

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, November 21, 2013

Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at ___3:03_____ PM__ by_Faculty Senate Vice President Dr. Cherie Trumbach (Senate President Dr. Elaine Brooks was out of town)

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

Administration	Rachel	Kincaid	(13-14)	Excused
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(13-14)	Present
For				
D.Rodriguez				
SG President	Brandon	Bonds	(13-14)	Absent
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(13-14)	Present
Adjunct	(vacant)		(13-14)	
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-14)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Present
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(11-14)	Present
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Present
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Present
Education	Polly	Thomas	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Matt	Lyons	(11-14)	Present
Education	Paul	Bole	(11-14)	Excused
Engineering	Enrique	La Motta (SE)	(11-14)	Excused
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Present
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler (SE)	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Robert	Montjoy	(13-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	John	Kiefer	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Christine	Day	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Present

Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Connie	Atkinson	(11-14)	Excused
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Alison	Arnold	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Andrew	Goss	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Elizabeth	Shirtcliff	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Steven	Shalit	(11-14)	Excused
Sciences	Mark	Kulp	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Tu	Shengru	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of minutes from the 10/23/13 meeting:

____Dr. Greg Seab _____moved and __Dr. Jim Logan_____seconded to approve the minutes of the 10/23/13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Vice President Dr. Cherie Trumbach for President Dr. Elaine Brooks):

- a) Dr. Trumbach announced Provost Payne’s response to the Faculty Work Load and Faculty Evaluation Resolutions 1 and 2: Dr. Payne will send a written response concerning the first resolution on Faculty Work Load and Faculty Evaluations before the end of the fall 2013 semester; concerning the second resolution about the need to empanel a committee to create an evaluation policy for instructors and part-time instructors, the Nominations and Elections Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are populating that committee now, and the committee should expect to meet once before the end of the fall 2013 semester.
- b) Dr. Trumbach read a letter outlining Vice-President for External Affairs Rachel Kincaid’s report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Wednesday, November 13 (**see**

Appendix 1). Ms. Kincaid wanted to update everyone on what she has been doing and what is going on in the Legislature. If anyone has something to ask Ms. Kincaid while she is in Baton Rouge, Dr. Trumbach has her cell phone number.

- c) Dr. Trumbach read Dr. Fos' written response concerning the closure of the UNO Children's center. Dr. Elizabeth Shirtcliff's brief statement: That summarizes the response very well.
- d) Dr. Trumbach announced that the Faculty Senate was co-sponsoring the Holiday Food Drive with the Staff Council and thanked everyone for bringing donations. She added that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had been asked to publicize the color flyer and would send out the electronic version.

5. Committee reports:

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Bylaws Sub-Committee - Review of Faculty Senate Bylaws and proposed emendations (Ms. Connie Phelps; see Appendix 2):

Ms. Phelps acknowledged Committee members Dr. Brooks and Ms. Marie Morgan and thanked Ms. Morgan for doing the bulk of the work. One of the reasons that we started with this was because the person just elected as President had never been on the Senate Executive Committee, plus she had a class and had to leave right after being elected. Ms. Phelps went over the compilation of changes, with the first major change regarding elections. The Committee looked at other Senate Bylaws; some had Vice-chair/Chair-elect, but that had a few problems. The Committee is proposing that Senators be elected by their units no later than April 1, which would allow new officers to be elected at the last meeting of the year. The pool of nominees would come from newly-elected and continuing senators, but only those senators at the last spring meeting would be doing the voting. The new officers would not take office until the fall, but they would become part of a transition team over the summer. The second major change involves representatives elected to statewide groups, with the proposal that the Faculty Senate President, or his/her designee, be the representative. Other changes include adding a retiree to the Faculty Senate, which was an idea proposed by a Senate Executive Committee member; changing the distribution of agendas and minutes; clarifying whether the reference is to the Faculty Senate President or the University President; and other clarifications and cosmetic changes. Any changes to Committee structures have to wait until other changes occur.

Dr. Andrew Goss wanted it clarified that when the officers are elected, the people who get to be on the ballot are for the next year, but the people who do the voting are the current senators. Ms. Phelps explained that the reason for that is that some colleges have way more senators than others. Suppose that there is a weird year when all of the former get elected – we end up with more people voting, which creates a more unequal vote. Dr. Goss had no objections to the

process, but he thought that it is not clear in the way that it is written. Dr. Dinah Payne thanked the Committee for its work, but she also said that Dr. Goss deserves a huge credit, too; that he and those who worked with him to begin with did a huge job putting it all together. Dr. Seab added that it never explicitly says that officers serve a one-year term. Article II, Section B, point 7 defines the end of the term, but not the beginning of the term.

Faculty Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee – Continuation of the study on the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM model as used in the University and as compared to our peer institutions that also use RCM (Dr. Vassil Roussev, vice-chair; see Appendix 3):

Dr. Roussev explained that since the last time, the Committee had a follow-up meeting with Dr. Gregg Lassen and a two-hour meeting with Dr. Matt Moore yesterday. This is Dr. Roussev's best effort to synthesize the discussions.

The first charge was to understand and get to the RCM model. The model has been there all alone, but nobody knew it. The Committee has been fleshing out our financial misfortune. The main sources of income are tuition and state allocation. The base state allocation is \$141.05 per credit hour, with that rate adjusted according to a matrix that subtracts 63.83%, followed by an additional reduction of 43%, which leaves \$29.00 per credit hour. Right now, everyone is focused on the 43% and that it does not go up. \$21M is our state allocation. The structural budget update: Close to \$4.88M this semester and projected for \$2.44M next semester, which is more than \$6M. The University does have some reserves, but they have mostly vanished; what remains are mostly restricted. According to Commissioner of Higher Education Dr. Jim Purcell's presentation the previous week, even that \$21M is overfunded – it should be more like \$17.6M. We are the sickest patient.

