

FACULTY SENATE CALLED MEETING
Tentative Minutes
Thursday, April 15, 1999, 3:30-5:30 PM
University Center Ballroom

ROLL CALL OF SENATORS IN ATTENDANCE:

1. Dewey Browder
2. Willodean Burton
3. Stephen Clark
4. Debbie Cochener
5. Doris Davenport
6. Daniel Frederick
7. Meredith Gildrie
8. Dolores Gore
9. Buddy Grah
10. Ronald Gupton
11. Kay Haralson
12. Carlette Hardin
13. Allen Henderson
14. Max Hochstetler
15. Tom King
16. Phil Kemmerly
17. J. D. Lester
18. DeAnne Luck
19. Robin Mealer
20. Bruce Myers
21. Stephanie Newport
22. George Pesely
23. James Prescott
24. Adel Salama
25. Cindy Taylor
26. David Till
27. James Thompson
28. Danielle White
29. Richard Williams
30. Howard Winn
31. Pei Xiong-Skiba
32. Greg Zieren

President Newport requested we observe a moment of silence in honor of Dr. Bob Sears and his family before beginning the meeting.

President Newport requested permission for the Senate Meeting to be tape recorded for accuracy purposes, with the tape being erased after minutes are written and approved. Approval voted by the Senate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda made by Senator Kemmerly, seconded by Senator Winn. The motion to approve was carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the February Senate meeting made by Senator Browder, seconded by Senator Winn. The motion to approve was carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the March Senate meeting made by Senator Kemmerly, seconded by Senator Burton. Corrections to the minutes: Senator Stephen Clark's name to be added to the list of Senators in Attendance; on page 2 under Budget Oversight Committee Report, next to last sentence should have *with Vice President Mounce* added; adjournment time changed to 6:00 PM. Motion to approve minutes as amended was carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Newport: A draft of the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Policies and Procedures Manual is available. There are 3 copies in President Newport's office, one copy in the library, and one copy in each of the Deans' offices. Faculty are asked to read and give feedback by July 1, 1999 to the VPAA. It will not be posted on the Web due to the length of the document.

Preference sheets for University standing committee assignments will be distributed soon. Please encourage faculty members to return them as soon as possible.

The Austin Peay Chapter of the AAUP has voted to endorse the summer school recommendations which the Senate passed at the last meeting and which were sent to the President and Vice President.

REPORTS

TBR Subcouncil - Senator Gore: Subcouncil will meet tomorrow.

No other reports.

President Newport: Due to the lateness of the year, could this information, when available, be posted on the web?

OLD BUSINESS

Budget Oversight Committee Report

Report by Senator Williams: Memorandum distributed from Budget Oversight Committee

After reporting at the last Senate meeting that information requested by the Committee on Dec. 9, 1998 would be available if the Committee meet with VP Mounce to explain the documents, there was a flurry of e-mails indicating that all the information was available whenever the committee wanted it. The documentation was received by the committee and the memorandum distributed provides a summary of the requests and responses. In reference to the memorandum, the code BOC at the bottom of a page means the Budget Oversight Committee prepared the document, the code AR means it is the Administration's response. The handout is divided into four sections: Section I--Information Request Number 1, Section II--APSU reports sent to the TBR, Section III--Proposed Motion to be placed before the Faculty Senate, Section IV--Additional Information. Under the summary of responses, our first request for information involved consultants. There was a long list of consultants, but several numbers jumped off the page: \$43,665 was listed as being paid to a consultant for the marketing study STAMATS and \$86,300 for the Mercer Salary Study.

Senator Winn: What was the STAMATS report. Was it to promote APSU's image?

President Newport: Has anyone seen this report?

Senator Grah and Senator Frederick reported they had seen the report.

President Newport: Was the expense reasonable?

Senator Grah: I have no comment, but I would have loved to have been the consultant on either job.

Senator Williams: This report today may raise more questions than it answers. Data concerning the Business and Community Solutions Center is included. We asked for the current year and two prior years. This is not what we received. It was our job to collect information and report, not to explain or justify. Questions coming from this report will need to be addressed by the Senate.

President Newport: According to these figures, the Leaf Chronicle erroneously reported that the renovation of the Dunn Insurance Building and the new center downtown cost \$66,000.

