**MINUTES**

***November 4, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ROLL CALL

Present:

Mary Kay Bauer, Wayne Billon, , Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Jamie Davis, Christopher Hoyt, Steven Ha , Eleanor Hilty, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Jane Perlmutter, Phillip Sanger, Jack Sholder, Chuck Tucker, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Richard Beam, Heidi Buchanan David Claxton, Jane Eastman, Terre Folger, John Hodges, Sean O’Connell, Barbara St. John, Michael Thomas

Members absent:

Kyle Carter, John Bardo, Jack Summers

Recorder:

Ann Green

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Motion:

Motion was made to approve the minutes of October 1 and October 15, 2009. The motion was seconded and passed by majority with no further discussion.

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Faculty Assembly/David Claxton and Beverly Collins:

No report

SGA/Josh Cotton:

No report

Staff Senate/Brenda Holcombe:

No report

SCH task force Report/Wendy Ford:

Dean Ford will be along shortly. I anticipated this might take a little longer and she had another meeting in conflict so she will be along shortly. Perhaps we can start with council reports and stop when she gets here. She did want to present a briefing about student credit hours and models developed by Arts and Sciences to deal with that. But, she had a conflicting meeting and won’t be along for another 15 minutes or so.

COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

APRC/ Wayne Billon:

Curriculum changes; there has been some curriculum that has been submitted through the committees and been approved by the committees and have been posted for you on the H drive. There’s no problems with them or questions. So, unless you have questions they are ready to be approved unless you want to open something up on them. I think the spreadsheet was enclosed in the material that was sent to you and on the H drive. It’s lengthy, but they all appear to be straightforward, new courses, program changes, etc. that would not require specific approval so unless there is question, consider those approved?

For the General Studies Review, let me bring you up-to-date on that. Last Faculty Senate meeting, X brought up a resolution for a plan for the way we would look at General Studies. In the start of the discussion on that Richard pointed out that he and Dr. Carter developed a similar plan last summer and it was posted on the Provost web page and it was suggested that together with APRC we would look at both of those proposals and there was discussion about X’s proposal. And, we did that Friday and we looked at them for a lengthy discussion. Several people had to leave early but with proxies we still had a quorum at the end of the meeting and I think we made some good progress. We saw some things, we discussed a lot of things, we made some progress, but we didn’t quite get to the end of the proposal that was on the Provost’s page. So, the plan was that before everybody left, we agreed the route we would take, there were some things I would look at and I would email everybody and they would email me back over the weekend and we would get it done. But, when I went to look at it, I found some more detail that we didn’t discuss and when I sent that out, which I hated to do, but it had to be done, it created questions. The Rules Committee has made some proposals of some things we thought they were going to do and thought maybe they weren’t going to do it the way we thought they were going to do it, but we had no one there to help us with that over the weekend. So, talking with Sean and Richard and Erin, we came up with a plan and I didn’t get a quorum over the weekend to approve; so we can’t bring it up based on that. But, also based on what may happen with the Rules Committee we think it may be wise for the APRC or some fraction of the APRC to get together with The Rules Committee or some fraction of the Rules Committee and iron out exactly what are they going to propose and what are we going to propose so we are all on the same page. And we can all make the same proposal. And then I had to go through a debate and then go through a debate again because it was all changed. So, that is what we’re going to do. I spent a lot of time on it; the committee spent a lot of time on it, but I would rather hold it instead of spending a lot more time and a lot more time again. That’s where we are. So, we have nothing else to report.

Richard Beam: If you’re confused as to exactly what Wayne’s talking about the Rules Committee has proposed some changes to the Constitution of the General Faculty including a specific section labeled Section 10 which I think also we sent out to you all dealing with curriculum development and review and the question came up and Wayne copied me on most of these emails maybe all of them so it seemed wise to a number of us that until its clarified as to exactly what and why the Rules Committee wants to propose these constitutional changes which affect curriculum development and review and study how that impacts the ideas that have been under discussion here in the Senate before forming a task force to look at Liberal Studies/General Studies it would be logical to get both documents or both discussions on the same page to make sure there’s no conflict. I’m not sure there is conflict, but I think that needs clarification.

Comment: There’s a philosophical disconnect. Where does policy get created as opposed to policy being administered? And that’s where I’ve heard concerns about the way this modification to the way our Constitution is structured.

Comment: I think it makes sense to table this at the moment to let APRC and The Rules Committee meet jointly and discuss things and clarify the proposals before we act on the recommendations of the Rules Committee on the Constitution and the By-laws of the General Faculty. So, is there a motion to table?

Motion made and seconded.

**Voice vote passed.**

COLLEGIAL REVIEW COUNCIL/Mary Kay Bauer, Chair:

We have not met yet. We are meeting tomorrow for the first time. We received a draft, a final draft, of the task force which has been studying and debating the process to simplify the collegial review process.

And the CRC is going to tackle it starting tomorrow.

The meeting time is 11:00 a.m. in The Rogers Room

Comment from Richard Beam: The Rogers Room is not a huge facility, but all these meetings are open to the public so if any of you want to attend to hear what is going on; you are entitled to do that.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COUNCIL/Frank Lockwood, Chair:

We did not meet on advising day. We are continuing to collect data on child care and on ADA campus audit. We will hopefully get a hold of Dr. Carter to get the University Patent Policy meeting going so we can get that put to bed. Jack Summers brought up some interesting thoughts regarding the creation of a grants center similar to the Coulter Center so we can enhance the capability of the Faculty in writing and getting grants. One of his suggestions is that we create a fund of match money so we’re going to look at that. Also, at the Leadership Group, we’re given another task and that’s to look at the emeritus faculty to review how you become emeritus faculty; how we can use emeritus faculty maybe as an ombudsman like we talked about last year and so we’re going to take a look at that at our next meeting. And, that’s where we are.

Comment from Richard Beam: Melissa, am I not correct that there was some discussion of research and grant issues in Strategic Planning the other day?

Comment from Melissa Wargo: I don’t recall that.

Frank Lockwood: Our next meeting will be Nov. 11th over at the College of Business, 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

EXTERNAL REPORT

At this time Dean Ford arrived and gave an External Report on the SCH task Force:

At the request of a number of faculty we asked Dean Ford to come and talk to us a little bit; brief us a little about the activities of the SCH (Student Credit Hour) task force that she chaired recently and the results of that as they’re being piloted in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Dean Ford:

This is a hand-out; a briefing. It gives a synopsis of a few key things. I thought I would give you a few key highlights of the SCH task force and the Institutional Funding Model and the Arts & Sciences Model that we’ve just adopted this year as a pilot. I’ll give you a few highlights of that and answer any questions you might have. It’s a lot to go through so I will give you just a few highlights. A first key highlight is that the Student Credit Hour Target Model task force was initiated by the Provost as an administrative task force to help guide administrative decisions about how positions and resources are allocated across academic affairs. And that task force was initiated last October and charged with coming up with SCH targets for programs on campus and so we weren’t charged with developing targets; we were charged with developing a model so that targets can be created for units. The members of the task force were faculty members representing each of the colleges on the campus and our series of meetings over a 6-month period we reviewed all kinds of data and met with the higher administrators across campus. We reviewed contextual factors and identified 11 real key challenges that our institution faces in having some relationship between the SCH based funding model that funds our whole University and how you allocate resources to some relationship to that model. Not necessarily perfect relationship; but some relationship. So, what I’d like to do; on the second page is give you a little bit of an overview of the institutional funding model. If I can overview a few basics of the funding model so everybody has some sense of how money comes to the university then what the task force recommendations were might make a little bit more sense. This is a University of North Carolina system funding model. Every University in the system is based on this same model and it is based entirely on student credit hour production. Every dollar we receive from this funding model is based on student credit hour production; whether it’s a dollar that goes to faculty, a dollar that goes to facilities, a dollar that is for finance, for anything; it’s based on that model. And the model applies a 12-cell matrix. You’ve probably all heard that phrase plenty of times-*12 cell matrix*. So, that 4 of the cells pertain to your discipline which is categorized in 1 of the 4 categories. English would be in the category 1 which tends to be a less costly program to fund for institutions and Nursing and Engineering would be in category 4; much more costly to fund, both in terms of faculty and support and other things. So, every program is categorized in one of those categories and then also in looking at undergraduate, masters and doctoral SCH. So that’s the 12 cells.

