FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 18, 2018
12:50 P.M. in SST 050

Present: ***Milton Shen, Laird Burns, Katie Baldwin, David Harwell, Joey Taylor, Joe Conway, David Johnson, Andrei Gandila, Anne Marie Choup, Dianhan Zheng, Kyle Knight, Mike Banish, Yu Lei, Tingting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Fat Ho, Earl Wells, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Gang Wang, Christina Carmen, Angela Hollingsworth, Ann Bianchi, Sharon Spencer, Monica Beck, Amy Hunter, Shanhu Lee, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Jeff Weimer, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Shangbing Ai, Lingze Duan, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathis, Ron Schwertfeger, Chris Allport***

Absent without Proxy: Deborah Heikes, Fran Wessling,

Absent with Proxy: Sophia Marinova, Kevin Bao, Carolyn Sanders, Lori Lioce, Qingyuan Han

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: Dr. Clay Ryan

- Faculty Senate President Carmen Scholz called the meeting to order at 12:49 pm.
- **Meeting Review:**
  - **Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook was passed.**
  - **Bill 417 passed second reading.**
- **Guest Speaker Dr. Clay Ryan**
  - I want to spend time talking about where things are in Washington. I want to hear the questions you have in regards to funding. Collaboration is the Chancellor's number one priority. We are looking for ways among the other campuses. We look to be headed towards a government shutdown. We haven't been able to achieve a budget deal. Rather than negotiate, they have entered into continuing resolutions. That allows us to continue to operate. We have been working hard with Senator Shelby and Congressman Aderholt. A prelude to the elections in 2018 was DACA and the Children's Healthcare has become election issues. They don't want to continue the healthcare without DACA. They are using this as a wedge. We may not see a budget deal anytime soon. Congress will probably remain in session through the weekend. The tax reform package was an issue at the end of last year. We didn't end up with as much bad as we started with. We did end up saving the graduate student tuition waiver. The student debt issue remains. The higher education is up. There are some things in there that is problematic. On the state side, it's mainly only bad news. Alabama has endured the hardest cuts on education besides LSU. This year is the first year we have seen an incline. Early projections are that we will be even better next year. We do nothing to fund at the state level. Most funding we receive is O&M. I would

say that the biggest challenge will be pension reform. We have to fight to save money within the RSA and the trust fund. We have a challenge in Montgomery. They believe we have enough money but we don't know how to budget it. In 2018, we hope that we will have the opportunity to address issues. There are talks about a gas tax. If legislator and state leadership are willing to pass this tax, that may allow other areas to open up.

- Christina – Why is Alabama the last to research funding?
- Dr. Ryan – We have some fundamental issues with funding in Alabama. Property tax is the primary funder of the general fund. In education, we have a robust revenue stream. We starve the general fund and that pressures the education fund. Our focus has been to get people in government that recognizes our issue. I don't see research funding at the state level improving. I think at the federal level, we may see some improvement. It will happen on the federal before we see anything on the state.
- Carmen – Where does this mentality within the state that we have enough money? Why isn't there a more progressive thinking?
- Dr. Ryan – We have always been a low tax state. We have been a populous state. A divide is almost rural versus urban rather than by party. The other challenge at the state level is at the system level. We haven't explained that well enough. We are going to do a much better job at communicating. We are the best thing the state has going. We operate out of scarcity than abundance. These are not issues.
- Carmen – The same people get elected?
- Dr. Ryan – We are limited and can't endorse. We try to make sure we know their opinion.
- Harry – I have been hearing you and your predecessors say the same thing. Why do you think you will see change? The main point is the economic impact.
- Dr. Ryan – I don't think that we have failed. Do you think we have failed?
- Harry – The rank seems pretty low. If you ask about Alabama, you only hear about football. Not the university with students. What can we do as faculty to essentially become more active?
- Mike – I am going to tell you that you should join the higher education partnership.
- Harry – I think it would depend on our spare time and faith on change. There are people that would be interested.
- Dr. Ryan – This legislature that we have now is very different. They are largely data driven; they are not worried about robo calls. They care about people that have relationship with current issues. We are careful to not wear them out until it's necessary. We are retooling higher education partnership.
- Member – Talking about getting students on a bus. We are about to do that. We talk about professionalism. In regards to funding, we partnered with the Alzheimer's foundation. We created this experience for the students. We are going with the students to their lobbying.
- Dr. Ryan – I think that makes a lot sense to do especially on the nursing side. We want to help you in that effort.

- Member – It was almost a roadblock because of funding. The association is providing the bus.
- Dr. Ryan – If you will send me a note of when you come I will make sure hook up with our people.
- Christina – I am worried about the RSA. Do you know anything?
- Dr. Ryan – It is a big fight right now with the successor.

