

Biological Sciences  
Faculty Meeting  
Stephens Room  
February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
Meeting begins at 12:05 p.m.

Jerry LeBlanc: Well we're having technical difficulties. Robert? In the meantime did you have a few items for us?

Robert Anholt reminds faculty of Darwin day (2/11/17) in the NC Museum of Natural Sciences, in which the KECK center will have exhibits, urges all to attend. Reminds faculty of Karen Carleton lecture on 2/9/17. Lastly, reminds faculty on April 22, Earth Day, scientists from all over the world will march in Washington, and he has chartered a bus to take anyone interested in attending. \$45 which will be round trip, leaving at 6 a.m., back at 11 p.m..

[Jerry advises group he has received many questions about the budget, so presents a few slides to explain it and its current and future state.]

Jerry: So this is looking at sources of funding for the department for 2015-16. Total allocations—this is largely tuition. Other things are earmarks, but for the most part it reflects tuition dollars which get back to the department and pay for salaries, and a bit of discretionary.

Summer fund—again largely to salaries, but some funds to run the department.

DE, same kind of situation there.

ETF, perhaps some are familiar with this, but it is earmarked for technology expenses with relation to undergraduate experiences, teaching labs, etc.

Genetics gets money from the provost. We manage it, but that's not ours to play with.

Grant/F&A/Overhead--totally discretionary funds. As head of toxicology, it was always my goal to get half back to the faculty, but when I came on board here, we were successful in giving 25% back. Moving on to 2017, we have no idea how much we'll have yet, and how much if any will be returned to the faculty.

(Expenditure slide) So where does it go? You can see it's heavily weighed to paying salaries. The sad news is we spent more than we brought in. So we were over, and we contributed to the deficit, but considering our size, we did a pretty good job I think. But, the accountants don't care about that, they need to clean up the red.

Supplies goes mainly to start-up packages, so not necessarily ours to run the department. Fixed charges, phones, computers, etc., capital outlay was funding we received to renovate the Stephens room, not a recurring thing.

We are being asked to carry more than our debt alone because the college also generated debt that had to be paid off. So, we made cuts. The red reflects cuts. That does not only reflect the 4 staff members we let go. As for faculty, retirements are returned to the college for 70k, and the rest of the salary goes back to the college and they keep it. Normally the position is left open so that in the future if you so choose you can replace with a tenure-track faculty member. Instead, all retirements and future retirements are not being renewed, so many several faculty positions will be lost. Predictions for recovery are in 17-18, two years out, because we can't pay the debt in one year, and it will take us that long to pay off this debt with the additional faculty positions that will come up in the next two years.

By the end of 17-18 we hope to be back into the black, so I hope that explanation is helpful. Any questions or comments?

Faculty Member A: What are supplies?

Jerry: Anything that anyone with start-up needs, ETF, etc. So, with the cuts, assuming our income stays consistent, we're projecting for 17-18 to have 120k. The college is projecting that in two years we'll be back on track. We are still 3 million in the hole. The provost said, I'll bail you 1.5m, you have to find another 1.5. The dean and associate deans are meeting with me and Lara on Thursday, and it's not a meeting I'm looking forward to.

As for the strategic plan, I've not had much time to address but it is still on the table, the dean is still saying he wants them, so we'll be doing it, but I take responsibility in getting it started.

On to the website, I asked Nate for the launch date. Now that they have the pictures, when's the date? And I saw all the pics from tox and you all look very handsome, but Nate does not have a date; he assures it will happen very soon. There will be a profile spot on the website for undergrads, and we've had a call for nominations; if you've forgotten about it, you got an email, and the last two newsletters included the call, so I encourage you to think about some students that can be featured on the website.

Zoology: I hear from the meetings that things are going well—I hear we have a name—'Biology', so we have a name, and concentrations have been selected.

FM B: Concentrations are Physiology and Behavior, Ecology & Evolution, Cell & Developmental Biology, Aqua Culture & Aquatic Sciences, and in general Zoology I think.

Jerry: So AE has zoology and aquatic something, right?

FM C: Masters in fish in wildlife?

Jerry: So, things are moving well?

FM B: Yeah remarkably well.

FM D: Becky Irwin deserves a lot of credit.

FM B: I think everyone's so fed up they just agreed. [group laughs]

Jerry: Well I think the plan provided by the external review helped.

Ok next up, please remember the joint faculty meeting between COS/CHASS (2/15 from 3-6). I don't know what to expect exactly but there's going to be free beer so, make an effort to go. I think we need to be supportive and maybe some good things will come out of it.

We had some discussions about cluster hires the last time we got together and Dahlia told us about a Microbiome cluster candidate. Well it turns out there are now 2 individuals that are interested in BioSci, and my inclination was to say, we don't have any money, but I felt we had to be at least good community members, and take part in the interview process. As for dates, you'll get more info on that.

[Edit: Since faculty meeting we have learned of a third Microbiome cluster candidate. All candidates and seminar dates are as follows, an open session for BioSci faculty was included for Eric Libby and Karthik Anantharaman.]