Senator Hardin: I have heard in recent months that the Solutions Center is making a profit. These figures do not show this. Has something drastic happened this year? The statement that they are making a profit is very misleading.

V.P. Pontius: That is very misleading. It is true that the revenue they are bringing in is higher than what was projected.

Senator Hardin: Does this list of expenses take into consideration everyone who works for the center?

V.P. Pontius: In the entire overall budget, every person must be accounted for.

Senator Williams: We totaled the revenues and expenses for the last 3 years. It is definitely showing a loss.

Senator Kemmerly: The department, though its GIS center, has 60 people down there now in two classes generating revenue. Even if they are not making a profit now, it is not hard to imagine they soon will.

Senator Haralson: Why is the Dean of Graduate Programs in this budget, and what is the Dean of Comm. Ed?

Senator Williams: I have been told that is the Dean of Community Education. I have no idea where this came from.

Senator Haralson: I would like this to be a question we ask of someone, who it is, why we are paying them and what are they doing. Why is it being called a Dean if this position has never been approved?

Senator Winn: Question to Senator Kemmerly, do the fees paid for GIS courses go into the Business and Solutions Center budget?

Senator Kemmerly: The GIS program is training city, county and Ft. Campbell folks in significant numbers. They pay a fee for that instruction. We provide the instructor(s) and software.

Senator Winn: Where does the income from that go?

Senator Kemmerly: I assume that above the actual costs, it goes into the Business and Solutions Center budget. These are non-credit courses.

Senator Winn: I thought all revenue from all instruction went into the general fund. My question is after we put money into the Business and Solutions Center, where does the revenue go when it is generated?

Senator Gore: What is the line for Chair listed under the expenses and also under the revenue?

V.P. Pontius: This is the Chair of Free Enterprise. The difference in the revenue and expense is the supplement in the salary.

Stan Groppe made a report at a Strategic Planning Committee earlier this year, identifying all persons involved in the Solutions Center and how much that cost. This should be in the minutes from earlier this year.

Senator Williams: The next page of the report refers to the baseline budget versus the new money the SP committee looks at. Financial Report of 6/30/98, Revised Budget of 10/31/98 Analysis, and Revised Budget 10/31/98 Summaries are included in the report. Look at page 7, Exhibit C: Statement of current funds, revenues, expenditures, and other changes for the year ended June 30, 1998 with comparative figures for year ended June 30, 1997. Looking under Expenditure and Transfers, line item for Instruction, in June 30, 1997 we reported expenditures of \$21,315,928 and to the left, on June 30, 1998 we reported expenditures of \$21,080,188, a reduction of \$235,740. Looking back to the October 1998-99 Budget (Form 1(A)), the 1998-99 budget submitted in July for instruction was \$20,490,300. The question that came to our minds was why was the July budgeted amount for Instruction in 1998-1999 less than the actual expenditures for instruction in 1997-1998?

***(Note: Report also showed that significant decreases in 98-99 budgeted amount versus 97-98 actual expenditures also occurred in: Research: \$1,500,820 expenditures for 97-98, \$574,700 budgeted for 98-99; Public Services: \$1,624,097 expenditures for 97-98, \$574,700 budgeted for 98-99; Student Services: \$7,220,962 expenditures for 97-98, \$6,852,700 budgeted for 98-99; Scholarships: \$5,679,354 expenditures for 97-98, \$879,900 budgeted for 98-99. The only areas with significant increases in budgeted amounts were: Academic Support: \$3,662,897 expenditures for 97-98, \$4,107,200 budgeted for 98-99; and Operation and Maintenance of Plant: \$3,672,157 expenditures for 97-98, \$3,917,600 budgeted for 98-99. The October Budget revisions brought all areas to budgeted amounts above 97-98 expenditures except for Research, still \$873,120 below 97-98 expenditures; Public Services, still \$788,197 below 97-98 expenditures and Scholarships, still \$4,789,654 below 97-98 expenditures.)**

President Newport: I calculated a \$1.4 million increase in revenues from all sources from year-end 97 to year-end 98. If you add together Instruction, Academic Support and Research they had a cumulative loss of \$52,572. If you lump together Student Services, Institutional Support and Scholarship they had a cumulative gain of \$1.5 million. I am not sure what this means, but it made me sick.