The initial funding formula was created in 1999. It was a funding formula intended to support increased funding to each university based on SCH change. Not based on all SCH you’ve ever generated but on how much you changed in 1999 relative to prior years. And that formula was modified several times. Our current version is the 2007 version. WCU is one of the benefitting universities of this 2007 formula in that we get an undergraduate cost factor. Some of you probably heard that phrase because our mission is much more so undergraduate, residential focus is our primary mission. Even though we have other missions too, most of what we do is undergraduate residential. So we get an extra 10% funding credit for all the SCH we generate from undergraduate residential courses. If you see around the middle of the page you see applying 12 cell matrix? These are the key things that are determined by the institutional funding model. One is the instructional FTE that gets most of the attention on this campus; but it funds a lot of other things too. But the model first tells you how many faculty you need to address the SCH change that you’re projecting at the University. Instructional salary is how many dollars we’re going to get per faculty. Last year it was $73,983 per faculty member whether they were in English or Engineering or whatever; that was the amount given to the University for faculty. Then there are the academic costs and this is a factor of about 45% of your instructional salary. Most of it is for faculty fringe, but it also covers your operating budgets, it covers your SPA staff for the academic year. So, the SCH not only told you how many faculty you need and how much you have to pay them; it also tells you how much operating support you have for your academic programs. Next is the Library; that’s another factor of about 11.5% of academic costs. You get that much more for your Library support and finally, is the general institutional support about 54% of the academic costs are then a factor for determining how much the University gets to run itself. For all the finance/administration, the student affairs as well as more academic support can come out of that too. So, that’s the basics of the funding model.

After these factors, starting with the SCH produced are applied to the funding model, they so okay this University is going to grow by this SCH so you need $5 million more. Then they deduct what extra money you’re going to get from tuition so if you’re going to generate $4 million from tuition that year, you’re going to get $1 million from the State. So, tuition is factored into the whole SCH model too. And the model applies to both resident and distant SCH. There’s one form for distance and one for resident; except the distance credits do not get the undergraduate cost factor; that’s the only difference there. So, from there you could determine your University’s entire funding. And where the task force was headed is, is there some way we can create a model that allows for some relationship between how the University generates all this funding to how many faculty you have in your departments to generate that funding. So, if you’re generating a whole lot of funding, will you get some more faculty to do it or will they be given out in some other way?

So, the next couple of pages highlight some of the challenges. I’ll address some of these key challenges. The first couple really has to do with all the pots of money that are distributed on our campus. So, each team gets one pot of money for all your faculty hiring, a separate pot for all your part time; that’s your part time budget, a separate pot from the grad school for all your grad assistantships; a separate pot from educational outreach for all your distance education; although that’s all in process now; we’re re-thinking how we will integrate distance education with everything we do more closely. So, you get all these separate pots of funding and it’s really harder to trace how that’s related to your SCH production. You lose some of that relationship. So, one a couple of those key challenges were about that. And, all SCH counted by the State; they don’t say okay that was an SCH done by a graduate student teaching a lab course and that one was somebody online. They don’t really think about that so much as here’s your total SCH whoever taught it. That’s what your SCH is in these 12 cells and here’s your money for it.

Another challenge that we have is challenge #3; lapsed salaries. Lapsed salaries have not been constituted as part of our budget. By lapsed salaries we mean for somebody who leaves mid-year. Let’s say Phil says he’s had enough in December and he leaves us in December and so we’ve got a whole other semester’s worth of money for Phil. All that gets dumped into a general fund for the institution rather than continuing to be funding part of your instructional resources. So when you think about the lapsed salaries that way we have relied on that for one time money a lot over the years and that’s a hard pattern to break. So, one of the things the task force had recommended was that you look at incrementally over time shifting lapsed Salary dollars so they’re not used for as many onetime funds so you can use them more for instruction and SCH instruction.

Then on #4; Challenge #4 is the 2007 Funding Formula is not perfect in explaining all of the FTE Faculty and dollars we generated for all time.

Comment: Can I ask a question? Lapsed salaries also include salaries which you have paid through grants. That goes into that bin as well. So, how would this recommendation deal with that as well? Suppose I get hired a grant; half of my salary is picked up by that grant; that goes into a lapsed salary bin. That’s almost on a regular basis.

Dean Ford: Now at that time, your Department Head could petition your Provost for allowing to keep some of that extra money to pay somebody to replace you. And what’s left from there; let’s say it covered $20,000 in salary, you got replaced at $10,000. There’s another $10,000 in lapsed salary. That extra $10,000 is put into the overall bin that funds a lot of our institution. So, what the task force had recommended is starting to shift that money toward funding the instructional needs.

On Challenge #5, one of the other challenges is the faculty FTE needs might differ from one college to the next. So, some colleges or some units might need be able to teach in larger classes of 60, where as other things you ought never dare teach writing intensive courses with 60 students for instance. So, there’s some variation in the FTE need that’s recognized. So, adjustments have to be considered there.

And another, Challenge #6, is salaries. Some people, I know College of Business salaries are going to be a lot higher than Arts & Sciences salaries generally. So, there has to be some consideration of the $73, 983 doesn’t apply to all people. It has to be balanced out to fund the discipline specific salary needs.

Challenge #7 is that if we were to implement an SCH model for hiring allocations across colleges; there’s some consideration that previous allocations were not based on this so would we suddenly say, okay, we’re going to take this much money out of your college and shift to that college? The task force doesn’t recommend that. They recommend the steady creates of targets and they start moving incrementally toward them all the time.

Challenge #8 is the issue of enrollment patterns. Especially in the professions, these might vary dramatically from year to year. Construction management might be up one year; down one year and a lot of other disciplines are that way. And, faculty can’t just change up and down every year with the disciplines. So, one thing the task force recommended is that we provide some stability by providing 3-year rolling averages of SCH generation so over 3 years you get some sense of stability. If one year is a little up or down it’s not going to throw the 3-year average.

Challenge #9 is that unit’s have not necessarily received increased academic support in relation to the SCH funding model. Remember when we talked about the funding model generally at the institutional level? That it funds the faculty lines then it funds the academic support. Most of that is fringe benefits, but some of its other stuff. There hasn’t necessarily been a relationship. So, there are other deans for instance when they get a faculty line; they also get some operating money with it. And they’re used to some relationship there. And so, our task force recommended that some relationship be established at a minimum of 50% of the net academic support so the other 50% could still support other things.

Challenge #10 was that sometimes FTE and instructional salaries were used for other purposes rather than direct instruction and this is a small amount of money about 5% of it, but it’s something there so the SCH task force recommended that where possible some of those be shifted over time to other funding sources so if you cover that expense from another funding budget instead of the instructional funding line we can try to shift some of that over. Remember the more actual instruction we can fund with the instructional salary dollars; the more SCH we’ll generate for the University and the more funding we’ll get for the whole University. That’s kind of the brains behind it.

Comment: What’s an example of that?

The 80% of a current instructional FTE and current instructional salaries assigned for purposes other than direct instruction?

Dean Ford: Some of the academic support, for instance, like for a Faculty Development Awards; those are funded out of the same instructional salary pool and those we have to look at is that really tied directly to instruction or could the Faculty Development Awards be funded out of something else? Another example would be…

Comment (Dr. Bardo): Dept Heads Salaries.

Dean Ford, Yes, Department Head salaries and part of what department heads do, is administration, and yet there isn’t any kind of accounting for that. And so that’s one of those things; should department head salaries be coming out of another source, or not? Teasing that out will be tricky over time, but that’s something to think about.

Comment: So should department head salaries be coming out of the .54 multiplier for general institutional ….?

Dean Ford: I don’t know. Not necessarily, they are faculty positions….

