
**The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is scheduled for
Thursday, January 22, 1998
at 3:20 p.m. in UC, Room 313**

**Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting
of the Faculty Senate, APSU
December 11, 1997**

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

Meeting Called to Order: 3:20 p.m.

Agenda approved without amendments.

Minutes approved with the following corrections: 1. DeAnne Luck in attendance at last meeting. 2. Change wording in report of Committee to Develop Instrument for Evaluation of Administrators, page five, starting second sentence to "He (Dr. Rinella) does not believe that it is a faculty responsibility to conduct evaluations of administrators. He thinks that administrative evaluations should be conducted by the next highest level of administration."

ANNOUNCEMENTS (Dr. Randall):

1. Four copies of Chancellor's Smith's report including all exhibits on reserve at the reference desk of the library. Copies were given to all executive committee members and the chairs of all committees since their names are mentioned in the report. Copies were made at my personal expense since the Senate budget is so tight. Please read and reflect upon the report and make copies if you desire. I have been asked by the press what the Senate will do and have responded that I have no idea. You can communicate any suggestions for a formal Senate response to me.
2. I am saddened to inform the Senate of Dr. Steve Ryan's resignation from the Senate. I asked him to reconsider, but must honor his decision. Letter from Dr. Ryan read to Senate in its entirety. Dr. Ryan has agreed to stay on the Committee to Review the Adjunct Situation. The Executive Committee will recommend a new Chair for this Committee and hold an election for a replacement for a Senator after the holidays.
3. I want to address one issue in the Chancellor's report which I have commented on to the press. It is the issue of intimidation of non-tenured faculty by tenured Senate members. I sent an e-mail to Senators and personally contacted several non-tenured members after my interview with the Chancellor when this issue was first raised with me. I asked in the e-mail that I be informed of any known instances of intimidation by Senate members. I also emphasized to the Chancellor that the Senate would address this issue and deal with it appropriately. I am very distressed over the issue of intimidation and I ask that anyone who has knowledge of problems come forward.
4. I received a memo from the Chancellor about ten minutes before this meeting addressed to each constituent group involved in the investigation. Memo read in its entirety to the Senate. The memo indicates recommendations to be taken to deal with the issues raised during the Chancellor's investigation (See attached copy). Some are directed at the Senate and some at the administration. Clarification is needed on some. I am asking the Executive Committee to stay after the meeting to determine when we can meet to discuss the memo.

Request for attendance from members of the Strategic Long Range Planning Committee, some of whom are not faculty. Motion made to approve attendance, seconded, approved unanimously.

REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS:

Dr. Rinella and Dr. Pontius are both out of town.

1. TBR Faculty Sub-Council (Dr. Dolores Gore): Sub-Council has not met since the last meeting. Before the Executive Committee could meet to discuss what action to take on the issue of reducing hours for graduation, the Chancellor had announced that no action would be taken by the TBR at this time.

2. Dean's Council Report (Dr. Dolores Gore): No report, has not met.

3. Academic Council (Dr. Steve Anderson for Dr. Mike Phillips): The council has approved minor changes in several majors. Our focus has been on the core. Due to the possible reduction in the minimum number of hours for graduation, the council has decided that increasing hours at this time may not be in the best interest of the university. A motion was approved to delay increasing the number of hours required for graduation from 128 to 131 hours until there is adequate funding for the additional courses. Changes made in the core have increased the Upper Division hours from 45 to 48. The hours can be lowered for transfer students by written approval of their Dean. Council has approved some Cultures in Context courses, including one in Nursing and one in Political Science, which can proceed as a trial.

4. Strategic Long Range Planning Committee (Dr. Stephanie Newport): Report to be addressed under new business.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Report of Committee to Review Dean's Council Recommendations on Reorganization Policy and Other Reorganization Issues & Items to TBR (Dr. Carlette Hardin): The Spring Reorganization process has been approved by the President. Dr. Rinella has some questions about the one for other years, so it is on hold. The deadline for submission of proposals for this Spring is January 30th. Dr. Pontius has one from Political Science and FCC will be submitting one. The organizational chart provided by Dr. Pontius at the last meeting is a draft, not a proposal. To clarify the changes in the College of Graduate and Professional Programs, I did a flow chart to indicate changes by year. The College of Graduate and Professional Programs still exists as a college. It currently includes Graduate Programs, FCC, Public Management, and Engineering Technology. Admission and record keeping aspects of Graduate Programs have been moved to Enrollment Management. The plan is to combine Public Management with Political Science and to move Engineering Tech to FCC. Proposals will go to Academic Council prior to coming to the Senate.

2. Report of Committee to Review Dean's Council Recommendations of Chair-Coordinator-Director Responsibilities and Compensation (Dr. Bruce Childs): Dr. Childs could not be present today. Motion made to delay report until January, seconded, approved by voice vote.

3. Open Meeting Policy: Motion from Executive Committee that action on the Campus Open Meeting Policy be tabled and requests that President Rinella provide written interpretation of the Policy's applicability to meetings of the Faculty Senate, and other University meetings such as the President's Council, Dean's Council, SLRP, etc. Motion seconded, approved by voice vote.

