

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting, January 14, 2014, held in Kirschman Hall 129.

Roll was not taken.

1. Welcome

Chairperson Connie Phelps called the meeting to order at 3:06. She thanked the crowd for coming to this important meeting.

2. Approval of minutes

Enrique La Motta made a motion to approve minutes of the August 26, 2013 Faculty Council meeting. Chris Day seconded this motion. The approval of the minutes passed without objection.

3. Remarks by chairperson Connie Phelps

Chairperson Phelps explained what the Faculty Council is: it was the main body of faculty governance since the founding of the university. In 1969, the Faculty Council created the University Senate as a committee of the Faculty Council, and the Faculty Council has met less since then. It continued to exist after our transfer to the UL System. Chairperson Phelps read Article I of the FC bylaws.

“The Faculty Council or appropriate standing committees thereof shall have coordinating authority in all matters involving the establishing of curricula, the fixing of standards of instruction, the determining of requirements for degrees, and generally the determining of the educational policy of UNO in all matters affecting more than a single college, school, or division, and shall advise the administration in other matters as appropriate.”

She then explained origins of this meeting. More than 50 faculty members requested (via email or by signing a petition) a special meeting and according to the bylaws she was then obligated to do so. Explained some of the questions and their origins from the FSEC and the FC officers.

Connie Phelps then explained that blank index cards were available on which questions can be written, and then given to Chris Day. She further explained that the officers of the Faculty Council and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had submitted questions to the Administration.

The three areas of questions are:

I. Budget: We would like to see a basic breakdown of the UNO budget. Where does our income come from? Where do we spend our money? And, in particular, where did the deficit come from, and how is it calculated? We are also interested in understanding what is the minimum amount of money that must be cut from the budget now, i.e. this current fiscal year, in order to meet the required deficit reduction? What will get us to next year? And how is this calculated?

II. Restructuring: If most of the immediate cuts are coming from the non-academic side, why is there such a rush to implement major restructuring decisions without a more complete review that includes both better data and faculty participation? Given that academic reorganization is not part of the Cost Containment, what is the overall timeline for the reorganization and where in the timeline is faculty involvement? What data does administration have to determine the effects of restructuring on UNO's future enrollment, given that most of our money comes from tuition?

III. Workload Policy. We are concerned that a new workload policy is being implemented without adequate faculty input. In particular, at various times, the UNO administration has insisted that the de facto 3-3 teaching load would remain in effect (for productive faculty) because we are a research university (and all recognize that it is virtually impossible to conduct research on a 4-4 teaching load). The administration now appears to be moving some departments to a 4-4 teaching load based not on their research productivity as faculty, but based on their affiliation with a graduate program. Why the change?

Connie Phelps then introduced President Peter Fos, and he took the floor.

4. Administrators' responses to pre-submitted questions

President Fos thanked the faculty for inviting him. He explained that he wants to address a number of false rumors that have been spreading.

"Nothing happens unless I approve it." Explained that the Vice Presidents don't make the final decisions. He gets all the information and then makes the final decision.

He began by working through the PowerPoint (attached to these minutes).

He first addressed the fiscal health of UNO. Second worst in UL system based upon an audit of fiscal health. UNO needs to therefore look for efficiencies.

- He then discussed that SACS/COC will evaluate campus shortly for reaffirmation. This has added further pressure.
- \$14 million taken from state appropriations since becoming President.
- Changing student entry requirements means fewer students.
- Biggest shock when Greg Lassen came during the summer. President Fos addressed Linda's budget presentations prior to that. President Fos said that in June we took \$5 million from reserves to balance the budget. This means that Greg has a \$5 million budget deficit to deal with.

President Fos introduced Vice President Greg Lassen.

Greg Lassen thanked the crowd. Said that the budget situation is not the fault of anyone in the room. Everywhere defunding higher ed.

He said that UNO used to be a \$122 million enterprise. Now a \$100 enterprise. Taken devastating cuts to get that far, but still more to go.