We have been hearing about the long-term income initiatives for some time, so Dr. Roussev elaborated on the immediate income initiatives. There are two legislative initiatives in Baton Rouge – variable rate tuition and removal of the cap. Whether they will go through is anybody's guess. By law, we cannot offer more than 120 scholarships, and we have over 2,600. Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht asked if that was graduate and undergraduate. Dr. Moore clarified that that was 120 scholarships coming out of the general fund. Dr. Seab added that it looked like a good way to lose 4,280 students.

Dr. Roussev continued by saying that cost containment is probably the operative word for the rest of the fiscal year. The Cost Containment Committee might be charged with a lot of stuff about which to make a difficult decision. The first thing that the Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee noted is the communication breakdown between Administration, the deans, and the chairs. A lot of time has been lost. The people in Baton Rouge are impatient, and if we do not do it ourselves, they will do it for us, a worrisome thing. There is no strategic plan by which the Cost Containment Committee can operate. There seems to be no established or clear mechanism for working together to make decisions in this budget cycle.

RCM is on WebSTAR, which Dr. Moore demonstrated yesterday. Most of the queries are available through WebSTAR for anyone to see. There is a 50/50 split of academic and non-academic cost (previously 40/60) and an 80/20 split for student credit hours between the college teaching a course and the student's major college.

Dr. Roussev said that in some sense, this is a call for the Senate to tell the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee what the former wants us to do next. If faculty wants to be part of the discussion, maybe there could be more discussion about the formula.

In response to Dr. Vern Baxter's question about where the money goes, Dr. Moore explained that there are five source of revenue – tuition, state allocation, indirects, fees, and earmarks. We say that we have \$106M budget, but a lot of it is funny money; e.g., waivers for out-of-state tuition is money we never really have. If they were to go, our budget is legitimately \$92-95M.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht stated that when we were first told about RCM, we did a number of changes, but they were not effective immediately. She is a little bit confused about the timing of these exercises. On one hand, we have \$6M deficit to cut by June, and, on the other hand, we are going to be cutting graduate programs. Yesterday we were told that there is no proposal to cut graduate scholarships, but today we are told that the majority of our scholarships are illegal. Dr. Goss commented that the UL system does not make law, they make policies. They approved our scholarship practices, so, apparently, they can contradict their own policies.

Dr. Roussev stated that he was not clear on where we are supposed to go next. Dr. Trumbach said that it is two-fold decision-making: We want to get rid of the whole \$6M deficit this year; we have one to two years before we hit the brick wall, but the Cost Containment Committee has to look at the short-term this year to get us better under control.

Dr. Ivan Miestchovich added that part of the issue we are dealing with right now is the result of financial mismanagement of scholarships over the years, and the University picked up for the mismanagement of the Foundation side of the house.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht's immediate concern is that financial is really the key, but we were told yesterday that scholarships are not going away next year. We are getting very inconsistent information, which is impacting lives of graduate students. More consistency is necessary. She is concerned that the Cost Containment Committee is going to be making decisions based on unclear information that will be shaping how we go forward and the strategy that we are having in our department.

Dr. Peter Schock said that he spent yesterday trying to calm down 100 graduate students who are unclear about their future. After a question as to how the budgetary pie is sliced up, Dr. Moore replied that we can put our hands on up to \$73M. Dr. Schock had tallied up everything in all academic colleges, including all salaries and fringe benefits, and found that it did not cost more

than \$45M. He suggested that this number should be borne in mind as we prepare for cuts to programs and personnel that are the source of UNO's self-generated revenue.

Dr. Roussev stated that the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee has pretty much put out everything that they have been briefed on. The 40/60 is now 50/50. The Committee's understanding is that the University is trying to wiggle out of commitments downtown. Dr. Lassen's priority is to cut as much as possible from the non-academic side.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht commented that we do not have any breakdown of the non-academic side; the detail that we have is on the academic side. Dr. Moore responded that the original numbers from ULS showed 61% overhead. When the Provost came, he immediately switched 10% to academics. Dr. James Lowry asked where it went, as we have not seen anything, and Dr. Trumbach replied it was because we are operating on a deficit. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that we do not have any information on where that money is going and that money goes out the door. In response, Dr. Trumbach mentioned various buildings that the University owns and said that nobody has told us no about seeing specific line items. Dr. Moore confirmed that it is all available, but a spider web. Dr. Trumbach added that for the longest time they were still unraveling it. Dr. Ehrenfeucht mentioned that electricity was another area. Dr. Trumbach affirmed that those things are a priority for the Cost Containment Committee to look at, but they also have to look at the array.

Ms. Alison Arnold asked what is the charge of the Committee? To recommend? Dr. Trumbach replied that they have only met twice. One meeting was to look at the non-academic services and make recommendations. The next meeting is not until December 6. There has not been much in the way of decision and problem-solving at this point. Dr. Miestchovich added that communication between deans and chairs is very uneven across campus. Dr. Dinah Payne stated that they have been told that the College of Business is fine, but that is not true. Dr. Goss suggested that there is a knowledge problem, and for us to get through this, there has to be a lot of good information. He is afraid that we have to move in a hurry.

Dr. Roussev thinks that there is going to be a short deadline and everything will be dumped on the Cost Containment Committee. This is why the concern about clear lack of priority. There is no strategic plan so how can colleges make decisions? We need to be able to support the decision-making. So far, it has been question and answer sessions. On the one hand, we are a research university; on the other hand, we are graduate student heavy. Does UNO want to move to fewer graduate students? Dr. D. Payne retorted that there is a strategic plan and that the colleges and departments are supposed to develop their own strategic plan based on the University one. Is the timeline our enemy now? We need to challenge our deans. She thinks that the Provost is frustrated with the deans. Who is going to make the decision to cut? If programs are to be gone, some of us will be gone. She would like to know who and when.

