
**The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is scheduled for
Thursday, November 20, 1997
at 3:30 p.m. in UC, Room 313**

**Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting
of the Faculty Senate, APSU
October 16, 1997**

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

Meeting Called to Order: 3:35 p.m.

The Senate has several requests for attendance which will be acted on individually.

Request for attendance two non teaching faculty, Aleeta Christian and Annelle Gracy. Motion made to approve attendance, seconded, approved unanimously. Request for attendance of a group of students. Motion made to approve attendance, seconded. Vote by hand ballot: 29 for attendance, five against, motion carried.

Motion made to approve attendance of media representatives: Alicia Moorehead for the All State, Becky Logan for The Leaf Chronicle, Amy Scott for WJZM Radio, Paul Donsky for The Tennessean, Mr. Adams for APSU Radio, and representatives from TV 43 in Hopkinsville. Motion seconded, and approved by voice vote. Motion made to allow TV Station to camera record for two minutes only, seconded. Vote by hand ballot: 21 for, 13 against, motion carried. Motion made not to allow recording equipment, seconded. Vote by hand ballot: nine for, 22 against, motion defeated. Guests invited into meeting and informed of stipulations.

Agenda approved without amendments.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (From Dr. Randall)

1. Senate sponsored Open Forum on Monday, October 20 at 3:00 p.m. in the UC 313. Dr. Pontius will address the status of Summer School and the reallocation of funds from DSP, Library, and Fort Campbell.
2. A reminder to those in attendance that only faculty can be recognized to speak from the floor. Senate reminded that approval had been given at prior meeting to allow Senate Committee members to speak.

OLD BUSINESS: Letter to Chancellor Smith concerning Senate Resolution on TBR Agenda Items

Dr. Randall indicated that the Executive Committee sent a letter to Chancellor Smith dated October 3 concerning the Senate's resolution. Chancellor Smith responded on October 7. Copies of the letter distributed to Senators. Letter read in its entirety to those in attendance. Major points in the letter included the following: that the Senate resolution had not "come up at the public meeting of the Board, but that the Vice Chair of the Board, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs, and several other members were, in fact, informed of the Senate Resolution and about the various other communication which I have had from you. Secondly, neither the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs nor the full Board issued any statement of commendation." The letter goes on to indicate that a Regent had made a statement indicating he thought that Dr. Rinella should be commended for his leadership and vision in relation to the development of the Solutions Center. Dr. Randall indicated that the Executive Committee and Chairs of the Senate Committees found the manner in which the resolution had been handled troubling, but had decided not to respond further.

NEW BUSINESS

The Executive Committee and Chairs of the Senate Committees recommend to the Senate for consideration the **Resolution for a Vote of No Confidence in Dr. Rinella** included in the agenda along with committee reports and comments from the

last three Senate presidents addressing the resolution. The Senate Committee Chairs were included in making the decision since there may be a perception that the Executive Committee is "out to get the President," and because they were providing information relative to the decision. No second required, the resolution is on the floor.

The Committee Reports will proceed in the following order: 1) Dr. Ellen Kanervo providing an overview, 2) Mr. Glen Carter representing the Committee on Reorganization, 3) Dr. J. D. Lester for the Committee on the Graduate School, 4) Dr. Steve Anderson for the Budget Oversight Committee, 5) Dr. Mike Phillips for the Summer School Committee, 6) Dr. Steve Ryan addressing issues regarding communication and integrity, 7) Dr. Howard Winn providing a supporting example, 8 & 9) the past two Senate Presidents, Dr. Steven Anderson and Dr. David Till and 10) the current Senate President. The floor will then be opened for debate and action. We had also asked Dr. Paul Shaffer to speak as a past Senate President, but he is in the hospital recovering from open-heart surgery and is doing well.