Senator Williams: If you will look at Section III--Proposed Motion to be placed before the Faculty Senate. If you have other request for the Budget Oversight Committee, please send them to Box 4415. We will be forwarding Request #2 to the administration.

President Newport: When I was talking about my disgust for the \$52,572 decrease in Instruction, Academic Support and Research and there being an \$824,000 increase in scholarships in 97-98, I was asked "how can you complain about scholarship money going up?" I

am not really complaining about that specifically, but what good does it do to buy some students, bring them on campus, and then cut Instruction and Academic Support. If you get them on campus, we can't keep them, we can't offer the classes they need, we can't offer summer classes. I am not saying we shouldn't have more money in scholarships, but not at the expense of Academic Programs.

Senator Winn: What are the scholarships for?

Senator Browder: I am on the scholarship committee, this is my third year and we have never meet. I don't know what the scholarship committee does, or who decides how scholarships are awarded. I assume there is some kind of formula used, which does not require the committee to meet.

Senator Kemmerly: Dr. Pontius, can you comment on the increase in scholarship monies? Does it have to do with doing away with scholarships in football and giving grants in aid?

V.P. Pontius: I have no idea.

Senator Kemmerly: Is it true that they are indeed getting what amounts to a scholarship?

V.P. Pontius: I can't respond to that.

Senator Myers: I can respond to some of these questions. There is not \$800,000 in scholarships at all. The amount dropped off by football scholarships was \$300,000. The football players receive pay just like all other students receive pay. There are a few still on scholarships which we agreed to honor for 4 years. The other athletes are still on scholarship, just like always. I don't know how this is tied to what is there, but the athletes we say are non-scholarship are not on scholarship.

Senator Kemmerly: It is hard to imagine if you are switching \$824,000 in scholarships on a campus the size of this one, the influx of that fund to bring in students would make a tremendous impact on the size of this campus. The question is if there is not a tremendous impact showing up in the classroom, is the money being utilized somewhere else, under the guise of some kind of scholarships?

Senator Myers: But you don't want to point the finger at athletes, because you don't know, any better than I do that this is where the money is being used.

President Newport: This might be where Buddy's comment about restricted versus unrestricted might be helpful. There has been a significant increase in scholarships, we need the breakdown on what the increase was in restricted and unrestricted. What Phil is saying is that we do not see the impact in headcount, so where is it going? That is another question we need to have answered.

Senator Frederick: One item Richard did not address fully is the question we asked in regard to travel. We did get a printout by account etc.. We asked for budgeted amount for previous years, what we received was budgeted for this year

and what was spent for this year. We did get a list of people with individual travel budgets. The budgeted travel for 1999 is somewhere around \$98,000 less than what was actually spent in 1998. In many areas, the amount budgeted for travel for 1999 and the amount spent in 1998, just does not make sense. Some may have a very good explanation, some may not.

President Newport: Since Sondra Hamilton's travel budget was of interest previously, do you have the figures for her expenses?

Senator Frederick: Yes. She spent \$5.76 and was budgeted \$1500. The previous year she was budgeted \$900.

Senator Winn: We have been denied access to this information so long, how can the budget oversight committee analysis this information when we have to drag it out. This has got to stop. It makes the administration look like a bunch of idiots and makes us look like a bunch of idiots for accepting it. It is time we get this stuff together and begin to act like an academic community. We are here for instruction, let's do what we are supposed to do and quit playing these silly games.

Question raised does the Budget Oversight Committee have access to budget screens?

Senator Williams: My answer to that is I have a full time job. We have this information already collected, we just need to be allowed access to it.

Senator Winn: We hire a whole building of people to do this job. It is public information. We shouldn't have to go through this song and dance every time. The stuff should be open, available and talked about and the faculty under the AAUP guidelines should absolutely and completely have access to this information. To continue this violates AAUP policy.

