ASU Faculty Senate Minutes
March 7, 2012
UC 203/204
3:00 PM – 4:38 PM

I. Roll Call:
   A. Senators Present: Martha Sleutel (Faculty Senate Presidentl/Nursing), Andrew Siefker (Faculty Senate Vice President/Mathematics), Loree Branham (Agriculture), Connie Kelley (Art & Music), Bill Doll (Communication, Mass Media and Theatre), Edith Osborne (Chemistry-Biochemistry), Mark Crouch (Computer Science), Bruce Bechtol (CSS), Mary McGlamery (sub for Kim Livengood, Curriculum & Instruction), Jason Pierce (History), Steven R. Snowden (Kinesiology), Richard Lawrence (Management & Marketing), María de los Santos Onofre-Madrid (Modern Languages), Scott Williams (sub for Joe Satterfield, Physics), John Glassford (Political Science), Marilyn Eisenwine (sub for Donna Gee, Teacher Education), Heather Braden (Physical Therapy), Valerie Reid (Aerospace Studies), Nicole McDaniel (English), Tom Starkey (Psychology, Sociology & Social Work)
   B. Senators Absent: Michael Butler (Accounting, Economics, and Finance), Connie Russell (Biology)
   C. Guests: Dr. Brian May (Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs), Michael Reid (Vice President for Finance & Administration), Angie Wright (Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration)

Dr. May addressed the following points:

a. Dissemination of Department Head evaluations had not been decided at this time. The deans have discussed options, but another discussion will occur. The information will remain confidential similar to the student evaluations of faculty. The survey is voluntary so faculty may complete the survey when they are comfortable with the dissemination process. The Faculty Senate has not had input into this process in the past. The final decision about the process will be emailed to the faculty.

b. Dean and Vice President evaluations will follow the Department Head evaluations.

c. Faculty will be paid for overloads in the fall, if the dean brings it forward. We are trying to avoid overloads for faculty. The college will set limits for online courses.

d. Lecturer and Instructor positions have been worked out so that everyone will be in the instructor line. There will be a pay increase for some of the instructors.

Mike Reid & Angie Wright addressed the following points:

a. The new way to determine the budget will be in place by Fall 2012. The budget will be based on three areas: administrative, facilities and academics. Only the academic area was discussed, but the slides for the other are available on the website and all the deans have been through the other areas.

The ASU model has worked well. It is a very simple model to use as long as the university gets more money every year. If the state does not get more money, or if there is even a small reduction, then only a slight modification is needed. As long as things are growing the process is positive. The State model appears to be turning into outcome and performance based. If all areas continue to take the same cut, then all areas are crippled and not able to do anything. Some departments are able to do more with resources than other. The areas of growth need to receive the necessary resources.

The budget formula provides a base budget. The base budget needs is enough to pay for all that the resources necessary to do what is needed to teach the courses. This part of the budget does not include going to conferences, starting new programs, etc. Base budget is basic and core for everyone, not just academics. The intent is to squeeze the budget.

The Academic areas are treated a little differently. The goal is to designate as many funds as possible for strategic initiatives. As of right now, no funds are available to start new programs. There is a need to create a mechanism to help manage the limited resources to make the funds available for possible initiatives at ASU. Right now ASU receives 64 million dollars per year. Of that amount, 80% is used for salaries and benefits. Out of the remaining about 20 million, more than half is used to pay for utilities, etc. So, only about 6-10 million or so may possibly be available for initiatives. We need to focus on how to use those funds to get the biggest bang for the buck.

b. This formula does not attempt to allocate I.E., DE or other fee restricted based funds. This model does not touch money generated by activities such as a play. It only addresses state allocated funds (not the line item, but the general allocation) and designated tuition.

The formula does not allocate funds to the various accounts. This model provides the amount and the process of how the amount available to the Provost was determined. The data will show what the academic department should receive, but ultimately it is up to the Provost to allocate to those areas. Politics or other outside influences does not affect the model. That does not mean that the Provost or others do not care. It does not control the budget process. It is a tool to help. We adjust the

variables that go in and come out. It is flexible and can be adjusted to be better every year.

