



FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING # 516
THURSDAY, 14 April 2011- 12:45 PM
SHELBY CENTER ROOM 107**

- 0. 0. Call to Order**
- 1. Administration Reports (attached)**
- 2. Faculty Senate President Report (attached)**
- 3. Approval of Minutes of Meeting #513 and #514 (attached)**
- 4. Acceptance of Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report (attached)**
- 5. Committee Reports**
 - Senate Committees (see attached reports)
 - University Committees and Ad-hoc University Committees
- 6. Old Business**
 - Bills for Second Reading
 - Senate bill 351: Encouraging Second Degrees (attached)
 - Status of Senate Resolutions: FSR 10/11 01-08 on the website
- 7. New Business**
 - Bills for Second Reading
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution – Support for Faculty/Staff Clinic (attached)
 - Senate bill 352: Mid-term Grading Policy (attached)
 - Senate bill 353: Supporting Degrees after Graduation (attached)
 - Senate bill 354: Full Refunds for Students in the Military who are Deployed (attached)
 - Officer Elections and Committee Selection for 2011-12 Senate Year
 - Upcoming Meetings
 - Webpages (University and Faculty Senate)
- 8. Adjourn**

Notes Made Available to Faculty Senate Executive Committee Prior to the March 31st Meeting

- The Board of Trustees meeting will be held on April 7-8 at the Bevill Conference Center on our campus. I'd like to encourage the senate executive committee to attend appropriate parts of the meeting, especially the institutional presentation which will be at 9:30 am on the 8th.
- 2 Proposals for new programs will be presented at the Board of Trustees Meeting
 - Master of Science in Earth Systems Science
 - Bachelor of Science in Individualized Science StudiesWe will also be seeking final approval for the Ms and PhD programs in Aerospace Systems Engineering, both of which were approved by ACHE at its March meeting.
- Resolutions requesting approval of construction related items, discussed at previous senate executive committee meetings by President Williams, will also be presented at the Board of Trustees meeting. These include
 - Resolution for approval to plan for the construction of an athletic complex entry for the baseball and softball fields
 - Resolution to continue moving forward with the construction of the Student Life Center through approval of the architect ranking and revised budget. This will be funded primarily from student fees.
 - Resolution for approval to plan a Track and Field facility.
- Through the continued generosity and support of the Dr. and Mrs. Chan we will be seeking permission from the Board of Trustees for the establishment of the Mrs. Pei-Ling Chan Eminent Scholar in Biological Sciences. We are extremely grateful to the Chans for their continued support of the University.
- Honors Convocation will be held on Tuesday, April 5, at 9:00 a.m., in the University Center Exhibit Hall with the individual ceremonies for Colleges being held that same afternoon. I'd like to encourage all of you to attend the appropriate ceremonies that day to celebrate our student's achievements.



SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

March 31, 2011

12:45 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: *Gupta, Etkorn, Warboys, Seemann, Karbhari, Severn, Joiner, English*

✚ Provost Karbhari's Report: Dr. Karbhari distributed comments.

Dr. Karbhari stated the Board Meeting will be held here April 7 and 8 at the Bevill Center. The Institutional Presentation will be Friday, April 8 at 9:30. He encouraged all to attend. This provides a chance to see how the Board works and the presentations from the faculty and student representatives.

We have proposals for two new programs. The Master of Science in Earth System Science, and a Bachelor of Science in Individualized Studies. We will have resolutions for final approval for Masters and Ph.D. in Aerospace System Engineering. They were approved by ACHE in March. This will be for final approval by the Board.

There are 3 resolutions regarding construction. These have been talked about at Senate before. We are planning for the athletic field for softball and baseball. There are steps in approvals. There are about 4 steps and this is the first stage. This one says we would like to start planning. This is what we would like to do. We continue to move forward on the student life center. In the selection of architects we bid the architects and choose the top 3 and show the ranking to the Board. Unless there is some problem the first ranked would be chosen. Funding for this will come from student fees and would not impact other things. We are in Phase 1 approval for a track and field facility. It would be going around the soccer field. This would be a placeholder to start planning. You can find further details in the booklet for the Board.

Through the generosity of the Chan Family we are able to establish an Endowed Chair in Biological Sciences. The Chan's will put money forward and will add over four years and it will reach the amount needed for a Chair.

Dr. Karbhari announced that Honors convocation is April 5, 2011, at 9 a.m. in the University Center Exhibit Hall. There will be ceremonies all afternoon for the Colleges and I encourage you all to attend.

Three Graduate certificate programs were approved by the Board and the 4th is being put forward. There will be discussion with Charles Nash on the afternoon of the Board Meeting on that one and two minors and a bachelors degree. Then we will submit NISPs or proposals. Dr. Karbhari explained the process for submitting NISPs and proposals through the Board and ACHE and back to the Board. Minors are also sent this way depending on the amount of change.

Letha Etzkorn asked are there any changes as a result of the resignation, etc. Dr. Karbhari stated that the Chancellor will likely announce the Search for a new president and how we go forth with that. No direction change for university is likely. Dr. Portera will serve starting tomorrow until the new president is found. The VP for Advancement search is suspended. Athletic Director Search is ongoing. There were 3 candidates on campus this week. Initially the Chancellor will be here most of the time.

There was some discussion regarding the Budget. Dr. Karbhari responded if nothing changes we should remain flat. We will be minus the funds from the stimulus package. It was not used for recurring expenses. Unless something changes dramatically we should be ok. We are not overly concerned but we will not know until the Governor and others decide what they will do.

There was a question regarding the incentive funds being discontinued. Dr. Karbhari responded there have been some discussion on it but there has been nothing sent from this office. This comes from a discussion from the Federal regulations. If faculty are paid and part of pay is for large classes then it is ok but if they are paid separately then that is not good. The money is not taken from the colleges. We will calculate the average for a couple of years and that money will be given to the dean for use in the college. A couple of scenarios were discussed with the deans but the money will be given to the dean. The money will go to the college. There is no intention to take money away from the college but away from the individual. We have not decided how the college will spend it and that is the discussion with the deans. This is not a cost cutting measure.