1. Overview (Dr. Ellen Kanervo) - Copies of summary distributed to Senators. The overview is an attempt by three Senators and Senate Committee Chairs, myself, Carlette Hardin, and Nancy Wright to outline the reasons for the resolution. We knew that morale had decreased, competent faculty and staff who had been here a long time were leaving, and there is no longer money to do the things that are required as faculty. It is an attempt to use logic instead of emotions, as indicated in the quotation, "Listen to your emotions, but look for the logical reasons behind them." There are four major issues: 1) reallocation of funds away from instructional purposes, 2) violations of Board policy and affirmative action guidelines, 3) lack of TBR approval of reorganizational changes, and 4) massive turnover in President's Cabinet in the last two years. It has been difficult to get all the requested information. We realize this can be the case in any complex organization, but when we have asked there have been delays, the President has summarized the requested information, or we have been told it is too much trouble or too difficult to provide the information. We have been as accurate as possible under those conditions.

First and most important, there has been a **reallocation of funds away from instructional purposes**. The information we have been given that the academic budget has increased approximately .84% may be somewhat deceptive. Supporting this we have five major points. 1) Faculty lines have been switched to administrative positions without a corresponding switch in their salary lines for a total of more than \$250,000. 2) There has been a movement of high budget items, such as Student Financial Aid, Minority Affairs, Grants and Sponsored Programs, and the Solutions Center, into the Division of Academic Affairs. 3) There has been an erosion of faculty salaries over the last five years in comparison to administrative salaries (faculty salaries have grown at 16% and administrative at 29%). 4) Departmental budgets were cut in expectation to a 1996-97 budget impoundment which never came and little of that money has been returned to departmental budgets. Another cut was made in anticipation of a lean 1997-98 year, but the University received more money than expected in the actual budget. The College of Arts and Sciences lost \$383,000 out of a total university cut of \$500,000 and has received back only \$77,000. 5) The Departmental library allocations have been seriously cut. For example, the budgets in the following departments have been cut the percentage indicated: Languages and Literature - 34%, Geology/Geography - 18%, and Agriculture - 26%.

Second, there are **possible violations of affirmative action and/or TBR policy**. We are not indicating a problem with the people in these positions. Many are good people and are doing a good job, but there are problems with having an interim in place for long lengths of time. There are questions about whether or not these positions received appropriate TBR approval and/or certification by APSU's Affirmative Action Officer. A partial list includes: Consultant in Extended Education/ Acting Administrator, VP for Student Affairs, Director of Student Development, Assistant VPAA, Cooperative Education position, Academic Advising Center Director, Non-Credit Business and Community Programs Coordinator, Consultant in Alumni Affairs, new position in Alumni Affairs, Development position, and Visiting Professor and Researcher position.

Third, there is the **lack of TRB approval for reorganization changes and other matters addressed by specific Board policy**. There is also the question of reorganizational changes going into effect before approval and changes being made despite faculty protest. There have been so many changes that we can't keep up with them. For example, I'm not sure what the unit with Nursing, Social Work, and Health and Human Performance is currently called. I think it's something like the College of Nursing and Health Services. Also, at a recent meeting the President could not remember which organizational chart was in effect. The Committee on Reorganization will address the specific changes.

Four, there has been a **massive turnover in President's Cabinet and other administrative personnel**. The high turnover has made planning and orderly progression in academic units difficult. It has led to an unprecedented number of interim appointments which adversely affect the University because they are in a weaker negotiating position and have more

difficulty charting direction than permanent administrators. Changes include the Executive Assistant to the President, Affirmative Action Officer, Director of Institutional Planning and Analysis, VP for Finance and Administration, Interim VP of Student Affairs, VP of Academic Affairs/Graduate College and FCC, Director of Athletics, and replacement for Executive Assistant to President. Other changes include the Assistant VP of Enrollment Management, Assistant VPAA/Interim Dean Graduate College/Fort Campbell, Interim Dean of College of Graduate and Professional Programs changed to two interim positions, Dean of Education, Dean School of Nursing, Interim Dean College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, and Interim Dean of Education.