Explained budget versus actual slide. As we are being cut by the state, enrollments declining. It is a fiction that we have \$105 million expenses or revenue, as we don't have \$105 of revenue. He then explained the difficulty of continuing declining enrollments. Should have been honest about \$98 million of expenses. Explains that the numbers are fluid, though. But we are structurally \$7 million behind. UNO's expenses can't keep up with declining revenue.

He wants us to appreciate that he and the administration want to fix this problem. There are ways to grow the university. So much to be proud of.

He said that there is real urgency as the reserves are nearly gone. Something has to be done very soon.

He then said that he and the administration are doing everything they can to make sure that faculty are the last touched by this. But there is a diminishing amount of time to take care of this year's deficit.

President Fos took the floor. Explained that he did not believe that it was mismanagement that brought us to this point, as he would have done the same thing in terms of drawing on reserves, as that was necessary.

President Fos asked late last year that the Cost Containment committee look at everything. Look at what we need to do. Look at what we need to do more of. And maybe some of the things we have to do less.

President Fos stated that if student numbers down in the Fall, there will be a total reorganization in enrollment management. If results don't show a turn on investments, there will be cuts in that area.

He suggested that there might be some relief on remedial English teaching, in that the state might allow us to enroll students who need remedial English.

He said that he would be happy to give everyone a raise, but that it would require about \$2 million in recurring revenue.

Continued that the ULS is telling UNO to look at all possibilities. He said that this year he will probably take some money from the reserves. Nonetheless, if we don't do something now, we are in trouble. Said that right now no faculty are being suggested for termination.

Four or five programs we need to close, according to UL System. But this gives no immediate benefit, because of notice rules for tenured faculty. We can not make all the cuts this year.

He said that example of ULM restructuring has provided UNO and the ULS with a model for making cuts.

He said that there is no timeline to make changes to Academic Affairs. No mergers of colleges have been decided. Science and Engineering merger is no longer on the table.

If we do programming changes, we will fill vacant Dean positions.

He then addressed the issues and questions surrounding the workload policy. He explained that he will decide to implement any new workload policy, not the Provost. He introduced Dr. Bill Sharpton

Dr. Sharpton explained that the first version of the workload policy was not favorably received. New policy that includes both full-time, instructor and part-time was requested by the Faculty Senate. And with greater flexibility. He explained that this new proposal is a pilot, which will be implemented in the fall, and then reviewed.

He explained the pilot would have a committee overseeing it. But it needs to get quickly implemented, in order to help make the Fall schedule work.

The new workload policy will address teaching, research and service. Then described assigning duties, reporting, and then evaluation. Pilot will focus on assignment of faculty time. Evaluation will be decoupled from the policy. The goal is to adopt a final policy for Spring 2015.

Data will be used to evaluate workload pilot.

Renia Ehrenfeucht asked: I'm still confused about research release. Some indication in the PowerPoint that some categories do not get a release.

Sharpton: one category does have a 5% release time. Can adjust at the department level.

Enrique La Motta asked about labs. Sharpton said built around 3-credit course. Flexibility through department. Will be evaluated during pilot.

Connie Phelps called upon Vern Baxter, from the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Vern Baxter: started by discussing the declining revenue, declining student enrollment at UNO. Must increase retention and students.

Vern read the following statement and resolution from the AFTPE committee, below:

"Proposed resolution from the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee for the UNO Faculty Council Meeting, 2/14/14

The University of New Orleans currently faces two fundamental challenges: declining enrollments and diminished budgets. Without increasing the number of students and improving student retention, the university will not be able to solve its budget problems. UNO has responded to budget cuts of more than 40% in state general fund allocations over the past three years, \$9.3 million in 2012 alone. The instructional budget has borne the largest share of cuts, both total amount and percent reduction, down from \$50 million in 2009-10 to just under \$40 million this year. Tuition has increased and we now self-generate 69% of total revenue, up from 46% four years ago. Still, a \$6.36 million "structural deficit" remains in the UNO budget that must be closed by June 30, 2014.

We are now presented the question of how to "right size" the university and be structured for growth.

The administration has proposed a number of specific policy ideas designed to address these issues. These ideas include combining colleges, a new faculty workload and evaluation policy, changing the university's general education requirements, reorganizing summer teaching, among other things.

