an academic. He has managed academic and non-academic research. He has some goals even though he is interim. He can review the research enterprise here because he has no stake. He will set the stage for the permanent VPR. He can give a truly objective view. This gives us the opportunity to help him. The best way to do that is to bring to him in to speak to the Senate. He is a

discussion guy but he likes to have it on paper to remind him. Giving committee mandate to compile issues and solutions and recommendations and meet with him over the 9 months. He cannot fix what he does not know about. He may not always agree. He is big into transparency. He had discretionary funding made public. I will say more at the Senate meeting. He has a book on managing the research university.

Richard Miller stated the **agenda for this year** is too big, too broad—my agenda boils down to the following—hope you will join me in working toward these goals. Establish or reestablish the Faculty Senate in shared governance.

(Re-)establish Faculty Senate in an advice and consent role to University endeavors.

(Re-)establish Faculty Senate and related groups as sources of solutions for the University not just identifiers of problems.

Work to identify projects and issues that facilitate our success and the success of our students – this will lead to growth.

Ramon Cerro stated it all boils down to shared governance. Most problems result from the lack of shared governance or shared governance being dismissed. Richard Miller stated the President who is an academic will listen. We have an opportunity. We are stepping forward and demanding we be a part of shared governance.

Jeet Gupta and Ramon Cerro discussed the fact that the Senate and Faculty should be part of the discussions when ideas are brought forward regardless of whether there is a document presented by the Administration.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

2012-13 Faculty Senate Membership

<i>OFFICERS</i>	<i>REPRESENTATIVE</i>	<i>TERM ENDS</i>
President	Richard Miller	2013
President Elect	Mitch Berbrier	2014
Ombudsperson	Ramon Cerro	2013
Parliamentarian	David Neff	2013
Past-President	Timothy Newman	

<i>COLLEGE OR DEPARTMENT</i>	<i>REPRESENTATIVE</i>	<i>TERM ENDS</i>
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION		
Accounting/Finance	Charles Hickman	2013
Management/Marketing	Jeet Gupta	2014
Economics/IS	Chris Allport	2014
At Large	Wai Mok	2013
LIBERAL ARTS		
Art/Art History	David Stewart	2013
Communication Arts	Eletra Gilchrist	2013
Education	Derrick Smith	2013
English	Angela Balla	2014
English	David Neff	2013
Foreign Languages	Kwaku Gyasi	2013
History	Christine Sears	2014
Music	Carolyn Sanders	2014
Philosophy	Deborah Heikes	2013
Political Science	Anne Marie Choup	2014
Psychology	Eric Seemann	2014
Sociology	Bhavani Sitaraman	2014

ENGINEERING		
Chemical/Materials	Ramon Cerro	2013
Civil/Environmental	Mohamed Ashour	2014
Electrical/Computer	David Pan	2013
Electrical/Computer	Jeffrey Kulick	2013
Electrical/Computer	Seong Moo Yoo	2012
Industrial/Systems	Sherri Messimer	2014
Mechanical/Aerospace	Kader Frendi	2014
Mechanical/Aerospace	Jeff Evans	2014
Mechanical/Aerospace	James Blackmon	2014
NURSING		
Nursing	Marta Browning	2013
Nursing	Ina Warboys	2013
Nursing	Anna Benton	2014
Nursing	Peggy Hays	2014
Nursing	Marlena Primeau	2013
SCIENCE		
Atmospheric Science	Phillip Bitzer	2014
Biology	Luciano Matzkin	2014
Chemistry	Carmen Scholz	2013
Chemistry	James Baird	2014
Computer Science	Ramazan Aygun (to be replaced by COS at-large member)	2012
Computer Science	Peter Slater	2013
Mathematical Science	Claudio Morales	2013
Mathematical Science	Leonard Choup	2014
Physics	Jakobus le Roux	2014
Physics	Nick Pogorelov	2013