2. Committee on Reorganization Issues (Mr. Glenn Carter) - In addition to examining the policy for reorganization, the committee was charged to examine other issues relative to reorganization. The committee reviewed TBR minutes going back to 1994 and developed two lists. Lists distributed to Senators. The first list contains a listing of **actions relative to APSU which had been made before September 1997**. Prior to September, items receiving approval included name changes, changes in GPA requirements, and changes in majors. The second list includes **organization changes requiring Board approval** and the policy number. Those **not approved** include the move of the reporting of FCC from the College Graduate and Professional Programs to Bob Kopecky, Interim Administrator; School of Nursing as stand alone unit, Extended Education as stand alone unit under Dr. Kopecky, creation of Division of Enrollment Management, temporary move of reporting of Developmental Studies from COAS to Enrollment Management, creation of Academic Advising Center, move of Multi-Ethnic Services to Enrollment Management, move of AAPP testing from Developmental Studies to Fort Campbell/Student Development, reporting of Disability Services from Developmental Studies to Student Affairs, reporting of FCC to the Assistant VPAA, and move of Public Management and Engineering Technology to FCC. Changes **approved September 1997** included move of Agriculture and ROTC to COAS, move of Social Work and Health and Human Performance to the School of Nursing, the Assistant VPAA become Assistant VPAA for Enrichment Programs including the establishment of an Office of Enrichment Programs in the Division of Academic Affairs, establishment of the International Education Center, move of units from their respective locations to the newly established Office of Enrichment Programs (African American Studies, Center for Excellence for the Creative Arts, Center of Excellence for Field Biology, Distinguished Speakers Series, Environmental Education Center, Heritage Programs, Honors Programs, International Studies, Presidential Research Scholars Program, President's Emerging Leaders Program, and Women's Studies), name change of FCC to Austin Peay State University's Center at Fort Campbell, and creation of Business and Community Solutions Center absorbing Extended Education. It should be noted that no Dean's position has been approved for Nursing and that Engineering Technology and Public Management are not part of an academic unit at this time.

3. Committee on Graduate School (Dr. J.D. Lester) - Copies of report distributed to the Senators. The report includes three areas: 1) history of Graduate Dean Position, 2) money trail, and 3) current status of proposal for Graduate Dean. The **history** includes recommendation relative to the position occurring Spring 1997. Dr. Ellis recommended the appointment of a full-time dean. The Graduate and Research Council endorsed a subcommittee report calling for a full-time dean. Dr. Camille Holt recommended the appointment of a full-time dean. The Chairs of departments that house graduate programs voted unanimously for the appointment of a full-time dean. Faculty Senate voted unanimously recommending a full-time dean. The administration Appointed Dr. Hunt as AVPPA in charge of Graduate Programs, Fort Campbell, and two Professional Programs. The doctrine of shared governance and collegiality failed in this case.

The **money trail** started when Dr. Ellis resigned and \$63,400 of the \$70,000 line went to Dr. Susan Kupisch. When Dr. Kupisch resigned \$49,400 went to the Solutions Center to Dr. Kopecky. The remaining went for stipends for Dr. Hunt and Dr. Holt who retained their faculty salaries from departmental budgets. Currently Dr. Hunt retains his agriculture faculty salary of \$50,400 and a stipend of \$16,544 from instructional funds. If we get a position, we do not know how it will be funded. It could be funded per SLRP recommendation, from a line in Academic Affairs, or from the old budget line.

In September, the administration asked the Graduate and Research Council to draft new proposal for the **Graduate Dean position** in order to get Board approval in December. I am Chair of the Subcommittee writing the draft and I realized that we could not meet the October 16 deadline since it would have to be distributed to the Deans, the Graduate Council, and Faculty Senate for approval. I also realized by reading Board Policy that the proposal was due at the Board Office in September if it was to be approved in December. Administrative permission has been received to submit the proposal for TBR approval in March to allow extra time to build a proposal upon consensus and collegiality.

