



Minutes of the Faculty Senate

Presiding: Richard D. Evans (Fin, Ins, & Real Estate)

Date: 1-28-14

Secretary: Cynthia G. Tucker (English)

Senators Present: Charles D. Bailey (Accountancy), Jeffrey S. Berman (Psy), Lawrence B. Blackwell (Thea & Dance), Patti Bradford (Univ College), David C. Burchfield (Public Health), Charles W. Crawford (History), Dipankar Dasgupta (Computer Sci), Jill A. Dapremont (Nursing), Maria E. Delavega (Social Work), Michael R. Duke (Anthropology), Richard D. Evans (Fin, Ins, & Real Estate), Donald R. Franceschetti (Physics), Edwin G. Frank (Univ Libraries), Michail Gkolias (Civil Engr), Michael M. Grant (Instr & Curr Ldrship), Reginald L. Green (Leadership), Michael G. Huffman (Health & Sport Sci), Eddie Jacobs (Elec & Computer Engr), Wade M. Jackson (Manag Info Systems), Donna R. Jones (Law), Benwari Kedia (Management), Erno Lindner (Biomedical Engr), J. Harvey Lomax (Political Science), Lisa Lucks Mendal (Comm Sci & Disorders), Cedar L. Nordbye (Art), Larry R. Petersen (Sociology), Heike Polster (Foreign Lang & Lit), Timothy D. Roche (Philosophy), Sandra J. Sarkela (Comm), Steven D. Schwartzbach (Biology), James C. McCutcheon (Crim & Criminal Justice), R. Jeffrey Thieme (Mrktng & Suply Chain Mang), Roy B. Van Arsdale (Earth Sci), Yongmei Wang (Chemistry), Ryan T. Williams (Couns Ed, Psy & Res), James F. Williamson (Architecture)

Senators Present by Proxy: Robert Kozma (Math Sci) Máté Wierdl

Senators Absent: Economics (vacant), Mil Sci ROTC (vacant), Sch Urb Aff & Pub Pol (vacant), Thomas E. Banning (Engr Tech), Evan T. Jones (Music), Jiada Mo (Mech Engr)

TBR Representative: Reginald L. Green (Leadership)

Faculty Senate Information Officer: Maria E. Delavega (Social Work)

Guests: David Cox (President Office), M. David Rudd (Provost), David Zettergren, Deborah Becker, Jeannie Smith, Lawrence A. Pivnick (Faculty Ombudsperson/Past-President), Martha Robinson, Kenneth Lambert, Craig Langstraat, Leigh Nanney Hersey, Various faculty members

The four-hundred-and-fourteenth meeting of the University of Memphis Faculty Senate was held Tuesday, January 28, 2014, in the Senate Chambers of the University Center.

1.28.14.01 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m. with a quorum present.

1.28.14.02 Approval of Agenda. The agenda was approved with no objections.

1.28.14.03 Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 12, 2013 were approved.

1.28.14.04 Reports

1. Provost's Budget Working Group Provost M. David Rudd, Vice President, David Zettergren, Martha Robinson (Management), Kenneth Lambert (Accountancy): In response to concerns being voiced by faculty regarding the budget, the Provost's Budget Working Group's member and chair of the FS ad hoc Budget and Finance Committee, Martha Robinson, delivered a power point presentation. The power point can be found at <http://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/> by clicking the right navigation guide under the heading Current and Recent Issues.

Provost Rudd introduced this presentation to show how the university got to this point financially. He assured us again that in moving toward budget reductions, every effort is being made to retain the university's academic integrity and financial sustainability. Members of the Faculty Senate (FS) Ad Hoc Budget and Finance Committee Kenneth Lambert (Accountancy), Craig Langstraat (Accountancy), and Leigh Nanney Hersey (Urban Affairs and Public Policy) were present.

2. TBR Faculty Subcouncil (FS President-Elect Reginald Green): R. Green distributed handouts from the January 24, 2014 TBR Faculty Subcouncil meeting. Items covered included the addition of American Sign Language as an option for meeting the Foreign Language requirement, faculty summer pay, and the instructional career ladder.

3. Revising the Budget Model (R. Evans, C. Nordbye):

a) R. Evans explained the work of the Provost's newly formed Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) Work Group, of which he, as Senate President, and R. Green, as President-Elect, are ex officio members. R. Evans sees merit in scrapping the old budgeting and planning system that has failed us by not responding to the massive change in state funding. He pledged to bring us a motion of Faculty Senate support for a change only once we have fully discussed the issue and processed it. (We might be ready to do this at our meeting on March 25 or on April 15.) Consultants are still explaining the methodology to the task force, and they have offered to visit the Senate, maybe in February. Presently, even the name—RCM, Revenue Centered Management or Responsibility Centered Management---is a problem. RCM might be renamed Growth Centered Management or Responsive Budgeting and Management.

Whatever it's called, every part of the university would operate like a small business. An extreme form of this model works well at Harvard and Johns Hopkins, but Vanderbilt relaxed its version 18 months ago. R. Evans himself finds that scary in some respects. But he thinks it makes sense in reducing costs and improving growth responsiveness. The needed expertise could be found in a good, new business school graduate, capable of managing a small business, whom we would not have to pay a big salary. "We would pay a dean to be an intellectual and inspirational leader, but the business part would be cheap and ordinary," R. Evans said.