**Karthik Anantharaman:** 2/16 from 1:30-3:30 p.m., Stephens Room

**Eric Libby:** 2/20 from 9-11 p.m., Stephens room

**Nicole Vega:** 2/23 from 1-2, Stephens room, 2-3 faculty session in 3508 Thomas]

Ok, a little bit about the BFF Program: Some of you might be familiar with it, but it's an annual event where the university invites individuals who aspire to a career in academia, typically from institutions where they don't get good exposure. It's basically a training opportunity to get them in and work with them. Typically post-docs but some grad

students, as well. One is a neurophysiologist, Michael Sidorov, who is coming for a department visit on March 16<sup>th</sup>. The university does everything, but our responsibility is to host a short seminar at 2 p.m. and I have asked the neuro faculty to be present, but it will be open to the department. Motivation for us is that it will be an opportunity to learn about some great new science, but to add feedback and advance his development and training for a career in academia.

Ok, information about the DE certificate program. Elizabeth Thompson is taking the lead. Elizabeth?

Elizabeth: Hi everyone, thanks. So this certificate is a project I'm working on with Jane and Tim, and the College of Education to create an online certificate in biological sciences available to in-service (working) teachers and/or teachers in graduate education programs. Most would be high school teachers, but also possibly middle and elementary teachers, as well. We'd like to make it available in summer of 2018, so right now DELTA is doing a feasibility study. If all is good we'll be looking for instructors to teach online courses in the program, which is a 12 credit certificate program. They'll be able to pick 4 3-credit classes that really serve to basically fill in any gaps where they feel their knowledge is weak or they would like to know more about.

Jerry: I received an email from Stefan Franzen, who was the individual who introduced the STEM study abroad program. He wanted to let me know that 40 students signed up for summer and he's thrilled at that number the 1<sup>st</sup> time around. He did make a point that BioSci was a bit underrepresented in that number, so I told him we'd be thinking about how to make our students more aware. We have some faculty going to work with the faculty there in the program (Poland). Structure is like a DE course in terms of how the dollars are coming in.

Reminder for calls that have gone out for awards: University Awards for Excellence, so if you have someone in your lab, a colleague that's not faculty, please nominate them. Pride of the WolfPack, deadline is much later, but again, you have emails, and if you need directions Kathleen can help you but both nominations forms are online. That's all I have. What do you want to talk about?

FM A: I don't want to open a can of worms, but the budget discussions seems very, "there's a problem, there's no solution". And I've been chewing on this and what I think is a myth that dean Bristol introduced that research doesn't pay. From a researcher's perspective, it obviously does pay. The university gets 51.5% of every dollar I bring in. It didn't occur to me until you were going through this--if they're asking us to pick up start up for new faculty, but only 2% of the research dollars we earn are tricking back to us, I think there's tricky accounting going on here, and I think you're in a position to articulate that.

FM D: Graduate Students bring in dollars. I'm more concerned that we are losing faculty and not hiring to replace them. We're going to have a very hard time to get good people to come here. If we have strong research programs, the budget will solve itself, but if we do this the other way around, you seal the fate of the department and we might as well pack up and go home.

FM A: For example, this microbiome candidate, if he/she is going to make money for the university that's one thing, but if not...

FM E: I'm glad this came up. The grants we bring in not only support the grad students, training grants, etc., but they also help to support infrastructure; if we get a grant and we don't get the overhead back, we're not able to keep the infrastructure, and it's not just for individual labs, it's for equipment that everybody can sign up and use, these are important.

Jerry: I think everyone recognizes our mission, which is 3 fold, teaching, research and public outreach, and as a research institution, research is a big part of our mission, and no question that grants bring in good money. But there are a lot of things that go into supporting research. Things like libraries, animal facilities, health and safety, all the things we have to do to allow research to happen here.

FM: I asked the chancellor, and he said we are threatened by the legislature. Faculty at other institutions get 25% overhead back, and they have great libraries, I don't understand where the money goes.

FM A: An alternative model is UNC; faculty gets 0 overhead, but the department gets 25% back to run the dept.

FM B: I don't know how we're expected to replace equipment under 50k on grants.

[Group discussion of where overhead goes.]

FM: The provost is running things more and more and cutting at the department at the knees.

Jerry: I'm sure information on where the overhead goes exists, I'll ask for it.

FM E: For the department, a fund for replacing large equipment items that are essential for our science infrastructure is really important and I don't think we have a mechanism at all to do that, do we?

Jerry: No. We have a discretionary fund for things like meals, events, graduation, etc., and the college is supposed to give us 5k a year. They didn't give it to us last year, or this year, so we're running in the negative, and they've just started locking the account. Rejecting purchases. College has our ETF funds and they want us to prepare a spreadsheet of how we're spending that money. We're almost at the end of the year, and we're talking about this year's ETF. Not only did they want to know how we spent it, down to the dollar, but also how we're going to spend it to the end of this fiscal year. They want every item, PO (purchase order) number, dollar item, what it's used for, etc....

FM: Can't they just pull that?

FM: Is that driven by Bristol and his people?

Jerry: Partly, but Lee Ann will be making these decisions.

FM: We have always had to lay out a plan of how we're going to spend it.

Jerry: They want to start going through it with a red pen.

FM F: What about smaller items? Faculty needs new computer, chair is standing on 3 legs; are we going to just have to have to pay out of pocket?

Jerry: We will look at items like that on a case-by-case basis.

FM F: This is getting to be a breakdown of trust between faculty and the college.

Jerry: For me, it's not a matter of trust. It's a matter of frustration. I'm meeting with the dean and I'm prepared to tell him, 'just tell me what programs we've got to cut'.

Anything else? Hang in there. Let me do the worrying.

FM F: I came out of the poorest, smallest department in the college [CALs], and we still had money to cover things as they came up.

[Discussion comes to a close.]

Jerry: Alright, thanks.

Meeting concludes at 12:49.