FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 19, 2008 – 3:30 PM – 150 SHELBY HALL

APPROVED MINUTES

ABSENT WITHOUT ALTERNATE: Tatiana Tsakiropoulou-Summers, John Hill, Giles D'Sousa, Doug Cook, Karen Burgess, Margaret Garner, Steve Miller, Jeff Weddle, Sharon Nichols, Lisa Scherff, Viola Acoff, Linda Enders, Roy Maize, Deidre Leaver-Dunn, Melondie Carter

ABSENT WITH ALTERNATE: Douglas Lightfoot/Pieter Visscher, Lee Pike/Lisa Yuro

GUESTS: Gabriela Merriman (visiting faculty); Cresandra Smothers, Dialog; Nathan McMullen, SGA

Roll call and quorum check by Faculty Senate Secretary Clark Midkiff.

The minutes from the January 15, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

President's Report – *(John Vincent)* A request for data on interaction between the Faculty Senate, Faculty Athletic Representative and the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee has been received from LSU. A response has been sent to LSU. The Chair of the Research Advisory Committee, Interim Vice President for Research Joe Benson, and John Vincent met to discuss changes needed for the **Research Misconduct policy** and the **Conflict of Interest policy**. There are federal compliance issues in the Research Misconduct policy that must be met. A Conflict of Interest policy must be established due to the lack of such a policy at this time. The Provost is distributing **"No Smoking" Entrance"** signs to the deans for posting limiting smoking areas at certain entrances to campus buildings. Decisions will be made concerning the entrances and areas that will be affected. A volunteer is needed for the **Faculty/Staff fund drive**. Any suggestions should be emailed to John Vincent. The Faculty Senate has requested the building managers email the proper **emergency procedures** to follow to the occupants of their buildings in the event of problems such as leaks, plumbing problems, etc. The Faculty Senate **Steering Committee meeting** with the Provost on Thursday, February 28 will be in 204B Ferguson Center in connection with the Faculty/Student Week. The Senate endorsed continuing to meet in 150 Shelby Hall. John Vincent will make the reservations for this meeting space. Recommendations are needed for faculty members to serve on the committee overseeing the placement of qualified names on bronze plaques on the **Academic Plaza** located between the Library and Clark Hall. Norm Stein volunteered to serve. Faculty members of Arts and Sciences were requested to encourage their colleagues to run for the Faculty Senate. Six additional seats were added this year based on criteria stated in the Faculty Senate bylaws. The SGA is looking at the issue of **student photos** as part of the electronic roster. The Faculty Senate passed a resolution in 2003 requesting student photos as part of the MyBama system. This issue will be brought up again with the Provost. The meeting of Southeastern Conference faculty

senate presidents has been finalized. The Faculty Participation in the Selection and Evaluation of Deans and Chairs Committee has recommended a new **chair/dean review** proposal.   The Faculty Senate passed a resolution asking for a mandatory review of chairs and deans in the past. The current proposal referring only to the review process has been passed unanimously by the faculty members, deans and chairs on this committee. This would replace most of Appendix A in the Faculty Handbook. Section F and Section A pertain to the selection of deans and chairs and would not be affected. Deans will be reviewed by the faculty every other year by electronic survey with questions and space for comments. Comments will not be edited and will be read by the President, Provost and Dean. Results will be tallied and given to the President, Provost and Dean. Faculty will not see those results. In the dean's fifth year the President and Provost will evaluate the dean and make the "retain or not retain" decision. This will be part of the normal review instrument in the fifth year or if it is not in the normal year, a "retain or not retain" question and space for comments will be sent electronically to the faculty. The President and Provost must go to the faculty in that division and justify their decision based on the survey information. The chair survey will be in the alternating years with the results going to the deans and the chairs. In the fifth year the "retain or not retain" decision will be made by the Dean, the same process will be followed for the chairs as in the dean evaluation. The dean will go to the department to justify the "retain or not retain" decision based on the survey results. The survey instrument will be designed by this committee with the approval of the President and Provost. This survey process eliminated the committees that made up questionnaires for each college. Following discussion a motion and second was made for the Faculty Senate to accept the review proposal. It was accepted unanimously. A recommendation to add "abstention" as an option will be passed along to the committee. Appreciation was expressed to the members of the Academic Affairs Committee over the past years and to the current committee.