Dr. Bardo: Let me talk a little bit about the model. I didn’t mean to interrupt. I apologize. Let me talk a little bit about the funding model. The funding model was a marginal funding model; it was never intended to fund the base. So, it can’t be retroactively applied to the base. And, it was just never designed for that. On the other hand, it’s the best estimate we have with the actual costs probably. There’s a flaw in the model if you look at the 12 cell matrix. And the flaw, aside from the fact that you can quibble about the credit hours by discipline, by level and all of that; but the flaw is that middle cost masters credit hours are reimbursed at a lower rate than low cost masters credit hours and the reason for that was; the deal with the legislature at the time was that implementing the new model would have zero impact on actual allocations of the money given to the UNC system at the time. So, when you got down to it; it was a degrees of freedom problem. And that they had to simply say this is the last cell and so it gets the net. So, College of Business, you know Masters students in Business areas are middle cost; we actually get less for them than we do people in English, for example, even though by state definition they’re middle cost. How middle cost gets reimbursed less than low cost…

Comment: Can we stop working as hard now?

Dr. Bardo: No, twice as hard (laughter)….It was the closest thing they could get to having a reasoned model given that we could not change the actual allocation of the legislature by applying the model.

General institutional support has nothing to do with academic administration and was designed purposely for that purpose. The assumption is in the model that dept heads are in fact paid out of faculty decisions. The assumption of the model is that if you get a study leave that’s an alternative assignment to your normal teaching that is a faculty activity paid for in salaries. And so the assumption on the credit hours; these are averaged across all disciplines and they are a generation model not an allocation model so it never was intended to be an allocation model. And so what you’re always trying to do with this is get a reasoned positioning based on the availability of funds but understand that it is strictly a fund generation model; not intended to be an allocation model. So that adds to the vagaries of everything we do.

Comment: Could I ask one more question? At several points in history, I thought, heard Chuck Wooten concerned about this exact issue that you’re talking about and I realize what you are saying; it’s allocation across generation model not allocation… (Interjection by Dr. Bardo: “Correct”) But at the highest level for instance if we are funded for 500 faculty positions, Chuck preaches to us that we’re supposed to generate that many as an institution. (Interjection by Dr. Bardo: “Correct”) That at that top level that has to balance out that doesn’t mean it needs to at the college level or the department level but that if we’re funded for 500 we’re supposed to generate 500 according to this process.

Dr. Bardo: Absolutely, let me give you; at the top level that is true.

Comment: Is that true; that’s the only place where the one to one correspondence would be true, but that is true there.

Dr. Bardo: Correct. Let me give you an example not from this University so we don’t get ourselves into the wait a minute why not this way vs. that way. It is typical for the Universities to have English sections of 22 students roughly. -Very typical to do that. It is typical for English to not be able to pay its way. Regardless the salaries in English don’t tend to be high but still you take 22 students and you put that across and it doesn’t work. So what ends up happening is that the Social Sciences and Psych end up teaching large sections to account for the fact that places like English, certain Foreign Languages can’t possibly have classes large enough to cover their total cost. And, so you can’t allocate the money based on the assumption that English is going to be a break-even that History is going to be a break-even. You just can’t do that because of the realities and then you add into it that a department may have four tenured faculty and enrollment may have declined a lot so they can really only justify two, but you’re not going to let two faculty members go because of short term enrollment needs. So, at the high level you must make whatever it is you were allocated, but how you allocate internally it is based on a lot of factors; if that makes sense.

Comment: It makes perfect sense.

Dean Ford: That’s a perfect segue on the next page.

Comment: It seems to me as you said, it’s in our interest to increase the SCH that we have coming in, but we don’t put any funding for example into the distance programs; there’s hardly any program for advertising where we can get more students in. It seems to me that we can get this money that’s going into the general pot, we might use it to do something; whatever.

Dr. Bardo: Sure, you can always re-allocate what you have, but if you look at how we’re allocating the money that does come through; if it is one-time expenditures for example if we have aggregated up one time expenditures, the vast bulk of that goes into the academic side of the house even though much of that was not generated on that side of the house. Ok so that, the reason is that I have a bias toward putting money into academic programs so I do; academic equipment etc. And so, we could allocate differently, but understand in the end it’s a zero sum so depending on what you decide is the highest priority.

Comment: It seems to me it is in our interest to level out some of these ups and downs we can generate and bring in more students. I wouldn’t separate that out. To me that’s part and parcel of what you are doing.

Dr. Bardo: I think a lot of why Kyle is moving a lot of responsibilities for distance education and summer schools into the colleges is to create that unified, uniform kind of planning process that we haven’t had with the parts separate. I think that’s really what he is intending to get more coherency to those kinds of programs.

Dean Ford: So they can be part of the faculty load for instance instead of an add-on for $3000.

Dr. Bardo: And then it allows us to think about in that context where do we spend the money for advertising for example; how do we do that in a meaningful way. You’re not going to see for example; you’re going to see very few billboards for us. There was a time when we needed name recognition. Name recognition is not a big issue right now for us. So, the other channels we’re using seem to be better. The billboards aren’t going to be out there. Some of our alums will hate that they love seeing the name of their university out there, but it isn’t effective for us right now.

All of this; the assumption is you get credit hours for FTE faculty members; the assumption is that normal other things happen and so that is an average allocation.

Comment: I’m just advocating that trying to promote our programs so it can bring in more students should be normal part of our operations; not an add-on.

Dr. Bardo: That’s right and right now it isn’t. We’re doing it mainly out of one-time money because of the nature of how we budgeted for…unclear.

Dean Ford: Now in the development of a model that considered those challenges there were 3 basic steps toward implementing. One was developing the FTE targets, the 2nd one is developing salary allocations and the 3rd one is academic support. Look at the FTE targets. This is hitting upon the point John was just sharing that English can’t generate enough to support itself, for instance. That the task force was concerned that units can not necessarily have one to one targets. Some needed different targets. So differential targets some might be 1.2 to 1; some might be .7 to 1; some kinds of targets give something for allowing for some accountability within units for achieving certain levels that are reasonable levels for their disciplines. And so the target ratios; the idea here is that the Provost would assign each college a target ratio. So, he may say Wendy, you’re getting a ratio of 1 to 1 with Arts & Sciences balancing out humanities. And Fine & Performing Arts, you might get 1.3 to 1 and whatever, but in the end after assigning each college’s ratio they do have to balance out, because we can’t give everybody a more attractive ratio because everybody wants more faculty and because we do have to balance out in the end. If there are some 1.2s there have to be some 1.8s to balance it out. So in establishing target ratios of the FTE earned relative to the FTE you are allocated the FTE earned the task force proposed that that be on a 3 year rolling average so you have some stability. That it also consider the 10% undergraduate cost factor and that it also include the modification index. And that was something that was proposed back when I was talking a little bit about the challenges is that the model changed between 1999 and 2007. The 2007 model does not really explain well all the money and positions we had in place before 1999 or between 1999 and 2007 and so the modification index that we proposed was 5.5% because it took us right to the exact percentage where we are supposed to be, but as we grow our enrollments that will get smaller and smaller and it will eventually disappear so we won’t need a modification index unless the model changes if we have to go to a new 2010 version.

Dr. Bardo: And it could because we would probably have a new President in 2011 or 2012 so it probably will change.