Faculty Senate Committees 2012-13

FACULTY AND STUDENT DEVELOPMENT		
ENGR	Mohamed Ashour (Civ. E.) (14)	David Pan (ECE) (13)
LBAR	Kwaku Gyasi (FLL) (13)	Eletra Gilchrist (CM) (13),
NURS	Ina Warboys (NUR) (13), Chair	
SCI	Carmen Scholz (CH) (13)	
BA	Wai Mok (IS) (13)	
FINANCE AND RESOURCES		
BA	Charles Hickman (ACC) (13)	Wai Mok (IS) (13), Chair
ENGR	Seong Moo Yoo replacement (ECE) (12)	Kader Frendi (MAE) (14)
LBAR	David Neff (EH) (13)	Christine Sears (HY) (14)
NUR	Marta Browning (NUR) (13)	Ina Warboys (NUR) (13)
SCI	Peter Slater (CS) (13)	Luciano Matzkin (BYS) (14)
Employee Benefits Senate Member	James Baird (CH) (14)	
<i>Chair serves on Campus Planning Committee</i>		

GOVERNANCE AND OPERATIONS		
ENGR	Sherri Messimer (ISEEM) (14)	
LBAR	Anne Marie Choup (PS) (14)	Angela Balla (EH) (14)
SCI	Phillip Bitzer (ATS) (14)	Claudio Morales (MA) (13)
BA	Jeet Gupta (MGT/MKT/IS) (14), Chair	
NUR	Marta Browning (NURS) (13)	

Faculty Senate Committees 2012-13

PERSONNEL		
ENGR	Jeffrey Kulick (ECE) (13)	Ramon Cerro (ChE), Chair (13)
LBAR	Carolyn Sanders (MU) (14),	David Stewart (AAH) (13)
SCI	Jakobus le Roux (PH) (14)	Nikolai Pogorelov (PH) (13)
BA	Jeet Gupta (MGT/MKT/IS) (14)	
NUR	Peggy Hays (NUR) (14)	
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM		
LBAR	Bhavani Sitaraman (SOC) (14)	Derrick Smith (ED), Chair (13)
ENGR	Jeff Evans (MAE) (14)	
NURS	Peggy Hays (NUR) (14)	
SCI	Ramazan Aygun replacement (COS At-Large) (14)	James Baird (CH) (14)
BA	Christopher Allport (ECN) (14)	
<i>Chair serves on Honors Council</i>		
UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLASTIC AFFAIRS		
ENGR	James Blackmon (MAE) (14)	
LBAR	Eric Seemann (PSY) (14)	Deborah Heikes (PHL), Chair (13)
NUR	Anna Benton (NUR) (14)	Marlena Primeau (NUR) (13)
SCI	Leonard Choup (MA) (14)	Carmen Scholz (CH) (13)

2012-13 Executive Committee

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE		
SENATE OFFICERS		COMMITTEE CHAIRS
President:	Richard Miller (PH)	Ramon Cerro (CME), Personnel Comm. Chair
President Elect:	Mitch Berbrier (SOC)	Derrick Smith (ED), UG Curr. Comm. Chair
Ombudsperson:	Ramon Cerro (CME)	Deborah Heikes (PHL), UG Scholastic Affairs Comm. Chair
Parliamentarian:	David Neff (EH)	Ina Warboys (NUR), Faculty and Student Development, Chair
Past-President	Timothy Newman (CS)	Wai Mok (IS), Finance and Resources, Chair
		Jeet Gupta, (MGT/MKT), Governance and Operations, Chair
<p><i>Legend = Name (Department) (year Senate Term Ends)</i></p> <p><i>Bold names are those who have been elected as Chair of the Committee.</i></p>		

FACULTY SENATE MEETING SCHEDULES 2012-13

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Fall	Place	Spring
8/23/12	SKH 369	1/10/13
9/20/12	SKH 369	1/31/13
10/18/12	SKH 369	2/28/13
11/15/12	SKH 369	3/21/13
	SKH 369	4/25/13

All meetings are 12:45-2:15 p.m. on Thursdays in Shelbie King Hall Room 369 unless otherwise noted.

FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS

Fall	PLACE	Spring	PLACE
8/30/12	SC 109	1/17/13	TBD
9/27/13	SC 109	2/14/13	TBD
10/25/12	SC 109	3/7/13	TBD
11/29/12	SC 109	4/4/13	TBD
		5/2/13	TBD

All meetings are 12:45-2:15 p.m. on Thursdays in SC 109 for fall semester. Spring semester meeting place will be determined after the classes have assigned rooms for spring semester.

SUGGESTED SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Fall	Spring
9/6/12	1/24/13
10/11/12	2/21/13
11/8/12	3/14/13
12/13/12	4/18/13

All meetings are 12:45-2:15 p.m. on Thursdays unless otherwise announced. The meeting place will be determined and announced by the Committee Chair. These are suggested dates and times. Other dates and times for the Committees may be determined by the Committee Members if it better fits their schedule.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE FACULTY SENATE

Senate Bill 361 : Improved Integrity for Communicable Diseases Information

Bill History: 10/20/11 Before FSEC, Passed at First Reading
10/27/11 Before Senate for Second Reading, Further Action Deferred until Jan. 5, 2012 Meeting
1/5/12 Before Senate again at Second Reading, action deferred until April meeting
5/10/12 Back before Senate for Second Reading (adjourned Apr meeting before consideration)

WHEREAS, The University solicited comment from the Senate on an updated Communicable Diseases Policy that was approved already by Campus Counsel and the Emergency Management Coordinator; and

WHEREAS, Many faculty believe that this policy needs additional revision as well as time for deliberation; and

WHEREAS, Certain terms in the policy have the potential to be interpreted in an overly broad way (for example: “diseases posing a **significant threat ... to health**”); and

WHEREAS, The Dean of Students is tasked in the policy to implement it, yet that individual has not been previously viewed as being responsible to the Faculty or directly involved with decisions directly, substantially impacting faculty life; and

WHEREAS, The policy in the long term may allow the Dean of Students and other officials not part of the faculty members' job-reporting chain to acquire information about faculty members' illnesses, including matters which some faculty view as deeply personal, and

WHEREAS, The policy allows faculty members to be excluded from work until a physician's statement is provided about treatment, and that the faculty member obtain indicated follow-up treatment by a physician (Sections G and H), without there being any exceptions for reasons of conscience

WHEREAS, The policy directs individuals have a duty to report others believed to have any disease potentially covered by the broad description of disease in the policy

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the policy be reworked to include (1) a less broad definition of communicable disease, with that rework to include more input from faculty, including health care faculty, (2) a time limit of a very small number of years that a disease incident can remain on file, (3) a requirement that on an annual basis, each faculty member will be notified if information about the faculty member was reported in the prior year, what information was reported, which individuals came into contact with that information, and given the opportunity to add a statement to the file. Any submitted statement by a faculty member must become part of the file and be attached to the disease incident report as long as the report is maintained.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That no University records maintained in keeping with this policy be stored out of the State of Alabama, to allow ready legal action (avoiding international or out-of-state courts) and to increase the capability for privacy protection to any faculty member. This restriction precludes storage of the information in a digital form, unless that digital form is strictly kept within this State.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the position Dean of Students have more accountability to the Faculty, in part by annually reporting in writing to the Faculty Senate by January 31 of: (1) the number of faculty who had communicable diseases that resulted in the collection of information, (2) a detailed explanation how that information was safeguarded in the prior year, (3) a detailed explanation of all individuals who came in contact with any identifying information about any faculty member reported to have a communicable disease, and (4) when that information will be destroyed. This reporting requirement is to be enforced by the Provost by incorporation of it into an annual list of tasks each Dean of Student is expected to perform.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That no faculty member be discriminated against in his/her ongoing employment for having a communicable disease.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
FACULTY SENATE**

Senate Bill 363: Differential Tuition Analysis Request

Bill History: 11/17/11 Faculty Senate EC Approved at First Reading
12/01/11 Before Faculty Senate at Second Reading (ran out of time; did not consider)
1/05/12 Before Faculty Senate at Second Reading (began debate, time expired during debate)
1/26/12 Received Majority Approval at Second Reading
2/23/12 Before Faculty Senate at Third Reading, final action deferred until April meeting
5/10/12 Back before Senate for Third Reading (adjourned Apr meeting before consideration)