Senator Williams: I was really impressed with the summer school committee report submitted at the last meeting. I thought if the Budget Oversight Committee could come up with something even half this good, it would be great. Back to Section III of our report. The committee presents to the Senate as a motion the proposal in Section III: *To aid in increasing the level of campus communication(as required by the truthful and factual TBR report of last year) regarding matters of budget and spending at APSU the Senate requests that the Budget Oversight Committee of the Faculty Senate should be added to the distribution lists and receive copies of the following TBR reporting documents: 1. APSU--Annual Financial Report 2. APSU--Revised Budget, October 31, Summary. 3. APSU-Revised Budget, October 31, Analysis. NOTE: By being placed on the Distribution List for each item the Budget Oversight Committee will be sent a copy at the same time as the TBR and other recipients.* Motion seconded by Senator Henderson.

V.P. Pontius: I suggest that someone from finance should also come and explain how to interpret the information.

President Newport: This is along the lines of what I told the President last summer when he asked, "Exactly what is it you are after?" And I said, " I just want to see the checkbook. I want to know where the money goes." What do we spend university money on, define academic support, where are the salaries, what else is included there. Maybe a good set of budget codes would help. Are you open to that friendly amendment, a once a year meeting with the faculty or faculty senate?

Senator Winn: I passed out today the resolution passed by the AAUP which has a section on page two that addresses what we are discussing now. If we followed AAUP guidelines, that is to incorporate our faculty budget oversight committee into the process from the very beginning this won't be a problem.

President Newport: I think we have two separate issues. We will vote on the motion as originally submitted and discuss the other issue separately. We will discuss the AAUP resolution next time in conjunction with Dr. Pontius' suggestion about a meeting with the finance officer.

Motion as originally submitted carried unanimously.

Summer School Committee Report

Report by Senator Carlette Hardin: Senator Hardin indicated the summer school recommendations passed by the Senate at the last meeting were carried to the President and Vice President. Copies were also distributed to the Deans and Chairs. The Committee has heard nothing directly from the President about the recommendations passed. Dr. Pontius has indicated he will respond for himself and the President.

Motion made by Senator Kemmerly, seconded by Senator Winn to allow Dr. Pontius the floor to respond. Motion carried.

V.P. Pontius: The President feels this is an academic issue and that a response should therefore come from Academic Affairs. One recommendation was for new dollars to come to the current summer school budget. Based on the current budget, this is impossible since we are almost at the end of the fiscal year. What we are proposing is to allow entrepreneur or "need based" courses to be added to the summer schedule which will pay for the salary and benefits needed to fund the course. To calculate amount needed, divide the faculty member's salary by 32 and multiply by the number of credit hours of the course. This amount, plus 20% of this amount for benefits, will give an estimate for the dollars needed to make the course self-supportive. For example: For a salary of \$40,000 and a 3 hour course: $(\$40,000 \div 32) \times 3 \text{ credit hours} = \3750 . $\$3750 + .20(\$3750) = \$4500$ for salary and benefits. Tuition is \$85 per credit hour, therefore $\$85(3) = \255 per 3 hour course per student. For the course to be self-supportive $\$4500 \div \255 per student ≈ 18 students. For each \$10,000 more in faculty salary, 5 additional students would be needed to fund the course in full. After speaking with the executive committee of the Senate, I am recommending that any additional dollars collected for the course go back to the department's operating budget. A list for additional classes for Summer I is in the VP's office now. The Registrar will look at enrollment over time. Joe Fillippo has contacted the Deans about meeting tomorrow to make decisions.

President Newport: I am concerned that if we look at just what has happened over the last 2 or 3 years, we will show a decline in enrollment, because courses had to be cut in the past.

Senator Till : If we add additional classes, do we have to assign a teacher to the class, or could we add the class, see how many register and if it is not enough, cancel the class?

V.P. Pontius: The added courses should only be need based. For example Education had a list of students who needed a course that was already closed, and DSP had a list of students who needed a course not being offered Summer I.

Question raised about decreasing the rate of pay for the faculty member if the necessary number of students to fund the class do not register.

President Newport: There was not complete consensus on this issue from the Executive Committee.

V.P. Pontius indicated that this rate of pay was set by APSU and TBR policy and could not be changed. Faculty members must be paid at 3/32 of their salary for a 3 hour course.

Senator Winn: Why can additional money not be set aside for summer school?

Senator Hardin: This is a stop-gap measure for this year only. We do NOT assume this is a pattern that will be repeated next year.

