

**Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting  
of the Faculty Senate, APSU  
November 21, 1996**

**Senators Present:** James Bateman, Patrick Bunton, Art Carpenter, Wayne Chaffin, Don Dailey, Thomas Dixon, Arthur Eaves, Sue Cloud Evans, Deborah Fetch, Daniel Frederick, Mark Ginn, James Goode, Buddy Grah, Kay Haralson, Carlette Hardin, Tom King, Larry Lowrance, Kathy Martin, Ramon Magrans, Maureen McCarthy, Stephanie Newport, David O'Drobinak, George Pesely, Michael Phillips, Jennie Preston-Sabin, Steve Ryan, William Renkl, Paul Shaffer, Lori Slavin, Linda Thompson, David Till, Nancy Wright.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Meeting Called to Order: 3:22 pm**

NANCY JANE GULNIAK  
P.O. BOX 4595

**Agenda Approved.**

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 24, 1996 were approved.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**President Sal Rinella reported:**

1. The deal has been closed to purchase the land for the Science Building.
2. Highlights of enrollment data: (handout distributed concerning enrollment)
  - Enrollment on campus 1% higher than last year. The largest growth is at the Ft. Campbell Center, where growth as been experienced in academic courses as well as technical programs. The Ft. Campbell Task Force is working to define goals for the Ft. Campbell Center. One goal is to have a greater set of offerings.
  - Entering traditional freshmen have a higher ACT score than a year ago.
  - Enrollment is 55% female and 45% male.
  - Our largest increase is in Hispanic and Asian enrollment, reflecting a national trend.
  - Enrollment of first time freshmen is 63% female.
  - There is a need for more analysis of the dynamics of the data. We have a high attrition rate, and we need to understand the makeup of our student body and why so many students do not persist.
3. When the University Center is renovated, the Ziegler building will be razed. Original plans were to renovate Harvill Hall to accommodate faculty from Ziegler. If the Engineering Technology program is moved to the Ft. Campbell Center, this would free up the Marks Building. Faculty from Ziegler could be housed in Marks on a short term or long term basis. Ft. Campbell is interested in moving the Engineering Technology program on Base, and has offered a location which will be at no cost to the University. APSU could benefit from this move by having a 4-year program to attach our technical courses to at Ft. Campbell, which would give us a building, Marks, on campus for Geography and Geology, and we would retain a residence hall.
4. There will be a faculty/staff night during this basketball season with reduced tickets prices.
5. **Question and Answers:**
  - Q: I would like a clarification on the fund-raiser for the Business Data Center.
  - A: This was a city fund-raiser.
  - Q: How much money will it take to renovate the Marks Building?
  - A: We don't know yet, it will depend on whether the building is to be used briefly or for an extended period. Dr. Pontius is looking into this.
  - Q: There is concern about moving the Engineering Technology program to Ft. Campbell. If you move a four-year program, students will still have to come to main campus to take other classes. Are we considering a shuttle to run from main campus to Ft. Campbell?
  - A: Dr. Pontius is looking into this. Engineering Technology is viewed as an underproducing program. This is an opportunity to revitalize the program. The two-year programs at Ft. Campbell are not viewed by THEC as appropriate programs to be offered by a four-year university.
  - Q: How many Engineering Technology students do we have on campus and will they be polled to see if they would have come to APSU if the program had only been offered at the Ft. Campbell campus?
  - A: I don't know if the Engineering Technology students will be polled. We also need to ask how many new students would come because the program will be at the Ft. Campbell Center.
  - Q: Is the increase at Ft. Campbell in standard courses or in other areas?
  - A: We don't know for sure. There is reason to believe that growth reflects interest in academic offerings.

- Q:** Is the increase due to the PLDC (Primary Leadership Development Course) program or our offerings?
- A:** PLDC could not explain the entire increase.
- Q:** Will Engineering Technology occupy new space or existing property?
- A:** It is new space we negotiated for in the move.
- Q:** Are there plans for the use of McReynolds when Nursing moves?
- A:** It is now scheduled to become a residence dorm, but may not if Harvill remains a dorm. There is a need for more dorm space. If we can keep Marks on line, we could join it to Harned Hall by a covered walkway.
- Q:** If Engineering Technology is moved to the Ft. Campbell Center, the students in this program will have to spend several hours to commute to Ft. Campbell to take these classes. I hear about what is in the best interest of the University, but what is in the best interest of the students involved?
- A:** If we don't do something within the program, we may very well lose it. I see this as a possible way of opening up new opportunities to other students.
- Q:** Could the university please try and work with the Science and Math Departments to make sure this is done in the best interest of the students?
- A:** Yes, we will work with the departments in this transition.
- Comment:** There are currently many night courses offered in the Engineering Tech program.

