
The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is
scheduled for Thursday, October 16, 1997
at 3:30 p.m. in KB, Room 119

Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting
of the Faculty Senate, APSU
September 18, 1997

Senators Present: Steven Anderson, Dewey Browder, Lori Buchanan, Patrick Bunton, Willodean Burton, Wayne Chaffin, Bruce Childs, Debbie Cochener, Sue Cloud Evans, Daniel Frederick, Meredith Gildrie, James Goode, Dolores Gore, Buddy Grah, Ronald Gupton, Carlette Hardin, Max Hochstetler, Tom King, J. D. Lester, Larry Lowrance, Ramon Magrans, Rebecca McMahan, Bruce Myers, Stephanie Newport, David O'Drobinak, George Pesely, Michael Phillips, Bert Randall, Steve Ryan, Paul Shaffer, Lori Slavin, Linda Thompson, Gloria Wacks, M.D. Waheeduzzman, and Nancy Wright.

Meeting Called to Order: 3:25 p.m.

The Senate has three requests for attendance by nonfaculty: APSU student, Christy Lombardo; The All State representative, Alicia Morehead, and Jennie Preston-Sabin who is directing a grant and thus no longer has faculty status.

Motion made to approve attendance of Jennie Preston-Sabin, seconded, approved unanimously.

Motion made to approve attendance of student, Christy Lombardo, seconded, approved unanimously.

Motion made to approve attendance of The All State representative without restrictions, seconded, approved by voice vote. Guests invited to return to meeting.

Welcome to New Senators: Lori Buchanan from the Library as new Senator from Education and Gloria Wacks from Nursing as the new Senator from Applied Science.

Agenda approved with following amendments:

1. Added Nominations & Elections Committee Report before Budget Oversight Committee Report (10 minutes)
2. Move Reports from Committee to Review Deans' Council Recommendations on Reorganization Policy and Other Reorganization Issues and Committee to Examine New Philosophy Statement, Faculty Handbook and Academic Affairs Personnel Policy Handbook prior to Discussion of Dr. Randall's Address.

Addendum to Minutes distributed by Senator from Business. Discussion of issues related to detailed minutes versus minutes containing only actions taken by Senate. **Motion made to attach addendum to minutes, no second, motion died. Motion made to approve minutes as circulated, seconded. Minutes from August 28, 1997 approved without corrections.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS (From Dr. Randall)

1. Apology made to The All State representative for any implication that she was responsible for the lack of clarity in The All State article. Dr. Randall indicated that he was responsible for any lack of clarity that the letter to the TBR was sent by the Executive Committee, not the Senate.
2. Senators interested in participating in the Homecoming event, "Family Feud," asked to contact Judy Blain at Ext. 7667.
3. Senate sponsored Open Forum on Monday, September 22 at 3:00 p.m. in the UC Ballroom. Dr. Rinella will address the Mercer Study.

NANCY JANE DULNIAK
P.O. BOX 4595

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

President Rinella Out of Town

Dr Pontius:

1. College of Education Dean's Search Committee has been appointed. Job description has been developed and it will be placed in appropriate journals and **The Chronicle**. Plans are to announce the new Dean by April 15, 1998.

2. **Academic reorganization** - In August, the Dean's Council committee submitted to the Senate a revised draft of the Process for Academic Reorganization Reidentification. I met with the Senate Committee yesterday to review their proposal. I appreciate Dr. Hardin's and the committee's efforts to improve the process. As discussed with the Senate Executive Committee in our meeting last week, the reorganization proposals will be placed on hold until the revised process is approved. A letter will be sent to the faculty informing them of this decision.

3. **FCC Budget** - Copy of spreadsheet of FCC budget for academic years since 1994 distributed to the Senate. Total budget has been consistent each year but the amount spent for academic and technical areas has shifted based upon demand for courses. Once the Fall I budget is posted to accounts, the budget including adjunct and overload salaries will go to the academic areas on campus and it will be broken down by department.

Q: It appears in the breakdown that the academic areas have received slightly more money than the technical. Is this the case?

A: Yes, the amounts have varied some based upon demand.

Q: Since the academic courses have been packed and the technical ones have not been, can more money be allocated for academic?

A: Dr. Hunt and Ms. Black are examining this. It is a complex issue since many of the courses are geared to the needs of the military. We are considering offering more academic courses as mini-sessions.