Concerned expressed that students would be upset if classes was offered with several enrolled, but not enough to fund the

course, and then the course was canceled.

President Newport: Political Science was not budgeted enough money for even one class to be offered with a full-time faculty member teaching the course. This needs to be addressed.

Senator Henderson: This is becoming like recruiting a softball team.

V.P. Pontius: The intent was to respond to already existing needs for courses, demonstrated by lists of students needing a course which was not being provided.

Senator Winn: There is no need to be in this situation.

V.P. Pontius: Future funding for summer school will be a charge of the Strategic Planning Committee. In a written document from the President where he gave his charge to the Strategic Planning Committee, he indicated that one way of approaching the budget is to look at a combination of baseline and one-time. In the discussion he presented to the Planning Committee he said he was willing to put 2-5% of the ongoing budget on the table for discussion by the Committee. Those items that are high priority items could be the beneficiary of this money. Items such as recruitment and retention and as part of this, courses needed by student demand. Therefore summer school or other things dealing with instruction could benefit. We discussed at length putting ongoing dollars on the table for the Strategic Planning Committee to look at.

Senator Hardin: I want to make sure the Strategic Planning Committee members from the faculty senate understand this the way I think it is being proposed.

Senator Henderson: Where will this 5% come from?

V.P. Pontius: From the existing on-going budget.

Senator Henderson: Is this 5% of all departments operating budget, 5% of everything, from every area? Are we talking about across the board?

V.P. Pontius: That could be a point of discussion.

Senator Henderson: I know our department could not operate on 5% less.

V.P. Pontius: If you believe in zero based budgeting, at the end of the year all the money does come back.

Senator Henderson: Senator Gupton and I were both present at the SPC meeting when the President presented the charge. I remember the three options he proposed and commented to Ron that this is in effect what we have now, because we have things changing around in departments with money shifting. I don't see this is a big change all of a sudden. That is happening, it is just not being up front. We basically have a combination of zero based budgeting and other things, but we are not being asked.

V.P. Pontius: The important point is this provides the opportunity for the Strategic Planning Committee to be involved in this.

Senator Henderson: Concerns have been expressed from many that areas already strapped for funds, such as Academic Affairs and Admissions and Records cannot afford to give up 5% of their budget to be considered for spending elsewhere.

Senator Hardin: My understanding was that we would look at 5% from big areas of the budget, Student Affairs, Athletics and then say we have this amount of money and where should it go.

President Newport: I would like to be in on the discussion of where the money is going to come from. Where was this money two or three months ago when we were discussing summer school? Why couldn't we have had it when we needed it? Now we are going to put together a faculty committee to discuss where this might go. I find this divisive, it is an appeasement, and it is insulting. This may be at least something, but I am not satisfied with it.

Senator Gupton: This does not solve the problem. The Strategic Planning Committee needs to be looking at the whole budget if we are going to do any good. There are probably pockets of money out there that need to be looked at, but they are not consistent across the budget. Even though we would be looking at a little more of the budget, this is still a very small amount of the overall budget for the university, somewhere around one million. If you rake off 5% of the budget, then you have to go back and justify getting the money back, you might not come out any better than you already are. This committee has not been able to look at other areas of the budget. I have not been able to convince the committee that this would be a good thing to do.

Senator Henderson: There is no time for the Strategic Planning Committee to do this now.

Senator Gupton: That is correct. The Strategic Planning Committee does not look at any part of the budget until Spring. This is too late, with the initial budget being submitted in the Spring. The Strategic Planning Committee has no real input into the budget process. I think that is exactly what the plan is, you don't get to look at it very long and you don't get to do much with it. To announce to the world that the Strategic Planning Committee is the way in which faculty have input, it is just not worth very much.

V.P. Pontius: It was also recommended that a task force be established to develop an action plan for the implementation and monitoring of the twelve recommendations. A task force will be established with two faculty members and two administrators.

President Newport asked for permission for items of the agenda to be taking out of order.