✚ Jennifer English Faculty Senate President Report: The Research Committee met with the Provost and have ironed out concerns and hopefully will iron out details and form a committee and develop the purview of the committee and a person will be on the Graduate Council and work with the Research Council. Hope to have something at the May meeting.

Elections took place and there was some concern for Physics and we addressed it and met and in theory we prefer the Senate not get involved in departments affairs. If provisions are violated then it is a different story but nothing was violated and it was just a comedy of errors and overreactions and under reactions. Have suggested the Chair look at what was sent. We have to hold the elections for ombudsperson and president-elect soon. Dr. English stated she will work with Paul Componation and Jeet Gupta on that and you can look for an email on that. If you are interested and want to nominate someone they have to be member now or on as a new member of Senate.

Higher Education day is Thursday next week. Remind people we are asking for no test or a liberal acceptance of excuses, but only if the permission slips are presented. We will have a list and if you have someone suspect, take care of it.

There was a questions regarding the Vision Statement Committee. It is not meeting right now.

Dr. English reported she is working with Louise O'Keefe on sponsoring a bill on funding for the Faculty and Staff Clinic.

There is no movement on the BETA representative yet.

The Bylaws changes were given to you based on the last meeting. There was some discussion on email.

The VP Advancement candidates withdrew once the Search was suspended and Dave left.

✚ **Finance and Resources Committee** Dr. Jennifer English reported the Committee still needs a Chair. There is work the Committee needs to do and I am trying to get it done but it is at the bottom of the list of priorities. Trying to get out next year's Distinguished Speaker Series out.

Governance and Operations Jeet Gupta reported he attached list of Senators. Physics remains as is unless Dr. Gary Zank says differently. There is no one from Economics. Jeet Gupta will contact Dean Raines regarding another Senator.

Jennifer English went over the list of members. Seong Moo Yoo is a one year term completing Rhonda Gaede's term and other 2 in ECE for 2 year terms.

✚ **Personnel**—Dr. Jennifer English reported that the document included comments for chapters one through nine of handbook. The Committee will look at 7 and 8 and see if there are things we can live with and if not throw it out and start again. We have to make decision of what do with this. We will need a special meeting to deal with this. Would like the Executive Committee to decide what they think the Handbook should look like based on what is here and put it to the Senate to decide and then adjust based on that and send it to faculty for review and then have a bill and submit it to the Administration. Jennifer English will send a copy of the revised version. There was some discussion regarding post tenure review and why it is there. We wanted to have something in place because we believe it will be required of institutions in the future. It is in favor of the faculty member. If you do not want to do the work or you are not capable of doing it then there is a means to deal with that. It follows AAUP guidelines. Jennifer English will email the edited Handbook. We will schedule a meeting with the Executive Committee and would like the Provost to come for the first 30 minutes.

✚ **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs:** Laurie Joiner reported nothing to add to the report submitted.

- ✚ **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs:** Clarke Rountree was not present but Eric Seemann was present for him. We will have business at the end.
- ✚ Old business—Bills 343 and 346 tabled. There are problems with the website. Working on getting it back.
- ✚ **Sense of Senate Resolution**—Louise O’Keefe wrote this and you were encouraged to send something to the Senate after the report last time. I thought we should support this and she sent this and we put it in a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Jeet Gupta asked why it is a Sense of the Senate Resolution instead of a Bill. There was a suggestion to scratch line 33. Sense of Senate could be sent to the Administration. We could change it to a bill on the floor. Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Eric Seemann to accept at first reading and it goes to the Senate floor.
- ✚ **Senate Bill 352 Midterm Grades**—Dr. Eric Seemann reported this was submitted February 11 for first reading and it was sent back to Committee and we are returning it today. We took the 300 and above out. Had people from Advising and SSC to talk and this addresses their concerns. It will aid retention and early intervention. Jeet Gupta responded he is against the bill. Students are given grades on all work and they can see how they are doing. Eric Seemann responded that not all faculty do that. We have no control over that but we do have control over this. This way they are forced to give feedback before the deadline to drop. Jeet Gupta responded that those faculty won’t do what they should but will give all satisfactory. We can use radio buttons and just do "S" or "U". Faculty should tell students on the syllabus what "S" and "U" means. We need some language to that effect. Add "Be It Further Resolved that faculty describe in their 100 and 200 level syllabi what "S" and "U" mean/indicates as midterm grade feedback". Ina Warboys moved, seconded by Jeet Gupta to accept the amendment. Accepted. This bill will go to second reading with amendments.
- ✚ **Senate Bill 353 Second Degree:** Jeet Gupta stated he had problems last time with this bill and still has issues. We should have language that says it is a dual degree. There is no provision in the bill that they have to meet the requirements of the degree. Add "Therefore be it resolved that within those three semesters (not including summers) the student must complete all the requirements of the major of the second degree". Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Eric Seemann to accept changes. Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Eric Seemann to second reading. The bill goes to second reading.
- ✚ Eric Seemann proposed a **Military Bill Regarding Loss of Tuition:** Eric Seemann stated he proposed this so that when military personnel are activated they don’t lose tuition money. We are out of compliance with the military act regarding soldiers and sailors relief. The way the law states the university does not have to refund tuition until they are sued. This is a civil relief violation. We want to get Senate backing to say service members can file for tuition refund. There are conditions to be met and if they meet them then they get the refund. Retroactively withdrawn. Jennifer English expressed concern for appropriate documentation—it needs to be firmed up—including but not limited to orders and official documents. Jeet Gupta suggested taking out the first two sentences and start with "Based on the requirements of. Strike through

line 20. It is redundant in bill to state what the policy does. Strike lines 26-30. Up to and including last day of class to right after active duty.

Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Eric Seemann to accept changes.

Jeet Gupta moved, seconded by Letha Etzkorn the bill to second reading.

Jennifer English will call a meeting of the Executive Committee to discuss the Bylaws.



