
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 19, 2017
12:30 P.M. in NUR 101A

Present: Chris Allport, Milton Shen, Sophia Marinova, Laird Burns, Kevin Bao, David Stewart, David Harwell, Ryan Weber, Joe Conway, David Johnson, Andrei Gandia, Carolyn Sanders, Jeremy Fischer, Anne Marie Choup, Dianhan Zheng, Kyle Knight, Mike Banish, Yu Lei, Tingting Wu, Yuri Shtessel, Fat Ho, James Swain, Kader Frendi, Gang Wang, Christina Carmen, Fran Wessling, Angela Hollingsworth, Ann Bianchi, Sharon Spencer, Monica Beck, Lori Lioce, Amy Hunter, Qingyuan han, Shanhu Lee, Roy Magnuson, Carmen Scholz, Jeff Weimer, Harry Delugach, Tim Newman, Shangbing Ai, Lingze Duan, Vladimir Florinski, Monica Dillihunt, Shannon Mathis, Roy Schwertfeger

Absent w/o Proxy: Earl Wells

Ex-Officio: Provost Christine Curtis

Guest: President Bob Altenkirch

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:52 pm.
- **Meeting Review:**
 - Nepotism Policy – Passed.
 - Bicycle Policy – Passed.
- Motion by Jeff Weimer to approve Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. Seconded by Harry Delugach. Ayes Carry.
- Motion to accept FSEC Report by Laird Burns. Member seconds. Ayes carry.
- **Administrative Reports**
 - President Bob Altenkirch
 - I want to talk about is Board Rule 108. It will be approved in November. It has to do with policies. I have extracted some statements. The statement in italics needs to be published along with the policy website. This statement is in the faculty handbook. It says that if there is a conflict between us and the board, the board prevails. It says that as much as possible the three campuses should be consistent. Someone on the campus will be a designee. Once it is agreed upon, it will be implemented. We will come to a consensus with a policy then it has to be discussed with the system office.
 - We have to make adjustments in the financial management system. There is a decentralized system, the Alabama system is decentralized. We have three units; they are responsible for their revenue, expenses, and system office taxes. The units are responsible for revenue and expenditure. The revenue needs to bigger than the

expenditure and tax. There are no funds at the system level. They tax us every year and spend it. The reserve funds are down at the unit level. A centralized system, revenue comes in and is budgeted out; the revenue is bigger than the sum of all the budgets. Most places wind up in the middle that is where we are. You have revenue coming into one place. Individual units here are not responsible for revenue and are budgeted out. The revenue equals the budget. There is an after the fact tax on residual funds. This flows back up into the central reserve. Before 2007, that percent was 50%. All unspent funds were split to stay with the unit and come back to the reserve. After 2007, the percent of residual funds went to 0%. There was no inflow from to the central reserve, but outflow. You could tax on the back end to compensate.

- Roy – All the salary lines were shifted to the central level. There were a lot of resources shifted to administrative levels after 2007.
 - Bob – Are you talking about the retirement incentive?
 - Roy – Yes.
 - Bob - There were no funds that went into the central reserve. Since you didn't hire everyone at one time, it went back into faculty positions. That program is pretty much done now.
- The central reserve is counted on to cover putting sidewalks in, roofs, maintenance. There is no inflow into this account. It also enters into the audit statement because the residual is counted on to cover investment loss and depreciation. Investment did occur in FY 15. There were not enough funds to cover that. The net asset change was negative. The investment income is generally positive. FY 16 was about \$9M. That comes from the money we have pooled with the system pool. The \$9M was a paper transaction. It isn't money we spend, but the residual has to cover it. Depreciation is the maintenance line. Previously, the board did not require depreciation be entered into the budget, so we placed a zero. Everyone then was hoping the residual would cover the depreciation when put into the audit statement and the loss of the investment income. We need to replenish the reserve. We need to budget depreciation up front because it is being required. I think it is good practice. We have to budget accurately up front and not hope there are unspent funds. The board wants the budget to be accurate. They don't want to see a lot of unspent funds. They want them budgeted up front. For FY 18, recurring funds in vacant positions have been pulled back into a central reserve. If there people in those positions that need to be paid, they will be paid from individual unit reserve funds. That moves funds from the unit reserves to the central reserve to account for having no flow to central. The same thing happens to staff. Then from 2019 and beyond, they will revert to central pools and be budgeted annually. We are trying to get away from unspent funds and build up the central reserve.
- Mike – It seems to be a board rule that says we have to as an individual campus account for a loss in the system investment pool. Why doesn't the board just make a rule saying we don't have to?
 - Bob – The system has no revenue except the tax. There is no way to account for the loss.
 - Mike – It isn't a loss.