Dean Ford: It probably will, but here we’ve got something of a starting point. So, looking at FTE allocated along a 3 year average and then the FTE, I mean the FTE earned, the FTE allocated which is how many positions allocated in your department so you can compare the two. The baseline target ratio that’s the target ratio; that’s the concept I put in here; it’s the 1 to 1 ratio being the baseline but you have to balance around the ….unclear and various adjustment factors like you have to balance around the 1 to 1 and various adjustment factors. The task force report is actually quite long. It has a lot more detail in it, but some of the factors include program cost, faculty ratio expectations from one different program to the next. If new programs are being implemented you might need to devote more or being eliminated you might need to invest less. So, things like that. Step 2 then after you determine the ratio for how many FTE faculty each college would have. Step 2 is to figure out how much salary to attribute to those faculty lines and so not every college would need $73, 983 dollars salary. Arts & Sciences would love it, but we know we don’t need that much to pay our Arts & Sciences faculty overall. So, more than likely the salaries would be balanced across the different colleges. And the salary allocations that we proposed in the task force is to give one single pool. So, here’s your pool of FTE for your dollars and you figure out how to allocate it cover all your faculty, your graduate assistants, your part time, your residential and your distance needs, within parameters. So the Provost can stipulate parameters. He can say certain amounts need to go toward this and that. But, one pool allows shifting more toward college model in terms of thinking about decision implementation for your college. Adjustment factors again for salaries you have market differences based on your discipline, you might consider things like the distance from the 80th percentile in discipline; the faculty compensation like John was mentioning. What if you’ve got all this tenured and senior faculty well that creates a different dynamic. So looking at the tenured level, the fixed term vs. tenured tract faculty for instance; those are all factors that might cause adjustments in how much salary per unit you get. Then there’s the lapsed salaries fitting into that. The task force recommended that some of the lapsed salaries be shifted to colleges over time as we reduce the reliance on the lapsed salaries for non-instructional purposes.

Then Step 3 is the Academic Support Allocations. That’s that notion that as you increase your faculty allocations you might be increasing your academic support as well in terms of staffing and operational expenses. The task force had recommended the minimum of 50% after all fringes are cut out.

If you have any questions about these recommendations; it’s like the whole report of recommendations in one page there.

Comment: We all have our hot buttons, but as a grant earner when I create lapsed Salaries and had it stipulated that it goes into instructional purposes; I cringe at that. I earn those dollars very hard; they should go to support the research objectives of which I created them as a benefit. Now, some of them could go to instructional but make them all go to instructional? I think that’s creating a disincentive for anybody to go do research grants. The other thing…

Dean Ford: That would be a thing the dean would pick up with you. They can really work carefully to make sure they are making the right decisions for their colleges.

Comment: Can those monies be put toward a funding match for the next grant?

Dr. Bardo: Not really. The way in which the money allocates out; if X gets a grant that money is assumed by us in the state to go away when the grant is over. Therefore, his salary, we have to hold back knowing that one day he won’t be funded. And so, it is possible that those funds might be available for match for a future grant; it’s possible, but there’s no guarantee because it depends. For example, oil right now; gasoline is running $2.80 - $2.70 a gallon and if gasoline goes to $5.00 a gallon we aren’t budgeted for that and some way we have to find the money to heat and light the place. But, all of those kinds of things happen within a year. So, you aggregate lapsed salaries to handle those kind of things and so the issue is would some of it be available; absolutely. Is there a guarantee in any given time period? No.

Comment: To me, it’s also the same issue of bringing money towards advertising. If we had some match money it might allow us to get more grants that would bring in more and more.

Dr. Bardo: Absolutely. And so we’re trying now with the institution as we grow to move things to the college level and to reduce the reliance on lapsed salaries to meet basic expenses. The main reason the state gave us budget flexibility is to allow us to do that. That was what the budget cut was really about. There is a level at which I think we can move that will provide some flexibility, but it isn’t going to happen in one cycle. It is going to happen over two or three cycles particularly as we grow.

Dean Ford: It will be incremental overtime.

Comment: That’s where we get out of all problems; growth. You said about four to five years ago that we need to get to about 13,000 students.

Dr. Bardo: What happens and there’s no magic number there. But somewhere over 10,000, the nature of the institution shifts and when you start getting, 10, 11 – 13,000 there’s a lot of flexibility you have in the budget that allows you to make some of these judgments. Where, at smaller institutions, you don’t respond to them at all. You just suck it up. At our size institution you try to move the money to account for it; when get to larger you can divide the pot up a little more and allow for local judgments about what you do because you have a little more. If you notice Chapel Hill divides the pot up a lot, because they can. And that’s part of our goal and part of why I’m so worried about governance within the colleges making it effective; these kinds of judgments really do require significant interaction with the faculty.

Comment: I was told; it’s a different subject, but this $73,983 that incorporates not only full time faculty, but thrown in there, is instructors and grad assistants. And we use a lot of those; it really is a disincentive to us because it lowers the average.

Dr. Bardo: I’m so glad you said that. One of the issues we got into as an institution is that we kept saying we had to have smaller and smaller class size. Well the problem is the state is going to give you one set of money so if you need to have smaller and smaller class sizes then you have to have more bodies; it’s the only way to do it. So that means your average has to decline. What Kyle and the deans have done is the move those class sizes more in line with the way we’re funded. So over time we can begin to make some headway on that average. It is; we’re not dividing the pot up as much so it does affect that average. And the average affects everything else because of the nature of the way the funding works.

Comment: I have a couple of questions. First I know you have a longer report so for the adjustment factor is that something you or the task force or the Dean would ask for input from each unit or would the factors be the same for all units.

Dean Ford: What the Provost wanted from the task force is a model he could implement at college level so he would be working with the deans determining the adjustment factors at each college. And then the college dean would work within the college to figure out how to distribute within.

What you will see in the model I’m going to present for Arts & Sciences is that we’re a broad enough college with such varied disciplines that we were actually able to implement the model and create different ratios for each of the departments in the college already and balance them out to a 1.0 FTE with the variability. Considering some factors that department heads worked on and some of them consulted with faculty and others. It’s our first stab at a pilot and each year we’ll improve it, but now we have a model. So we can always improve our model. But that each dean may do it differently. There may be another dean that says I don’t want to do it this way; I want to do it another way. Dean’s have the ability to do that, working with their department heads and their faculty, on how to do that.

Comment: …Some people are going to lose money; we had to send money back last year, right and we didn’t get any increase. Does that mean next year we might be down and …unclear.

Dean Ford: Well a lot of the positions we eliminated were lower paid positions and that would make our average salary higher. The part time positions, well the graduate assistants thrown into one pot; it’s a 1 million dollar pot called 1.0 FTE. That’s like a one person making a million dollars, but we know it’s a lot of graduate assistants funded out of that pot.

But that if that got smaller and as graduate assistant funding is lower; what is it like $900 now will that’s a smaller salary averaged in. It’s just part of how we’ve done things, but all of the graduate assistants are paid of the instructional salary pool as well.

Dr. Bardo: And that’s true across the campuses of the North Carolina University system.

Comment: How do we maintain emphasis on University priorities like Stewards of Place and QEP and specific engagement and assessment in other areas and once that pie starts to get divided in this that and the other. I appreciate the work behind this, it’s brilliant and I don’t have to go slog through that whole report. But, there’s overarching…

Dean Ford: Well, the model we developed in Arts & Sciences, you will see in the subtitle, it was part of our discussion and we’ve added subtitles as the starting point of faculty hiring positions. It’s not

okay, you earned 2.38 that’s what you get. It’s a starting point for the conversations so all this other faculty work in and if we talk about what we do in Arts & Sciences as one model to be looked at; you’ll get a sense on that.

Dr. Bardo: X, another thing is I’m holding Kyle responsible for the University’s strategic plan that applies to academic affairs. He then is going to hold the Deans responsible for how it applies to them. And, so the allocations are just a matter of kind of blind, you want 10 tickets, it’s $20 bucks. It has to do then with the real key decisions on how are we going to achieve the goals that we’ve set and so that’s why I said it was never an allocation model. Because it really is about how do we allocate funds to achieve the goals we have. If it means that, I’ll use my department Sociology, doesn’t have a position that it might have had otherwise because that position has to go to whatever to solve an institutional problem. It really is a very complex process that requires in my opinion a great deal of conversation with faculty.

Comment: That might be why the other night at UNC Rising of the four multiple choice questions tossed out to the audience leadership came in first.

Dr. Bardo: Yes. Well, and it is the issue overall, in all regions. How are you going to get somebody out there that can help focus. But that is really where that conversation. Wendy’s making the point of why in my opening address I talked about the importance of college/faculty interaction in the colleges. This really is where the rubber begins to meet the road.