Dr. Roussev commented that the University of Monroe is cutting 30% of its budget. Dr. Moore pointed out that it is posted on their website. It is a good model because it shows what could be done. Dr. D. Payne asked Dr. Moore to forward the link.

It seemed to Dr. Baxter that we are up against the timeline and that the Faculty Senate should have a role in the Cost Containment Committee. He appreciated the Senate Budget Committee's work to make it clear, even though Administration has been pretty transparent. Dr. Trumbach explained that all of the faculty representatives on the Cost Containment Committee come from the Senate. Dr. Baxter then asked if there will be a representative from each college. Dr. Trumbach responded that there are a lot of non-academic people to deal with academic issues. The deans are supposed to have colleges come up with whatever plan, but that is not being done, or that is not being sufficient. Her impression is that what was supposed to have been done at the college level was not done, but it will be on the Cost Containment Committee to make sure that we are protecting our programs. There is a good cross-section, but there needs to be a lot of communication. Dr. Miestchovich added that there are 27 people on Cost Containment, and five of them are at the table here. We are on a collision course with the UL System – if we do not do it with a scalpel, they will do it with a meat cleaver. Dr. Baxter wanted to make sure that the Senate is involved.

Dr. Steve Striffler commented that it does not seem that the Committee is functioning. It seems that we have to make cuts very quickly. Dr. Trumbach's concern is that she cannot see sitting on something like this over the holidays.

Dr. Roussev then excused himself as he had a class to teach.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if she understood that this model is the one that has the 50/50 split. Dr. Trumbach responded that right now, the model is just producing information. It was still not that clear to Dr. Ehrenfeucht what are the parameters of the cuts that we have to make. What do we want to get to and how? If we had that, then possibly those in Liberal Arts could sit down and discuss. But how do we get in that discussion if we do not have the parameters of what we are discussing? Dr. D. Payne was also concerned about the timeline and the fact that we are getting started so late, but she does not think that it is the Provost's fault. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that in COLA, some departments are in the black, but there is still a lot of pressure on their programs. Departments in the red are not feeling the pressure. If we are going to be part of the discussion, we need to know the parameters.

It seemed to Dr. Baxter that June 30th is too soon to have to make the cuts, but on the other hand, we have to. He likes the fact that we are communicating and moving forward, but by June 30th? Dr. Trumbach added that it is pretty much a given that we are not going to hit the \$6-7M by the end of the year. Another senator suggested that there are easier ways to have a budget cut, such as a cause and effect analysis. Are we in a death spiral? It should be high priority to have a cause and effect analysis.

Dr. Logan surmised that what is probably going to happen is that everyone is going to have a list of what they can cut, and then by mid-April/May, we are going to get a budget from the Legislature and will have to cut even more. It happens every year. We truly do not know what the number is. He agrees with Dr. Baxter that the Administration has been amazingly transparent, but they do not know what to do either. The Cost Containment Committee will have to be able to move on short notice. They should do some scenario generation.

Faculty Senate Evaluation of Administrators Committee - Procedures concerning the evaluation of Dean Sharon Mader and Dean Steven Johnson in spring 2014 (Ms. Phelps):

Ms. Phelps explained that university-wide administrators and deans are evaluated on a broad basis every three years. This spring, they are Dean Mader, Library, and Dean Johnson, College of Sciences. There is a Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators composed of one person from the Library and one from each college. The Committee puts together an appropriate survey that goes out to all. The survey is used as feedback to advise the Provost.

University Committee on Courses and Curricula - Report on recent decisions and discussions regarding policies that affect faculty and students (Dr. Trumbach):

Dr. Trumbach read a letter from Committee Chair Carla Penz (**see Appendix 4**) and added that a lot of issues have come up this year having to do with our change to the UL System. There have been a lot of crackdowns on things that have not changed for 20 years and also because of SACS. There have been issues that have come up when faculty are not sure that they have been informed about the decision. She encourages us to know who are representatives are. She also encourages Administration to indicate when the decisions have been vetted. We have a lot to be worried about from what has been done in the past and it is all coming down on us.

6. Old Business. None.

7. New Business. None.

8. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Jan. 16, 2014

APPENDIX 1:

Letter from Vice-President for External Affairs Rachel Kincaid:

President Fos and I began working on a legislative strategy for the 2014 session early this summer. Since that time we have met with key legislators, the Governor's staff, Dr. Woodley and her staff, and our higher education colleagues in the UL and LSU Systems. Dr. Fos has also assigned me to temporarily assist Dr. Woodley from now until the end of session July 1, 2014.

Our goal is to seek the support of the Governor for inclusion in his Executive Budget, the maintenance of the current level of funding and the retention GRAD ACT tuition fund increases. UNO's current level of state funding is \$30 million. Under the provisions of the GRAD Act, UNO has the authority to raise tuition by 10%. Last year, UNO exercised its option to increase tuition by 10%, which totaled \$4.3 million. If we are successful, UNO would expect to see an increase in revenues in that range, adjusting for any changes in enrollment.

Additionally, we are working with all of the higher education community on the establishment of an incentive fund for higher education. We are still working on the details of the fund and garnering consensus with all systems and campuses, which will be key moving forward. This proposal would in the form of a legislative bill during the regular session which begins March 10, 2014. I hope to have more information soon.

On the Federal Level, Crystal Ellerbe, Director of Governmental Affairs, has been monitoring President Obama's higher education policy initiative entitled: "A Better Bargain for the Middle Class: Making College More Affordable Paying for Performance."