**Faculty Senate Meeting
February 24, 2011
12:45 p.m. SC 107**

Present: Wei Mok, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Clarke Rountree, Laurel Bollinger, David Neff, Carolyn Sanders, Kathy Hawk, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Mohamed Ashour, Laurie Joiner, Jennifer English, Aleksandar Milenkovic, Paul Componation, Louise O'Keefe, Ina Warboys, Brenda Talley, Carmen Scholz, Ramazan Aygun, Peter Slater, Dongsheng Wu, Richard Miller

Absent with Proxy: Jeet Gupta, Samuel Thomas, Seong Moo Yoo, Kristen Herrin, Roy Magnuson, Tim Newman, James Baird, Max Bonamente

The meeting was called to order at 12:50 by Dr. Jennifer English

Provost Karbhari:

- Four items approved at the Board Meeting. We are preparing for the submission of a few more.
- BETA Document –This document was distributed and Dr. Karbhari asked for comments.. He stated this is not a perfect document. It doesn't say do "x" or "y" but provides a process for the Committee to look at concerns that are brought forward. Individuals do not have to report everything they see or that believe that everything is a threat. The Senate should nominate and individual or individuals and the Provost will approve an individual for a 3 year term. Will answer questions on the document and the team. Please send your comments by early March. This is a living document and as we learn more we will change it. We have been working under this document although we have not had a policy in place but working from this document. Will have something on website and will know the process. Deans have seen the document and the group from EMOG wrote parts of it and then the Deans saw it and you have what has been discussed . There have been a number of changes. This was leveraged from other universities. Have borrowed and have spoken to others. Talking to other people as to what should go in. New for academia. Learning what we can and cannot do and what we should and should not do. Learn from those before us.
- Higher Education day April 7. Important to represent SGA decided to provide letter for instructors prior to April 7 and get a letter signed by a representative to prove the student made the trip. Faculty should get a letter saying the student is going and then proof that they were there. We seek your assistance that tests or anything like that not be due that day and if it is please give the students a chance to make up missed work. Honors Day is April 5, at 9:00 a.m.

The correct time is 9:00 a.m., the time in the second memo. Colleges have individual events do not overlap. Spread the events out.

- We are establishing a Committee to review the Honors Program. It will be done in 2 stages internal and external. The internal review Committee will be Chaired by Jack Fix . The Deans provided names from the different colleges. We will send an official memo when all say yes.
- Athletic Director search is going on. The Committee is in communication. Search process now –nominate or send names forward.
- HERS program—Rhonda Gaede is going—those who did not apply are encouraged to apply next year. This will be ongoing.
- Miller—bills are going to the Legislature across the country—for students, faculty and staff to carry weapons, health and safety of campus –can we get a commitment from the administration that you will oppose such bills submitted to the Legislature. Dr. Karbhari will speak to the President.
- Bhavani Sitaraman—midterm grades—heard we are changing to "S" and "U"—there was an email saying preferring "S" and "U". Basing on exams prior to the day but you might see "S" or "U" instead of grades. Didn't think they knew they got grades—up to students to check grades—if to catch students not doing well—not checking grades. SSC will send something out. Contacted by students. Contact made through official UAH email. Everything is sent electronically now. No snail mail to students. Addresses were not correct and it was a challenge to keep up to date with snail mail. Unless they tell us it is not possible to find out. Dr. Carolyn Sanders stated she is on the Admissions Advisory Board and in Orientation and FYE they make sure the students know we use the official mail and make sure they know how to forward their mail.
- Carnegie Foundation—There was a question regarding a change in rankings. The latest ranking is very high related to the research ranking. There will be an official statement in the near future. We used to be research 1, etc. and now it is high and very high. We are in very high. They are using 2008-09 data. It is not just based on expenditures but the number of faculty involved, reputation, post docs, etc. Richard Miller asked what are the tangible benefits beyond advertising. It goes to funding agencies so being in very high ranked with some of the very prestigious schools.

Faculty Senate President's Report:

- Jennifer English has a report—for those who do not understand the Research Centers discussion report from Dr. Gaede. There is a delay in research funding for the URII. Dr. English does not know why the delay. Dr. English will check and send an email on what she finds out. Development team—you got an email before this meeting—we have 3 that are not Senate Members to participate and Senators—there are 3 meetings scheduled. Carmen Scholz asked how did a research person get on the Committee—Dr. Jennifer English responded that we asked for faculty not specific on which faculty. Did not specifically say who could and could not be on the Committee. Dr. Pogorelov is a research person. Dr. Carmen Scholz stated he is not associated with Senators. Dr. Jennifer English stated she does not have a problem taking someone off. She does not expect everyone to attend all 3 meetings. But everyone should