4. Budget Oversight Committee (Dr. Steve Anderson) - Copies of the report distributed to Senators. The committee's full report to date includes documentation and is approximately an inch thick. The **one page summary** includes a recommendation that the Executive Committee has approved of an independent and complete state audit. It provides ten

observations and concerns including the following financial issues not already addressed: inappropriate segmentation of duties of finance, limited relationship of July budget determination/approval and budget revisions and actual expenditures in various accounts, estimated extensive budget transfers between subject codes accounts negating original/revised budget and actual expenditure verification, recent budget reallocations from DSP support accounts in conflict with TBR A100 policy on required tutorial, lab and assistance support, identified non academic "administrative" assignments budgeted out of academic affairs in support of administrative position support without TBR Administrative increase notification, identified budget shifts/increases to support and public service areas in years of flat/declining revenues, uncertain Business and Solutions Center total and incremental funding status and sources, and a general erosion of Control Procedures (policies, audits) due to a questioned Control Environment (management philosophy and structure).

The fifteen page report is an attempt to initially summarize the findings and impressions associated with a **six-week review of budget and policy documents** having budget implications. The committee has found itself in the process of an institutional audit of infinite design with limited time, resources and closure. The committee has found in its search for errors or irregularities the following conditions: a) inappropriate segmentation of duties (identified), b) absence of approval of transactions (identified), c) evidence of intentional override of the internal control structure (probable), d) failure to perform reconciliations (not identified), and e) falsification of accounting records (not identified). We have used the following auditing textbook and philosophical assumptions: a) "Unless evidence suggests otherwise, events that occurred in the past can be expected to occur in the future," b) "Is everything I see OK and what I see everything," c) Internal control structures defined as control environment, accounting system, and control procedures; d) "Concentrated authority might create a climate in which irregularities are more likely to occur," e) "Even a strong accounting system or strong control procedures may not mitigate management indifferent attitudes or actions about control," and f) Institutional appropriations carry the force of the law."

Organization of Financial Functions at APSU - The loss of Mr. Bowman in 1994 as VP for Finance and Administration was serious in terms of institutional history and accounting expertise. Since then the following changes have occurred, the hiring of Dr. Mounce as VP for Finance and Administration who has not been involved in budget matters for a year, the promotion of Mr. Irby to Assistant VP Finance and Administration away from daily budget control, and the promotion of Sondra Hamilton as Budget Officer and Assistant to the President as a non C. P.A. This has led to a lack of fiduciary checks and balances. Mr. John Rudley at TBR has been informed of the situation and has indicated that two other TBR schools had also been experimenting with a similar arrangement. He plans to inform the schools of the need to revise their budget officer/Office of the President structure. In addition, it was indicated that only aggregate controls of budgets are examined by TBR with internal allocations/reallocations being left to the institution. TBR approves the original (July) budget and the October revisions as aggregate accounts transfers. The final Spring revisions are not approved by TBR.

Initial Review of Academic Budgets Over Time - The budget committee's attempt to review the academic budget over the last three years was futile. There is much observed movement and variance for all accounts for all years from the July, October and Spring budgets. The committee selected accounts in five categories and compared actual expenditures for the fiscal years 1994/95, 1995/96 and 1996/97 with the Revised and Final budgets. The July budget is a planning document based upon prior and anticipated expenditures, but it seems of little use in that area. For example, under the Supplemental/Overload Account the July budget is \$533,000, the Revised Budget is \$10,516 and Actual Expenditures is \$2,830 and for Other Instructional the July budget is \$723,251, the Revised is \$9,525, and Actual Expenditures is \$0 for 1996/97. We have a question of where the money went and the reason accounts are being loaded in this way. We are not suggesting anything illegal, but it does indicate inconsistent planning. Funds are being shifted away from a primary mission of teaching as indicated in Schedule II. Enrichment Programs has a two-year increase of 39.1 % and Extended Education has a two-year increase of 26.6 %. At this time we have not been able to obtain a budget for the Solutions Center. In relation to the SLRP Committee involvement in budget issues, the committee only deals with the July budget, not the October or Spring.

Account Variance Analysis - The committee has requested repeatedly the past three years transfer summaries as a form of variance analysis. No such account transfer summary variance exists or is possible contrary to corporate comptroller expectations. We then requested access to the original budget transfer paper source documents and we told these documents from one year would fill a cardboard file chest even with the removal of intra-account documents. Thus, a variance analysis is impossible without a full state audit. The committee wants to stress that all accounts in an aggregate sense reconcile at the end of the year. Fraud is not the issue. The work of those in the budget office is respected in terms of accounting integrity. They do what they are told correctly regardless of policy or administrative correctness.

