

**Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting
of the Faculty Senate, APSU
January 30, 1997**

Senators Present: James Bateman, Patrick Bunton, Art Carpenter, Bruce Childs, Don Dailey, Thomas Dixon, Sue Cloud Evans, Daniel Frederick, Mark Ginn, James Goode, Buddy Grah, Kay Haralson, Carlette Hardin, Tom King, Larry Lowrance, Ramon Magrans, Maureen McCarthy, Bruce Myers, Stephanie Newport, David O'Drobinak, Michael Phillips, Jennie Preston-Sabin, Steve Ryan, William Renkl, Abu Sarwar, Lori Slavin, Linda Thompson, David Till, Victor Ukpolo, Mickey Wadia, M.D. Waheeduzzman, Nancy Wright.

Meeting Called to Order: 3:30 pm

Agenda was approved.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 11, 1996 were approved.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

President's Report delayed until Dr. Rinella arrives.

TBR Subcouncil - Dr. Dolores Gore, ex. officio: Information should be forthcoming after the next meeting of the TBR Subcouncil.

Academic Council - Dr. Mike Phillips:

1. Handout distributed on calendar changes.
2. The committee dealing with the core is meeting soon, report will be made at a later date.
3. If there is anything to be brought before Academic Council, let Mike Phillips know.

Deans Council Report delayed until Dr. Maureen McCarthy arrives.

SLRP Committee Report delayed until Dr. Wayne Chaffin arrives.

OLD BUSINESS

1. The Process for Academic Reorganization and Reidentification Recommendation given to VPAA Dr. Steven Pontius is being negotiated. Status of the recommendation will be reported at the next meeting.
2. **Faculty White (B) Committee report on Evaluation of Academic Administration, Buddy Grah, Chair:** The committee will meet early next week. Information has been gathered, we have the form that was previously used to evaluate administrators. This form was redesigned by a faculty committee. We could use this form with minor adaptations. Questions to be answered: Who should be evaluated? VPAA, Deans, Department Chairs? President? Does the administration have to agree to this process? At some institutions the president has refused to participate. Is it mandated by TBR?
Dolores Gore: I don't think it is mandated by TBR, but it is recommended. Several universities do have an evaluation process for administrators.
Buddy Grah: Who is going to provide the funds and tabulate the forms?
Discussion of who should be evaluated: We may not want to do Chairs because they are already evaluated. We do not want to evaluate those in interim positions. The President should be evaluated.
Buddy Grah: The committee will provide the Faculty Senate a recommendation after looking at the issues and input from the Faculty Senate will then be sought. If there are any questions or comments please call or e-mail me.
David Till: The evaluations in the past were called **perception studies**, which served to forestall hostile responses.
Discussion of evaluation of chairs: Q: What happens if a chair thinks they are a chair for life or does not perform his/her job or act in a professional manner? **What is the recourse? A:** There is a mandated review of chairs every four years. Any faculty member that behaves in an unprofessional manner can be charged.
Comment: Chairs should be monitored. **Comment:** The type of evaluation proposed for administration would probably not involve chairs, since this is already done every four years.

David Till: These issues do not begin or end with the Faculty Senate. I will try to find out where this procedure should take place.

The committee will report at a future senate meeting.

Arrival of President Sal Rinella

President Sal Rinella:

1. The FAST FACTS, a report done annually and produced by Dennie Burke's office, was distributed. This report is enclosed with letters about APSU used in recruitment. Important data on the report: increase in ACT scores, which are at an all time high. Average ACT scores of entering freshman has increased to 21.5.
2. Dr. Rinella thanks the Senate for the recommendations given to the President and the Vice President by David Till from the Faculty Senate meeting in December. The Process for Academic Reorganization is being worked on with Dr. Pontius. This process is long overdue. Faculty Senate Vice President is working with Dr. Pontius on the document and will have it ready to come back to the Faculty Senate by the next meeting.
- * 3. Documents concerning the budget are available in the library, including individual salaries. All are invited to look at these documents. The documents do not always reflect the way we organize ourselves, but are numbers being used to report to external agencies. Ideally, we will someday have a BLUE BOOK explaining the budget.
4. Dr. Rinella feels one of the problems at Austin Peay is that we do not have very many formal rules of engagement, we largely operate informally. The budget is especially important. The problem on campus is that we do things without consulting one another. The budget has been a bottom up process, with departments suggesting what they want and the President making the final decision. President Rinella does not want to operate this way. He would like to see a defined plan with values and activities listed put in logical order to achieve the ultimate end. Dr. Rinella is attempting to establish a strategic long range plan, and considers the opinions of the faculty and the Faculty Senate very important to him. He feels he will not accomplish anything without faculty support and has tried very hard to achieve this.
5. Handout distributed on committees and task forces established since January 1995. There have been 22 committees in which faculty have had input in the last two years, i.e. Enrollment Management Task Force, Science Building. Out of respect for the committees with whom he works, Dr. Rinella cannot think of a single recommendation that has come from a committee that has not been honored, or one requested that has been denied. He appreciates the faculty taking time to make this a better university.
6. Concerning the organizational structure of the budget, it is imperative that we create logical systems of process. **The SLRP committee will become the principal advisors to represent faculty, students and alumni on all issues relative to resource management.** Space allocation and fund-raising needs to be looked at by the SLRP committee. In Dr. Rinella's view there is no question that there should be more input by the faculty in budget decisions. Many things have been accomplished because of the cooperation between administration and faculty: the new University Center, Science Building, Enrollment Management, the Environmental Geography major. Dr Rinella is committed to shared governance and is open to listening to problems.
7. We have an improved reporting system (handout distributed), **Internal Reallocations Plan** used in proposed 96-97 budget allocations. Major objectives were identified: 1) instruction 2) development. We realized we had to redirect a lot of dollars into instruction to avoid cutting positions and managed to have no reduction in instruction. (Handout distributed concerning cut back of jobs at University of Memphis.) We were badly underfunded in development and had to move over \$900,000 from non-academic areas to fund instruction. This money came from student affairs, and finance and administration. (Handout distributed on where the money went.)
8. Dr. Rinella has a vision that the SLRP committee will begin deliberations every year with a picture of where we are. We are required to have 2% of our budget set aside, this year we have only 1½% set aside. **The SLRP committee will be the way in which faculty has significant involvement in budget planning and will provide input to the administration on budget issues.** The President's Cabinet is the same group of people as before, with only the name changed. The Cabinet will make the final decisions, with the Vice President accountable for these decisions. The Vice President needs to hold the Deans accountable for their communication of facts to the Chairs and faculty. Dr. Rinella has heard over and over that messages do not get down to faculty. **Dr. Rinella does not feel at ease with having two faculty on the President's cabinet, sees no value in adding two faculty, but feels this has nothing to do with openness. He wants to use the faculty on the SLRP Committee to accomplish faculty input.** If there were two faculty members on the Cabinet, then students and staff would have the right to ask for representatives also. He wants the Cabinet to be open, to know who we are and coordinate with the Strategic Long Range Planning Committee.

Proposals such as this usually come out of frustration, reaction over issues, or the faculty feeling powerless and he does not want to base decisions on things of this type. **Dr. Rinella fundamentally disagrees with the Faculty Senate on this issue and declines to accept this recommendation.** The data in the handout was not produced solely for this meeting. A staff member in the budget office, Sondra Hamilton, is solely handling the budget. Questions?