attend at least one and then have a meeting after that to finalize everything. Richard Miller stated he is troubled at the delay in getting this worked out—the first or second bill passed this year and now it is almost 7 months later we are meeting to discuss goals and issues if we form a committee it will be the end of March and school will be over a month later. An academic year has gone by and the reason to have interaction with the Vice President for Research won't happen this academic year. This seems to be problematic. We are not meeting with the person who should be discussing ongoing issues. Jennifer English stated she does not know if he is going to be there, she is letting Provost Karbhari invite him. Richard Miller asked if there is opposition to an ad-hoc committee? Jennifer English stated she agrees it has taken a long time and she has gone as fast as she can. Richard Miller stated that the comment was not directed at Jennifer. Key element of faculty productivity has not risen to the level to get on the administration's schedule for 7 months. Laurie Joiner asked have we gone as group and said we want a meeting. Richard Miller stated we met in November and Provost Karbhari has issues with the Committee. Laurie Joiner stated the blame is on us. Bhavani Sitaraman asked why not set up an ad hoc Committee and start working and when he has time to come and talk to us then it will happen. Jennifer English stated the first meeting is Tuesday. Jennifer English stated if you want to set up ad hoc to work in parallel then no problem. You have to have faculty willing to be involved. Richard Miller asked if the goals and issues of the committee are resolved will they sign off? Jennifer English stated she hopes to get from the meetings where we are lacking and how can the committee effectively make needs, etc. known. Richard Miller stated the committee needs to be in the Senate to discuss the needs and serve as an advocate for scholarly activities and supply to the Provost and Vice President for Research and can act or have a discussion. Just like legislative and executive body does. It would be much more effective to speak with a consistent voice rather than have 10 speak with 10 different voices. Jennifer English stated anything other than ad-hoc committee would require approval. It was stated the bylaws are restrictive. Richard Miller stated we need to develop a uniformity of opinion and present it. Some at the meeting are not very productive. It is troubling that people who are supposed to support scholarly activity don't know the requirements and this is the reason for the committee. Carolyn Sanders suggested revising the meetings to not include administration—would this serve the same purpose? Jennifer English asked why is 4 faculty positions not working on the Research Council? Right now there is one voice in Research Council. Why would putting this committee in place be more effective? How can we make it more effective? Carmen Scholz stated the Vice President for Research knows Centers and their budget but he does not know about those outside Centers. Carmen Scholz stated she mentioned a Committee to work with him and it was met with rejection. Jennifer English stated if the Provost has not paved the way for this Committee then there is no guarantee it will be heard. We hope from the meetings a path is created to make sure we are a position to be considered valuable. This is not a group that can be pushed aside. Carmen Scholz mentioned that the Vice President for Research sent students to Prague and is now sending some to South Africa. Carmen Scholz asked if other disciplines might be included or considered and it was met with a no. The Vice President for Research needs to represent all. David Stewart stated if the Committee bill stated there should be an ad hoc committee then we should have an ad hoc

Committee. Jennifer English stated she asked for an ad hoc committee and got only one volunteer. Carolyn Sanders stated the meetings sound like a means to talk them out of having a Committee. Jennifer English stated she doesn't think so, what faculty want and need in general is to be heard. Committee could argue every college has certain needs like a budget person. David Stewart proposed an ad hoc committee. The Parliamentarian stated we should have a bill but it is not necessary we had bills before. Bhavani Sitaraman seconded the motion. How will it be formed, who will be on it, how will we elect a chair. The Parliamentarian suggested those interested start it and do a straw vote. Carmen Scholz stated we will only meet with those on the Senate right now. We passed a bill saying anyone could be on it and those on the list are not all senators right now. Louise O'Keefe asked if those interested are here now and could they decide. Carmen Scholz agreed to be the contact. Ad hoc with Carmen Scholz for Research and Scholarly Activities—she will send email to the Senate for involvement and determine how the group will interact. Richard Miller made the motion and Paul Componation seconded. The vote was 1 abstained. Still meet on Tuesday.

Jonna Greer was supposed to talk about Higher Education Day but she is out of town. Jennifer English stated Higher Education Day is April 5 and requested that faculty be understanding of Higher Education day but do demand slips that the students are supposed to have signed and give to faculty. Jonna will speak in March.

Minutes Approved:

- Minutes from the last meeting January 20, motion to accept by Clarke Rountree, seconded by Louise O'Keefe.
- Executive Committee minutes of Feb 17, correction to "radio" button. Move to accept by Ina Warboys, seconded by David Neff.

Committees:

- **Finance and Resources:** Jennifer English reported it still needs a Chair. There are 3 Distinguished Speakers for an abbreviated series. There are some concerns for not enough money for truly distinguished speakers. We had preliminary discussions for extra money. The Senate has some money and could match for the College or Department. The Committee would welcome input. Make awards larger. Reducing numbers maybe from 7 to 5. Historically 7 were given with about \$10,500 in the pot. Happy to hear what you have to say. Clarke Rountree suggested reducing the number so we have a decent amount for good people. Matching College and Department. Some do not have to match. Richard Miller suggested this is an opportunity for the Vice President for Research to chip in. Deans match 3 or 4 to 1. Eric Seemann suggested language in the instructions based on what we receive and other is covered by the Department or College. Better to reduce number by half and increase amount. Kathy Hawk asked for clarification regarding whether the one that they did now is just for Spring. One coming out in a month or so for the next Academic Year. Reduce to 4 or one per College and every College have an opportunity. Carolyn Sanders suggested approaching the Dean of

Students for assistance. Jennifer English reported the REU program is woefully behind. We have not had time to get it out. John Gregory and Bernhard Vogler have offered to step up and do it. Eric Seemann moved, seconded by Richard Miller to allow them to go forward.

- **Personnel:** Bhavani Sitaraman stated she has nothing to add. The Committee has gone through 3 or 4 chapters and have comments. The first few are introductory we need accurate information about positions etc. We are looking at other chapters this coming week that deal with personnel issues.
- **Undergraduate Curriculum:** Laurie Joiner reported there was a bunch of stuff from history and changes to the course approval form.
- **Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs:** Clarke Rountree stated there was nothing to add to the submitted report.

- Jennifer English reported she is currently on the **BETA Team**. The BETA team member is elected during the regular elections for a 3 year term. The individual does not have to be a Senator. I would like feedback on that—nominate just like the President-Elect and Ombudsperson. Eric Seemann, Carolyn Sanders, and Louise O’Keefe- volunteered for the BETA Team to finish out this year. We would like background on those to serve between now and next meeting so we can make an educated decision. Clarke Rountree suggests they send information on the 3 willing to serve and Peggy can send to the Senate and they can vote by email. Ina Warboys wants a bio on this person in a formal election. Eric Seemann suggested including a bio with the name on the ballot. Maybe should be for all officers. Kathy Hawk suggested the President-elect stand and tell what the plans are. Jennifer English stated for now send bios to Peggy and then send her how you want to deal with the elections for a permanent position.

Senate Bill 350 Conflict of Interest—open at second reading—Clarke Rountree moved to call the question, Paul Componation seconded. There were 3 abstaining

Did not carry.

Senate Bill 340 Eligibility to Vote in Department Chair Selections—amended at second reading

Richard Miller moved to 3rd reading, seconded by Bhavani Sitaraman. Laurel Bollinger asked when does it expire? Change to “prior to each secret ballot for chair selection” in line 14, a friendly amendment from Laurel Bollinger, seconded by David Neff

Mohamed Ashour asked How is this applied to department for size. How do you deal with the vote if there are 3 or 4 people. Clarke Rountree stated size does not matter.