Several of these policy ideas have been hurried into place as "drafts" or "pilots" to facilitate fall scheduling deadlines, without adequate regard for shared governance, faculty expertise, or the core teaching and research missions of the university. The UNO Faculty Council is not confident that these policies can increase enrollments, stabilize the university, or work to address the fundamental challenges faced by UNO. The rationale for restructuring is driven by cost reduction; how to balance costs, realize recurrent savings, and pursue reduced spending everywhere. This is obviously important but too little is said about creation of a better learning environment for students and a better working environment for faculty and other employees of the university. It is our view that the

restructuring and policy process has lost sight of the delicate and collaborative balancing act required to recruit and retain more students while we close programs, increase class size, and reduce course offerings. That collaboration needs to be repaired.

The workload policy is a case in point. The Provost offered a draft faculty workload/evaluation policy in August, 2013. The Faculty Senate responded in October with two resolutions requesting modifications in the draft policy. Academic Affairs responded at the end of January. The Faculty Senate was prepared to act on the response and likely approve the policy when, “under the constraints of scheduling deadlines,” fall scheduling guidelines were sent from Academic Affairs that placed departments in one of four categories based on degrees offered. This entirely new wrinkle in the workload policy immediately increases teaching loads of regular and term limited faculty in many departments, and acts to undermine the research mission of the university without consultation with the Senate committee or affected faculty.

Therefore, we resolve: Further development and implementation of policies should stop immediately and should not begin again without additional formal faculty involvement from departments, programs and the Faculty Senate.

Further steps are necessary to ensure that new policies reflect faculty knowledge, experience, and responsibility to design curricula, schedule courses, organize teaching, and conduct research in ways that will increase enrollments and stabilize the university. Our goal is to rebuild UNO as a dynamic and effective institution of higher education. Success requires that the administration recognize more fully that much of the expertise to achieve this objective resides with faculty.

In response to recent policy changes, the AFTPE committee makes the following stipulations.

The Faculty Council recognizes the need for faculty workload policies that can serve the needs of students. The expertise to develop such policies resides with the faculty. Any new workload policies should be developed by the faculty, then discussed with the deans and with the administration prior to implementation. Workload policies must not be sidetracked by scheduling deadlines and must proceed with great care and cooperation with departments and programs, and should not be implemented until each program has determined how to rationalize their workload in ways that will help UNO grow its student body, stabilize its budgets, and deliver programs that reflect the university’s mission as a nonprofit state institution of higher education.

The Faculty Council recognizes the need to measure the success of general education requirements through student learning outcomes. Measuring that success does not require the drastic measures proposed recently, some of which we fear further undermine programs of study and student retention at UNO. The expertise needed to develop courses within each program to meet general education objectives resides in the departments and programs. Reforms to the general education requirements should start in the departments and programs.

The Faculty Council recognizes that the success of UNO’s programs depends on providing an adequate array of courses to students. The organization of the academic year schedule and the summer schedule should reflect each program’s strategies toward that objective, measured by department and program, rather than through each individual course. The expertise needed to

design the schedule during the academic year and the summer resides in the departments and programs and they should be relied upon to create a schedule that will best serve UNO's students."

A vote was then taken on this resolution. It passed with many yeas, no nays, and approximately 8 abstentions.

Polly Thomas: She said she attended part of last Faculty Senate meeting, and was quite disturbed. Provost Payne said his bosses at the ULS had explained the ULM was a model UNO had to follow. Asked President Fos whether this was true. President Fos said no.

Peter Schock was recognized. He read the following statement and appeal to President Fos.

"The workload of the faculty in rank has been addressed, but so far, not that of instructors. The draft workload policy all department chairs have received calls for a 25% increase in the teaching load of all full-time instructors and other faculty now classified as "non-regular": from four courses to five per semester unless their service commitment is 20% of workload, a standard which I anticipate will be hard to apply and harder to reach as time goes by. President Fos, I appeal to you: please halt the implementation of this policy, which will inflict heavy damage on teaching and learning on this campus. If the policy goes forward, my guess is that we will dismiss up to 20 of our colleagues and destroy the morale of those who remain, saving the salaries and fringe of our lowest-paid colleagues as the only gain in a race to the academic bottom. UNO may win this race, but our students will be the losers.