Dr. Kopecky's Contract and Contract Policy Assessment - The committee did not go after this because they do not like him, but for many reasons including his continued assignment to an unadvertised position and his longtime friendship with the President. His contract violates TBR policy in the following ways: 1) the maximum temporary employment term of six months is violated, 2) rehiring of temporary employees requires a thirty day break in employment, and 3) emergency hires can extend no longer than one year. His contracts have never been submitted to TBR for approval.

DSP Budget Transfers and TBR Policy - The department was not notified of this transfer. The transfer is part of a larger transfer of \$200,000 which may be used to support new positions. DPS has lost \$44,945 which is in direct violation of TBR policy (A-100 Guidelines) requiring support through staff, materials, equipment and computer resources.

Motion made to extend time by 30 minutes, seconded, passed unanimously.

5. Summer School Committee (Dr. Mike Phillips) - The Committee has no report because they have been unable to get the requested data on the Summer School revenue and expenditures.

6. Issues of Communication and Integrity (Dr. Steve Ryan) - Personal request made that all recording equipment be turned off since comments are intended for Senate. I believe this is necessary for fairness and humanity since a person's reputation and life is at issue. The comments come from six hours of discussion with the Senate Executive Committee and the Chairs of Senate Committees and will address four areas. [Dr. Ryan has requested that these four areas and the explanation of each not be reported in the Faculty Senate minutes since again the reporting of them would open the use of them to unintended and undesired circulation.] Due to the blunt nature of this address which may lead to a vote of no confidence, it was essential that it not be recorded by journalists. These are deeper accusations with a person's life at stake. It is up to each of you to determine if they are well grounded. I turn the floor over to Howard Winn who will give a specific example.

Example (Dr. Howard Winn) - In order for a President to have the support of the faculty, they must be able to believe what they are being told. We believe there has been an attempt to falsify information. The day after the last Board meeting there was an article in **The Leaf Chronicle** about the events occurring at the Board meeting. In it there is a quotation from a Board member giving accolades to the Solution Center and the President. The paper did not have a reporter at the meeting and the article was based upon a press release written at APSU on orders of Dr. Rinella. A speech was read by Regent McCord from Knoxville who was the Chair of the TBR Search Committee for the President. The speech was written here at APSU in the Browning building. The article in the paper could not accurately represent what happened at the meeting. The paper, the public and the university were misled. I give this as an example of the type of administration we have here. We trust the President to be open and above board and not to fabricate what happens. I have a copy of the speech from a member of the Board. I no longer have confidence in the President.

7. Past Senate President Dr. Steve Anderson - First, I have a correction in the Budget Committee report. The 4680,00 estimate of the Business and Community Solutions Center budget came from Dr. Kopecky, not Dr. Foote (See page four, 10/16/97 Summary Report, Item II. 3). The problems began in 1995 when I became President of the Faculty Senate. It was the longest year of my life. There were times I felt like I was fighting for my life. A number of conversations with the President ended in shouting matches. Many things were said which I will not share because you would not believe them. The issues as I see them include differences in culture, movement of control in the Browning building, secrecy, and financial matters. The President often comments that his reality is different from the faculty's. He has had one year in the classroom and the rest of his career has been in financial planning and administration. I believed at the beginning of my office that if I could just communicate with him one on one it would make a difference. I worked to set up meetings with him. I found that I was unable to communicate with him. He is incapable of listening. He has his opinion and listens only if yours is the same. He has numerous times indicated he is not here to make the faculty happy. I have no confidence in him, and I wish him well personally some place else.

8. Past Senate President Dr. David Till - I want to begin with a kind of *caveat*: that matrix in which we live and have our being here is a bureaucracy of extraordinary complexity. It is probably the case that there is nothing we can do that can alter things either very much for the better or for the worse. On the other hand, precisely because that is our situation, any change we can make for the better is all the more precious, and any loss we suffer is all the more painful.