Clarke Rountree asked what was the previous policy? Richard Miller stated there was none and it was different in different departments. This enables the Department to decide formally. Peter Slater asked if it was intended that there would always be such a vote. Jennifer English stated she thinks so. Paul Componation commented this implies some faculty could bring this up in the absence of an actual vote. Only tenure and tenure earning faculty vote. David Stewart commented in the previous Handbook clinical and research faculty were allowed to vote. We

are taking away votes from people who now have them. Participation in the Handbook is interpreted different ways. Eric Fong stated for some it enfranchises and some it disenfranchises. Laurel Bollinger stated she has concern for the inclination of some to give lectures more power and may make lecturers more like tenure and tenure earning faculty. Laurel Bollinger does not want to enfranchise lecturers. Carolyn Sanders stated they could still have a discussion in the department and prevent. Carolyn Sanders stated the goal is to allow the department to make the decision rather than decisions made in other ways. It still leaves it to the department but it gives tenured and tenure-earning a greater voice. There was some discussion regarding the Dean's part and different groups and different recommendations. Richard Miller stated there are people voting in the election that have spent no time in the department and not active and people voting in the Department not seen and not here. Tenure and tenure-earning should have primary say because they have a long term commitment but are some clinical and research involved in health of the department. No problem with just saying tenure and tenure-earning per Richard Miller. Louise O'Keefe—stated still in hands of tenure and tenure-earning but gives an out for those who need it. Like the way it is. Laurel Bollinger stated she has concern for dirty politics. Someone offering courses want for support. Jennifer English stated she is not interested in legislating to deal with bad behavior. Carolyn Sanders stated there is a change in behavior and in interest of protecting faculty. Eric Fong asked can we cross out lecturers. Richard Miller stated in our department lecturers are more involved in the health of the department. Ina Warboys asked for the Chair—isn't it a recommendation to Dean—how much power are we worried about.

Bhavani Sitaraman moved, seconded by Clarke Rountree to end debate

Vote to Accept with amendment at 3rd reading: 2 opposed 2 abstaining. Passed at third reading goes to Administration

Clarke Rountree moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.



**Faculty Senate Meeting
March 10, 2011
12:45 p.m. SC 107**

Present: Jeet Gupta, Wai Mok, John Burnett, Eric Fong, David Stewart, Clarke Rountree, Laurel Bollinger, Kathy Hawk, Eric Seemann, Bhavani Sitaraman, Michael Banish, Seong Moo Yoo, Laurie Joiner, Jennifer English, Paul Componation, David Moore, Louise O'Keefe, Ina Warboys, Brenda Talley, Roy Magnuson, Letha Etzkorn, Peter Slater

Absent with Proxy: David Neff, Carolyn Sanders, Mohamed Ashour, Aleksandar Milenkovic, Tim Newman, Richard Miller

Dr. Jennifer English called the meeting to order at 12:50 p.m. and stated she cancelled the Executive Committee Meeting due to a misunderstanding. There has been much discussion regarding the Bylaws and she talked to Dr. Tim Newman and both thought addressing the Bylaws issues with the Senate was a good idea. Discussion about issues that are causing trouble either with interpretation or things we want to do.

- Louise O'Keefe reported regarding the **Faculty and Staff Clinic** and gave an update and ask for support. The Clinic Opened June 2007 in Spragins Hall. The hours are 7:30-11:30. Going to be an issue with space. The current space was on loan for 5 years and want to put on radar so as new buildings go up and space is assigned the Clinic can be considered. At this point about 1600 employees with 4 hours seeing patients about 722 patients, 2500 visits, the clinic has caught on. Staffed by Louise O'Keefe and one staff assistant. Have physician contracted to come in once week for an hour. When you go back ask around what faculty and staff want changed, what would make the Clinic better, how could we serve you better. Services are we see for faculty and staff for sick visits and immunization, all except well physicals. People are using the Clinic. We get patients through word of mouth. We try to hit most departments. We visit custodial areas and do presentations at orientation and Staff Senate. Keep in mind as a suggestion, how to improve. Each new encounter is \$5. Don't file for insurance. If draw lab work, lab files for insurance. If we have another practitioner we could open all day and offer more services. We do not do allergy shots. We have a website <http://www.uah.edu/clinic> for forms for new patient.
- Dr. Jennifer English stated there is a need for a **BETA Representative** from the faculty for the rest of the year. We have to send more than one have name to the Provost and he and the Deans will choose who will be the representative. We need to send a list of acceptable people.

Send a list of acceptable candidates to be representatives. Do we want a ballot to say who is acceptable or how do you want to do that? We can vote to say acceptable or unacceptable. Want a process in place. The qualifications of the faculty member are unclear. It is hard to make a recommendation unless we know what the qualifications should be. Will take questions back to EMOG and ask what they are looking for. General guidelines not specific on what they are looking for. No current BETA cases right now. Nothing submitted for review that is pending so not in a rush to make a decision. Can go back and ask questions and see where things stand. Person to finish the year and then another for a 3 year term. Jeet Gupta stated we could take a look at the current people for the rest of the year and then get answers for next time. Will give couple of days for person to respond then get information out. If anyone else is interested send information to Peggy as soon as you can.