**Vice-President Steve Pontius reported:**

1. Follow up:
  - If Harvill stays a residence hall, we will have to make arrangements for faculty in Archwood.
  - If Ft. Campbell phase 2 building is constructed, Engineering Technology will move into a new building.
2. Eight weeks ago, I discussed with Al Irby the fact that Summer II 1996 had overspent the budgeted amount of \$425,000 for each summer term. This meant the amount left for Summer I 1997 was \$371,000. I brought it to the attention of the Deans and to Dorosia Black in Records and Registration, and suggested we needed to firm up the realistic number of summer offerings before the schedule is printed. The proposals from all departments totaled \$1,087,000. During the two previous years, there was \$850,000 budgeted, but we spent \$168,000 over the budget one year and \$130,000 over the other year. I want to stay within the budget of \$850,000, which is important. In working with the Deans, the mistake was made to allow departments to submit what they would like to teach, without being aware of the amount which could be spent. Therefore the courses requested far exceeded what was available. \$371,000 is available for Summer I and \$425,000 is available for Summer II. I asked the Deans to transfer administrative pay to Summer II. Summer school budget should not contain administrative money. This expense will be moved to a separate budget. Administrative cost, including Chair stipends, is approximately \$50,000. The summer school money available is \$50,000 less than what had been budgeted. Spending more money does not necessarily mean having more students. The goal is to be creative with respect to summer school offerings.
3. Questions and Answers:
 

**Q:** Will the proposed Advisement Center have any impact on faculty reassigned time for advising students? Does this reassigned time have anything to do with the cost of the Advisement Center?

**A:** This will depend on the Enrollment Management Task Force. They will be looking at a lot of issues on reassigned time.

**Q:** Since summer school salary is based on a percentage of the yearly salary, maybe we need to go to a rank based salary. Senior faculty are making much more for teaching a course than junior faculty.

**A:** Different ways of being paid for summer school could be approached if approved by the Chancellor. My recommendation is to not make any changes right now. We need to work through TBR to investigate this. Theoretically, we could tell exactly how many sections could be offered if everyone at the same rank got the same amount.

**Q:** Historically, Summer I has been better attended than Summer II. By balancing Summer I and Summer II offerings this may hurt the students. Since Summer I goes through July 2, could part of Summer I be paid out of the Summer II budget?

**A:** In talking to Al Irby, he indicates that the money must be paid in the fiscal year in which the predominate number of hours of the course are taught. The Music Department has demonstrated a need for almost all of their classes to be taught in Summer I. This will be allowed by shifting money from another account, then shifting back during Summer II.

**Q:** Students may go home and take courses at another university and transfer the hours back in if they cannot get the courses they need at APSU.

**A:** We are trying to offer the best diversity possible. It has been suggested we remove multiple sections for the same course, but this is not always possible because of enrollment caps.

**Comment:** The discussion of paying junior faculty at the same rate as senior faculty could lead to dangerous

ideas on ways to save money.

- Q:** We have overspent for 3 years. We have always found the extra money to pay for summer school. Why can it not be available now? Are you saying this year the money is not there, and will not be there?
- A:** We can not tell what will be left in the university accounts at the end of the year. Dr. Butler worked with Al Irby to shift funds. It has been difficult to determine where the fund shifting occurred. One year the money came from the Ft. Campbell budget. There is no guarantee the money will be there. When we get through with budgeting at the end of the year, we will look at planning of resources.
- Q:** In my department 3 faculty members and the chair will have to give up classes. Our classes have always met enrollment criteria, so why are they now being cut?
- A:** My only answer is that we have already spent some of the money allocated. Summer school employment is not guaranteed. We try to offer classes as needed for students and faculty. Hopefully we can address this if we try creative ways of dealing with summer school.
- Q:** If plans are based on previous years, this will lower enrollment for this year, and next year will be less.
- A:** We may have as many students with fewer classes.
- Q:** We have nursing students who will have to go elsewhere to get the classes they need in the summer to be able to enroll in classes this fall.
- A:** I think the Deans are trying to provide the classes needed.
- Q:** If our summer school offerings are based on the number of sections offered the previous year, will next summer's course offerings be affected by the cut backs in courses this summer?
- A:** No, next year we will still be operating under a budget not less than the current \$850,000.
- Q:** If we have overspent the summer school budget for the last 3 years, why has more money not been budgeted for summer school?
- A:** This year's budget was in place before I took office. There was a large increase from \$700,000 to \$850,000 about 3 years ago, approximately 21% increase. Since then it has leveled off. The increase in faculty salaries during this time was only 13% which does not account for the large increase in expenditures. The number of students enrolled in summer has slightly gone down in recent years.
- Dr. Rinella:** There seems to be a correlation between Ft. Campbell enrollment and the summer school budget. Last year the Ft. Campbell Fall I enrollment dropped 16% FTE from the prior fall. In 1993 enrollment dropped 11%. We could have the situation that when the problems in VA occurred enrollment dropped at Ft. Campbell, and Dr. Butler used excess money from Ft. Campbell to pay for overspending in summer school. Since enrollment at Ft. Campbell is now up, there is no money to use from Ft. Campbell. It is questionable if we should have increased the summer offerings.
- Q:** What are the plans for the new roof on Claxton?
- A:** There was no money during the last fiscal year. Now there is money available, but we are having a hard time getting anyone to bid on the job.