Specifically, the plan proposes to:

- Tie financial aid to college performance, starting with publishing new college ratings before the 2015 school year.
- Challenge states to fund public colleges based on performance.
- Hold students and colleges receiving student aid responsible for making progress toward a degree.

Promoting Innovation and Competition

- Challenge colleges to offer students a greater range of affordable, high-quality options than they do today.
- Give consumers clear, transparent information on college performance to help them make the decisions that work best for them.
- Encourage innovation by stripping away unnecessary regulations.

Ensuring that Student Debt Remains Affordable

- Help ensure borrowers can afford their federal student loan debt by allowing all borrowers to cap their payments at 10 percent of their monthly income.
- Reach out to struggling borrowers to ensure that they are aware of the flexible options available to help them to repay their debt.

The U.S. Department of Education is seeking public input about these proposals, and in particular the development of a college ratings system. The Department has held three forums to date including; California State University, George Mason University and the University of

Northern Iowa. The final forum will be held on Thursday, November 21, 2013 on the campus of Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge at the Lod Cook Alumni Center from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Additional details about the plan can be found here: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/08/22/fact-sheet-president-s-plan-make-college-more-affordable-better-bargain->

At the forum, a senior Administration official will provide an overview of the plan and receive feedback about the development of a college ratings system. Forum participants are welcome to share their views on measuring value and affordability, and in particular on the metrics and weighting of the ratings system.

You may also submit comments regarding the Administration's proposals by electronic mail or by U.S. Mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Electronic mail comments can be sent to: collegefeedback@ed.gov. If you mail or deliver your comments, address them to Josh Henderson, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 7E313, Washington, DC 20202-0001.

APPENDIX 2:

Here is an outline of the proposed changes to the "Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans" (last amended April 30, 2012). The changes and additions are highlighted in red; the deletions are indicated with strikethroughs.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Bylaws Subcommittee: Elaine Brooks, Marie Morgan, Connie Phelps

A. Major changes regarding elections:

- 1) That unit elections for senators be held no later than April 1 of each year
 - a) Article II, Section C, item 2
- 2) That election of Senate officers be moved from the first meeting of the academic year to the last meeting of the academic year
 - a) Article III, Section B, item 1
- 3) That Senate officers be elected from continuing and newly-elected senators
 - a) Article III, Section B, item 2
- 4) That newly-elected Senate officers form part of the transition team with the current officers over the summer
 - a) Article III, Section B, item 4

B. Major changes regarding representatives elected to statewide groups:

- 1) That attendance at the UL System Faculty Advisory Council or other statewide groups be made a duty of the Senate President or designee
 - a) Article III, Section A, item 1
- 2) That all references to other specific statewide meetings and all references to elected faculty representatives be removed:

- a) Article II, Section C., item 2
 - b) Article III, Section A, item 1
 - c) Article III, Section A, item 5
 - d) Article III, Section B, items, 1,3, 6, and 7
- 3) That the reference to the Senate President’s reporting on any statewide meetings be moved from Article III, Section A, item 5 to Article III, Section A, item 1

C. Other substantive changes:

- 1) That a retiree be added as a member of Senate
 - a) Article II, section A, item 5
 - b) Article II, section B, item 5
- 2) That notices of meeting and agendas go out to the entire UNO community, along with changes in the method of distribution
 - a) Article III, Section A, item 1
 - b) Article VI
- 3) That the time frame and routing paths of the Senate minutes be altered
 - a) Article III, Section A, item 3

Clarifications/rewordings:

- 1) Clarified whether “President” refers to Senate or University President (except in the section about Senate President’s duties)
- 2) That Senate will recommend faculty to serve on University-wide committees when appropriate
 - a) Article I, 2nd paragraph
- 3) That it is the elected Executive Committee representative from each unit who must be full-time faculty, etc.
 - a) Article II, Section A, item 6.a
- 4) That the Senate Executive Committee will forward the number of full-time faculty to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee after it is received by Senate Exec.
 - a) Article II, section A, item 6.c
- 5) That all terms run until the convening of the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year
 - a) Article II, Section B, item 7
- 6) That Secretary be added to the list of officers being elected
 - a) Article III, Section B, item 2
- 7) That the term of officers be clarified
 - a) Article III, Section B, item 3
- 8) That only faculty Senators serve on Senate Standing Committees
 - a) Article IV, Section B, 1st paragraph
- 9) That the statement about the Nominations and Elections Committee electing its own chair be moved from Article IV, Section B to a statement covering all Senate Standing Committees in Article IV, section B, 1st paragraph

Essentially cosmetic changes:

- 1) Re-ordered items 1 and 2 in Article III, Section B

- 2) Made changes under Senate Standing Committees and University Standing Committees for wording consistency
 - a) Article IV, Sections B and C [NOTE: We have left any changes to the actual descriptions of the Senate Standing Committees charges for another time/group]
- 3) Removed all notations of the Arabic numeral in parentheses after the spelled-out form of the numeral, such as ten (10)
- 4) Other minor cosmetic changes to standardize language, capitalization, etc.

BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

ARTICLE I. NAME AND PURPOSE

The name of this body shall be the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans. As an authorized, representative body of the faculty under the administration of the University of New Orleans, ~~this~~ **the** Faculty Senate is constituted to promote and implement, consistent with the purposes of the University, maximum participation of the faculty in university governance. In this capacity, the Faculty Senate will assist the administration in such matters of primary faculty responsibility and interest, such as academic standards and curriculum, student affairs, and administrative policy as it affects faculty welfare. Further, the Faculty Senate shall have authority in all matters affecting more than a single college, school, or a division and involving the establishment of curricula, the fixing of standards of instruction, the determination of requirements for degrees, and generally the formulation of the educational policy of the University in such matters.