Status on Structural Repairs to Buildings Damaged by January Tornado

Senator Allen Henderson: As Chair of the Space Utilization Subcommittee, I have been receiving a lot of calls from affected chairs after the tornado. This subcommittee has not been asked to meet and has not been asked for input into any of the plans being made to relocate departments and programs. There does not appear to have been a lot of faculty input into the rebuilding process. Chairs indicate that plans are changed on a daily basis, and they are not being kept informed. I would like faculty members to know that even though this subcommittee already exists, we have not been asked for input or advice even though we made a lot of recommendations through the Master Plan.

President Newport: The executive committee was asked to have the Senate put forth a resolution calling for no delay on approving the Master Plan. I haven't seen the Master Plan. I just said no. The senate is not on the list of people to approve the plan.

Senator Henderson: Technically the Master Plan was presented and time was allowed for input from areas, for changes, etc. The committee has not yet meet to finalize and send it off.

Motion made by Senator Winn to move the next item on the agenda *Concerns regarding hiring for faculty positions* to the May meeting due to the length of time needed for discussion of this item. Seconded by Senator Thompson. Motion carried.

Final Submission of Reorganization Policy

Report by Senator Hardin: Handout distributed of the Reorganization Policy which will become part of the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Minimal changes in the proposal discussed. One positive thing coming out of this, it will no longer be just a Senate policy, but will be a university policy. We have cited the relevant TBR Policies. I think this is a good policy and will insure that reorganization cannot occur on this campus without lengthy input from everyone impacted. This committee puts forth this proposal as a motion to accept the Reorganization Policy as outlined in the handout. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Report of Status of Senate Elections for 1999-2002

President Newport: Education and College of Business are fine, we have enough nominees to send out their ballots. We need four nominations from Humanities and we have only one. I will send out another mailing tomorrow asking for nominations. In the Natural Sciences, people were nominated who were retiring and were ineligible. I will have to call some people there. In Social Sciences we have one nominee and need two.

The recommendation of the Executive Committee is that during the summer transition period, that on a voluntary basis, senators remain in place on the various committees until the new senate and executive committee are geared up and ready to go. If I do not hear from you I will assume you are willing. Recommendation approved by Senate.

Recommendations of the Senate Rules Committee

Report by Senator Gupton: Handout distributed.

The handout distributed outlines two proposed changes in the Senate by-laws. These proposals go in front of you today and are to be voted on at the next Senate meeting. If you would like any kind of rewording, please send your suggestions. Proposed rewording of Article III. Attendance: *Section I. Regular meetings of the faculty senate are open. The faculty senate reserves the right to go into executive session by majority vote of members present or to be called into executive session by the senate executive committee.*

The second item is a proposed change in Article V., renaming of the Budget Oversight Committee. The president was unhappy with the name of the committee. Senator Winn suggested "Budget Review Committee". This was not a big issue with the Rules Committee. What is critical is that we continue the process, whether it is called *oversight* or *review*. This year

appears to have been a disaster as far as budget goes, culminating with the summer school situation. We put this forth as a possibility if you like this name better.

Senator Browder: When you say "go into executive session", do you mean the whole senate or just the executive committee?

Senator Guppton: This means the senate as a group. I thought that was clear, but maybe it needs to be reworded. The idea is that the senate would be there and no one else. This will come before you next time for a vote.

President Newport: The AAUP resolution has been distributed to you to be looked at and discussed under New Business at the next senate meeting. There has also been a response from the President on the Faculty Senate's recommendation on the Mercer study for you to consider for next time.

Senator Thompson: I have a question about the last sentence on page one of the response from the President.

On the other hand, downward adjustments will be made effective July 1, 1999; but, I would not authorize retroactive deductions.

Senator Haralson: I would like clarification on this also. Dr. Rinella's response came to the committee members yesterday. The recommendations were sent to the President in November. We have not had time to convene the committee and ask questions about the response. I have no idea what this means, other than, I personally feel the new DSP salary study is being done in such a way that the target salaries for DSP will go down.

Senator Thompson: Is he talking about your salary going down?

Senator Haralson: No, he is referring to our target salary, which I assume could not be lower than what we already make. However, since DSP has received no information at all about the new study, or any data collected from the new study, I am just guessing. We requested this information be sent to us as it was happening, but we have received no information. I do not know if Geology was informed that their target salaries would remain the same or not. I assume Senator Kemmerly will communicate this to his department if they were not aware of this decision.

Meeting Adjourned 5:30