Dean Ford: You’ll notice even in the adjustment factors one of the notes was non-instructional service expectations for instance. So, like in Fine & Performing Arts you have a lot of service expectations on them and that may be embraced within the university’s strategic plan. We need to be supporting it and they can’t do a 1:1 ratio and support all the service expectations. So, at the Provost level he can already begin adjusting allocations based on strategic directions of the University.

Dr. Bardo: You may have already made this one (this point). What is really allowed is the opportunity for the dean, the department and the department head to sit down together and say alright we have to make X number of credit hours to make our budget. Now, I always wanted to teach this really small specialty course, but it’s always been canceled. Under this model, that small specialty course can be taught as long as the department works out where it’s going to pick up enrollment elsewhere. Folks out there who are now monitoring class sizes, whoa, time out. We can’t afford that. As long as you’re making your credit hours and making your base in that sense, how you distribute that work is really a discussion within that college, within that department. And that adds to the departmental flexibility and the faculty members’ flexibility in terms of the kinds of things you can experiment with and do. Right now, it’s very difficult under the old model where some of or no less than 17 students; that disappears, as long as you make the student credit hours, no one else is going to worry about it. It’s within your college and within your “clusters” judgment whether this is a good thing or not.

Dean Ford: That’s one of the things the department heads in Arts & Sciences like most about our model is that now I won’t be calling them and saying this class size is too small. They know if they’ve got these targets in place as long as they are using their target ratio they’re not going to have to account for all this; we can have confidence that the department heads work with the faculty to make the right decisions on how they cover their classes. If they want to give somebody release time one semester to finish a book then somebody else can pick up. They can do that. We don’t want to micro-manage we have plenty of other things to do. This allows that flexibility, but it does provide accountability as well. But, don’t ask for some more hires, if you can’t make your ratios if we determined it was an appropriate ratio for you. Now, in the college’s application piloting this there is a model on the back that shows you, the illustration, it’s really not that sophisticated. First you have your modified FTE earned and that’s taking the formula applying the undergraduate cost factor modification index and saying in 07-08 here’s how much each of these departments earned in Arts & Sciences. The faculty FTE allocations earned, not allocations, but FTE earned…

Comment: One question. The 10% is that what?

Dean Ford: For all the SCH we generate for undergraduate residential SCH we get an extra 10% of our FTE.

Comment: 10% of what exactly?

Dr. Bardo: I negotiated this. Because the original model was biased toward graduate education we shifted money over time from undergraduate education to graduate education and state law says that undergraduate education is the purpose of UNC. What I negotiated was if we on average kept our class sizes relatively small, we didn’t create a bunch of lecture sizes of 400 kids, but kept our sizes relatively small, then we were putting our resources as an institution toward meeting the state’s highest and best purpose. And therefore we should be rewarded for that and President \_\_\_\_ agreed to a 10% bump so every credit hour we get, we get 1.10 hours counted if they are undergraduate resident credit. If we allow our class size to we start making a bunch of big lecture halls, we would probably lose that but right now we get.

Comment: If we earn 50 FTE we get 55?

Dr. Bardo: That’s right.

Comment: For our undergraduate?

Dr. Bardo: Correct.

Comment: And then that is like getting 5 extra FTE, but then it gets multiplied by all the other multipliers the .11, .54, etc.

Dean Ford/Dr. Bardo: Yes, it gets you more library support, more institutional support. This is a very big deal.

Dr. Bardo: I can tell you I have large very large strips on my back that have disappeared as a result of that. There are several other chancellors that took significant umbrage at that; all of whom are now retired or are working at other states. But it was to me a major deal if in fact, we are going to support undergraduate education that you couldn’t over time transfer your resources out of undergraduate ed.

Comment: I read the full report until my eyes watered. You created the 16 cell grid that you’re proposing instead of the 12 cell grid…

Dean Ford: It’s really the same.

Comment: I hear you, that’s what I really want to make sure that it really is the same, so that we would end up the same way.

Dean Ford: It’s an in-travel 16 cell grid. Yes. But it’s nice because it is accounting for all the distance based SCH you’re generating as well as part of your model. So, ultimately if all the money is put into one pool for you all the distance ed that you’re teaching on top of what you do; it’s part of what you do and part of what you get funded for. Now, in this little projection here, I’ve got it all spread out so I don’t know how your eyes are for looking at yours, but the most critical column in there is column E. In E, that’s where we develop proposed target ratios of FTE allocated vs. FTE earned for each of the departments in Arts & Sciences and what you’ll see in column E is some departments have a 1.10 ratio or a .80 ratio; only 2 departments have a 1.0 ratio in that whole model. In the end as we averaged out we ended up being almost a perfect 1.0 across the college in terms of the ratio. The Provost could assign Arts & Sciences if he so chooses 1 FTE for every 1 we earned and then leave me alone to work with everyone in the faculty to figure out our target ratios and implement our model. So once you get that target ratio that can be multiplied by how much you earn to determine how many positions you actually get. A variation in the Arts & Sciences model is that we found out we’re growing and we’re growing really fast because we tend to cover about 57% of the freshman classes. And so we couldn’t just base our expectations for needs on hiring for next year on what we generated over the last 3 years because we weren’t going to be close. This all grew 7.1%; we had projected an enrollment of 4.08% so we were a little conservative. But we will see what it flushes out over next year. We threw in some enrollment targets in Column G and Column I it added an enrollment growth factor that we projected in Arts & Sciences. Not necessarily in all disciplines across the University because it hits our freshman first and then it will hit our sophomores later. So we did some projecting out to get a sense, but that side you’ll see not particularly scientific but as past as we could get in some conservative enrollment growth projections to make this work in June when we were making our decisions about hiring for next year. So, ultimately, Column J then gets the difference in how much FTE that department is currently allocated vs. how much its required per the whole funding formula; applied by our target ratio and adding in the enrollments. And you’ll see underneath the columns you’ll see a little multiplier like by C it says: “A+B divided by 2”. Those are intended to help you figure out all the formulas so by the time you get to J it’s just “D-I” and you can get to J. D what we’re currently allocated minus I what we need by next year. Per this model, I asked the Provost for 8.5 more positions. I didn’t get them this year. We’re in one of those fluke years where we couldn’t do it. What could we do with this model this year? Well, we could look at some re-allocation. We used zero based staffing planning. We looked at every position coming available in the college by the end of the year which includes the fixed term contracts that are ending. Faculty that are saying they will retire or resign. Put it into one pot and start to figure out per this model should any of it be re-distributed? Most of it stayed right there within the departments, but some faculty lines were actually re-allocated to other departments based on the model because their needs were even higher than those departments. And actually department heads were very open to that because they know they have an accountability plan; they know if they reach their ratio by the end of next year; it’s a reasonable ratio; they’ll know if they need it they’ll be getting more lines just like the others did. In the end, it’s all going to work. There are always going to be conversations and we have to refine it every year and just the other day one of the department heads brought up another issue we didn’t have in here so we’ll be refining it by next year and that’s okay. At least you have a starting point. So, this is something we created for Arts & Sciences; the Provost Office is looking at this as a starting point for creating something for each of the colleges. Instead of listing departments it will be colleges. But what ratios they will come up with you know this will be an all dean conversation.

Comment: Will ya’ll tape that for us? I’d like to have a videotape of that meeting.

Dean Ford: I would too. We’ll have very spirited discussion I’m sure.

Comment: How is scholarly activity, you were talking about grants, how is that reflected at all in this or is this all about classroom time. For example, some departments do a lot of things with their students, undergrads that aren’t really classroom related, but they are time and prep related.

Dean Ford: A lot of our departments do a whole lot of service that doesn’t count toward SCH generation and that’s one of our adjustment factors. It could be that in a particular unit in a college if a college decided to use this starting point and then create their own version. They could decide that one unit was so service oriented that they had to have more positions per earned and then it balances out across another unit. So it could be in Education & Allied Professions they say Psychology you’re going to have to cover more because we want this other unit….

Comment: Well, we know that. We want to be in college of cash cows (laughter).