The Faculty Senate will recommend, when appropriate, faculty to serve on **university-wide committees, including** the search committees for **University-wide** administrators. The Faculty Senate shall establish, set charges for, and supervise University and Senate Standing Committees. It shall be responsible for populating membership of **Faculty** Senate Standing Committees.

The Faculty Senate will advise the administration in the formulation and execution of policy with respect to the broadly defined goals, priorities, and financial needs of the University. The Faculty Senate shall serve as the forum for meetings between University administration and faculty regarding relevant issues for debate and discussion. This body will also serve as a forum for advocacy of faculty prerogative and position on important academic and University matters.

The Faculty Senate shall assist in the dissemination of appropriate administrative information to faculty. The Faculty Senate will also communicate faculty interests to the public and public officials as deemed appropriate.

ARTICLE II. REPRESENTATION

Section A. Composition. The Senate shall be composed of the following:

1. Students. The student body shall be represented by the President of the Student Government Association (or by his/her designee).

2. Alumni. The alumni shall be represented by the President of the Alumni Association (or his/her designee).

3. Staff. The staff shall be represented by the President of the UNO Staff Council (or his/her designee).

4. Administration. Administration shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.

5. Retirees. Retirees shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.

6. Faculty

a. Each academic unit (each college or the Library) shall be represented on the Senate Executive Committee, elected in a manner to be determined by that unit. This election shall precede and be separate from that for the remaining faculty Senators. Elected representation membership on the Senate Executive Committee from each unit is limited to full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrators of rank of Dean or above, with at least five (5) years of full time academic service at UNO, or tenure.

b. The remaining faculty members of the Senate, elected from full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrator of rank of Dean or above, shall be divided among units to be one representative for every ten faculty members. Each unit shall determine the manner in which their representatives are elected. Each unit with ten or more full-time faculty members at the rank of Instructor will have at least one Instructor representative to the Senate at all times.

c. The chief academic officer shall by December 1 of each year forward to the Senate Executive Committee the number of full-time faculty for each major unit, using the methods employed in IPEDS reporting. The Senate Executive Committee will forward that information to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee, which will then compute the number of seats to be elected by each unit for the next year and shall notify each unit.

d. At the beginning of each academic year, the Senate Executive Committee will nominate one adjunct faculty of the University to be a Senate member.

e. Vacancies shall be filled in a manner to be determined by the respective electoral unit.

f. If there should exist full-time faculty members who are not accorded representation on the Faculty Senate under the procedures outlined above, and if these faculty are associated with administrative units not large enough to merit individual Senate representation, the Senate Executive Committee shall develop a mutually satisfactory agreement by which these faculty will be attached to an appropriately represented unit for purposes of Senate representation, and for purposes of being eligible to be candidates and to vote in Senate elections. Such agreements will be subject to ratification by the full Senate.

Section B. Terms of Service.

1. Students. The student representatives representative shall serve a one-year terms term.

2. Alumni. The alumni representative shall serve a one-year term.

3. Staff. The staff representative shall serve a one-year term.

4. Administration. The administrative ~~representatives~~ **representative** shall serve a one-year ~~terms~~ **term**.

5. Retirees. The retiree ~~representative~~ shall serve a one-year term.

6. Faculty. Full-time faculty shall serve staggered three-year terms. The adjunct faculty representative shall serve a one-year term.

7. All terms shall run until the convening of ~~a new Senate~~ **the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year**.

Section C. Timing of Elections.

1. The elections of faculty Senators shall be staggered so that one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$) of the elected representation from each unit shall be chosen each year.

2. Senatorial elections shall be held in the spring semester **no later than April 1**.

The elected officers of the Senate shall be a President, Vice President, and Secretary. ~~The elected faculty representatives of the Senate shall be the faculty representative to the UL Board of Supervisors and an alternate, and two delegates to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities.~~ The Parliamentarian shall be appointed by the **Senate** President from faculty Senate members.

ARTICLE III.

OFFICERS

Section A. Duties.

1. The **President** shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate. The President shall have the primary responsibility for preparing the agenda for each meeting and shall circulate notices of meetings and agendas to ~~all faculty members~~ **the entire UNO community**. The President shall maintain a Senate calendar of business in committees and shall publish an updated calendar with the agenda for each regular Senate meeting. The President shall monitor the status of all resolutions passed by the Senate that request action and take appropriate steps to expedite implementation of such actions. The President shall report on the status of all actions passed by the Senate but not yet implemented or rejected. The President shall serve as the faculty's representative to the **UL System Faculty Advisory Council and other statewide groups** ~~Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates~~ or may designate another member of the Senate to serve in his/her place. **The President or his/her designee shall report to the Senate on issues being considered by any of these statewide groups that have an effect on the UNO campus.**

2. The **Vice President** shall assume the responsibilities of the President whenever the President is absent or otherwise unable to perform these duties and shall handle all correspondence of the Senate other than that specifically assigned to the Secretary. The Vice President shall keep minutes at the meetings of the Senate Executive Committee.

3. The **Secretary** shall keep minutes of each meeting of the Senate and **send them to the Senate President for inclusion with the meeting notice and the agenda for the upcoming meeting. The Secretary shall ensure that the approved minutes are posted to the Faculty Senate web page and SharePoint sites within one week after each Senate meeting.** ~~shall send an email notice that the minutes have been posted on the UNO University Senate web page (senate.uno.edu) to senators, appropriate members of the Administration, and the Driftwood. Two paper copies will be sent to the Library for inclusion in the Louisiana Collection. The minutes for the year~~

~~just ended will be archived on the web page by the beginning of each new academic year. Such distribution shall take place no later than ten (10) days prior to the following Senate meeting. Reports made to the Senate shall be made available to the Secretary by electronic means within one week of the Senate meeting at which the report was made.~~

~~4. The **Parliamentarian** shall ensure that all meetings are conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order (latest edition).~~

~~5. The **Faculty Representative to the UL Board of Supervisors** shall report to the Senate on issues being considered by the Board that have an effect on the UNO campus. The Alternate Faculty Representative shall fulfill these duties when the Representative is not able to attend.~~

Section B. Elections and Terms of Office.