9. Question and Answers:

- Q:** We are at the bottom of pecking order on salary, we have been promised salary increases for years, but none have been forthcoming. In the last 10 years we have probably lost due to inflation. At the same time we see management increasing and the university becoming top heavy. We would like to see a President that would deliver us from "40 years in the desert".
- A:** I will try to provide the information to the Chancellor necessary to make sure the salary study is done in a way to get more money. MTSU and TSU had budget proposals approved as a result of salary studies. Steve Anderson, Dolores Gore and Robbie Robison were on a committee which defined the way formula funding is applied. In 98-99, Gov. Sundquist has indicated that universities will be fully funded. This will not come from new money, but from moving the \$120,000,000 currently being used by K-12 to higher education. Should we put all the money into salaries or in other areas such as technology? The state has a very unstable revenue base with a shortfall of \$100,000,000 in November, by the end of December this had decreased to \$65,000,000 due to robust holiday sales. January is looking good and we could get half-way there. We may have a flat budget next year and may have to have a tuition increase to provide for inflation increases and promotion increases. We will have to make another year of reductions in some areas, and this year it may not be possible to hold academic areas harmless. Faculty may be impacted in the next reduction pattern. I plan to ask the SLRP Committee's advice on how these cuts should be made.
- Q:** What about the impoundment?
- A:** An impoundment is not likely for this year.
- Q:** There is a sense of faculty discomfort. It seems the faculty is not nervous about their participation in the planning stage or the reporting stage of the budget, but are nervous about how plans are taken and implemented and how closely plans are followed. Faculty need a way to provide input when individuals are making the crucial decisions.
- A:** At the moment decisions are made, ultimately the decision belongs with the VPAA, who is to be accountable to the faculty. If this works well the decision about money will come from the SLRP committee. We may disagree, but we need to explain it honestly. Faculty need to rely on Chairs, Deans, etc. and not look to people higher up, more has to happen at this level. The fact that we did not take issue with the recommendations from various Task Forces is because they were so good.
- Q:** Are you saying that the SLRP Committee, as presently constituted and functioning, with faculty representatives on it (Wayne Chaffin as VP of Faculty Senate), is aware of all monies available in all areas, and that they decide how much to allocate in areas? Do they talk about numbers and is this information shared with faculty? Before decisions come to the VP is there time for faculty to know about plans, before the decisions are made?
- A:** I would not want information to go to the SLRP Committee and be distributed. The information needs to go to Deans, with the Deans having faculty meetings and faculty expressing opinions. I will institute a spring convocation, presenting the entire university's budget for the last year. I don't think it will be successful if another group has to be in the loop. The SLRP Committee is going to be held accountable. People will have input there. Maybe we need town hall meetings, or university committees having an open forum for faculty to speak their minds.
- Q:** A point I would like to make is the number of "surprises" that have occurred, with changes affecting the classroom. We are suddenly told we cannot do something. Faculty are getting things coming from nowhere.
- A:** I do not think that is a problem I can address. The summer school budget has been in process for months. There seems to be a major problem every month, the "hiccup of the month". We need to provide information to faculty.
- Q:** Very few people knew that the summer school budget was \$850,000 or that more had been spent last year which forced a decrease this year. This has an effect on faculty morale.
- A:** We could have found the money. This is something Steve (Pontius) will have to address.
- Q:** How was the budget for summer determined?
- A:** Steve (Pontius), working with the Deans, did a fairly thoughtful job. Faculty salaries during the summer should be based on true academic needs. The question is what is that number? We need to analyze. Dr. Pontius had a budget and he worked within that budget.

Comment made out of order by Dean Cooter: (Approval had not been passed to allow non-senators to speak to the issues.) In the two years since I have been here, the budget was in an awful situation. We were operating like a small college. There was no budget, you just asked for what you wanted (courses) and it either happened or not. Good things are happening at Dean's Council. Things once mystified are becoming defined. Before, the summer budget was not known. Even though there are some negatives, we at least know where we stand, we are getting our house in order. Steve (Pontius) is a linear thinker, a micro-manager. The end result will be that in a year or two, we will know where the money is. Before, we did not know there were any choices.

A: Next year the summer budget will be laid out by departments. We will determine what the summer school program needs to be at APSU.

Q: The salary study might be a misperception. Are we trying to justify that we are good enough for salary increases, or is it an attempt to find the money for justified increases?

A: None of these. We must determine what our salary scale needs to be, based on averages across the state. We may need to have salary increases for 3 or 4 years to get us up to other schools. We can phase this in when money becomes available in 98-99. Faculty members deserve salaries comparable to other institutions. If you have any doubts about the budget figures, please ask me.

Dr. Rinella departs.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONTINUED

Deans Council- Dr. Maureen McCarthy:

1. **Question:** Is Wayne Chaffin our representative from Faculty Senate to the SLRP Committee or was he appointed by the President?

Answer: The Vice President of the Faculty Senate is automatically appointed to this committee.

Question: When did this method of representation begin?

Answer: Major changes in the SLRP committee were made last year (1995-96). Radical changes have been made since the hiring of Dr. Carol Kominski.