Dean Ford: There are a few colleges on our campus that are generating a lot more FTEs than they are receiving in the allocations and a lot more dollars than they are receiving in the allocations. When you get all the way down to the end of that report it shows you that. Not necessarily good; not necessarily bad it just shows you where we are. This college is earning this much dollars; Arts & Sciences is kind of one of those mysteries because we’re receiving a little more FTE than we earned but we’re receiving a lot less dollars than we earned. So we might get more positions to teach our little old English classes; Brian’s not in here to argue with that; we need more, right? But we’re not getting as much dollars because it doesn’t cost as much to pay the English professors as it does in some of the other colleges. It balances out in our college.

Comment: Is the transparency working okay? You sound like you have a happy group.

Dean Ford: Well, everybody knows what they are accountable for and everybody had a part of the conversation in terms of the department heads working through it.

Comment: I think that’s essential that there has to be full transparency across the campus. We’re already running into issues. For instance, Psychology is everywhere. We know there are 18 of us and our target is going to be in the low 20s and I anticipate it; I’m fine with it. That’s the nature of the discipline and we’re fine as a group with teaching bigger classes so our students can have smaller English classes. That makes good sense to us and we’re teaching bigger classes. But, the Counseling Program in our college, their accreditation agency says the faculty member can only teach 3 classes, they can only have 10 students each. That produces about 5, 6 FTE per faculty member and there are 8 of them. That’s a hell of a gap that somebody is making up. We’re not as happy making up that gap as we are about making up the English gap. So the transparency in the conversations is critical in the implementation of this and transparency across colleges.

Dean Ford: Well in Arts & Sciences in talking with department heads at some points in the conversation, I said, you know, can you explain this to your faculty? And if there were any element they couldn’t explain to their faculty, tell me, let’s talk through that and make sure we understand and agree with it. And we modified things and so, they should be able to talk every faculty member through. I want every department head to be able to explain why one department got one thing and another got another. That’s the position they should be in when they talk to their faculty.

Comment: This is a great report.

Dean Ford: Do you all have other questions?

Comment: In those instances in which target numbers are not met in departments what solutions are available to these departments to come up with these deficiencies?

Dean Ford: Well, your department is one that has the 1.2 ratio because we know you are going to have trouble meeting as it reaches the target and you’re trying to teach smaller and more intensive foreign language classes. So, that already starts to adjust for it right there and you are right at it right now, in foreign languages it’s about 1.2 underfunded. You need more positions. We asked for another Japanese position, but we didn’t get it. It’s just a bad year. Next year we’re going to ask for it again unless something else emerges that is a higher (priority).

Dr. Bardo: I think what happens it that when you have a department that could be large or small that underperforms over time then it really is a conversation between the dean and the Provost about the role of that department, whether or not it really is a functional department. It could call for an external review; it could call for the department to think through its distribution of work. There’s a lot of things. If you all; the best program of this general type I know of and they’ve taken it way, way out is Stanford University and they have been at this now for probably 20 years or more. I actually brought the Provost from Stanford here to talk about this at one point. It kind of freaked people out at the time because it was so different from what we had been doing, but we’re really kind of moving down that road now. Over time we’re going to add assessment targets; we’re going to have enrollment targets that you are seeing there. Probably not a huge amount; we will have 7-8 that will create a dashboard of targets. Departments that are doing fairly well on those things will stand to get resources etc. Those that aren’t we will look at and say, why, what’s the story? It may be that it is anything from helping them think through a different curriculum, thinking differently about the distribution of work within their department, calling for an external review to see if we can figure out is there something happening there that isn’t happening in other programs? It gives you as a department much more clarity as far as what the expectations are, but it also gives a great deal more flexibility in terms of how you get there. It’s going to be pretty much up to you within the department in terms of things like Service Learning, undergraduate research in the sciences for example. It may be that over time within the department, the department says well this faculty member is going to take that work on and this faculty member is going to teach more students, so we balance out. There are different ways of thinking about these things, but what this is doing is putting a lot more flexibility in the department’s hands now, knowing what the real, these are kind of where we need everybody to be to get there. Would it be possible for an argument to be made; wait a minute this is really wrong, we need to have this amount of money? Sure, but then it recognizes that it has to be done in the context of what happens to this other departments around you. It also may mean that over time a college says look we’re going to do something special with counseling. You just mentioned that. Nobody has planned that so we’ll just use that as an example. We’re going to do something really special with counseling. That means we’re going to have to ramp up some other programs enrollment to make sure we can do whatever is intended to do with counseling. So there is a lot of different ways to look at these kinds of things. What it really does is change the nature of the planning process so it’s a known set of parameters you’re working with.

Comment: I’m concerned though, our college won two national awards the last few years for doing a really good job with preparing teachers and in our department, we had always in general capped courses at 20 and then we would let in more if we needed to; this kind of thing. Part of what we tried to do is to model in our classes some of the things that we hoped people would be able to do in their classrooms. At this point, I’m teaching a class of 50 and it’s not the same thing. It’s just not. I’m concerned that the focus seems to be completely off, for us anyway, of having smaller class sizes where we show our students and hope our students really learn to teach.

Dr. Bardo: I don’t think that is what this is going toward. I think what this is going toward, is asking the question of if in fact the University is funded at a given level at the top as you call it. You know, one big pot of money here, how’s it distributed in a way that all the various demands can be met in a reasoned way where there is real conversation about it. I think that’s what the intent of this is. The current situation in your department, I don’t know what particular budget decisions led to that. That was done in the colleges and migrated on, but those things all become discussable over time. If in fact, you need to have a class of 20-25 to make that work, then the question becomes where is that get picked up and it’s not a matter of saying nowhere that was the decision that was made earlier, but what we did was pick it up with a lot of lowly paid part time people, but that’s not where I see the University going and I think over time we’re going to more tenured track people and more full time faculty. So that also gets in the balance, in that conversation, but that was the way it was handled, a lot of lowly paid people to do piece work and maybe we moved too far, there may be a mix there in terms of professionals in the field to come in and teach a course as part of their own professional development as well. I think all of that could be up for conversation.

Comment: It could be that the Provost decides that your college is underfunded relative to the SCH production and FTE earned and maybe it’s at a .6 level and needs to be a little higher. But this provides some framework for the Provost to be having these conversations about the appropriate amount of funding for your college.

Comment: I either misunderstood something or misheard something. I thought I heard you say to X, that Modern Foreign Language, that that was taken into account with a lower number. I might be misreading the chart or misheard you say that. My reading and I want to make sure I get these numbers right is that is a 1.1 which actually means they have to generate more.

Dean Ford: No, allocated 1.1. per 1. So, they are a category 2 so they actually generate more positions than some of our category 1 humanities disciplines. They have a 1.1 ratio which means they are allocated 1.1 positions for every 1 earned.

Comment: Right. So they have to generate and I’m not arguing the point at all. It’s actually the opposite of what I heard you say before. They have to generate more to get?

Comment: No, they generate less.

Comment: Further clarification discussion.

Comment: The 10% gratuity that we get is based on average or number of classes over a certain size?

Dr. Bardo: No, it’s based basically on average class size remaining relatively small. Originally there was number, it’s was the focus for institutions that were really were focusing a lot of attention on undergraduate education and we still are and always will. So, it was a useful number. Is it the right number? I don’t know. It was the best estimate at the time. Again the numbers of today, I don’t know what the numbers today whether we net or not. I think we probably made a percent or two on it. But state law is real clear on what the legislature believes the primary function of UNC is. It was really an effort to say those of you doing it and mean it we’ll help you.

Richard Beam: We do have a couple of other agenda items to move to. I think I will put my foot in my mouth and suggest that if there are further questions you can follow up…

Dean Ford: You can follow up with me or any member of the task Force.

Richard Beam: Or look at the complete report which this is just a summary of.

Dean Ford: If you want, I could send that report; it’s a really big document. If I send it to you, Erin?

Comment: Yes, I’ll put it on the H drive and then when we get the new Faculty Senate website, we can put it there as well.