- **Bylaws: Issues:** Jennifer English stated one of the issues is the Library Faculty. David Moore is now the Interim Director. The bylaws state Senators should be tenured or tenure-track. The Library no longer operates under that, they do not have any tenured or tenure track faculty. The Library has always been a part of the Senate. The language now does not apply. How do we handle this? Clarke Rountree states there have been no tenured faculty since the Dean chose to get rid of tenured faculty. Jeet Gupta stated the Senate represents the academic units. The Library is not an academic unit. Laurel Bollinger stated there should be equity, if some lecturers are not represented then none should be represented. If some are represented then all should be represented. Clarke Rountree stated he doesn't agree that they are not represented, we all care. Think they should be represented. If they were clinical then they could be represented. Research Faculty can be tenured. Clinical is not tenured. There are gray areas—they are tenured but not teaching, academic- what does it mean and who is included and should the criteria be that they are involved in instruction. Jeet Gupta stated they had a lot of discussion on this. Why we do not have is because there was much discussion and trying to agree on something. Some wanted only tenured tenure earning then open to clinical, research, then went to all with teaching—it was not passed. Michael Banish stated the Library needs to be included—they have a core mission like the rest in educating students. Part of being academic is dealing with a unique population. Jeet Gupta stated that we could create a membership and an ex-officio membership. There things we can do. Roy Magnuson stated that lecturers are not represented and this is the real problem. Discussion of being uncomfortable with disenfranchising a group. Clarke Rountree stated that administrators make decisions that de-activate areas and there should be consequences for that. Long term interest in university and somehow connected to the core academic purpose of the university should be two qualifications. After 6 years lecturers could be eligible. There is still a concern for the number in English. Letha Etzkorn stated that Lecturers mean different things in different Departments. If you change the title in the Library it is not a problem. John Burnett stated that he thinks of himself as representing the College whether they are lecturers, faculty, etc. Jeet Gupta stated that the unit could specify the kind of faculty who are eligible. Issue in including lecturers is the primary responsibility is to teach and there is little time for service. If now represent in Senate imposing an assignment on them. Also do we represent the entire unit.

There is a danger in giving almost power to the administration to increase lecturers. Michael Banish stated he agrees with John Burnett in essence we represent all. Library has no one now representing their interest so we need to find a way to be inclusive. The Library is a core component of the Institution. Can farm out business area but we do not want to do that with the Library. Brenda Talley stated she represents the Faculty Senate—Lecturers are Faculty and yes we had lecturers then. Laurel Bollinger stated we have more lecturers now and most are teaching. Term of contracts 1-3 years. Bhavani Sitaraman stated tenured and tenure earning are people in the Departments who do review lecturers. We represent the totality of those in the unit. If you get in ratio of Senate and could get bizarre and have more Senators and could represent all different interests. May not be able to represent all different issues of the unit. All sorts beyond instructional. What do we represent in academia? Kathy Hawk asked how long are the appointments? Three years for the Library. Laurel Bollinger stated the budget issue makes it easier. Jeet Gupta stated that when we reviewed other university bylaws the lecturers were represented by having 2 for every 10 or models like that to work out. We represent all and handle departments who represent all. Library—and then lecturers in departments, two issues. If the Library is represented in Senate then work toward being Clinical. David Moore explained to Jeet Gupta what lecturers in the Library do. Jeet Gupta stated the Library is a support unit for the academic. Jennifer English believes there is an out for representing if they go to Clinical. Library does not have a vote but they are welcome to any meeting and welcome to hear from them. Jennifer English stated we don't know how to solve the lecturer problem. Interested in hearing what you want to do about Lecturers. David Stewart stated there should be a small number represented through the university so the voices are heard—have some voice rather than no voice. Interesting model if set right balance. Brenda Talley suggested they have an advisory committee who could bring issues to the Senate and were not Senators. Jennifer English mentioned letting lecturers have their own group and a voice that way. Think what Jeet Gupta and David Moore discussed could work. Bhavani Sitaraman wants to fine tune other areas more so we don't keep coming back to it.

- Jennifer English stated there is ambiguous language on the President-Elect. The bylaws are ambiguous. The President-Elect is running off the election as President-Elect and do they need to be re-elected to serve as President. One interpretation that should be elected when term ended. Jennifer English stated she served as Chair of the Governance and Operations Committee and then President-Elect and the two year term expired and then she served as President. The Parliamentarian says elected by Senate and not representing the Department any more so do not need to be re-elected. Have precedence for not but it is ambiguous language. The Department could decide not to re-elect and undo what the Senate had done. Would like to clean up the language. Jennifer English would like to clean up language to say when an officer they are a Senator. Only for President and President-Elect. President-Elect does not need to be re-elected by the Department. When a person is an officer they represent the Senate and not the Department.

- Jennifer English stated that the elections this year regarding the President-Elect, Ombudsperson, and new senators. Speaks to elections but not who does it. Do we want to have language that the Governance and Operations facilitate with blind vote or let the Department do it on their own as long as they verify it was done by vote. Is there not enough of a problem to do anything. Letha Etzkorn stated some Departments Chairs chose the representative and not by election. There were arguments for both sides. Bylaws can be read both ways. Jeet Gupta stated the Departments should be able to do their own elections. If there are problems then handle separately and not blanket ruling that we control. That is the way it is done in the Senate –states elect their own. Clean the language and let Departments do it. Yeqing Bao is concerned for someone else dictating. If departments do then send something that certifies that done right and if know of not being done then notify us immediately. Can do forms that will be hoist upon Peggy. Roy Magnuson suggests when requesting unit to elect then remind of best practice. Laurel Bollinger suggested sending to all in the Department not just the Chair. Bhavani Sitaraman stated if we want the Senate to be taken seriously then choose the best person to represent the department and the department needs to schedule accordingly—sometimes department uses other criteria and not what is here. Jennifer English stated that is when the election schedule done. Maybe January send a reminder so they think about it when scheduling. Clarke Rountree stated don't know if there is a problem running earlier. We could do the election in January. Jennifer English stated do we want to leave it as an option? No, departments run the elections with Governance and Operations giving them sufficient guidelines. Give everyone information so no one feels they are not empowered to say if the elections not done properly. Jennifer English stated if brought forth that not done right then the Ombudsperson brings it to the Executive Committee and then decide how to handle it. Yeqing Bao stated if it is run by the Senate can you guarantee it is done right. Will we know what is going on. Ina Warboys stated Colleges elect and someone says not done right and tell parliamentarian and say Senate Executive runs as an elections commission. Laurel Bollinger stated if there is a complaint will run election, have to have evidence of done inappropriately then move to do re-election. Jennifer English stated if you feel the Department is not doing it right let someone know.