Q: It seems that money will come to the departments prior to it being spent. When will the money be in departmental budgets?

A: Once the decision is made on what will be allocated to each College, the Deans will decide how it will be divided by department.

Q: Is the budget set for the coming academic year?

A: It will be divided into Fall II, Spring and Summer just as it has been in past years.

Q: Is this the final budget, can it be revised or changed?

A: If there is a documented need to increase it, we can examine it. For example, we are looking at providing graduate courses in education at FCC since an interest has been expressed in that area. Murray State is bringing a graduate MBA program there. We need to bring forward new programs.

Q: Are the tuition and fees the same at FCC as at Main?

A: We give scholarships to be competitive with Hopkinsville Community College. There is a difference in the fee scale.

Comment: The active military have a reduced tuition, and they do not pay an activity fee or technology fee.

Q: What will happen if the demand for courses increases to more than the budget? Would we offer another course or increase the size of the current courses?

A: We can add classes but would have to look at the budget and shift funds. There would probably be an increase in demand for some and a decrease in demand for others. The Deans would have to work with FCC and consider who is teaching the courses since there would be a difference in salary for junior and senior faculty.

Thank you for your attendance Dr. Pontius. Dr. Pontius departs.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Response to Dr. Rinella's Comments to Senate: (Synopsis)

The Executive Committee decided that some response to Dr. Rinella's comments to the Senate at the last meeting was in order. A response is in order for four reasons: 1) inconsistencies in the remarks, 2) problems in communication between the President and the last three Executive Committees, 3) failure to respond would be dishonorable to faculty who have expressed support of the Senate's action, and 4) it would be a violation of dozens of staff who have communicated the unhealthy atmosphere of intimidation and fear in which they work. Prior to addressing specifics, I want to place them in the context that the President is ultimately accountable for whatever

happens on campus.

I have three reflections on Dr. Rinella's comments. First, Dr. Rinella's implication that the Senate Executive Committee meant to hide the letter from the Senate is an *ad hominem* argument. In the address Dr. Rinella complimented Dr. Pontius for circulating the letter, but the Executive Committee had been informed by the President that university administrators had no right to distribute the letter without Dr. Smith's permission. His comments are inconsistent and the issue of confidentiality he raises is a red herring. Second, the letter was sent after hearing from the President that he stood behind the VPAA's decision relative to the Graduate School and that the matter was closed. This does not constitute open communication. In response to a question concerning Board policy he indicated that everything had been done according to Board policy. In examining TBR minutes there are no records of TBR approval of a number of changes over the last two years. If the changes had been approved Dr. Rinella could have presented documentation to that effect which would have put an end to any questions about violations of policy. Third, his comment that 'TBR policy only serves as a guideline and is not meant to stifle imaginative leadership is a troubling and questionable interpretation of TBR policy and guideline statements. Finally, the comment attributed to Dr. Pontius, "that since the Senate has raised the question of SACS accreditation in connection with the Graduate School it is my responsibility to check it out," is an example of administrative decisions being made without adequate consideration of the consequences.

As examples of the kind of reasoning, Dr. Rinella uses to justify decisions, I share two examples. First, in a meeting with Dr. Rinella concerning the reasons for Dr. Campbell's dismissal, he stated the most important reason he had to remove her as Dean was an error made and acknowledged by another administrator. When questioned about this, he replied that even if the error was made by the other administrator it was still Dr. Campbell's fault since she should have noticed it and notified that administrator of the error. Secondly, last Spring when six assistant professors were promoted to associate professor and they were given the usual 5% raise, they were still \$1000 - \$3000 below the base salary (\$34,000) for associate professors. When they appealed to Dr. Pontius, his response was that it was a matter of equity and would be referred to the Mercer study. When these associate professors appealed to Dr. Rinella, he indicated that all of them would be raised to \$34,000 floor salary for associate professors. When they appealed the leveling out of their salaries, Dr. Rinella told them that the university did not have the money to do anything else. Decision made! Meeting over! Let me explain more fully. One of these associate professors had been here 19 years, one 14 years with two merit raises, one 14 years with one merit raise and one unfunded merit raise, and one 7 years with one unfunded merit raise. When he gave them all the same raise he took away any salary differential for length of service and meritorious service. When Dr. Rinella was confronted with this, he indicated it was unfortunate but that length of service did not mean quality of service and that some of the faculty thought merit increases should be done away with. This attitude indicates that he does not value length of service or quality of service.