**President Rinella and Vice President Pontius depart.**

**TBR Subcouncil - Dr. Dolores Gore, ex. officio:**

The TBR Subcouncil has not met recently.

**Academic Council - Dr. Mike Phillips: (handout on CORE Survey results distributed)**

1. The Academic Council met yesterday to review the Liberal Arts Core revision. A proposal was approved unanimously to add the Culture in Context course. Items 1-7 were voted on and approved. The course is to be controlled by the major, but does not have to be in the major. The cap on the course will be 21. We will try to do a one year catalog, and then a 3 year catalog, to allow time to finalize the Core revisions, this is an evolving process.
2. **Discussion:**
  - There was discussion concerning how transfer students would be evaluated and what exceptions would be made due to articulation agreements with other institutions and military credits, which are usually lower division credits. Academic Council representatives indicated there was no intent to impose hardships on transfer students. Cases would have to be evaluated on an individual basis, as it is currently handled. Representatives also stated that the average graduate already exceeds this requirement of upper division hours. It was pointed out that this change in graduation requirements will bring our requirements up to what MTSU's requirements are currently.
  - The quality and design of the CORE survey was questioned. It was pointed out that faculty designed the survey through open forum discussions with the committee, Deans, and Chairs. There was a 49% response rate from faculty. The Academic Council is trying to reflect the wishes of the faculty as presented in the

survey. Percentage reports on the other items on the survey can be obtained if desired.

- Concern was expressed over our low graduation rate, and fear that this additional graduation requirement would make this rate even lower.

- Concern was expressed that if the Culture in Content course is a graduation requirement and the course must be offered through the major, it appears that an outside force is determining what should be offered in each major.

- It was questioned whether the Academic Council could pass a recommendation for a one year catalog followed by a three year catalog without input from faculty. It was noted that the Academic Council representatives from each college represent faculty input.

- References were made to discussions in previous years about the increase in upper division hours generating more revenue. The question was raised as to whether or not academics would ever see any of the increase in funds if there was one. The representative from the Faculty Salary Committee indicated that if the Faculty Salary Study shows TBR that APSU faculty are paid less than the average across the state, the money for equity adjustments will still have to come from the APSU budget and this could be a source. Academic Council representative was assured by Dr. Pontius that any money generated by this change in the CORE would be allocated to fund positions needed to offer the extra courses. The new requirements could generate four faculty positions.

- It was mentioned that some departments already have a course of this type such as History of Mathematics. The Business Department is looking at an International Business course.

- Academic Council representative felt the process of developing the CORE revision had been thorough, spanning a three year review and many committee meetings for several years.

#### **Deans Council - Dr. David Till:**

1. Since the last Faculty Senate Meeting, the ad for Dean of COAS has been published at least once. Applications for Dean are coming in. Please take advantage of the opportunity to look at applications which are on reserve in the library. Interviews will begin in the Spring. The Faculty Senate should take a straw vote after completion of the interviews.
2. The common hour will be reviewed in the Spring. The President is forming a committee for this review. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommended appointing Mike Phillips and Tony Golden to serve on this committee. Dr. Golden is knowledgeable in creating an effective evaluation instrument that will reflect the truth even if there is a low response.

#### **SLRP Report - Dr. Wayne Chaffin**

No report.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

1. Academic Reorganization/Process [Academic White (A)]  
No report, chair not in attendance.
2. Evaluation of Academic Administration [Faculty White (B)]  
Buddy Grah reports that the committee has not yet met. The committee is having a hard time locating evaluations used in the past.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

1. "Common Hour" Review Committee: already discussed
2. Discussion of Summer School Budget and Course Offerings  
After a general discussion of the lack of funds for summer school and the potential decrease in offerings the Faculty Senate unanimously voted to make the following recommendation:  
"The Faculty Senate unanimously recommends that President Rinella and Vice President Pontius reconsider their positions regarding the 1997 Summer School budget."  
The recommendation is to be delivered to the President and Vice President on Friday, November 22, 1996.
3. Discussion of VPAA's "Proposed Organizational Changes"  
There appears to be no commonly recognized process used in making decisions. Changes that are under consideration and being discussed are announced to the local paper as fact before appropriate and sufficient discussion can occur.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:40 pm

FSminNov.21

**\*\*A December Faculty Senate Meeting has been scheduled for December 11 at 3:30 pm in the Gove's Room of the UC.\*\***