Vice President's Report – *(Karen Steckol)* No report.

Secretary's Report – *(Clark Midkiff)* The Faculty Senate seats needed by division are: Arts & Sciences 22; C&BA 6; CCHS 3; CIS 3; Education 5; Engineering 6; ELI 1; HES 3; Library 2; Law 2; Nursing 2; Social Work 2 bringing the total number of senators to 57. Elections should be held within the next three weeks. Results are in for two colleges.

Academic Affairs – *(Marcia Barrett & Rona Donahoe)* There is not enough flexibility in the **final exam** periods due to increased enrollment and additional course and section offerings. Suggestions considered were expanding the exam period from five to six days with Saturday after exam week not being an option due to maintaining graduation schedule and Sunday not being an option; giving up the Friday of the last week of classes which was not popular with faculty committee members; giving exams the next day following the last day of classes; and changing exam times from 2 ½ hours to 2 hours. The implementation of the final exam change will be Fall of 2008. The solutions for consideration were: (a) return to a six day final examination schedule beginning on the Saturday immediately following the last day of class allowing separation of combined hours and/or movement of departmental exams to a single day or (b) add a 5th exam slot

to the existing five day exam schedule and shorten the allotted time for the examination by 15 minutes. The proposed schedule is as follows: 8:00-10:15 am/ 10:45 am-1:00 pm/ 1:30 – 3:45 pm/ 4:15 – 6:30 pm/ 7:00 – 9:15 pm. These two options would have the least impact on the academic calendar.   The possibility of students having three exams in one day would increase. The suggestion was made to have something built into Banner to red flag those instances that the student would have three exams in one day giving them the opportunity to change their schedule. The viability of this is not known at this time. Following discussion the Senate voted - 9 for "A" and 17 for "B".

Faculty Life – *(Lowell Baker & Deidre Leaver-Dunn)* No report.

Financial Affairs – *(David Arnold & Jeanette Vandermeer)* The Financial Affairs Committee has been looking at the **PEEHIP** issue. On February 23, 2006 the Faculty Senate Steering Committee met with the Provost, Dot Martin and Charlotte Harris. Data pertaining to grandfathering in those affected by the PEEHIP policy change had been requested. The number 786 was given at that time as the number of faculty hired before the change. The cost projection at that time to grandfather those affected was $18 ½ million dollars. In December, 2007 John Kasberg and Charlotte Harris met with the Faculty Senate Financial Affairs Committee and the Faculty Life Committee.   The request was made to include the turnover rate in the numbers. In January, 2008 the number given was figured with 5% turnover rate putting 585 affected by the change with the cost projection at $8-1/2 to $9 million dollars. On October 1, 2003 the PEEHIP rules changed requiring four-year state colleges in Alabama to begin contributing an average of $282 per month toward the PEEHIP retiree's monthly health premiums. Prior to this the K-12 and 2–year colleges and the State of Alabama contributed $120 per month per retiree, but the 4-year colleges did not pay toward the PEEHIP retiree's health premiums putting the University in a position of paying a large amount toward this benefit following the change in the law.   To be eligible for PEEHIP, the retiree's health insurance program, an employee must have ten years in and be vested.   The second change came in October of 2005 requiring all future retirees who are vested to pay 2% a year of the employer's contribution for each year under 25 years. If someone retires at age 65, single with 10 years of service, then they lack 15 years having 25 years and the PEEHIP premium penalty is 15 x 2% - 30% x $244/mo = $73.20 + $1.14 = $74.00/mo. If someone retires with 17 years in, the premium would not be any more than their BC/BS now costs. To determine the exact benefit for each individual, a conference with Human Resources should be scheduled. The sliding scale chart for PEEHIP giving single versus family coverage is available at www.rsa.state.al.us.   Karen Steckol has an appointment with HR concerning her personal retirement plans and will report that information back to the Senate. The Human Resources Department has determined that improvements should be made in the service they offer to the University faculty and staff. Suggestions, ideas and input on methods to improve their services have been requested. An email will be sent to the entire faculty. Additional issues suggested for the Financial Affairs Committee to address are increased allotment for meals during travel, phase retirement for faculty, and Bama Flex benefit plan changes.