While Dr. Rinella has inherited many problems from prior administrators, these are examples of ways in which he is making decisions which are adding to the inequities rather than correcting them. These decisions are just some of the reasons the letter had to be sent. These instances are just a few of the many things communicated to me in the last few months which are clear violations of the moral principles I communicated in my first comments to the Senate in June. I promise to go the extra mile with anyone on campus who struggles to implement these principles which are necessary for just and respectable treatment of human beings and to criticize decisions which violate them. (Copies of full address available upon request from Dr. Randall.)

2. Approval of New Senate Committee Members: Motion made to add Glen Carter, Bob Sears, and Jane Dillard to the Committee to Review Deans' Council Recommendations on Reorganization Policy and Other Reorganization Issues, seconded, approved. Motion made to add Lori Buchanan to Committee to Study Internal Salary Equity and Review Present Policies Concerning and the Mercer Data, seconded, approved.

Prior to beginning reports from committees, we need to address recognition of Committee members who are not Senators. Since they are involved in work of the Senate, we need to allow them to speak. **Motion made to allow Non-Senator Committee members to speak from the floor, seconded, approved.**

3. Report from Committee to Review Deans' Council Recommendations on Reorganization Policy and Other Reorganization Issues: Dr. Hardin indicated that the present process was approved by the Faculty Senate in March 1997. In August, the Senate received a revision from the Dean's council for review. The committee began by reviewing TBR policies on reorganization. The committee has several concerns about the current policy and the proposal from the Dean's Council. One concern is the use of the word "interim" in reference to reorganization. According to TBR policy there can be interim people but not interim departments. TBR was called to clarify. It was

indicated that there could be no "interim" reorganization and that before any changes could take place they must be approved according to TBR guidelines and timetable. The word interim needs to be removed. Secondly, the Deans Council's proposal adds that an "individual" can submit a proposal for reorganization. That could mean that in one department five different individuals could send forward five different proposals or someone not in that department could send forward a proposal. Also, in the Dean's Council proposal two paragraphs have been combined changing the procedure slightly. Issues that need to be dealt with include: 1) that any proposal coming forward must be sent to the unit or body being affected for discussion, 2) that alternative proposals must be sent to the affected unit for review, and 3) the timetable does not follow TBR guidelines.

The Committee is bringing forward a revised proposal which includes the following changes:

- 1) Addition of a philosophy statement,
- 2) Deletion of "interim" from the definition,
- 3) Addition that the appointment of an interim administrator does not constitute an academic reorganization,
- 4) Deletion of an "individual" as an initiator of a proposal,
- 5) Adding that regardless of the level at which a proposal was initiated, it must go through the process,
- 6) Adding that all alternative proposals must be reviewed by affected areas before they are forwarded to the next level,
- 7) Adding TBR guidelines related to approval,
- 8) Modifying time line to comply with TBR timetable.

In meeting with Dr. Pontius yesterday, he indicated that he had no problems with the Committee's revised process.

Q: Should not the Academic Council be involved in the process for review, they are not included in the proposal?

A: Yes, I agree. Please give me suggestions. E-mail me your concerns prior to the next committee meeting.

Please send any comments to Dr. Hardin by Monday, September 23 at 10 am.

Motion made to Table proposal from Dean's Council received by Senate in August, seconded, approved.

Discussion of announcement made by Dr. Pontius that proposals received under current process are on hold. There is process in place which would allow them to go forward which was approved by the Senate last March. Issue raised about approval of current interim reorganizations. Senate informed that APSU reorganization is on TBR agenda for September 25, 1997. Discussion held until after the other Committee reports.

5. Report from Committee to Examine New Philosophy Statement, Faculty Handbook and Academic Affairs

Personnel Policy Handbook: Dr. Pesely reported that most of the comments received are minor editorial changes.

Major concerns expressed relate to the paragraph on mentoring and include deleting the entire idea, deleting the connection to the evaluation process, and changing the wording to reflect that it is a departmental decision. Another major issue addressed changing the wording in paragraph four to reflect that research is valuable in its own right as an advancement of knowledge, not just for its connection to teaching. Finally, there is a need to address the inconsistencies in paragraph five between "being strong in one area" and having "a balance in all three."