WHEREAS, Recruitment and retention of students is paramount to the future viability and success of our University, and

WHEREAS, The University has significant competition from other academic institutions, and

WHEREAS: The faculty of the University of Alabama in Huntsville believe that new, well-motivated ideas highlighting the uniqueness of UAHuntsville academics while promoting the University’s financial viability can serve both the institution and students/families, and

WHEREAS: Ideas for increasing student enrollment and retention were presented in the “Restructuring Report” drafted by an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee, yet little or no relevant discussion or action has been taken regarding these ideas,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Faculty Senate requests that the Offices of the Provost and VP of Finance perform a detailed analysis of the viability of scenarios related to the concept of “differential tuition”, a term referring to tuition and/or fee schedules that depend on academic level (e.g. freshman, sophomore, etc), examples of which were included in the Faculty Senate’s “Report on Realignment and Restructuring” submitted to the University Administration;

AND THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That these scenarios be analyzed for viability as an option increase student enrollment, encourage matriculating students to enroll in UAHuntsville courses whenever possible, and to creatively identify financial solutions advantageous to both the University and students/families;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the requested analysis be reported to both the Faculty Senate and University President and made available to the Faculty Senate no later than 3 months following the passage of this bill.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
FACULTY SENATE**

Senate Bill 365: Performance Criteria for Tuition Remission

Bill History: 02/16/12 FS Exec. Comm. Placed on Senate Agenda (First Reading) (sub. by Sen. J. Kulick)
 02/23/12 Before Faculty Senate at Second Reading; time expired before consideration
 03/15/12 Before Faculty Senate at Second Reading, action deferred until April meeting
 05/10/12 Back before Senate for Second Reading (adjourned Apr meeting before consideration)

WHEREAS, A well-educated faculty and staff and their dependents are an asset to themselves, the community and the university, and

WHEREAS: UAH also desires to provided employee benefits comparable to employers in the local private sector, and

WHEREAS: UAH has an interest in encouraging high standards of student achievement, particularly students sponsored by the University,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

Any person requesting tuition remission for an undergraduate course shall have a GPA of (2.0) to be eligible for tuition remission;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

Any person requesting tuition remission for a graduate course shall have a GPA of (3.0) to be eligible for tuition remission;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

A student must earn the grade of C for any undergraduate course for which tuition has been waived;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

A student must earn the grade of B for any graduate course for tuition has been waived;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

Students failing to earn the requisite grade for any course taken shall be required to reimburse the university for the cost of the course before being eligible for any further tuition remission and,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

Previous grades shall be grandfathered in and the GPA computation shall commence with courses taken following the enactment of this bill;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the University shall encourage faculty, staff, and family members to educate themselves in areas outside their work domains by encouraging students to take courses for audit credit with no performance requirements, and be if further resolved that the university shall encourage employees to participate in professional development and continuing education programs through the existing tuition discount plan as part of this activity.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE
FACULTY SENATE**

Senate Bill 367: Eligibility for Senate Officers Elections

Bill History: 04/20/12 Received from (non-Senator) faculty member
 05/03/12 Executive Comm. directed bill onto Senate Agenda for reading before the Senate
 05/10/12 Before Faculty Senate for Second Reading

WHEREAS, The faculty senate President-Elect and Ombudsperson are elected by the entire senate eligible faculty of the university; and

WHEREAS: The President-Elect and Ombudsperson represent the entire senate eligible faculty of the university; and

WHEREAS: The current faculty senate bylaws requires the unit of the President-Elect to elect another faculty senate, and

WHEREAS: The requirement to be an outgoing or incoming faculty senator for senate officer's election is an undue, redundant, and duplicative,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That any faculty senate eligible faculty member of the university can be a candidate for election to the positions of faculty senate President-Elect and Ombudsperson.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the first sentence of the faculty senate bylaws section IIIC be changed to "In the spring of each year, the Senate Operations and Governance Committee will nominate, from the Senate eligible faculty, candidate(s) for President-Elect and Ombudsperson."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That these proposed changes become effectively immediately.