➢ **Administrative Reports**

- Provost Christine Curtis
  - Dr. Altenkirch is on his way to Atlanta. He asked me to talk to you about commencement. If you were at commencement in December, you realized that we had to open our bags to get in. In May, there will be metal detectors and badge checks. I think the VBC is a little late, but have been forced to adopt these. That gives them an opportunity to count us. There is a fire limit in the arena. They count the number of individuals in the arena. We can't have more than 6,200 people. We don't know if they counted us and the number. We weren't stopped. In May, they have told us once we get to 6,200 they will stop us. We don't want to turn away families. We have several options. We will talk to them and see if they will relax that standard until next December. If they don't, we will be forced to go to two ceremonies. The President has talked with the FSEC. We have checked the dates in May. We can only get Sunday, our normal day. If we have to split into two, we will separate the colleges. We will start at 1:00 with colleges that do not have PhD students. The second will start later in the afternoon. The time is unknown at this point. It is up in the air as to what we will do. Next year, we will be talking to the VBC to see if the ceremonies can moved to a weekday or on Saturday. We then do a morning and afternoon. We leave afterwards. The staff has to stay there and move everything out. That can get very late for those individuals. The idea of tickets has come forward and from my experience, those don't go over very well. This is a big even for the student and don't want to dampen their spirits.
    - Jeff – Do we have any other possible venues? So they can go parallel.
    - Provost – We only have one President. It's a problem if you want your President, speaker, and staff there.
    - Jeff – I am relating back to Penn State, we were not in one place. Each college did their own at the same time.
    - Provost – We don't have too many venues to host all this on campus either. There are different ways of splitting. We will always inconvenience someone at this point. They have warned us twice.
    - Roy – How much over were we?
    - Provost – I don't know. We don't have that number. When Senator Sessions was here, that was our biggest year and they warned us.
    - Provost I think for the families it is very important. Many have sacrificed and they want to see their student graduate. Whether there is a monetary benefit or not, it's building relationships with the families.
    - Carmen – IF we split into two ceremonies in the VBC, will our cost go up?
    - Provost – It's one price. We have it for the day. If we split it to another venue at the VBC, the cost would go up. The cost on campus was asked by the FSEC. All the things that are done at the VBC when we pay, we have to do ourselves here on campus. It basically balances out.

- Member – How would it be perceived if you split the ceremonies simultaneously and had a monitor in another place to broadcast the President and speaker?
- Provost - I would think we would have to talk with A&M to see how they do it. In other situations that we have done that, it didn't go well.
- Roy – In terms of number is there an obvious way to split?
- Provost - To have a shorter first, have the three colleges without PhD's first. It isn't an even split on graduates. There will be more undergraduate graduating.
- Carmen – This would allow the smallest number of guest to clear out first.

- I want to talk with you about collaboration with UAH and NCUT. NCUT came to UAH at the suggestion of the University of Mississippi. There have been conversations in China and with the BOT to see if they are willing to entertain collaboration. The board wanted us to continue to talk with NCUT and move forward. First, it has not been approved by the Chinese government. Until we get that approval, it is still a proposal. It can be changed dramatically. NCUT is on the fourth ring of Beijing. According to colleagues at NCUT, there is a lot of interest from them to have an education from here. Many students want this education but they can't go out of country. They don't have the fiscal resources. The two that they are interested in are Mechanical Engineering/Electrical Engineering. These are UAH programs that we would teach at the university in China. We would teach the entire curriculum. We are basically taking our program and teaching it in China. We would be teaching about 100 students per program per year. It would be teaching all the required courses. At this point, the thought is to ask faculty if any would be interested in teaching. A number of faculty came back and would be interested. There are two ways we can do this. One is that we would allow a faculty member to go over for a semester. The other option due to the semester setup is teach a shorter term before our semester starts or after ours has ended. It would be a volunteer basis solely. The NCUT will have international housing and eat on campus. We don't know if there will be a sufficient number of our faculty to go. We have other ideas. We could open the idea to our system faculty. The second is to hire non-tenure track faculty. The program will have both NCUT and UAH faculty. Everything will be in English. The student would have a UAH and NCUT degree. There will be a couple of courses that will be added on to our degree that NCUT would teach due to a requirement of NCUT. The governance would be a joint management committee. They would be in charge of the programs. We will have an administrator on campus. NCUT has to receive approval then we will go back to the BOT's. After seeking their approval, we will have to seek ABET accreditation and SACS approval. This would allow another tuition revenue stream. We see this as an excellent place for graduate student recruitment. The presence of UAH on that campus will establish us. We would hope that would recruit students to come to UAH. WE hope this would strengthen research collaborations.
    - Tim – I have concerns about shared governance aspects of this. This should have been vetted by the senate long before today. I am concerned this is another top down. I am disappointed in that. I have concerns with academic freedom. It seems like for the first time the faculty doesn't control the curriculum, but the government. I am concerned about the ACT

scores. Our ACT scores have been high and they are staying high. We offer a quality education here. It is not a high-ranked school. I am concerned about the students at this school. I am afraid it will drag down our scores.