Dean Ford: I’ll send you this briefing as well. It summarizes it.

Report from Dr. Bardo: Applications are continuing to come in, in a large number. I met with Sam this morning and over 7,600 freshmen already applied and anticipate 10,200 by December and anticipate the total number to be about 14, 515 thousand people will apply this year for our freshman class. That’s a long way from 2007 when we were 4,700 people that applied for freshman class. We are keeping up with it and are starting to do our merit based financial aid reports as well. I just wanted to let you know that it is moving along. What we also know is that we’ve been keeping track of which departments were best at calling students back and which departments were not as good at calling students back. Those departments that were best at calling students back and actually had faculty interact with them, the better students tended to come in larger percentages. That’s a shock isn’t it?

But there’s now empirical evidence, our Honors College is keeping track because they wanted to know what was happening. But, those departments that were really good about calling the Honor’s Students back a significantly higher percentage tended to come and those that were not as good and it ranged from as low as 17% to those who didn’t pay attention to the student to approaching 80% for those that did. It really has real implications. So, when you get asked to call some of the better students, if you will, have your colleagues call, it really does make a difference. Our overall sense is that the class is going to be a little better than this year’s class from the preliminary look that we have now; probably the same size even though we’ve raised admissions standards and increased the number of applications. We think next year’s enrollment will be up 150 – 200 students and then the year after that we lose a small class and so we anticipate seeing some significant growth the year after that. That’s just to give you a sense.

In terms of budgeting, I’m not hearing anything new. We’ll meet with the Board of Governor’s next week. I expect I’ll get an update at the point on the budget. I think we have managed the budget to about where we would expect to be about now. I don’t anticipate a lot of change unless the revenue projections change a lot and we’ll know more about that. The real revenue projections begin to pay you got to pay close attention; January, April is the big month for revenue projections. With the legislature; obviously, is the last one’s they have to make decisions on. Right now revenue is running slightly lower than expected, but it is not out of bounds of what we guessed. So, we think we are about where we need to be. I don’t see, I think we are going to do some administrative areas still, but that’s not a budget related question. It’s just doing a better job at administrating. But those are the only things I know of that are still out there that will appear to have budget relationships, but not really and they will certainly have impact on the way that we distribute money.

Comment: The application; when does it count as an application. If I write down “X” and never get back to it; does it count as an application.

Dr. Bardo: No, it has to be a completed application. You have to actually send in the full thing, sign your name, so it’s a full application. If you just sent in a card saying you want more information; that’s just information, but if you file and most of these are not coming in electronically. We’re getting anywhere from 150-250 or more a day. It is interesting to see the process. Now, do you follow up and do every single thing, I have no way of knowing that. In terms of to count an app. you have to actually file an app.

Is everything else as you expect it to be this time of year? It is what it is and looking toward the end of the semester, but those are the big items that I know of.

Comment: I have a question. How are we going to pay for our van to go to California?

Dr. Bardo: Probably part out of one time money and probably part out of fundraising, part out of the students themselves raising it.

Comment: Pretty Neat.

Dr. Bardo: Yes, it’s pretty neat. Its broadcast live in 40 countries so a lot of people will go, Western, what? But, that’s okay. I’m looking forward to the person in Bangladesh trying to figure out where we are.

Comment: How much approximately is it going to cost to send a member of the band?

Dr. Bardo: My understanding is $1500 dollars or less? That includes all their equipment.

Comment: How much is each student supposed to come with?

Dr. Bardo: They’re still working on that. That’s Buckner and Clifton and…

Comment: That could be several hundred dollars.

Dr. Bardo: I would think. You know, scholarship funds for those that that can’t pay for it.

Comment: Let’s get that band alumni association cranked up.

Dr. Bardo: And there are a lot of other folks who are interested just because obviously it’s become quite a calling card.

Comment: And we have a year. And they have a year.

Dr. Bardo: Yes. I’m glad it’s not this January.

Comment: It’s not quite beating Michigan in Football, but it’s up there. (Laughter)

Dr. Bardo: Well, I have a theory about that as an Ohio State Alum. (Laughter)

There were no further questions.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Richard Beam: Resolution regarding faculty representation on Strategic Planning Council

I hope this is fairly straightforward. The desire has been expressed to me through the Provost that the Chancellor and the Executive Council recently agreed to expand faculty membership on this group which does have a, I believe, significant impact on budget priorities and other major items that the Executive Council ultimately decides. I think this is a positive step in the right direction. The reason this is as complicated as it is. In order to get this group functioning this year, in order to meet things like budget recommendations by the end of the year the decision was made to have deans nominate specific faculty members from their units/colleges. This year with the approval of the Senate and in conversations I had with the Provost and obviously, he had them on up the line, we thought it would be more ideal in the future that these would be elected from the faculty, by the faculty rather than basically being dean’s appointees. But in order to make the council be able to function this year we had to get it started which is why we’ve done this. The only minor change that I would propose to what was circulated with you is that Mr. Armenaki from Fine & Performing Arts is Mister, not Doctor. So, that is a minor change here. I would like to have this dropped to the table.

Motion was made and seconded.

Discussion: A grammar error was fixed in the language.

**Voice Vote Passes.**

Earlier on we tabled the discussion of the changes to the By-laws and the Constitution of the General Faculty. We can still if it is the pleasure of the Senate consider modifying the By-laws of the Faculty Senate that we can do. We can do it with a single reading. In looking through this myself, I don’t see anything particularly controversial here it seems to me this is all stuff that’s been talked about before.

Minor grammatical or format kind of things where we need to add a couple of spaces.

Comment: What are you talking about? I have so many By-laws, I wasn’t sure which.

Richard Beam: The By-laws of the Faculty Senate. There are a very limited number of very small changes. Council Membership: originally, it read Council Membership would be three years staggered terms. The insertion was for Senators. There were some changes proposed taking out some language that now we are already having the University Curriculum Committee engaged in some of these things in relation to policies or practices with the APRC. There was a provision to add a faculty member representative from University Curriculum Committee to APRC. -Clarifies the idea that the student assessment instruments are overseen by the Faculty Affairs Council. I think that is basically it. It struck me as fairly non-controversial. I suppose to get this officially on the floor is there a motion to accept these changes as proposed.

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion?

Hearing None. Proceed to Vote.

**Voice Vote Passes.**

Proposed Academic Calendars: Richard Beam: Okay, I’m not sure when this came out. I think it was fairly recently, Beth. And I don’t know if it is your desire for the Senate to take any kind of action on this.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Actually this year it is coming for information. Let me explain the process of the calendar always in years past. We have a Calendar Committee made up of representation all across campus; residential living, student affairs, some associate deans, etc. They develop a calendar. Once it passes that curriculum committee, it goes to Executive Council for approval. If the Executive Council approves it then the calendar it just submitted to General Administration. And, that’s what has happened so far. We usually approve the next year’s calendar and then propose a calendar for the year after that. What we would like to do is change this process after this year to where the calendar committee will meet; propose a calendar; it will come before the Council of Deans. They will look at it make adjustments, whatever. The Calendar Committee will finalize it then bring it to Senate for action. Then if Senate approves it, then it will forward to Executive Council and from Executive Council to G.A. This year, we’re kind of, been there done that so I thought at least we needed to bring it to you for information. The biggest think you will notice about the 2011-12 calendar not the 2010-11, but the 2011-12 does have two proposals for Spring semester. One includes a January term; the other does not. Currently we have a task force put together to look at a January term, what it would take; do we need to move forward, do we not. For every response I get that says yes, we like it. I get another that says, no, are you crazy? So, it’s going to be an interesting process, but we are studying it. Your Associate Deans are on that task force for the January term so please if you have opinions and things you want to share your Associate Deans are the ones that will bring that to the table. If you have any questions...