Our information tells us that our peers in the UL System—the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and Louisiana Tech—already assign their instructors a 5/4 load. We should not accept even this precedent. Judging from the standards of the discipline of English, it is not conceivable that instructors teaching five courses can teach writing effectively; whatever these instructors may be doing, they cannot be doing much to help students learn to write. The same can be said of Freshman Math. Who in this room thinks that our current students and their families will not notice the impact of increased faculty workload on the quality of instruction, then vote with their feet, and withdraw? What parents would want to enroll their children at UNO if they knew of this shift in workload policy and its implications for lower-division instruction?

I make this appeal on behalf of the more than fifty full-time instructors on this campus, who together with the professors of professional practice and artists in residence, comprise nearly one fourth of the teaching faculty at this university. They are already underpaid, overworked, and practically invisible to far too many of us, in spite of the essential role they play. President Fos, please do not let them and the students they teach bear the burden of our efforts to contain costs."

Loud applause greeted the conclusion of his statement.

There was a question about the low percentage of instructional costs as part of the overall university general fund budget.

President Fos said that there would be job losses announced in the next month of about 30 staff members.

Mathew Tarr, stated that even though no faculty had been fired from the department of Chemistry, that the total number of faculty in his department has decline by 1/3 in recent years, and that they weren't being replaced. This was weakening the department of Chemistry.

President Fos then explained that there was new money available from Jindal's announced program, about \$2.55 million. And state universities will also keep the basic appropriation level. He also indicated that there would be new money from the GradAct, \$4.6 million, from tuition increase.

President Fos thanked Vern Baxter for his statement.

Rachel Kincaid added that each college at UNO could get something in the new budget initiative.

Bob Shenk, stood and said that he had one rhetorical question. "Why is the Provost still here?" Loud applause followed this question.

President Fos answered: there was a meeting in the Fall with members of the FSEC. Discussion of an earlier discussion in the FSEC in which there was discussion of the Provost. There was a back-and-forth about what the tenor of that discussion was, which included President Fos, Steve Striffler and Richard Speaker.

Rob Racine asked a question about graduate tuition. Why decouple tuition waivers from stipends? He said it would make it hard to attract quality student.

President Fos said he would look at it.

Steve Striffler addressed President Fos: What I hope, when you get the resolution, is that you see that shared governance is not working at UNO now. When shared governance doesn't work, when you don't get faculty involved, you get bad policy. And in those areas where there has been some effort of shared governance, for example the cost containment committee, it hasn't really worked. Academic program reviews have not had wide inclusion.

President Fos agreed that the cost containment system has not worked.

Leonard Spinu asked about enrollment management. He explained that the high school senior in his house doesn't get mail from UNO, while he/she gets mail from many other colleges.

President Fos began to tell us about some of the enrollment initiatives. Further discussion about enrollments.

There was a question about Delgado. And why no seamless transition.

Question from card. Statement that using bad data creates bad policy.

Question from card. Question about administrators' salaries. Fos answered that his salary was \$325,000, less than what Tim Ryan made.

Polly Thomas: discussed the 50-year celebration of the College of Education. Would like to keep it that way, and not merge with Liberal Arts.

She then asked about the summer school pay scale. She was concerned that unlike last year, this summer it was not possible to transfer excess profits from one class to another faculty member that was under the minimums.

President Fos addressed the college merger. He said that if faculty think it is a good idea, then we can do it. If the faculty don't like it, then we won't. He said he has not made a decision. Then gave the example of a school for the Arts, which Susan Krantz had indicated this was needed and supported by the faculty. He said he would do make it happen, if the faculty indicated the wished it.

Rob Racine responded. Claimed there was a fog between the faculty, who wish it, and the decision makers.

Trish Roger: Asked about instructors. She explained that there are a lot of full-time instructors. Gave some detail about the 19 instructors in English. Average salary is about \$37,000. She really hoped they will not increase our workload to 5-5.