Last year was a difficult year for all of us. At the heart of it was not the fact that there was so much change, but the way the change took place. Faculty were again and again having to react to changes that were made *fait accompli*, or proposed

in such a way that we were given to understand that they were to become reality no matter what might be proposed by way of objection, modification, or alteration. Seldom, if ever, did discussions take place on a "what if?" basis. The faculty was seldom, if ever, treated as the source of original thought and as the body which might best bring matters of importance to a fit conclusion. Consequently, there has been a perpetual flurry of reactive activity, much of it, on all sides, defensive. There has been an enormous waste of energy and time on the part of many. There have been a host of unnecessary suspicions raised and accusations made on all sides, as well as real ones that, in an atmosphere this charged, are hard to address. Fundamental to our problem is a sense on the part of many faculty that the senior administration does not believe what we believe is most real: a primary commitment to the discipline, to teaching, and to inquiry as it is expressed in scholarship, creative activity, and performance. If this is so, then what we have is not a communication problem, but a very substantive difference. Explanation and reiteration cannot heal the breach. I had hoped, last year, that by resolutions and recommendations that the Senate passed that some breakthrough might be made. It was for that reason and that reason alone that I resisted those who thought we ought to call for a vote of no confidence. This was no strategy, though it could wrongly be seen as such. The current state of affairs suggests that the senior administration may be more interested in the ownership of ideas than in what we take to be the fundamental and ongoing process of university life. If that is so, then what is left to us is little more than the business of making compensations.

I am stopping short of making a recommendation in this public forum and for this reason: almost all our "conversation" in public is tainted by rhetorical purposes and opportunities. It is all but impossible to gauge and rely upon "sincerity." I can admonish each of you who must cast a vote to rely on that sincerity which Henry James said was to be found in the best fiction, namely what was to be discovered in taking a direct impression from life. I ask each of you to trust your own experience and intelligence, and to take into account what your trusted colleagues have told you out of their experience. I will say one more thing: that this is not a resolution of impeachment, but a resolution of no confidence. I take that to mean that there is no necessary impugning of motives. Rather, it is the settled opinion that a meeting of the minds has not taken place, and that it is not possible. Whatever further dislocations beyond our present situation this vote might occasion, however it is decided, all of us in this room know that we can come through this on the basis of our respect and regard for each other and our work, and on the basis of our desire to achieve consensus whatever and whenever possible and/or genuine compromise.

9. Current Senate President Dr. Bert Randall - I want to first reinforce that no matter what our differences or whatever the vote, we need to respect one another and resist evaluating motives. I have seen the same things both the other two past presidents have seen. Within three days of taking office in May, I had received more than three dozen messages from people indicating a desire for a vote of no confidence in June. I responded that witch hunts were not in order and if that action was taken it would be based upon information, not emotion. Unfortunately, Bert Randall has become the issue in the President's perception and numerous *ad hominem* arguments. The real and fundamental issue is faculty governance. We are more than teachers. We are stewards of academic programs and thus the budget. The money comes from tuition and formula funding. If the faculty does not play a major role in the budget, something is wrong. The Senate is responsible for insisting, not begging, to be part of the process. For this reason, I believe that when you vote you are taking three votes: one for no confidence in the President, one for confidence in the Executive Committee and Senate Committee Chairs, and one on the future of the Senate. In my judgement the refusal of the President to withdraw the agenda items at the TBR meeting in Dyersburg is enough to affirm a vote of no confidence. It has been said that there are no substantive problems, only failure to communicate. To clarify the issue of communication, the faculty is listened to only when they agree. I had hoped it would not come to this point. If we fail to act with a strong and clear communication then we will no longer be a Faculty Senate. We were not in the dark ages when he came and he did not need to drag us out of them. He has not respected the University. I have been here 26 years and hoped to retire here. I really don't know if I can work in the environment we have right now for another five or ten years. There was a time when we were a family, where there was mutual respect and concern and that is gone. No one person is responsible for that division. I want to resurrect that spirit. I not only miss it. I need it to nurture me.