4. Motion to Untable Graduate School Name Change, seconded. Motion cannot be discussed. Approved by voice vote. (Dr. J.D. Lester): The Graduate and Research Council unanimously approved the name change of Graduate Programs to College of Graduate Studies with an autonomous Dean. This needs to be approved so we can advertize for the Dean's position. We are at a real disadvantage with other universities in not having an autonomous Graduate School with a full time Dean. The Graduate Council's recommendation is in line with those of SLRP. I would like the motion to change the name to go forward with the understanding that Professional Programs needs to be addressed in relation to their reorganization. Motion made to change name of College of Graduate and Professional Programs to College of Graduate Studies with an autonomous Dean, seconded.

Motion made to extend time by five minutes, seconded, approved by voice vote.

Comment: Doesn't this need to go forward as a proposal for reorganization in January with a formal written proposal?

A: There has been a proposal on the books for several months using the old guidelines.

Q: If we wait until January to deal with this, will it go to the Board in March or June? **A:** It would go in May or June.

Comment: I have questions about the Dean's role, not knowing what will happen to FCC. What is their proposal?

A: It is not final, but we are looking at combining the Associate Degree Programs with various Professional Programs. We would like a College of Professional Programs.

Motion to extend time by five minutes, seconded, approved by voice vote.

Comment: I support the proposal, but we have to be concerned about what will happen to Professional Programs. Public Management would like to become part of Political Science and thus part of COAS.

Comment: Engineering Tech is not being spoken for, if they move to FCC, the program will die. I have the students in pre-requisite classes and they do not want to move there. There are over 600 students, what will happen to them?

Comment: When we voted for a Graduate Dean last Spring it was with the understanding that it would continue to have a

free standing and independent office. The office has been decentralized so the situation is not the same. I would be more comfortable after reading the proposal. I need to know what the Dean will be doing. It needs to go through the process.

Q: Since the College is currently under the Assistant VPAA, what happens to that position? **A:** The title will change.

Motion to extend time by five minutes, seconded, approved by voice vote.

Comment: If we change the name now, then we have students and faculty who are not under any college. It needs to be done as a package. Doing things piecemeal is one of the things we have been so mad about. Let's not get into that position.

Comment: I support the idea of a Graduate School. It exists now. We need to give everyone time to get proposals in so there will not be confusion about the changes. We need to wait until January so we can better understand. It would not be approved by the Board until at least March.

Comment: I know that Dr. Lester has put a great deal of effort into this, but we need to see the proposal.

Comment: Even if we voted today the Graduate School would operate as is until August.

Comment: We will need copies of the proposals. I will pay for mine if I need to do so.

Motion to extend time by 2 minutes, seconded, approved by voice vote.

Comment: We could advertise pending board approval.

Call for question, seconded, approved by voice vote.

Vote on motion to change name: For change five, against 25, no abstentions.

Comment: I suspect that administration may proceed with process despite lack of approval.

5. Rules Committee Report (Dr. Stephanie Newport): Request to delay until January.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Report of Committee to Review Adjunct Situation: Due to the need to appoint a new chair, report delayed with request that the committee report as soon as possible.

2. Report from Strategic Long Range Planning Committee (Dr. Buddy Grah): I have been on the committee for five years. I asked to be on it at a time when it was not considered an important committee. I am pleased with the increased responsibility of the committee. We need to plan as an institution for our future and we need to encourage its implementation. A long range plan is part of SACS accreditation. It is addressed as being important by AAUP.

Over the years a comprehensive plan with ten major goals has been developed by the committee. Under each goal there are a set of at least five objectives for a total of fifty-five with strategies for obtaining them. The strategies include activities and indicate who is responsible. The plan is not set in concrete. It is a living document which can undergo change. If you have suggestions please submit them to me by e-mail and then I can relay them to the entire committee.

Periodically the University Planning Council meets to discuss the plan,. This council includes the Senate Executive Committee, Chairs and Directors, Deans, SGA Executive Committee, Governor's Club, Staff Council, and community members. There will be a retreat on January 26 from 3-7 pm. Invitations will be sent to all parties.

The committee is currently addressing budget recommendations. The plan must be tied to the budget to make progress. Since we cannot fund all the initiatives, they have to be narrowed and priorities set. The first survey was an attempt to do this. Faculty were asked to rank their top ten, and second ten. We examined the responses of each group and listed their priority items. We ended up taking the top five for each group for a total of ten. Since there was some overlap, two more were added for a total of twelve. Salaries was first for faculty and staff and library resources for students.

The next survey (distributed to Senators at meeting) will address the strategies and the money needed to implement. This needs to be completed so we can proceed with the next step which is budget allocations. The money indicated is an estimate of the minimum amount needed to fund. Please complete by ranking top ten and return by campus mail.

Q: On many of these you have to read between the lines to know what will be done and how. For example, on salary what and how will that be done? **A:** Salary will be addressed based upon Mercer recommendations.

Q: How much impact would be made? **A:** The amount provided is the minimum needed to make any impact.