Research & Service – *(Shane Street & Ed Stephenson)* The Research and Service Committee is proposing the establishment of a **"Sustainability and Environmental Resources Management Committee"**. This is an expansion of a proposal made by the Faculty Senate four years ago with the reporting channel changed to the Vice President of Financial Affairs rather than the Vice President of Student Affairs. This will be forwarded as a recommendation to the University Committee on Committees.

Faculty and Senate Governance – **(***John Mason & Roy Maize)* There are no nominees for **Ombudsperson**. The deadline for nominations has been extended to February 29 with the election to be held on March 3. The nominee must be from Engineering or C&BA. The nominees for **Faculty Senate officers** are Karen Steckol for President, Clark Midkiff for Vice President and Jeanette Vandermeer for Secretary.

Student Affairs – *(Carolyn Cassady & Melondie Carter)* The second annual **Student Faculty Week** will be February 25 – 29. The SGA will host a reception for faculty and students on Thursday, February 28 from 5:00 to 6:30 PM in the Heritage Room in Ferguson. The SGA is also sponsoring "Take a Faculty Member to Coffee" during that week. Various locations will give discounts to the students participating in this event. The Faculty Senate will split the cost of advertising Student Faculty Week; the senate share will be $163.00. A joint resolution for the Faculty Senate and SGA possibly could pertain to the **printing** cost issue. Arts and Sciences changed their policy increasing printing costs for the students. Methods of establishing a printing account for students has been discussed. The SGA is also interested in having student photos posted on online class rosters. The Faculty Senate passed such a similar resolution in 2003. The Student Affairs Committee will be looking at that issue. This committee will meet on Tuesday, March 4 at 3:30 pm with Darrell Hargreaves, UA Student Affairs representative, to discuss **student block seating** at football games.

Legislative Agenda – *(Margaret Garner)* John Vincent reported in the absence of Margaret Garner that **Higher Education Day** will be Thursday, March 6 in Montgomery. Buses will be available for transportation departing Tuscaloosa at 7:00 AM and returning at 5:00 PM. Faculty members are encouraged to be considerate of those students participating in this event. Support of faculty members and students is crucial in view of proposed budget cuts for higher education. For reservations contact Carolyn Benton cbenton@UASYSTEM.UA.EDU at the UA Systems Office. Bill Jones, Director of Government Relations for The University of Alabama System, will address the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the full Faculty Senate meeting in April.

University Committees –

The CUC will be making recommendations to President Witt for the appointment of faculty members to various standing committees on March 13.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 PM

Proposed changes to Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook

A. Basic Principles

Academic excellence is essential to the educational mission of The University of Alabama. Such excellence is achieved in an environment of mutual confidence, collegial participation, effective leadership, and strong academic programs. To foster that environment, it is University policy that the faculty* are expected to participate in the selection of deans and departmental chairpersons and that the advice of the faculty shall be actively and systematically sought concerning possible improvements in academic programs and in administrative leadership of academic divisions and departments.

The process by which the views of the faculty shall be sought is based on seven understandings:

1. Final authority over the selection and retention of deans and other academic administrators rests with the President but primary authority for the selection and retention of associate deans, assistant deans, and departmental chairpersons rests with the academic dean.

2. Normally, no person shall be appointed as a dean or a departmental chair who has not received a positive tenure recommendation from the relevant academic departmental tenure committee or, where the smallest relevant academic unit is the division, from the divisional tenure committee, of The University of Alabama.

3. The feedback and advice of the faculty shall be systematically obtained and considered prior to the initial and subsequent appointments of deans and chairpersons.

4. Program direction, program quality, and the performance of deans and departmental chairpersons shall be evaluated periodically and an important consideration in this process shall be the feedback from the faculty.

5. It is the responsibility of the faculty to participate in reviews of programs and leadership and to provide reasons for their recommendations which can be considered by the administration when making decisions. Faculty members who fail to participate fully in the leadership evaluation process, either by making no recommendation or failing to give reasons for a recommendation, impair the administration's ability to make an appropriate decision.

---

*Throughout this document, "faculty" shall be understood to consist of all persons who have a tenured or tenure-track appointment in the appropriate academic unit of the University; the status of exceptional classes, such as members of the full-time clinical faculty of the College of Community Health Sciences or full-time temporary instructors, will be decided by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit.