- **Resolution 7: Non senate faculty on Senate Committees.** Research Committee and others. Put bill through voted and implemented—very ambiguous and not clear how we add Senate eligible faculty on Senate Committees. Process of how to put on. Jeet Gupta stated they are working on a proposal of how Committees are formed. Particularly if need 5 people and have 10 nominations. Believe Senate Executive should decide who serves. Jeet Gupta stated the current Bylaws say elected by Senate. Governance and operations and Senate Executive come up with changes to Bylaws. Tighten as much language as can and Parliamentarian does great job but should be easier. Clarify processes and procedures of what we do. Jennifer English changes to bylaws have to be approved by the Board. Bhavani Sitaraman has the 1973 derivation been changed? Jennifer English stated if it is important then fight for it but if you do not feel strongly then not send. Bhavani Sitaraman stated concern about the statement about deriving authority from the President. Look at examples of shared governance and come up with something

different. Check out Bylaws of others. See what acceptable elsewhere. Help make case stronger. If what different from all others then not good, especially peer institutions. Take a few minutes and look at what another university does.

- If you have other issues forward them to Jennifer English we will get a discussion on that. Lecturer issue good one to go look at from other universities.

**Faculty Senate Membership
Term Expirations for 2011**

COLLEGE OR DEPARTMENT	REPRESENTATIVE
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	
Accounting/Finance Economics/IS At large	Charles Hickman, Yes Wai Mok, Yes
LIBERAL ARTS	
Art/Art History Communication Arts Education English Foreign Languages Philosophy	David Stewart, Yes Eletra Gilchirst, Yes Derrick Smith, Yes David Neff, Yes Kwaku Gyasi, Yes Deborah Heikes, Yes
ENGINEERING	
Chemical/Materials Electrical/Computer Electrical/Computer Electrical/Computer	Ramon Cerro, Yes David Pan, Yes Jeffrey Kulick, Yes Seong-Moo Yoo, Yes
NURSING	
Nursing Nursing Additional	Louise O'Keefe, Yes Ina Warboys, Yes (No Name)
SCIENCE	
Chemistry Mathematical Sciences Physics	Carmen Scholz, Yes Claudio Morales, Yes Nick Pogorelov, Yes

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report
March 31, 2011

- Approved new courses
 - HY 385 History of Modern Africa
 - HY 310 Introduction to Public History
 - HY 311 Historic Archaeology
 - HY 312 Cultural Resource Management
 - HY 330 The History of the Christian Church
 - HY 369 American Environmental History
 - HY 370 Social History of American Technology
 - HY 371 US Military History to 1920
 - HY 372 US Military History from 1920
 - HY 395 History of Medicine from Antiquity to the Enlightenment
 - HY 429 Civil War and Reconstruction
 - HY 482 Comparative Slavery and Abolition
 - HY 483 Women and Gender in Latin America
 - HY 486 Europe during the Cold War
- Approved course change
 - HY 230 The Early Middle Ages in Western Europe

Minutes for Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee

12:45-2:05 p.m., Thursday, March 3, 2011

Present: Clarke Rountree (Chair), Eric Seeman, Dongsheng Wu; Michael Banish, Kristen Herrin

The committee met with Holly Arnold from the Student Success Center. Diana Bell was originally scheduled to attend and was unable to do so. We discussed the SSC's procedures for following up with at-risk students. Contrary to what others had reported to the committee, SSC does not follow-up with students who receive an "Unsatisfactory" on their midterm grades, unless those students already are on academic warning or probation. Clarke Rountree asked Amy Mack, a College of Liberal Arts advisor, to join the meeting to see how they handle students who are in academic trouble. She discussed processes of advising, but no systematic and regular way that those with "Unsatisfactory" grades are handled.

The committee revised drafts of three bills: one on midterm grading, a second on changing requirements for earning a second degree in some cases, and a third on refunding tuition for those called to military service. All revised versions of the bills passed unanimously.

The committee discussed the need to review the uses of SIE forms for teacher assessment to see if there is room for improvement.

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

Senate Bill #351 : Encouraging Second Degrees

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC
2/17/11 Amended and passed first reading at FSEC

1

1 **WHEREAS,** The University of Alabama in Huntsville encourages students to engage
2 in interdisciplinary studies, and

3 **WHEREAS,** Earning undergraduate degrees from two different colleges is a
4 particularly intensive and commendable approach to interdisciplinary
5 studies, and

6 **WHEREAS,** Getting a second degree from another UAHuntsville college is
7 challenging, given distinct demands for general education requirements
8 and for pre-professional course work.

9 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

10 That the Faculty Senate requests that Deans of Colleges overseeing
11 UAHuntsville dual-degree students' secondary degree programs offer
12 flexibility in helping students complete college-specific requirements in
13 that second degree through substitutions and waivers where appropriate.

14 **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

15 That the undergraduate catalog include a notice indicating that students
16 wishing to earn a second degree from another UAHuntsville college may

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

Senate Bill #351 : Encouraging Second Degrees

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC

2/17/11 Amended and passed first reading at FSEC

17 petition the Dean of that college for appropriate substitutions and

18 waivers.

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

31 March, 2011

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

INCREASE FUNDING TO FACULTY AND STAFF CLINIC

1 **WHEREAS,** One of the most important assets of the University is the health of the
2 institution's faculty and staff, and
3

4 **WHEREAS,** The UAH Faculty and Staff Clinic was established in June 2007 to serve
5 the health needs of the faculty and staff, and
6

7 **WHEREAS,** The UAH Faculty and Staff Clinic has seen 729 faculty and staff with
8 2,509 clinic visits and saved the University an estimated \$163,085.00 in
9 insurance co-pays and other expenses, and
10

11 **WHEREAS,** The Faculty-Staff Clinic is open to see patients only 4 hours per day
12 from 7:30 a.m.- 11.30 a.m. due to the limited hours of nurse practitioner
13 time budgeted for the clinic, and
14

15 **WHEREAS,** The UAH Faculty and Staff Clinic is located in the weight training
16 facility in Spragins Hall in space which was volunteered by the
17 Department of Athletics for 5 years and that facility is not a desirable
18 long-term location for the clinic, and
19

20 **WHEREAS,** The success of the clinic in terms of serving as a valuable source of health
21 care for faculty and staff and a financial savings for the institution;
22

23 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

24 That University administration increase funding to the Faculty-Staff
25 Clinic to provide an additional nurse practitioner (1.0 FTE) to expand
26 availability and services for University employees beginning as soon as

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

31 March, 2011

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

27 possible, but not later than the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic year,
28 and

29

30 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

31 That University administration allocate appropriate space and facilities
32 for the clinic facility for the 2011-2012 year.