- Bob – It’s a paper loss. In the audit statement, if it’s big enough to drown out the residual you will get a negative asset change. That will affect your status for a bond rate and BOT.
 - Roy – I see there are two issues. One is the sensation of moving the goal post. A year or two ago, the university was supposed to account for retirement. Then suddenly the university has requested to set aside for depreciation. Now we have a discussion about retirement investment returns and the shortfall being accompanied at this level. I believe they generally expect a 5-6% return. There is an effect on faculty morale. The goal post keeps moving. I am not saying these are terrible ideas. When you see a progression of them being added each year when resources are tight on the ground. The second general issue is centralization of power. I always thought the middle management was squeezed. I don’t like to see power moved from upper management to central management. That seems like the wrong direction. It is hard for Dean’s to do anything without going up so many chains. I think that we have failed to develop initiative.
 - Bob – What we are talking about is budgeting out what we are going to spend. You have money for initiatives; it’s just coming back in another way. The state has a requirement obligation to retirement. No one seems to be able to explain this. The obligation is on individual agencies books. Year before last we had to put on the books a \$140M obligation. It’s on the books and is not an expenditure that we would ever make. They aren’t paying attention to it. The state wants to show it on each individual agency.
 - Kader – I think what we see here is a constant effort to move around. The faculty morale isn’t there.
 - Bob – The central reserve has to be replenished.
 - Kader – Is there a cap on this central reserve?
 - Bob – We don’t have an experience with excess. I am looking at a management system that will allow us to do two things, replenish the central reserve and on the audit side account for depreciation.
 - Jeff – I understand that depreciation is a capital expense. I am concerned using personnel to do that.
 - Non – We are not using personnel to do that.
 - Jeff – Capturing faculty lines, how is it not the case?
 - Bob – If you look at what we are doing for FY 18, management moves money from the central.
 - Jeff – The experiences that I have gone through is once you capture those positions, they are lost. I have seen that experience in two departments. I am concerned it will happen.
 - Bob – I don’t agree with you.
 - Mike – As far as depreciation goes, according to the budget book up to this FY, tuition fees got rolled into tuition. We were charging the students almost \$7M a year building fees. Where was that money going towards depreciation? Now it has disappeared and has to come from other places.
 - Bob – Those were fictitious. They weren’t split out.
- Provost Christine Curtis

- This will go into the minutes. There is a lot of data on enrollment, housing, and where we stand. I will not go into detail here. Very briefly, I want to remind you we are at 1,345 new freshman and 1,811 new transfer students. Our total graduate enrollment is over 2,000. We are pleased with that. Even though we didn't get as many international students. The really good news is our ACT score is 27.9; we don't have official numbers yet. You can see that we are the highest in the state at this point. I am sure that Auburn and USA will be less. Out of state is 32.1%. That will affect our pell grant rating. This is the 15-16 pell grant data. The low number at Auburn and Alabama is because they bring in so many out of state students. As you bring in more out of state the percentage of pell recipients goes down. Campus housing, we are similar to everyone else. We will have 400 more beds next fall. Retention of our first time full time freshmen, we are at 82%. In order to push graduation up, we have to increase our retention at the first year and each year after.
- With the student success center, we will have a book reading. Dr. McGuire will be coming here in the early spring. We invite you to get the book. It is made available for every faculty member. You are invited to come to the book reading. I am going to have to miss the first two but I hope to make the last. Please read the book and have a discussion. We will announce her dates of coming.
 - Jeremy – Why is our four year graduation rate low? Any guesses?
 - Provost – Our overall graduation rate is lower. We lose students from the freshman to sophomore, but we lose them at every level. That is what we are all trying to work on. We are trying collaborative learning to engage the students. Another thing is we lose them to work. We encourage them to get their degree before going full time in the work force. In polling, there is a wide range of issues. We need to truly engage them in the classroom letting them know we want them here. Anyone with ideas to do this better, we are truly open.
- Lingze – A lot of physics course have been stressed because of the increase of enrollment and less GTA's. Some of the money should go to the colleges to hire GTA's with increased enrollment. I want to ask are there any letters being done to address this issue?
 - Provost- The tuition waivers for GTA's was budgeted in the FY 17 budget. It had never been done before. It was money from the residuals used to pay. We have at last money in the budget for GTA waivers. We still have work to do in terms of budgeting stipends. I have been asking. This year, FY18, we put in about \$1.4M into new faculty. That was tenured track. A large portion of that was in lecture and clinical.