- Provost – They are in the top tier. In terms of ACT, I don't believe they will be taking the ACT. They will follow the Chinese government rules on applying to their universities. NCUT will be doing the recruiting within China. I think academic freedom will be an issue in some classes. I think we have to decide individually if we can teach in that situation or not. There is no one forcing anyone to teach in China. We have to be careful of what we say. After saying this, we discussed in length the University of Arizona. They have several campuses nationwide. In China, they are teaching law. We asked them about the freedom issue. They say they haven't had any issues. I do imagine if we spoke against the government we would be asked to leave. That is the reality. When I talked with another professor at NCUT, he said we have a lot of freedom but we can't speak against the government.
- Sharon – This was brought to you by Mississippi, why didn't they jump on this?
- Provost – I think it was because of the programs that NCUT is interested in.
- Anne Marie – Obviously we can say anything against someone, are they going to vet textbook or syllabi?
- Provost – Not syllabi, because that is what they want us to bring. The people from Arizona said there were no issues as to what they said in classroom. There were some observers in the class.
- Anne Marie – We would have access to everything online?
- Provost – I don't know for sure but I would assume we would have access to everything we would have here.
- David J. – Could they take online classes here?
- Provost – That hasn't been part of the discussion. It is a good question. I have VPN on my phone and computer and could go directly to my email while I was there. We would be on NCUT campus. WE would have that support structure around us.
- David H. – How would the charger foundation courses be handled?
- Provost – Number of faculty said they would be interested in teaching in China.
- Harry – Would they be paying tuition comparable to our tuition?
- Provost – Our in state rate. The benefit to us is all the facilities, overhead, security, student affairs, counseling would be covered by NCUT.
- Harry – My paycheck would come normal if I were a faculty to teach there
- Provost – Yes.

- **Officer/Committee Reports**
  - Carmen - You received the packet. The first item of business is approve FS minutes.
    - Mike motions that we approve FS minute notes. Tim, on page 3, "but not unanimous". All in favor. Ayes
    - Accept FSEC report: Mike moves. Laird seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry.
  - Christina Carmen, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
    - No report.

- Anne Marie Choup, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
  - We will meet next week to discuss proposals.
- Laird Burns, Finance and Resources Committee Chair
  - The students are finishing applications for RCEU. The deadline for faculty has another week. They have seen applications as they have come in, so they should have some idea.
- Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
  - No report.
- David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
  - We will meet next week to discuss Bill 418.
- Mike Banish, Past/President-Elect
  - No report.
- Kader Frendi, Ombudsperson
  - No report.
- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
  - Chapter 5 was reviewed by the handbook committee.
    - Carmen - – I want to thank Tim and the committee for putting together the latest draft of Chapter 5. I want to open this up for discussion.
    - Tim – Moves the adoption as written. Mike seconds.
    - Carmen – All in favor of this version. Ayes carry. 1 abstains.
- Bill 417:
  - Mike – Motion to bring bill back. Monica seconds.
  - Carmen – ICR. You have seen this before and it has been discussed. Are there further opinions on this?
  - Vladimir – Have you seen the discussion per email?
  - Carmen – Yes.
  - Vladimir – I would propose that we revise the bill in the ways that were discussed in the email.
  - Mike – Did all receive the amendment per email? I motion to accept the amendment. I motion to approve the amendment. Monica seconds.
  - Carmen – All in favor of amendment. Ayes carry.
  - Jeff – The amendment proposes that we sit down and evaluate the set up options and come back with a report. The amendment strikes the graphics. This amendment takes out these specific proposals.
  - Tim – One thing that wasn't clear, is that an additional statement or a replacement?
  - Jeff – It is a removal of the second resolution.
  - Tim – Vladimir, what is your guess about your department if the break out is removed and this is placed.
  - Vladimir – I would think it would make it more palatable.
  - Mike – I read this opposite. I don't necessarily agree with the percentages in there. This basically says that the Provost gets more money.
  - Roy – I didn't understand the nature of the proposal of the distribution. There is no free money and the ICR rate is adjusted by how much we actually spend. That doesn't mean you can't change the distribution. I don't understand the objection.
  - Vladimir – We are against the revision.
  - Roy – Because?
  - Jeff – I do not read the same thing. In respect to your concerns, I propose we remove any example in the proposal. I propose that we engage the faculty senate

to the finance committee to do the review. I ask that goes across the academic units for input.

- Tim – I think having the percentages in there is important. There is a historical reason for them.
- Carmen – There is some science behind it. These numbers are more arbitrary. Everyone wants more money and that is the thought behind it.
- Tim – I think the amendment is good.
- Harry – I want to make sure that I understand the amendment. I don't read the second paragraph has an example.
- Carmen – This is a hard request and if we move this forward and we could get struck down.
- Provost – A review will have to be made.
- Carmen – We take out the numbers and insert the amendment.
- Monica – I move to end debate. Seconded by Roy.
- Carmen – All in favor of ending debate. Ayes carry. 12 oppose. 2 abstain. All in favor of the amendment as it is before you. 28 all in favor. 1 opposed. 10 abstain. Motion carries. All in favor of the bill amended. 28 in favor. 7 opposed. Bill passes second reading.

- Meeting adjourned at 2:19.