~~1. The President and Vice President shall be elected from faculty Senate members.~~

~~1. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall be nominated and elected by majority vote of members present at the first last regular meeting of the Senate during each academic year.~~

~~2. The Senate President, and Vice President, and Secretary shall be elected from continuing and newly-elected faculty Senate members.~~

~~3. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall serve until their successors are elected the convening of the first Senate meeting of the academic year.~~

~~4. The newly-elected Senate officers will form part of the transition team with the current Senate Executive Committee members between the spring and fall academic semesters.~~

~~5. Elected officers of the Senate shall be eligible for reelection but shall not serve more than three consecutive terms.~~

~~6. The Faculty Representative to the UL System Board of Supervisors will be elected by the Senate to serve a two-year term. The Alternate Representative to the UL System Board of Supervisors will also serve a two-year term and will be elected in alternate years. The Representatives and Alternates may be either a senator or non-senator. Representatives and alternates will serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.~~

~~7. Faculty Representatives to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities will be elected from the Senate members for one-year terms, one of whom is also the representative to the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates.~~

ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES

Section A. Executive Committee.

The Senate President, the Vice President, the Secretary, and representatives elected by each college and the Library shall comprise the Senate Executive Committee. There shall be no more than two members from each of the colleges and Library serving on the Senate Executive Committee at any one time. The President shall chair the Senate Executive Committee. The Senate Executive Committee represents the faculty as an advisory committee to the University President, making recommendations and stating faculty viewpoints concerning the policies and proposed policies of UNO.

The **Senate** Executive Committee shall meet following each Senate meeting to review proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate for action and to determine whether the matter should become an item of Senate business. The **Senate** Executive Committee may seek clarification of the submitted item from the senator who originated it. If the **Senate** Executive Committee agrees that the matter deserves Senate attention, it shall assign the item to a Senate **Standing Committee**, a university committee or an ad-hoc committee, with a specific written charge, a tentative timetable for action, and a recommendation to work with another **University** committee if appropriate. If the **Senate** Executive Committee chooses not to accept an item for Senate action, it may refer the matter to the administration. Decisions by the **Senate** Executive Committee not to accept a proposal may be appealed to the entire Senate at the next regular meeting. The **Senate** President shall report the actions of the **Senate** Executive Committee to the Senate.

Section B. Senate Standing Committees.

It shall be the duty of the Senate **Standing Committees** to study proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate and to recommend appropriate action on them to the full Senate. Each **faculty** Senator shall serve on at least one Senate **Standing Committee**. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee. **Each committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.**

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee.

This Committee shall concern itself with the academic privileges and responsibilities of all members of the University community.

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee.

This **Committee** formulates and reviews policies, rules, and regulations governing the admission, readmission, academic standing, and dismissal of all students for academic deficiency. The **Committee** examines policies and procedures for academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and registration. Additionally, the **Committee** creates and analyzes policies to be observed by the instructional faculty in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee.

~~The~~ **This** Committee shall review the University-wide budgets in cooperation with appropriate officers of Administration. ~~¶~~ **The Committee** shall apprise itself of the general financial position of the University and of significant policy and priority aspects of budget decisions. ~~¶~~ **The Committee** shall report all significant plans to the Senate, with recommendations when appropriate. ~~¶~~ **The Committee** will include a representative from each college and the Library.

Evaluation of Administrators Committee.

~~This Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators~~ shall be composed of the Senate President, one Senate member from each college and the Library, and one staff member from the University Computing Center. The Committee will conduct the surveys which are part of the evaluation of the Deans for the Office of Academic Affairs, and surveys of other administrators, as directed by the University President. The Senate President shall accompany the Provost or other administrator to faculty meetings to report the results of such surveys.

Nominations and Elections

~~The~~ **This** Committee functions as a committee on committees, and shall be responsible for populating Senate Committees. ~~This~~ **The** committee will also make recommendations to the University President concerning the selection of individual faculty members whom the University President will appoint to the appointed University **Standing Committees** and ensuring that vacancies on elected University **Standing Committees** are filled. The Committee runs the election for Hearings Committee pool at-large members. In addition, the **Senate Nominations and Elections** Committee submits a slate of candidates for the Senate transition meeting elections. The Senate relies on the good judgment of the members of the **Senate Nominations and Elections** Committee to present candidates that reflect the quality and diversity of the campus community. The ~~President of the Senate~~ **President** serves as a non-voting ex-officio member of the **Senate Nominations and Elections Committee**. ~~The committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.~~

Faculty Welfare Committee.

This committee shall strive to secure for faculty members those services which will contribute to their welfare or convenience, including orientation to the University, housing, payroll deductions, insurance, health services, and they shall communicate annually with the **University** President regarding policies governing faculty perquisites and the structure of salaries. The committee shall, acting of its own volition, upon the request of the Senate and/or others, study, evaluate, and report on faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; act in an advisory capacity with the University administration in ascertaining desired changes in faculty compensation; provide information to the faculty on available fringe benefits; solicit faculty suggestions, information, and advice regarding faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; and maintain and keep current committee website.

Section C. University Standing Committees.

University **Standing Committees** shall be composed of faculty members appointed by the **University** President on the recommendation of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee or elected by the colleges and the Library. The Senate will establish, set charges for, and supervise the University **Standing Committees**. Reports from the committees will be discussed in the Senate before being formally communicated to the Administration or other body as appropriate. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee.