➤ **Officer/Committee Reports**

- Christina Carmen, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
 - From the governance committee, I am working with Joy McClung. She is finalizing the university committee list. Last week, the student affairs advisory board needs volunteers. Some are interested but wanting more information. We need three members right now. This committee meets with other faculty members and student representatives. This provides guidance on anything related to students.
- Anne Marie Choup, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
 - We are going to catch up on all our work when we meet in person next Thursday.
- Laird Burns, Finance and Resources Committee Chair

- We have been working on the faculty call and student calls for RCEU. WE have been working to do this under Charger Path. We have had a few glitches getting that out, but hopefully soon we will have it out.
- David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
 - No report.
- Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
 - We will be talking about retention. We are meeting next Thursday at 12:30 in CTC 101.
- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
 - Vladimir Florinski, Jacob Heerikhuisen, and I put together a report on the OIT policies. They were sent to OIT. I have copies if anyone wants one.
- Mike Banish, Past President/President-Elect
 - From putting stuff together on the past years, we are trying to better understand the UAH budget. We put some stuff together and sent inadvertently. If you want to read the assessment text, you can.
- Kader Frendi, Ombudsperson
 - No report.
- Nepotism Policy
 - This has been tabled in the senate last year. We ran out of time. I understand that there are suggestions.
 - Tim – The President needs a motion to remove from the table.
 - Carmen – Thank you. Do I have motion to remove? Tim moves. Roy seconds. Ayes carry.
 - Roy – I think there is a need for this policy. I believe this policy should be subordinated to the conflict of interests. We already deal with numerous entanglements. We do this under conflict of interest. This is included in Appendix I. My first suggestion is that we tie this into the existing practice. I have some language to do that.
 - Carmen – Right now, this policy is on the books. It is on the President’s page. If you don’t like it, you will have to put a bill forward asking for a replacement to place into faculty handbook appendix I. Is that what you are saying? It is in existence.
 - Roy – I think it is more efficient to have a policy saying nepotism is a conflict of interest and go to appendix I to follow the procedures. Provost can you comment on how you would like to proceed?
 - Provost – It affects more than faculty.
 - Roy – We have that issue in intellectual property.
 - Provost – It needs to be where it is readily available on the policy and procedures.
 - Roy- I think it should point to the appendix.
 - Member- Is the process the same in both.
 - Carmen – Do you want to reference appendix I.
 - Roy – It starts well. The policy isn’t coherent with COI. I think we should say, “any such COI should be reported, as described in appendix I of the faculty handbook, so that an appropriate plan of action can be developed to eliminate, mitigate, or manage the COI.”
 - Jeff – I second that amendment.

- Laird – Who creates the plan of action?
 - Roy – Immediate form of execution by the Chair, then the Dean, it keeps going.
 - Tim – Are you saying the COI specifies those two levels or that is your opinion?
 - Roy – No, the COI already states that.
 - Laird – What happens if a married couple is in a department and one becomes a supervisor?
 - Roy – There are set ways to address those.
 - Laird – We need consistency on how we handle these situations. I like the two level ideas.
 - Mike – It's part of professional review committee.
 - Provost – Does it state when the faculty doesn't disclose?
 - Mike – Yes, it does.
 - Tim – I want to second the amendment. I think it strengthens the policy.
 - Carmen – All in favor of the amendment. Ayes carry. 2 abstain.
 - Roy – the second suggestions is we have a list of actual examples. I suggest that language be changed.
 - Carmen – You want that to replace the existing list?
 - Roy – Yes.
 - Jeff – I understand correctly, you are taking our specific and give general, and that they have to be reported.
 - Roy – Correct.
 - Carmen – Is there a motion of this amendment? Mike seconds. All in favor. Ayes carry. 2 abstain.
 - Tim – I noticed under formal evaluations, I think we unstrike the last sentence. Ayes carry.
 - Roy – Also unstrike the sentence before it.
 - Monica – In nursing, I was a course manager for a course. She didn't get in here. She graduated from USA. Does this say don't bother with applying?
 - Roy – No, it is saying that we are a small community. There is a duty to disclose. In many cases, there are other avenues.
 - Carmen – All in favor of the amended policy. Ayes carry. 1 opposed. Policy passes.
- Bicycle Policy
 - Jeff- I have a request for change. The next to last paragraph, replace second sentence. Cyclist who find themselves sharing the sidewalk with pedestrians must cede the right-away,
 - Carolyn – With all respect, that ain't going to happen. They aren't going to dismount.
 - Mike - Motions to accept amendment. Kader seconds.
 - Laird – I agree with the yielding. Is yield sufficient? Can I stop and stand still? According to the policy, I have to walk.
 - Jeff – Are you saying yield instead of cede?
 - Laird – Can they do something else besides walk?
 - Jeff- I can accept a friendly amendment to the response that “ain't going to happen.”

- Member – When is this policy going to help us? The policy should be based towards things that would help us. If it does help us, we do want some procedure to help us.
- Carmen – All in favor of amendment. Ayes carry. All in favor of policy, ayes carry. 1 abstains.

➤ Motion to adjourn at 2:19 pm.