Comment: The idea of mentoring is a serious concern. If the mentor is assigned and the person they are mentoring does not receive retention or tenure, could the mentor be sued for not fulfilling the implied obligation to the person they are mentoring?

Comment: Mentoring grows out of a relationship between two people. Assigning a mentor does not fit the definition of mentoring as I understand it.

Comment: Some of the problems can be dealt with by changing the wording from "will" to "may."

Response: The committee will consider these issues. Please talk with your departments and send comments.

Q: Didn't Dr. Pontius want us to vote on this at this meeting.?

A: Yes, but one problem we have is pushing to get something done before there is time for full consideration and reflection on the consequences. We can delay.

Please send comments on Philosophy Statement to Dr. Pesely no later than Friday, October 10.

6. Report from Nominations & Elections: Dr. Randall gave report for Dr. Shaffer. The committee is investigating changes made in the University Standing Committees from the recommendations made by the Committee on Committees. In addition, they are looking at the role of the President's Assistant in determining committee membership. Today the Senate needs to address the membership of the Academic Council. The Constitution of the Academic Council indicates that seven faculty members will be elected by the full time faculty from among tenured teaching faculty for the term of three years each with at least two terms expiring each year with the number proportional to the faculty in each college. The Senate decides the method of election. The committee is asking that the

following faculty be approved to serve until an election can be held: Ellen Kanervo, David Grimmer, and Holly Walker. Motion made to approve, seconded, carried by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Report from Budget Oversight Committee: Dr. Anderson recognized and thanked committee members. The committee has met several times and has developed an agenda for action. We have copies of the three year summaries of the budget and ledger accounts. We are looking at the original July budget, October revision, and Spring budget to determine what was actually funded. The requested four year Account Transfer Reconciliation Summary includes the movement and transfer of money which is the information the faculty most want to know. The requested four year Summary of Actual Expenditures on all ledger accounts indicates the amounts spent horizontally and vertically.

The committee has been frustrated in its efforts to obtain information from TBR. A letter was sent asking for a meeting with Dr. Rhoda. A meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, September 10 and rescheduled for September 17, but it was canceled last Friday. When TBR was called to reschedule, we were told that no meeting could be scheduled in the foreseeable future because of Dr. Rhoda's new position. The committee got tired of being sandbagged and went to the Board Offices this week without an appointment. We met with the TBR VP for Finance who was very gracious. After the first half hour, he realized we meant business. We discussed with him concerns over TBR policy, reorganization, faculty versus administrator appointments, as well as budget issues. He indicated that he thought that the lack of involvement of APSU's VP for Finance in budget issues was only temporary and did not know it was still the case. In addition, he indicated SLERP involvement could not replace a VP for Finance.

When asked for copies of specific administrative contracts, they could not be found. Keep in mind that at the Board, functions are widely separate and they focus on the Big Picture and expect internal control afterwards. They only get involved when there are problems. After returning to the campus, an attempt was made to obtain a specific administrator's contract only to discover that no current contract exists, only a one page undated memo indicating that the administrator would be continued in the position of an interim administrative consultant on a monthly basis. The memo for the position may not match payroll records for salary. The individual's salary is coming from several accounts and when combined may be well over the \$50,000 requiring Board approval. It has not been approved by the Board.

We can tell that money is being moved from some accounts to others. We are concerned that if we do not do something, we could be in trouble. The current administration is not playing by the rules and the committee will continue to review a number of budget transactions from an audit and TBR perspective.

2. TBR Meeting on September 25, 1997 on APSU Reorganization: Discussion of Senate communication with TBR at Board meeting on September 25, 1997. The role of the Board clarified in relation to action on recommendations from Chancellor Smith. Senate discussed sending a delegation to the meeting, but the delegation would not be allowed to speak. Senate approval is needed for both the strategy and content of any message sent to the Board. Concerns expressed over approval of reorganization. The Senate needs specific information of reorganizations going forward prior to determining action. Discussion of possibility of having APSU reorganization pulled from agenda. Senate informed that the Executive Committee already has meeting scheduled with Budget Oversight Committee on Monday, September 22 at 4:00 p.m. and can address communication with TBR at that time. Possible resolution read to Senate, but no motion made for approval. Resolution referred to Executive Committee for consideration. Motion made to have a called Senate Meeting on Tuesday, September 23 at 4:00 p.m., place TBA, seconded, and approved by voice vote.

ADJOURN: 6:10 p.m.