Motion made to extend time for 30 minutes, seconded, approved unanimously.

Dr. Randall indicated it was time for questions, comments, or other actions.

Motion made to delay action for one week until Senators have time to examine information provided, think about it and make decision, but that we can continue discussion, seconded.

Comment: I would like to have time to think things through and to give administration a chance to respond to the charges. I would like us to consider the retreat.

Comment: The President can call a meeting if he wants to with the faculty or send out information. He should consider it.

I have questions about agreeing to a retreat until action has been taken. The retreat could not interfere with classes. I have a question about whether it is an invitation or a requirement.

Comment: I do not have time for a retreat. It would be a distraction from my task of teaching.

Comment: I have a question about where the money for a retreat would come from.

Comment: The information we have been provided with is not new. He has had three years to respond and he has not.

Comment: I am against the motion to delay. There is a political reality that the delay can increase doubt. It provides the President who has a full PR staff time to respond. The reports are strong and detailed. I am impressed. The administration had an opportunity to negotiate. We do not need to deal with them now. We need to vote.

Comment: I am still trying to get a handle on the information. Some of it may not be factual. I want time to look into the facts myself.

Comment: I would like time to look at the information, share it with the faculty that I represent, and to poll them, instead of representing myself.

Amendment made to motion to delay to have meeting next Tuesday instead of next Thursday, seconded.

Comment: I want a week. Two working days are not enough to find out what I need to know.

Comment: Can we consider delaying even longer, maybe ten days, to give some of us time to adjust our schedules.

Comment: I have a problem with the delay. I respect and trust my colleagues who have spent the last four to five months making this decision and gathering this information. We elected them and appointed them to the committees.

Comment: Senators need time to share this information with the faculty. We are asking for time to do that.

Vote on Amendment to delay action until next Tuesday. Vote by hand ballot: Seven for, 21 against.

Motion made to amend original motion to delay action until the following Tuesday, no second, amendment died.

Vote on original motion started, vote to delay 21. Call of a point of order by Dr. Newport, acting parliamentarian, to inform Senators that motion to postpone business requires a two-thirds vote.

Comment: This should have been announced before we voted. Many Senators want time to think about the decision and we need to respect that. I will change my vote on the no confidence resolution if we do not give them that time.

Comment: (Dr. Stephanie Newport) I apologize to the Senate for not informing them of the rule before we started the vote. I was given the task of being parliamentarian a couple of minutes before the meeting along with a copy of Robert's Rules of Order. I only found that rule a few minutes ago. Since it was my error, I will change my vote and vote to delay.

Comment: (Bert Randall) I will also change my vote since I should have been aware of the rule.

Vote on motion to delay the vote on the resolution. Vote by hand ballot: 31 for delay, six against, motion to delay vote on resolution carried.

Comment: (Dr. Bert Randall) Please carry this information back to those you represent. I will get copy of the information to the President tomorrow.

Comment: I have a question about the faculty and administrative salary information. You started with 1991-92. Dr. Rinella was not here then.

Response: I decided to use a five year period. I will go back and recalculate.

Comment: I have been here 30 years and when we evaluate faculty we give them five to six years. I know we don't have a system for administrator evaluation like that, but could we consider giving the President that length of time before we make this decision.

Comment: In relation to evaluation, a faculty member can be dismissed and often is, if there are problems, before the five to six years are up. A faculty member can be dismissed at any time in the process.

Question: How do we know what Dr. Winn reported is accurate?

Response: It has been confirmed by a Board member and two staff who cannot come forward for fear of losing their jobs.

Comment: I need to let the Senate know that I have been asked by the University Public Relations Office to let them know which way the vote went, so that they can release one of three press releases.

Announcement: All copies of committee reports distributed to Senators and those in attendance today was copied at the expense of individual committee members. The chronology distributed to the faculty by the Senate Executive Committee was paid for at personal expense. We are not using University funds for copying the information.

ADJOURN: 6:00 p.m.