Current appointed University **Standing Committees** are:

Committee on Courses and Curricula

Committee on Recruitment &

Retention Committee on Student

Affairs

Student Publications Board

Current elected University **Standing Committees** are:

Committee on Distance Learning

Committee on the Library

Committee on University Honors and Awards

Section D. Disciplinary Committees.

All disciplinary-related committees, including the Charges Committee, Hearings Committee Pool, Grievance Review Committee, and the Peer Review Oversight Committee, are elected from the faculty, and work under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs. The Senate Nominations and Elections Committee will assist in the elections of members, and in the functioning of the disciplinary committees where appropriate. In particular, the chair of the Senate ~~Committee on~~ Nominations and Elections **Committee** shall direct the election of the Peer Review Oversight Committee chair by the voting members.

Section E. Senate Ad-hoc Committees.

The Senate Executive Committee may establish ad-hoc and temporary committees for the purpose of addressing specific and major faculty and/or institutional concerns. Upon activation of a specific committee, the Senate Executive Committee shall prepare a specific charge for the committee and include the form and timing of the response requested.

ARTICLE V. MEETINGS

Section A. A regular meeting of the Senate must be held monthly on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday rotation, except December, during the fall and spring semesters. Special meetings shall be convened on the call of the **Senate** President or on the request of four (~~4~~) members of the Senate addressed to the **Senate** Secretary.

Section B. All meetings shall be open to members of the UNO faculty, staff, student body, and alumni, except when the Senate, by majority vote of those present, designates a meeting or portion thereof as an executive session.

ARTICLE VI. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

One (~~1~~) week before the date of regular meetings, ~~written~~ **an electronic** notice shall be sent to ~~members of the Senate and to department chairs, the Administration, the Student Government Association, the Staff Council, and the Alumni Association for public posting.~~ **the entire UNO community**. Notices of special meetings must precede the meeting date by a reasonable time and shall be circulated as indicated for notices of regular meetings. All notices of meetings must contain as complete an agenda as possible. Members of the Senate may have items included on the agenda by forwarding them to the **Senate** President two (~~2~~)-weeks in advance of the regular meeting.

ARTICLE VII. QUORUM

A majority of the voting membership of the Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any regular or special meeting of the Senate.

ARTICLE VIII. RULES OF ORDER

When not in conflict with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the University of Louisiana System, Robert's Rules of Order (latest revision) shall constitute the rules of parliamentary procedure applicable to all meetings of the Senate.

ARTICLE IX. ACTIONS OF THE SENATE

Any action taken by the Faculty Senate may be overturned by a majority of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

Amendments to sections I, II, and X of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of two-thirds (~~2/3~~) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (~~1~~) week having been given to all members of the Faculty Senate of the proposed amendment, or by a majority vote of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote. Amendments to sections III through IX of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of one-half (~~1/2~~) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (~~1~~) week having been given to all members of the **Faculty** Senate of the proposed amendment.

[Faculty Senate approved by the Faculty Council on December 7, 2011; Amended by approval of Faculty Senate on April 30, 2012]

APPENDIX 3:

The RCM Model & UNO

(draft report, Nov 21, 2013)

The UNO Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee (*the committee*) has been charged by the Senate with “understanding the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM Model as used in the University and to compare our RCM Model to our peer institutions that also use RCM.”

Status Quo

As part of its charge, the committee met with Dr. Gregg Lassen, VP for Business Affairs, on Oct 16 and Oct 30, 2013, and with Dr. Matt Moore, Assistant Provost and University Registrar, on Nov 20, 2013. Based on the discussions, the overall fiscal situation faced by the university, which can be summarized as follows:

- *Sources of income.* Tuition (\$42M) and state allocation (\$21M) constitute 95% of our current income. Fees (1.5%) and indirect cost recovery from research grant (3-3.5%) comprise the rest.

The base state allocation rate is \$141.05 per credit hour; that rate is adjusted according to a matrix of parameters, such as level of student, program of study, and CIP codes. The rate is then adjusted by subtracting 63.83% of it and, from the result, an additional 43% are subtracted; this leaves ~\$29 per credit hour.

- *Declining income.* Over the last four years support from the State of Louisiana has declined from \$54M to \$21M; we’ve had a parallel decline in enrollment and the corresponding tuition income. Although costs have declined as well, the rate of decline has been slower leading to a primary imbalance between income and expenses.

- *Structural budget deficit.* UNO, following poor budget practices, has had a structurally unbalanced budget, with operating expenses exceeding revenue from tuition and the State, for the past several years. The difference had been covered with existing reserves, ORSP funds, and other unsustainable sources. At present, there are no more funds available to cover the gap and UNO has no choice but to balance its books. The budget gap as of last years was in the order of \$6M: \$100M in income vs. \$106M in expenses.

Updated numbers show an estimated gap of \$4.88M for the Fall 2013 semester and a projected \$2.44M for the Spring 2014.

- *Cost structure.* Approximately 70% of the expenses are payroll related; following years of persistent cuts, the usual “easy” targets outside of personnel (such as travel) have already been shrunk to a rounding error. UNO is locked into some external contracts that could be improved but timing and success of such efforts are uncertain at this time.
- *Vanishing reserves.* As of the beginning of the FY 2014, UNO has approximately \$14 million in reserves (down from \$19 million in FY 2013). The vast majority of these are restricted and access to them to cover any shortfalls is difficult and complicated, *at best*.
- *View from the top.* According to Dr. Jim Purcell, Commissioner of Higher Education, during his Nov 14, 2013 campus visit, UNO is *overfunded* as per the State’s allocation formula, which points to funding at \$17.6M. UNO has the lowest student-to-faculty ratio of 20:1 among our peers; the next closest institution is at 26:1. State allocations assume an average size of 26.