Comment: This next year it seemed like we did that change for the Spring Break which realigned with the public schools and community colleges, but it looks like we got away from that again.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: What happened is there is a reason for that. For every year that Easter holiday, because the public schools are trying to make their Spring break before the Easter weekend, for every year that Easter is early, we can make our Spring break coincide. For every year that Easter is late, in April, it doesn’t make sense for us to have a week off two weeks before the end of the semester. What you will see is a long weekend around the Easter holiday weekend for the public schools if it is later in the semester so that’s why you’ll see those flipped back and forth from year to year. Now, I’m hearing, I mean we had a representative from the task force of the public school system and now I’m hearing they might be changing their plans for Spring break. But we’ll all go right back to the table and see if we can’t coincide; at least collaborate to see if we can’t give part of that time off.

Comment: Our department asked is this is stone. Because, I think this year we had three different calendars; you know the Reading Day.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Right, and now the Reading Day is no longer. This is the calendar unless something unforeseen comes; that I don’t know about. The Executive Council has already seen this and they have already approved it. I’ll tell you why the calendar changed this past year and don’t shoot me. Homecoming changed and when homecoming changed, Student Affairs, and I understand this, they wanted a full week before homecoming for student events and student activities and so we really tried to accommodate the student side of things and that’s why it sometimes changes.

Comment: We just try to do our syllabi very early.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: I understand; I really do. I invite you to a calendar meeting anytime you would like to come. We did add Associate Deans so we get all college’s representation, but hopefully we will get more and more faculty input as we go.

Comment: Would the January term be like the mini-mester where it is optional?

Beth Tyson Lofquist: That is correct. You would have like a 2 week, 2 ½ week the first part of January. We would start our semester a little later that means we would end our semester a little later. You would not have mini-mester if we move for it. I don’t know if we will, but what is really being looked at is to have just a certain population have a January term. For example, you might have it just for freshman and do some freshman seminar type things; first year seminar type things. This is just an idea that has come forward. Where you could travel; there would be no schedule conflict for that 2 ½ weeks so you could do some great things. So, we’re looking at maybe that January term, if we do it, might be part of the Spring semester so a student actually could take 3 hours and it would be part of 15 hours but actually during the Spring term they would only be taking 12 hours.

Comment: One of my questions was about financial aid because right now mini-mester counts as part of the Summer.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Yes, that’s the reason and financial aid would just be part of Spring term plus we would earn student credit hours and would get state funding whereas mini-mester does not. So there are all kinds of things to consider for this January term. Please if you have opinions and whatever let your Associate Deans know.

Comment: Would this not go through the Senate at some point or is that something that really the Calendar Committee…

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Well, the calendar next year will go through the Senate so you will

Comment; So that’s when we would talk about.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: That’s right. There would be a proposal that comes from the task force to the Calendar Committee to the Deans to the Senate to the Executive Council.

Comment: One of the things that did not come up in talking about the funding model for I think obvious reasons, but it is relevant to this discussion is that Summer School is a separate entity by itself. It has to pay for itself; support itself. Basically in essence, there is no state funding for Summer School.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: That is correct. There is no state funding.

Comment: Except Distance.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Right, resident Summer Session is self supporting. Distance earns state support and student credit hours.

Comment; One of the things that struck me as being attractive about this proposal for a January term is that it could be rolled into the regular Spring semester term. Exactly how it would affect tuition and fees is still being worked on but it could offer some interesting opportunities to do some interesting short term kind of experimental classes other kinds of very focused type of activities that may be harder to do during the regular term and still have it count as regular load.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: One thing to think about is that students could take an overload without feeling like they are taking an overload. They could take a full 15 to 17 hours in the Spring or 18 and still take 3 hours, so you’re talking about catching up when it comes to graduation.

Comment: And how is that going to be done with the Faculty?

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Well that’s all got to be considered. There are lots of questions.

Comment: Dr. Carter would have to have a task force and a grid with lots of formulas multipliers and that would kill your ratio. (Laughter).

Comment: Why can’t we count our current mini-mester as part of the Spring semester?

Melissa Wargo: The State won’t let us. If we have a winter mester in January we generate student credit hours; if it’s outside of that it has to be self sufficient.

I don’t know the specifics. That’s just the way it is.

# SENATE REPORTS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Report/Provost Kyle Carter by Beth Tyson Lofquist:

I do want to let you know that revenue sharing for summer session is final. The Deans have been given revenue sharing for their colleges that eventually will be posted on our web site, but we’re waiting to get transferred into their accounts and the paperwork was done yesterday. But the final figures are determined.

The Board of Trustees now is asking for the colleges and the Office of the Provost/Academic Affairs to respond to our action plans. So, in March the Board of Trustees will be getting a report based on what Academic Affairs has done to implement action plans for our divisions. So, that is a little bit of a different request from them so that will be interesting as we move forward.

Moodle Blackboard as you well know we have a task force looking at that. We hope to have a recommendation from the task force in the middle of December. So, if you are playing around with Moodle and Blackboard please contact your task force members and let them know.

Other than that, if you have questions, please let me know.

Comment: I have a question having to do with the summer courses. Is there revenue sharing if a 12-mo employee teaches a course?

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Oh yes, because you still collect tuition although you are not paying the faculty member any extra money because it is part of their duties. But you still collect tuition and that still gets shared back to the colleges.

Comment: The other question I have is the new pay scheme where teaching summer courses where if the course only gets a very low enrollment; the teacher only gets a very small amount of money.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: We are revisiting in fact we have a meeting on Monday to revisit the pay schedule. The task force has met about the pay schedule for summer session to debrief about what happened this past year. There has been a different proposal. The Deans are having a session on Monday to look at that proposal.

Comment: Is that task force composed of members of the faculty?

Beth Tyson Lofquist: It has faculty, it has associate deans, it has some department heads, it has deans, and it has support units like HR and Adm/Finance.

Comment: Is this something that will be vetted by a committee from the Senate or will it come before the Senate or ….

Beth Tyson Lofquist: It has not been planned to do that. It has been planned to look at what happened and then determine from there. That’s not been a part of the plan.

Comment: Thank you.

Comment: That’s a really good point; it seems like Faculty Affairs Council. This is a really important

issue to faculty. It seems like an entirely appropriate thing for the Senate to have some presentation on it and offer some feedback to.

Beth Tyson Lofquist: If anyone on the Faculty Affairs task force would like to join our task force, I would be glad to take those names and put you on there.

Comment (Frank Lockwood): Why don’t you email me?

Beth Tyson Lofquist: Okay. We’ll do that.

Chair Report/Richard Beam:

I’ve just got a couple of things. I think I reported last month that a task force dealing with benefits for domestic partners and so on had been formed, but we had not yet met at that point, but we did meet a week or so ago. That group is currently exploring the status of exactly what benefits are currently being offered. Spouses and other family members so we can determine exactly what we are talking about, what the parameters are and we will be developing a draft policy and procedures to include domestic partners. This will include not just faculty, but all staff and so on. I’m on that group, the chair of the Staff Senate is on that group and there are some other folks from HR and so on. It seems like it’s not going to be terribly difficult, once we determine what benefits we have control over locally on campus and those will simply be dealt with probably along very much the lines of what’s being done now, but none of us know exactly how it’s being done now. Non faculty or staff spouses, how they get an id card to use the library and so on. None of us knew. So, we’re going to have to some of these things, but that is progressing. I assume there will be a draft policy statement coming from that group shortly.

I hope you will all be pleased to know the revisions to Section Four Tenure policy has been approved by G.A. so that issue has been settled.

One other quick point, I have been asked to inquire about advising and registration problems that you may be aware of that maybe have some significance and to send them on to Dr. Henson. So please let me know if there are issues that either have come up or will come up or do come up during the course of this registration and advising cycle. My impression is that things are going reasonably well, but I don’t know. Things may be working well for me and my department, but not so well for other units. So, if they do come up please let me know so I can pass on what the problems are and hopefully actions can be taken to address them.

The question has arisen relating to proxies. The By-laws of the Senate are very clear on this. If you wish a proxy, it needs to be a current member of the Senate who gets your proxy. You can’t just assign that to another colleague friend. They must be a member of the Senate themselves unless we want to change the By-laws of the Senate themselves, but that is what the rules are.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.