President R. Evans likes the example of OSU, where every dean gets a budget based on formulas such as the ones our Academic Performance Work Group will try to devise. This group has the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect as ex officio members. The dean's budget may also include a subsidy or investment from central administration. The dean has to know the numbers and balance the budget, taking extra initiatives as he sees feasible. The dean also pays a tax on maybe 10% of the funding number, plus has to pay for utilities, maintenance, IT, accounting, and other services that are more supplied more efficiently by campus-wide providers.

As student demand ebbs and flows, and as funded research evolves, a dean's budget will respond to those changes. Parts of the university that have growth opportunities will not have to wait for the provost or president to decide to let them grow. When things turn south, the dean will be able to win funds from the central administration to subsidize a slower, orderly change. The central administration can also invest in particular units, giving the dean money and instructions to exploit growth opportunities.

R. Evans trusts these new changes more than he trusts our old process where the president and the provost took money from parts of the university that were low priority in their view and moved it to precincts they favored. We can still, Evans said, have a beautiful campus physically and intellectually while enjoying more growth by making these changes.

b) Cedar Nordbye (Art) was then given the floor to speak on two closely related matters. First he aired his concerns with this process and new approach. He spoke of his fear that it will create intra-department rivalries that will sabotage solidarity and the faculty gaining a larger hand in institutional governance. Then, too, with new model's "chaperones" coming to us from corporate life, he worries about them seeing only enrollment numbers and dollar signs and neglecting the substance of what institutions of higher learning should be.

C. Nordbye then spoke of having silkscreened small decals on the doors to several buildings on campus during the recent semester break. His intent, he stressed, was to stimulate thought and discussion of whether the U of M is simply a business or something more. Artists have long used such visual prompts in this way, and he had made sure that the decals would be easy to remove. The administration, however, saw this differently. They believed that his action was damaging, and reported it to the campus police. To them and to any who think that all sides of this issue are being addressed, he said, he was sorry for the distress that this had caused.

4. New FS Information Officer (R. Evans): R. Evans has appointed M. Elena Delavega to replace J. Berman in this position.

5. L. Pivnick to Serve on Executive Committee (R. Evans): Lawrence A. Pivnick, FS Past-President-once-removed, has agreed to replace T. Banning in voting on the Executive Committee.

6. Vision Statement/Proposal for FS (R. Green): President-Elect R. Green laid out a general plan to improve the transition from the FS of 2013-2014 to that of 2014-2015; to help us become a less reactive and more proactive body; and to help both the new and returning members be better informed and equipped to meet these ends. He would like to see the production of a FS manual of policies and procedures; a half-day retreat for members of the EC and chairs of committees; orientation sessions for all new senators on committee structure, the FS's relationship to the TBR Sub-Council, and other structural matters; and a list of 3-5 goals (e.g., clarification of senate's positions on research support, summer school, teaching load, and shared governance) on which the new senate will focus.

7. Academic Policies Committee: E. Jones acting in behalf of the chair, B. Kedia had no report

8. Academic Support Committee: P. Bradford, chair had no report

9. Faculty Policies Committee: E. Jacobs, chair will bring a motion to us as New Business.

10. Research Policies Committee: R. Van Arsdale, chair had no report.

11. Administrative Policies Committee: L. Petersen, chair will bring a motion to us as Old Business

12. Library Policies Committee: T. Hrach, chair report that Sylverna Ford, Dean University Libraries will present her annual report to the Senate on February 18. Library administration restructuring was touched on and information technology impact on library services presented.

13. Committee on Committees: C. Nordbye, chair report that a replacement on the Faculty Grievance Committee is needed to fill the vacancy left by the retirement of our former FS President Edward Perry (Mechanical Engineering). Nominations should be directed to Cedar Nordbye.

1.28.14.05 Old Business

1. Administration Policies Committee Recommendation on Bicycle Rack Facilities (L. Petersen): Recommendation to Improve Bicycle Rack Facilities

The Administrative Policies Committee recommends that the administration increase the number of bicycle racks at The University of Memphis. This fall, the university initiated a new bicycle rental program called Tiger Bike Share (<http://www.memphis.edu/update/sep12/bikeshare.php>). This program allows students and faculty to check out university owned bicycles for transportation to, from, and within The University of Memphis campus. The program, which is part of the university's sustainability plan (<http://www.memphis.edu/bluegoesgreen/sustainabilityplan.php>), currently has a fleet of 50 bikes, with plans for more as the program grows.

Even before the program's initiation there was a need for more bicycle racks on campus. On any given school day, one could find bicycles locked to lampposts, trees, "handicap" rails, and handrails on steps leading to building entrances. The new rental initiative will undoubtedly increase bicycle usage at the university, creating an even greater need for bicycle racks.

Adding bicycle racks is not only consistent with and supportive of the university's sustainability mission, it would give more students and faculty the opportunity to safely secure their bikes on campus and potentially increase campus safety by reducing the number of bicycles locked to handicap rails and rails leading to building entrances.