6. Faculty participation in the evaluation of administrative performance shall be accomplished by providing the opportunity for feedback at two-year intervals except as hereinafter provided.

7. Program direction and program quality shall be considered by higher administrators when considering faculty feedback of the leadership of academic administrators. Normally, the nature and timing of academic program reviews shall be left to the discretion of the higher administrators, but these reviews must be reasonably extensive and current and must involve opportunities for faculty members to express their views about the program.

In the following policies and procedures governing the selection and evaluation of deans* and departmental chairpersons, there exists an intended degree of latitude and procedural flexibility to accommodate differences and preferences among academic divisions and departments. Each academic division and each department may adopt more specific formal procedures provided that these procedures are consistent with the University policies and guidelines stated herein and provided that they are approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the academic dean, as may be appropriate.

C.   Policies and Guidelines for Leadership Evaluation of Divisional Leadership

It is the policy of The University of Alabama that faculty members in each academic division shall have periodic opportunities to provide feedback on the leadership of their division, normally a dean, and that the views of the faculty concerned expressed in these evaluations shall be an important component of any personnel decision by the President and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Office for Academic Affairs will establish a schedule for the leadership personnel decision of each academic division. A leadership personnel decision shall be scheduled in each academic division at least once every five years except that the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affair*s* may vary the schedule by as much as one year if a change in the leadership of a division occurs or is anticipated or if other circumstances arise in which it becomes desirable to do so.

1. Early in the fall or spring semester in which a division's leadership personnel decision is scheduled, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall circulate an electronic ballot to the divisional faculty asking whether the divisional leadership is be retained or not retained and allowing faculty to provide discursive comments. If this is a year in which the divisional leadership is scheduled for regular feedback

---

*Certain positions which carry the title of dean do not have faculty constituencies which are limited to a single division, such as Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the Library, or Dean of Continuing Studies. For these positions, it is necessary that the formal review process include campus-wide faculty participation and that the procedures stated herein be modified to accommodate such participation. Such modifications will be developed on a case-by-case basis by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs or other appropriate administrative officer, in consultation with appropriate faculty and administrative bodies including the Faculty Participation in the Selection of Deans and Department Chairpersons and in the Evaluation of Academic Programs Committee, Council of Deans and the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate. These modified procedures shall be implemented upon approval by the President.

from the divisional faculty (see Section D below), the question will be part of the regular evaluation. If this is in a year in which the divisional leadership evaluation is not scheduled, an electronic ballot containing the question of whether the divisional leadership should or should not be retained will be distributed. This ballot will also provide an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments will not be edited and will be available to the President and/or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and divisional leadership.

D.   Divisional Leadership Evaluations

Evaluation by the Faculty. The following policies and guidelines for obtaining the divisional faculty's advice on the division's leadership are to be employed:

1. Every other year, an electronic survey will be distributed to faculty of the division providing them the opportunity to give feedback on their divisional leadership. The electronic survey will be administered in alternate years from the electronic survey to evaluate departmental leadership (see section H). The survey instrument will consist of a series of questions in which participating faculty will assign a score and will be given an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments allow faculty to state any reasons they have for believing that the divisional leadership has or has not helped the college or division make progress in meeting its mission and goals. The comments will be anonymous and will not be edited. The President and/or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and divisional leadership will receive the results of the electronic survey.

2. If a divisional leadership personnel decision is required in a year in which the regular divisional leadership feedback is not scheduled, an electronic ballot containing the question of whether the divisional leadership should or should not be retained will be distributed.   This ballot will also provide an opportunity for discursive comments will be distributed to faculty.   The discursive comments allow faculty to state any reasons they have for believing that the divisional leadership has or has not helped the college or division make progress in meeting its mission and goals. The comments will be anonymous and will not be edited. The President and/or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and divisional leadership will receive the results of the electronic survey.

3. The electronic survey will be developed by the Faculty Participation in the Selection of Deans and Department Chairpersons and in the Evaluation of Academic Programs Committee, with input from the Faculty Senate and the Council of Deans. The President and/or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will approve the final form of the electronic survey.

Decision by the President. Upon receiving results of the electronic survey, and after any other evaluations, discussions, and clarifications which the President and/or the

Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs consider necessary, the President will communicate his or her decision to those concerned, normally no later than one month following submission of the electronic survey. The President or the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet, normally no later than two weeks after communication of the results to those concerned, with the divisional faculty to discuss the President's views. Then, if the faculty so chooses, it may transmit through the President's Office to the Chancellor, and through the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees, its concerns regarding the President's decision.