For the historical process, the institution should be looking at the priorities, the strategic plans for the academic programs, and the budget enhancement on SPOL. The new total budget could then be determined by the prior year budget plus or minus the requests that are vetted by the deans.

c. For the budget calculations the VPs review the formula and review the variables entered such as class size, undergraduate and graduate teaching load, and ratio between tenure and non-tenure faculty.

Basically, the variables are entered in to the formula. The results are then sent to the department. If the formula provides for all needs, then the process is complete. If more money is needed then requests are submitted and ranked based on how well the request fits the institutions mission. Funding begins with the #1 priority and continues down the list.

Departments have costs that are not department specific. For example, IT spends 2 million a year on Microsoft software. This process attempts to capture cost out of departments that really are not department specific and handle those costs with an Institutional Support fund. The strategic planning fund would be for special needs.

The formula is tied to semester credit hour production. This part considers salaries, administrative support and M&O. The main concern is how to calculate faculty salary taking into account the required teaching load – 24 hours for undergraduate and 18 hours for graduate faculty. With the class size and the load for faculty, the number of faculty lines can be determined. If the class size was set at 25, then the budget formula uses that information to determine if a department is meeting the required class size. If it is, then the funds will be there. If the department is growing, then the funds will be there. If the class sizes are declining, then the funds will not be available. The funds will go first and foremost to growth. If the program does not have the sch needed for support, then the program will go away.

Based on the prior years numbers, if the credit hours have been exceeded then additional lines may be added. The model shows the amount at which a section will break even.

Accreditation issues will be entered to adjust the formula for programs such as nursing and physical therapy. With out the adjustment for cost factor then programs such as nursing or lab classes would be

underfunded. The formula will be adjusted for factors that qualify as constraints beyond our control.

As the department chair sets the sections, they are looking at the average class size.

The money from this formula would be the general operating dollars. Probably 90% or more of this amount will go to paying faculty salaries. The model generates what is needed based on enrollment. The Provost will have the flexibility to fund under funded departments, to not fill lines and determine future projects. The formula will show the number to help see where the departments are going. The data could use an average of the previous 2 years of data, but the data at this time does not show a difference between the two-year average and the previous year alone. However, if the department is increasing in size the average may hold an area back.

To receive additional funds, the departments will need to make a case. A committee with representatives from different areas will make recommendations since the requests will impact the amount of money available for all areas from the strategic fund. The other funds from IE, DE, etc. will still be available for initiatives.

Initially, 15% needed to be cut from the budget for academics. When using this model, the numbers indicated that only one academic program did not generate money, all the rest covered their cost. Finally, the model provides the data to show the numbers.

Specific fees are not factored into this budget model. Any fees that have specific restriction must be allocated in accord with Regent's mandates.

Budget information can be found on the finance and administration website. If you have questions, give Mr. Reid a call or send an email. He will be happy to meet with department to help others understand how the budget model works.

The model looks at averages. Eventually as the finances are in order, then some of the salary equity issues may be able to be addressed.

Mr. Reid may present a campus wide-open forum to present this information to those curious about the budget. The Faculty Senate fund may be used for food. The funds may be switched in the future so that the funds are more useful.

II. Approval of the February 8 minutes.

Senator María de los Santos Onofre-Madrid moved to approve the minutes with the corrected typographical errors. Senator Steve Snowden seconded. All approved the minutes for February 8, 2012.

III. Standing Committee Reports

A. By Law and Rules

President Sleutel discussed the email that will be sent to the faculty to request that they vote yes or no to accept the revised Bylaws. The wording of the email had been sent out for comment with a few responses indicating the wording was acceptable.

Senator Bechtol will request that the new version of the Bylaws be posted on the Faculty Senate website this week so that the link can be sent for all to compare before voting. Paper ballots will be sent on the Monday following Spring Break for the faculty to send their vote back by Friday.

B. Academic affairs

Merit Pay Proposal needs to be approved to move forward. The final version will be sent to the Faculty Senate. At the April Meeting we will vote to approve the proposal to be sent to the Provost.