33

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

Senate Bill #352 : Mid-Term Grading Policy

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC
 3/31/11 Resubmitted by USA for and amended at first reading

1

1 **WHEREAS,** Student retention is a priority at UAHuntsville, and

2 **WHEREAS,** Intervening with struggling students is imperative to help them succeed,
3 and

4 **WHEREAS,** Faculty have been remiss in submitting midterm grades

5 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

6 That UAHuntsville encourage faculty to submit midterm grades for all
7 100 and 200 level classes with the same conscientiousness they apply to
8 the submission of final grades.

9 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

10 That only “S” (Satisfactory) and “U” (Unsatisfactory) or “W”
11 (Withdrawn) be presented as options with all midterm grades on the
12 reporting form defaulting to “S” (so that only the less frequent “U’s”
13 need to be changed, speeding the grading process), except for those the
14 registrar has listed as withdrawn (W).

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

16 That Faculty must define in their 100 and 200 level course syllabi what a
17 midterm S or U indicates.

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

Senate Bill #352 : Mid-Term Grading Policy

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC
3/31/11 Resubmitted by USA for and amended at first reading

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

19 That departments consult with one another within and across colleges,
20 where necessary, to determine whether there are 300-level classes that
21 would benefit from inclusion in midterm grade reporting.

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

Senate Bill #353 : Supporting Second Degrees after Graduation

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC
 3/31/11 Resubmitted by USA, amended and passed at first reading

1

1 **WHEREAS,** The University of Alabama in Huntsville encourages students to engage
2 in interdisciplinary studies, and

3 **WHEREAS,** Earning undergraduate degrees from two UAHuntsville different
4 colleges is a particularly intensive and commendable approach to
5 interdisciplinary studies, and

6 **WHEREAS,** Getting a second degree from another UAHuntsville college is
7 challenging, given distinct demands for general education requirements
8 and for pre-professional course work, and

9 **WHEREAS,** UAHuntsville students in professional degree programs seeking a second
10 degree may graduate and begin work before completing work on that
11 second degree, and

12 **WHEREAS,** The current UAHuntsville undergraduate catalog requires students who
13 have already earned a degree and are seeking a second UAHuntsville
14 degree to complete at least 25% of the requirements for such a degree (or
15 32 hours), and

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

Senate Bill #353 : Supporting Second Degrees after Graduation

Bill History: 2/11/11 Submitted by USA, considered for first reading at FSEC
3/31/11 Resubmitted by USA, amended and passed at first reading

16 **WHEREAS,** This 25% requirement may dissuade UAHuntsville graduates from
17 completing a UAHuntsville second degree when less than 32 hours is
18 needed to do so,

19 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

20 That UAHuntsville’s policy and catalog be changed to allow
21 UAHuntsville graduates to complete second UAHuntsville degrees with
22 fewer than 25% of the degree requirements hours providing they do so
23 within the three semesters immediately (not including summer
24 semesters) following their graduation.

25 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

26 That within those three (3) semesters, (not including summer) the student
27 must complete all the requirements of the major for the second degree.

28

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

**Senate Bill #354 : Full Refunds for Students in the Military who
are Deployed**

Bill History: 3/31/11 Submitted by USA, amended and passed at first reading at FSEC

1

1 **WHEREAS,** Many UAHuntsville students are members of the active duty military,
2 military reserves, or National Guard, and

3 **WHEREAS,** The Service Member’s Civil Relief Act of 2003 (formerly the Soldiers’
4 and Sailors’ Relief Act of 1940) provides the service member with
5 specific financial and legal protections if military service has had a
6 "material effect" on the legal or financial matter involved, and

7 **WHEREAS,** The Service Member’s Civil Relief Act of 2003, along with other Federal
8 rules and guidelines, provides protections for service members in an active
9 duty status as well as military reserve/National Guard service members
10 called to active duty active duty, and

11 **WHEREAS,** Being deployed in active military service away from UAH has a “material
12 effect” on a student’s ability to complete a course of instruction, and

13 **WHEREAS,** If a student/service members withdraws from class due to a pending
14 deployment or activation, that student currently loses some or all of the
15 tuition and fees paid that semester, and

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

**Senate Bill #354 : Full Refunds for Students in the Military who
are Deployed**

Bill History: 3/31/11 Submitted by USA, amended and passed at first reading at FSEC

16 **WHEREAS,** This loss of tuition and fees under these circumstances has an adverse
17 financial impact on student/service members and has a “material effect” on
18 the student/service members ability to pay tuition and fees in the future,

19 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

20 That based on the requirement of the Service Members Civil Relief Act of
21 2003, the University adopt a policy of allowing student/service members to
22 receive a full, non-prorated refund of tuition and fees paid in a semester,
23 up to and including the last day of class, during which they are called to
24 active duty (in the case of the National Guard and Reserves) or are
25 deployed from their local permanent duty station (in the case of active duty
26 service members) if the above conditions of activation and/or deployment
27 are met, or within 60 days of the student/service member’s return from
28 deployment or release from active duty.

29 **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

30 That appropriate documentation, such as a copy of official orders, is
31 required to process this refund.

32 **AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

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

**Senate Bill #354 : Full Refunds for Students in the Military who
are Deployed**

Bill History: 3/31/11 Submitted by USA, amended and passed at first reading at FSEC

33 That the semester for which tuition and fees were refunded the student is
34 retroactively withdrawn for the courses refunded.

35