Early Divisional Leadership Decisions. Upon a written petition to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs requesting an early leadership personnel decision, signed by at least 25 percent of the total faculty of the division, or upon a vote of one-third or more of the total divisional faculty requesting an early evaluation at a divisional faculty meeting, an early decision on divisional leadership shall occur, except that

(a) only one early decision may be called for during the interval between regularly scheduled divisional leadership decisions; and

(b) if an early decision results in the continued appointment of the divisional leadership, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs may schedule the next leadership decision to occur as late as five years after that early decision. No additional early decision can be called for before the date when a leadership decision would have occurred had there been no call for an early decision.

Early decisions shall be conducted in the same way as regularly scheduled decisions. The timing of these activities may, however, be adjusted by the President and/or the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs to accommodate those periods of the year during which faculty are not, or may not be, available to participate in the process, provided that such adjustments in time shall not defeat the purpose or unreasonably impede the progress of the procedures prescribed herein.

E. Divisional Program Reviews as Part of Divisional Leadership Decisions

The President and/or the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall consider any available reviews of program direction and program quality when considering the results of Divisional Leadership Evaluations as part of a divisional leadership decision. These include external and/or internal reviews (e.g., accreditation reviews; internal reviews of departments for the Alabama Commission on Higher Education), if sufficiently extensive and current, and if they provided adequate opportunities for faculty members to express their views about the program.

G. Policies and Guidelines for Leadership Evaluation of Chairpersons

It is the policy of The University of Alabama that faculty members in each academic department shall have periodic opportunities to provide feedback on the leadership of their departments and that the views of the faculty concerned expressed in these evaluations shall be an important component of any personnel decision by the Dean

(or other divisional leader). The Dean, in consultation with the Office for Academic Affairs, will establish a schedule for the leadership decisions of each department within the division. A leadership decision shall be scheduled in each academic department at least once every five years except that the Dean, in consultation with the Office for Academic Affairs, may vary the schedule by as much as one year if a change in the leadership of a department occurs or is anticipated or if other circumstances arise in which it becomes desirable to do so.

> 1. Early in the fall or spring semester in which a division's leadership personnel decision is scheduled, the Dean shall circulate an electronic ballot to the departmental faculty asking whether the divisional leadership is be retained or not retained and allowing faculty to provide discursive comments. If this is a year in which the departmental leadership is scheduled for regular feedback by the departmental faculty (see Section G below), the question will be part of the regular evaluation. If this is in a year in which the departmental leadership feedback is not scheduled, the electronic ballot will contain the question of whether the departmental leadership should or should not be retained and an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments will not be edited and will be available to the Dean and departmental leadership.

H.   Departmental Leadership Evaluations

Evaluation by the Faculty. The following policies and guidelines for obtaining the departmental faculty's advice on the department's leadership are to be employed:

1. Every other year, an electronic survey will be distributed to faculty of the department providing them the opportunity to provide feedbackon their departmental leadership.   The electronic survey will be administered in alternate years from the electronic survey to evaluate divisional leadership (see section D). The survey instrument will consist of a series of questions in which faculty will provide a score and will be given an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments allow faculty to state any reasons they have for believing that the departmental leadership has or has not helped the department make progress in meeting its mission and goals. The comments will be anonymous and will not be edited.

2. If a departmental leadership personnel decision is required in a year in which the regular departmental leadership feedback is not scheduled, an electronic ballot containing the question of whether the departmental leadership should or should not be retained will be distributed to faculty. The ballot will also provide an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments allow faculty to state any reasons they have for believing that the departmental leadership has or has not helped the department make progress in meeting its mission and goals. The comments will be anonymous and will not be edited. The Dean and departmental leadership will receive the results of the electronic survey.

3. The electronic survey will be developed by the Faculty Participation in the Selection of Deans and Department Chairpersons and in the Evaluation of Academic Programs Committee, with input from the Faculty Senate and the Council of Deans. The President and/or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will approve the final form of the electronic survey.