Question from card. How do support international students if they can't work. Added from the English dept that there isn't a good ESL program.

Alea Cot responded to question about what the IELP is.

Greg Lassen responded that people in China and elsewhere can pay tuition. UNO needs a business plan for bringing those students to UNO.

Connie Phelps proposed that the unasked questions be submitted to the President because we couldn't get through them. The FC agreed.

David Beriss asked about making faculty pay their own way in the regular year. David explained that this was illogical, and that we sank or swam as departments. Asked if this was a decision. No, said President Fos. He added later that he expected most departments would break-even, or at least get close to that

Question about SACS and realignment. Bill Sharpton answered about required assessments.

Cheryl Hayes: question about enrollment minimums and tuition.

Elaine Brooks, FS President, thanked President Fos for listening. She asked President Fos to come to the FS meeting to explain what the corrections are being made. She said she wanted to hear from him.

Andrew Goss made a motion to change the Faculty bylaws. Seconded by John Gery. Andrew Goss recommended that the SEC study the motion and suggested bylaws change, and that we discuss it at the next meeting. Proposed motion is as follows:

'Motion to amend the Faculty Council Bylaws, by altering Article V "Committees" by replacing

"Section 2. University standing committees. The Faculty Senate will establish, set charges for, and supervise the University standing committees except for the Courses and Curriculum Committee and committees dealing with disciplinary matters."

With:

“Section 2. University Courses and Curricula Committee. This committee is charged with reviewing all course and curricula changes, catalog alterations, and policies that govern curricula, courses and graduation requirements.

Its membership is appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate. The voting members will be two faculty members from each college and one from the Library with staggered terms of three years. Faculty members must be of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor rank with at least one year’s experience at UNO in any rank.

The University Courses and Curricula Committee’s will work in conjunction with the office of Academic Affairs to develop procedures for approving changes to the courses and curricula of the University of New Orleans, as well as the university catalog. In order to facilitate reporting via the Faculty Senate, the President of the Faculty Senate, or his or her designee, will be an ex officio non-voting member of the committee. Committee decisions are subject to appeal to the Faculty Council.

Section 3. General Education Committee. The General Education Committee is a university-wide, standing committee charged with providing leadership for the overall direction and support of the general education curriculum. The committee will monitor general education requirements and review changes made to the program. The committee will oversee general education assessment and evaluation to ensure integrated, meaningful and sustained improvement.

The responsibilities of the committee consist of the following: Develop and maintain criteria for general education courses; Oversee assessment and evaluation of general education goals and student learning outcomes; Steward data for improvement purposes; Provide recommendations for budgeting and strategic planning based on assessment results; Communicate the results of assessment efforts to appropriate campus and external stakeholders to promote accountability and transparency; Serve as a resource for general education efforts on campus

Its membership is appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs. The voting membership is comprised of: faculty representation from each college, nominated by the Faculty Senate, with at least two members from the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Sciences. In addition, Academic Affairs will nominate a total of four committee members drawn from the college administrations and the Office of Academic Affairs.

In order to facilitate reporting via the Faculty Senate, the President of the Faculty Senate, or his or her designee, will be an ex officio non-voting member of the committee. Committee decisions are subject to appeal to the Faculty Council.

Section 4. University Standing Committees. University Standing Committees whose charges fall within the purview of the Faculty Council’s responsibilities will report to an administrative officer via the Faculty Senate. Such active University Standing Committees are to make a formal report to the Faculty Senate once per academic year.

A four member committee on committees will monitor and oversee the activities of all University Standing Committees. They are charged with maintaining and updating the University Standing

Committee governance document. Two faculty members of this committee on committees are to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Section 5. Ad hoc University Committees. Ad hoc University Committees authorized by the university President whose charge fall within the responsibilities of the Faculty Council shall have faculty membership nominated by the President of the Faculty Senate.”

Motion to call another meeting. Motion seconded. Connie Phelps said she would schedule a meeting for an afternoon shortly after Mardi Gras.

Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Meeting adjourned at 5pm.