Adopted by unanimous voice vote.

1.28.14.06 New Business

1. Faculty Policies Committee Recommendation on Non-Renewal of Faculty Due to Budgetary Concerns (E.Jacobs):

Recommendation on Non-Renewal of Appointment due to Budgetary Concerns
On occasion, shortfalls in budgets may not rise to the level of a financial exigency but nonetheless force reductions in force at the University. In those cases, it is imperative that the academic mission of the University guides those reductions. Unless the President demonstrates (preferably by means of past performance evaluations) that an exception should be made to insure proper operation of the University or one of its educational units, the following procedures must be followed:

- Sharp reductions must be made to the following categories of employees prior to any reductions in teaching, research, or clinical faculty.
- Employees of the University non-essential to the academic mission.
- Administration and staff not associated with academic units.

After drastic reductions have been made in these categories, any further reductions in teaching, research, or clinical faculty must be made as follows:

- The President will request that an academic unit identify personnel for a possible reduction in force. The academic unit will follow the following guide for the order of faculty reductions.
- Tenure-track faculty should have preference over clinical and research faculty

- Clinical and research faculty should have preference over temporary, part time and adjunct faculty
- The academic unit will conduct an assessment of the impact of the reduction to the academic mission of the unit. This assessment should address the impact to teaching, research, and other scholarly activities, of any proposed reduction including but not limited to the impact of additional teaching load on tenured faculty, the reduction of research productivity, the reduction or elimination of classes or sections due to lack of available instructors, and the impact on the progression of students. The academic unit will then make a recommendation for or against the proposed reduction based on this assessment and deliver the list of personnel selected, the academic assessment, and final recommendation to the President. The President will then make a decision regarding the reductions. Should the President decide to take action against the recommendation of the academic unit, the President will provide an independent assessment of the academic impact justifying the decision to the affected academic unit and the Faculty Senate.

Should tenure-track, clinical, research, or temporary faculty be selected for non-renewal, all procedures outlined in section 2, parts c-g of the American Association of University Professors Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (2013 Revision) shall be followed with the following clarifications.

- In part 2.d., the individual making the decision not to renew an appointment is the President of the University.
- In part 2.g., the committee that reviews the faculty member's allegation that the decision was the result of inadequate consideration in terms of the relevant standards of the institution shall be the Faculty Grievance Committee.

This motion on "Non-Renewal of Appointment Due to Budgetary Concerns" was tabled with the intention of getting more clarification from the Legal Counsel and then returning to it when we meet next month.

1.28.14.07 Forum for the Development of Faculty Opinion: Mary Beth Mader (Philosophy), Professor and College Director of Graduate Admissions, subject: Impact on graduate recruitment of proposed reductions in graduate assistantship

My purpose here today is to register a concern on a topic that may be of interest to many departments, but I speak only about the topic in the context of the Philosophy Department, namely: the impact on graduate recruitment of proposed reductions in Graduate Assistantship offer terms.

Our general concern is the future of graduate admission, and in particular, its continued competitiveness. Administration representatives express constant interest in recruiting strong future researchers for University of Memphis MA and PhD programs. Yet several potential developments would seem to put in peril our ability to recruit the most talented and accomplished applicants who seek admission to our programs. Among these is the proposed plan to standardize offers of graduate assistantships across units, and as a part of this, to limit the term of the PhD assistantship offer either to three years, or to four years with the option to petition for a fifth year of funding. Like many PhD programs, the Philosophy PhD program is a packed five-year program of study, research and teaching. Our funding offer term, and the standard funding offer term for the discipline of Philosophy in the US, is five years. In three weeks, I will be calling

applicants to make offers of PhD funding. I don't yet know how long a funding term we will be permitted to offer. Nor do I know what the proposed process of petitioning for a fifth year of funding would entail. But I do know that both of these proposed offers are feeble, and could in no way be said to be competitive—they will cripple our recruiting.

So, the administration should know that the suggested offer terms will see us lose strong students--who want to come to our program--to universities that heartily and truly compete for the best future researchers. As I understand the proposed changes, the new standardization and reduced offer terms are just that: proposed, and not finalized. Our hope is that our colleagues in administration working on graduate funding issues will reconsider this certainly destructive change. Although I do not have information about other UM PhD programs potentially affected by the proposed change, I suspect that my particular department is not alone in being able to anticipate quite easily the damage the change would do. We are interested in learning whether or not the Faculty Senate might address this issue as a body, and bring this concern about competitiveness in graduate admissions to the attention of the administration.

1.28.14.08 Announcements

1. U of M Veterans Resource Center (VRC). This facility, opened last month, is located in the Panhellenic Building, Room 110.
2. Campus Visit by TBR Vice Chancellor Tristan Denley: VChancellor Denley will meet with the deans, directors, and chairs on Thursday, Feb. 13, from 1:00-3:00pm.
3. U of M 2014 Research Celebration: Tuesday, February 25, 2014, 2:30-4:00pm, in the Fogelman Executive Center Lower Atrium.

1.04.14.09 Adjourn: 4:30 pm