Decision by the Dean. Upon receiving results of the electronic survey, and after any other evaluations, discussions, and clarifications which the Dean consider necessary, the Dean will communicate his or her decision to those concerned, normally no later than one month following submission of the electronic survey. The Dean will meet, normally no later than two weeks after communication of the results to those concerned, with the departmental faculty to discuss the Dean's views. Then, if the faculty so chooses, it may inform the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President of its concerns regarding the Dean's decision.

Early Departmental Leadership Decisions. Upon a written petition to the Dean requesting an early leadership personnel decision, signed by at least 25 percent of the total faculty of the department, or upon a vote of one-third or more of the total departmental faculty requesting an early evaluation at a departmental meeting, an early decision on departmental leadership shall occur, except that

(a) only one early decision may be called for during the interval between regularly scheduled departmental leadership decisions; and

(b) if an early decision results in the continued appointment of the departmental leadership, the Dean may schedule the next leadership decision to occur as late as five years after that early decision. No additional early decision can be called for before the date when a leadership decision would have occurred had there been no call for an early decision.

Early decisions shall be conducted in the same way as regularly scheduled decisions. The timing of these activities may, however, be adjusted by the Dean to accommodate those periods of the year during which faculty are not, or may not be, available to participate in the process, provided that such adjustments in time shall not defeat the purpose or unreasonably impede the progress of the procedures prescribed herein.

I. **Departmental Program Reviews as Part of Divisional Leadership Decisions**

The Dean shall consider any available reviews of program direction and program quality when considering the results of Departmental Leadership Evaluations as part of a departmental leadership decision. These include external and/or internal reviews (e.g., accreditation reviews; internal reviews of departments for the Alabama Commission on Higher Education), if sufficiently extensive and current, and if they provided adequate opportunities for faculty members to express their views about the program.

J. **Implementation**

Each academic division and department of the University may propose to the central administration the use of more specific guidelines and procedural details. As with any University policy, the provisions for faculty participation stated herein are subject to modification and change by the President whenever circumstances and experience may warrant. However, any such changes will be discussed fully with the Faculty Senate (acting on behalf of the faculty), deans, and chairpersons prior to their approval by the President.

Express provision for monitoring the effectiveness of this policy and for recommending any changes in the policies and guidelines herein as might become desirable shall be provided for by the establishment of an advisory committee of deans, departmental chairpersons, and faculty, called the Faculty Participation in the Selection of Deans and Department Chairpersons and in the Evaluation of Academic Programs Committee. The members of this committee shall be appointed by the President, except that the faculty appointees shall be from a list of persons furnished to the President by the President of the Faculty Senate. A faculty member will chair the advisory committee. This committee shall report to the President through the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and shall be charged with (1) monitoring the effectiveness of the existing policies on faculty participation, (2) offering proposals for changes in the mechanism for faculty participation for consideration by the University community, (3) screening proposals for change from other sources, and (4) coordinating discussions and study by the faculty, deans, chairpersons, and the central administration of any proposed changes prior to their approval by the President.

Proposal to Establish a New Standing Committee
Committee on University Committees

TITLE: Sustainability and Environmental Resources Management Committee

DUTIES: To advise the President and Administration on issues related to sustainability, energy conservation and maintenance of the natural environment of the campus. The committee shall investigate and recommend policies with respect to recycling, energy conservation, environmental impacts of operations and construction, environmentally responsible management of University landscapes and aquatic resources, and preservation of the natural beauty of the campus. The goal is that the University become a model of environmental responsibility and stewardship.

COMPOSITION: The committee shall be composed of six faculty, three staff and a Faculty Senate Representative and Professional Staff Representative. [There shall be four student representatives: the President of the student chapter of the Alabama Environmental Council, the President of the Water Awareness and Protection student organization, the Chair of the SGA Environmental Committee and the President of the Environmental Law Society.]* The chair of the committee shall be a faculty member with voting privileges on the Campus Master Plan Committee. The Vice President for Financial Affairs, a

representative from the Land Management Office and a representative from the Office of Environmental Health and Safety shall serve as liaison members.

REPORTING CHANNEL: The President through the Provost and Vice President for Financial Affairs.

JUSTIFICATION: There is currently no individual or committee charged with the specific mission or responsibility of sustainability, environmental responsibility, and preservation of the beauty and integrity of The University of Alabama campus and its environs.

* Student representation not yet decided.