Instructor & Clinical Faculty proposals emerged from this process. Drafts were sent to the Provost office and were turned down. The proposals will not move forward, but Dr. May has indicated that he is aware of the issues with the lectures and instructors and a plan will be developed to address the issue.

On the clinical side, the substitution of work experience for credentials was not considered acceptable. Additionally, the length of time required to be at a specific level was not acceptable.

The instructor proposal was not viewed as necessary since it has been indicated that a plan will be implemented. The concern is this history of the issue not being addressed.

The original mandate to the committee was to develop a proposal for a pay raise and only a pay raise, rather than other issues. The committee viewed the issues as related. A collaborative effort is viewed as a better approach. The proposal for clinical tract would go to the dean. The merit increase was accepted where as the clinical tract and lectures and instructors proposal is dead at this time.

C. External Affairs - None

D. Student Affairs – None

E. University Affairs –

The banquet is at the point where the committee needs to plan with Lina. A slide show of images of faculty needs to be coordinated. President Sleutel will ask Senator Satterfield for feedback on the status of the banquet. The committee will divide up the responsibilities to complete preparations for the banquet.

IV. Unfinished Business

A. President's Awards

A reminder for the President's Awards has been sent. The deadline is Friday before Spring Break. The first level award nominations will go to a Faculty Senate committee who will name the semi-finalists. The semi-finalist will not be connected to the specific colleges. The Executive Committee will decide on the finalist. The rest of the Faculty Senate will determine the semi-finalists. The nominations will be ready on the Monday when we return from spring break. Someone from the Senate needs to take the lead. Senator Branham described the process from last year – ranking and discussion. Everyone not on the Executive Committee was to meet with Senator Branham after the meeting to decide on who will take the lead.

B. Provost Search

The Monday after spring break, the committee will be meeting to determine which candidates to bring to campus. Background checks and checking references were in process at the time. The plan was to bring 3 candidates on campus.

C. Faculty Senate Elections

Faculty Senate representatives need to be elected in April for those departments with senators whose terms are complete. Hopefully the new Bylaws will be in place. Large departments will have a mechanism by which they can petition for an extra senator if they deem necessary. If this does occur, then the Faculty Senate will need to have made a decision.

V. New Business

A. April Meeting

During the April meeting scheduled for 11th Dr. Rallo will be in Lubbock. He has requested that the meeting be moved to the following Thursday, April 12 at 3:00.

B. Gary and Pat Rodgers Awards

The Distinguished Administrator award will be determined by an Ad Hoc Committee of faculty and staff representative. Three senators were asked to consider their participation: Senator María de los Santos Onofre-Madrid, Senator Bill Doll, and Senator Valerie Reid.

C. University Committee Assignments for Fall

A survey will be sent to the faculty requesting information to assist the committee in making university committee assignments for the fall of 2012. Tenure track and those who are soon eligible for promotion will be given first priority. Suggestions to improve the process were requested. The highest priority will be given to the tenure track and first responders. Some committees do have stipulations such as requiring the members to be from certain areas.

The plan was to have a meeting by the end of March for all who could attend to work through the assignments and make a recommendation for the Faculty Senate. We would like to have the recommendations on the president's desk by June. The recommendations will be posted on the Faculty Senate website as well as who will be rotating off the committees.

The survey will be sent the Friday before spring break with a reminder email the week following spring break to complete the survey.

VI. Roundtable

Internal Grant Committee is not a part of the Faculty Senate, but is populated by the Committee on Committees. The two members who are submitting proposals and cannot be on the review committee have been asked to identify another member of their department to serve.

An issue related to late registration after the 12th day was raised, but more information before further discussion or action could continue.

President Elect's term will be extended if they are schedule to rotate off the Faculty Senate according to both the old and new Bylaws.

After a discussion as to who could vote, the result for the Bylaws were 14 yes votes and 0 no votes. A majority of the 22 members was needed to pass.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board committee on curriculum tuning will be sending a survey to the students about learning objectives. More information will come later.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn and seconded. All approved.