Q: What is meant by reallocation strategies? **A:** It is likely there will be no new money next year. So to fund we may have to reallocate from other areas. I would ask that as you rank that you keep in mind that faculty are at 92% in comparison to peer institutions, staff at 87%, and administrators at 93% on salary. The last item, restoring budget cuts, is based upon having new money.

Q: Could you clarify the difference in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2? **A:** The first relates to averages and the second to inequities.

Q: So how do we decide what will make the most difference? **A:** You have to decide which is most important, raising everyone or dealing with inequities. **Comment:** The second would help with the first, but not the other way around.

Q: Will the Mercer plan address inequities? **A:** It was designed with the intent to move all people up to 100%. The first year we could move those who are at 87% up to the average of 92% or we could move everyone up but keep the inequities.

Q: So the plan is linked to new money? **A:** We have to identify the highest priority so that if APSU has new money we will

Q: There seems to be redundancy in the document. For example, what is the difference in 1.2.4 and 4.2.2? **A:** It helps to look at the original plan, not just the questionnaire since items are cross-referenced. To clarify these two items, let's say that 1.2.4 deals with merit and that 4.2.2 deals with development. **Comment:** You can include comments on the survey form.

Q: How will equity be addressed since some disciplines are paid more?

A: As chair of the salary study let me address some of these concerns. The significant variables derived from historical salaries were highest degree and time in rank. Mercer is constructing a new formula that will be used in generating equity adjustments. The new formula will have weighted variables: highest degree earned (20%), years teaching in higher education (25%), years in rank (25%), job related experience (10%), and merit (10%). Merit is a problem since it has not been given consistently. Highest degree earned was weighted less as a way of addressing that in some fields a master's degree is the terminal degree. Faculty can decide to change these. Mercer has developed two models. One moves people up to the 92% and the second moves everyone to 100%. We decided to go with the 100% to get the worse case figures for funding. Some faculty are as low as 57% and others over 100%. We also need to address 12 month contracts and chair compensation. Since there will probably not be enough new money to make adjustments immediately, we may have some time to address these issues. I want to work with the University and the administration to move forward.

Q: Will the administration act on the Mercer proposal? **A:** In the Open Forum, the President indicated he wanted to do something to address the salary issue.

Q: Is the 1½ % salary increase being considered? **A:** Not as far as I know.

Q: If we get the 1½ % increase will the figures be adjusted to include that. **A:** The other institutions may get an increase too. We can run the numbers again. Please send any suggestions related to the salary study to Dr. Newport.

Q: What procedure is in place for knowing what happens to the recommendations? **A:** We plan a series of meetings including coming back to the Senate with our final recommendations.

Q: What procedure is in place so that administration comes back to SLRP and the faculty to let us know what was implemented? **A:** I'm not sure what you mean. Last year we had a series of meetings. One step is to go back to the Senate.

Q: Once the administration decides, how will they communicate the final decision? **A:** The President sent a letter last year and the budget is available. Do we need to do more and what? Do you want us to come back and report our deliberations.

Comment: The plan will be placed on the Web so that faculty can provide input.

Q: Who will report back to the faculty and SLRP which recommendations were addressed, how and why?

Response: You want an explanation of the final decision and reasons? **A:** Yes, there needs to be a reporting back.

Comment: You want to see the entire advanced plan or just that related to the budget.

Comment: We want to know what was done and what was not, what was budgeted and what was not.

Comment: You want to know if the process was adequate, a detailed explanation of the process.

Comment: We can tell you which items were the five top priorities. They go to President as recommendations only.

Comment: We want to know what procedure is in place so that the President reports to SLRP, the Senate, and the faculty about what was implemented and if the priorities were changed. That is the kind of information we are asking for.

Comment: For example, was item 4.1.5, chair stipends, funded fully, partially, or not all and the reason for the decision.

Comment: If the committee has done its job well, all will be funded by the President.

Comment: There is a need for ongoing reporting like in teaching where we have objectives and check to see if met or not.

Comment: Ultimately we want to know what is being done on each item and who is accountable.

Comment: SLRP reports recommendations in each area and the President reports back implementation.

Q: Where would the money come from if it was reallocated? **A:** We may not reallocate at all.

Comment: If we reallocate, I am concerned about the consequences to the various University units.

Comment: I agree there is a problem with reallocation.

Comment: The committee has a meeting each year where each unit and department addresses their progress toward objectives of the plan. Minutes are available of these reports.

Comment: Accountability is critical to the plan to determine that progress is made and if not why. From that strategies are addressed for ways to make progress so that recommendations can be made by the Vice Presidents to the President.

Q: What changes have been made from SLRP recommendations?

Comment: The committee only made suggestions related to budget expenditures, not reorganization. One example is the COOP program which dealt with the objective to assist graduates in finding employment. The students thought that was so important that we reallocated funds for it. Another item the committee approved was that departments would absorb the one cent increase in copying costs.

Time up for discussion, need motion to extend time or to adjourn. Motion made to adjourn, seconded, approved by voice vote.

ADJOURN: 5:45 p.m.