2. Wayne Chaffin has done a lot of work with Dr. Pontius on the wording of the Reorganization recommendation. With some revision of wording, Dr. Pontius has agreed to the recommendation. The spirit of the document has been retained.

3. The proposed spring calendar was distributed. There is still discussion concerning Veterans' Day.

4. Under discussion in the Deans Council is a Teaching Capacity Model to be used in determining reassigned time. Reassigned time to be allotted each department will be determined by an equation based on several criteria: number of faculty, number of students, number of majors, number of minors, number of advisees, etc. There is a movement in place to specifically outline each faculty member's duties for which reassigned time is granted. The present structure shows who has reassigned time, but not what duties are expected. The issue is accountability.

5. A search has begun for a Director of the Solutions Center.

6. A proposal was made for an FN Grade. (Failure due to non attendance.)

7. **David Till:** The reorganization proposal looks good. The revised document will be sent to all senators when we get final wording.

8. **Question:** Concerning reassigned time, how do we account for this in the department?

Answer: The intent is to make the document listing all persons receiving reassigned time and what their responsibilities are available to all in an attempt to hold each person accountable.

SLRP Committee - Dr. Wayne Chaffin not present: No report.

OLD BUSINESS CONTINUED

3. **Discussion on recommendation to the President that two faculty members be involved in the budget process:** **Buddy Grah** - The function of the SLRP Committee is going through a lot of changes, and making long range plans for the university. SACS requires that the budget process be tied to the plan. There has been no discussion of budget on the SLRP Committee thus far. The SLRP Committee has not made any decisions, but is obtaining information on how things tie together.

Discussion on how members to the SLRP Committee are chosen: The SLRP Committee is not one of the regular Standing Committees, however it is believed that the Faculty Senate makes recommendations for the membership. If the members are recommended by the Faculty Senate and not chosen by the

President, this process might work.

David Till: I will find out the procedure for SLRP Committee appointments.

Buddy Grah: I asked to be put on the SLRP Committee when the forms came out for requests for committee assignments.

David Till: In what way does the SLRP Committee make suggestions on budget issues? What counts is the way faculty can participate in the process of budget allocations. I cannot tell from the President whether he intends for this to happen.

Buddy Grah: I expect the SLRP Committee to develop a procedure for making budget recommendations. I advise everyone to look at the plan and give us feedback. The plan changes as a result of faculty input.

Comments: We need to see that the faculty are aware of the importance of this committee. They need to be viewed as representatives of the faculty if this is our way to have input. We have not seen this committee as a committee of authority. Is this the place to go with complaints?

Buddy Grah: Only with the change in administration has the SLRP Committee been used in a major planning process. For a long time the committee had very little visibility. There is nothing in the plan that would address the issue of summer school.

Comment: This is not a committee that looks at short term decisions.

Comment: The President feels the nature of the SLRP Committee is evolving, but currently is not a means to address short term decisions.

4. **Status report on COAS Dean search: Steve Ryan** - We have between 75 and 80 candidates, 11 or 12 have been eliminated on the basis of 3 criteria: degree, years teaching, and administrative experience. There are 65 candidates left in the pool of applicants. The committee is currently narrowing the field down to 20 and will then compile a top 10 list.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Discussion of future meeting times:** Due to the common hour, to continue meeting on Thursdays after classes are over, would mean a meeting time of 3:50. Senate meetings seem to be getting longer. Suggestion was made that we have two meetings each month, one devoted to communication from the President and Vice President and the other solely for faculty to discuss issues of concern and conduct business. Some expressed a desire to have one of the meetings at the common hour. Others mentioned that the common hour is being taken up with other meetings and that Ft. Campbell and Nursing faculty would have a hard time meeting during the common hour. A suggestion was made to have two afternoon meetings beginning at 3:50. **Motion made to have two meetings a month as designated by the Executive Committee.**

Discussion: The responsibility of being a Faculty Senator should be taken seriously and arrangements made to stay until the end of the meeting, whenever that might occur. If there are two meetings a month, the number of meetings missed should not be held against someone who cannot attend. Suggestion was made to survey the Senators on preferred times.

Motion passed with one vote in opposition.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:35 pm

FSminJan.30