The essential takeaway is that, over the medium-to-long term, the university cannot simply cut its way out of the current situation—the proverbial “fat” is long gone. UNO needs (urgently) to bring in more income in order to sustain itself and compete successfully with other universities.

Long-term Income Initiatives

The main focus of the administration at presents is twofold: a) stop enrollment decline and improve retention rates; and b) begin investing in initiatives that would bring future growth.

- *Improve retention.* Currently, UNO is at the bottom of its peer group in terms of student retention and any success in improving that will have an immediate impact on the bottom line and will also improve our reputation.
- *Recruit out-of-state students.* While UNO will always serve the needs of the Greater New Orleans area, we need a larger pool of potential students. One strategy would be to use New Orleans and low tuition to attract students from large metro areas, such as Houston, Dallas, and Chicago, which are one short flight away. Given the large populations of these metro areas, up to 1/3 of our future student body could come from out of state.
- *Recruit internationally.* With its international initiatives, UNO is well positioned to attract international students, which (over time) could account for up to 1/3 of our students.

The takeaway is that these initiatives are in the process of being implemented now but, even in the best case, the returns on investment—especially recruitment—would take in the order of 3-5 years to make a notable impact on our budget situation.

Immediate Income Initiatives

Currently, the most immediate path to improving the income rests with:

- *Variable tuition rate and per-hour tuition pricing.* Variable tuition rate would allow the university to charge different tuition rates for different specialties (thereby, better aligning them with actual costs); per-hour pricing will remove the current cap on tuition charges per semester (which forces the university to subsidize student taking more than 12 credit hours). There are active legislative initiatives that would implement these (potentially) in time for next fiscal year.
- *Reduction of scholarships.* By law, the university should not be offering more than 120 scholarships at any one time; currently, UNO offers upwards of 2,600 of them at a total cost of \$10.9M. Normalizing the scholarship level would take several years but some results, in the form of smaller future commitments, will begin to show up next fiscal year.

Cost Containment

Cost containment will be *the* major task for the university for the remainder of the fiscal year, and for the foreseeable future. The Board of Regents has made it clear that fiscal discipline will be imposed on the university should the internal process fail to deliver the necessary results in the form of a balanced budget.

The main concerns on part of the committee are that:

- There seems to be a breakdown of communication between the administration and the faculty body. Faculty have had difficulty in obtaining direct, relevant information regarding the transition process and the decisions that would have to be made at the department/college level. The administration has not received the expected response from the departments and colleges. Much valuable time has been lost in this untenable situation.
- It appears that the *Cost Containment Committee* is expected to bear the heavy burden of making some very critical decisions, yet there is currently no strategic plan clearly outlining the priorities for UNO. There seems to be no concerted effort to understand UNO's current (and potential) program capabilities at different funding levels.
- Although the new administration has been responsive and forthcoming with respect to information requests, there seems to be no clearly established decision-making mechanism by which faculty and the administration can work together constructively and efficiently through this difficult period.

RCM

The purpose of the *Responsibility Center Management* (RCM) approach to budgeting is to attribute both income and costs to individual units (colleges/schools) of the university, thereby creating a more direct connection between decisions made and budget reality at the individual units; it is a more decentralized approach to budgeting.

“As typically implemented, RCM prescribes revenue and indirect cost allocation (ownership) rules and then gives schools and other revenue-generating units the responsibility to cover the total costs of their programs indirect, as well as direct from the revenues generated by their teaching, research, or business service activities. Program revenues include tuition, gifts, endowment, research and service income, and indirect cost recoveries.”¹

The budgeting process that the State mandates is request-driven and all requested funds from the State will continue be submitted and justified in its current form; the university is not in a position to replace that. Internally, UNO can decide to use RCM (or any other model) but the final request coming out would still need to be translated to the required format.

Currently, UNO has a fairly detailed implementation of the RCM, which accounts for all tuition and state allocation income (but not indirects) and all expenses down to the faculty level. Most aggregate queries related to the model are available to all faculty via Webstar.

Two of the main parameters that are being used in the current model are:

- 50:50 split between academic and non-academic costs (vs. the prior 40:60)
- 80:20 split for SCH between the college teaching a course and the student’s major college

Dr. Moore has committed to explain/demonstrate the live model as it currently stands.

Open Questions

There are a number of open questions that the committee has identified that go beyond the technical implementation of the RCM and into issues of policy and decision making mechanisms:

What is the envisioned budgeting process?

The reference document sketches out a multi-step budgeting process; at this point it is unclear what shape that would take at UNO.

What principles will be used for attributing SCH and other income?

¹ Strauss, Jon C.; Curry, John R., “Responsibility Center Management: Lessons from 25 Years of Decentralized Management.” 2002. ISBN-1-56972-020-7. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED469330.pdf>

In the reference document, the following example suggests that some principled choices would have to be made:

“We will suppose that tuition revenues are allocated in proportion to credit hours taught. Thus School A generates 67 percent of total credit hours (100/150) and School B, 33 percent (50/150). An alternative algorithm might recognize that the majoring school should receive some direct portion of tuition revenues to represent the fact that it attracted the student's interest (and tuition payments) and incurs advising costs. Thus one might allocate 80 percent of total tuition revenues in proportion to credit hours generated, and 20 percent in proportion to total numbers of majors.”

Who will determine the RCM formulas, and based on what principles? What is the process by which adjustments would be made?

“Develop broad-based involvement and acceptance for the underlying principles early on. They will guide intelligent evolution of the system.”

What is the relationship between the numbers produced by the RCM formula and actual budgets?

The committee had the distinct impression that no specific decisions have been made at the administration level, yet. Dr. Lassen pointed out that, in its pure form, RCM would likely show all units in the red as the whole university has a sizeable fiscal imbalance; it is unclear what individual colleges could practically do to balance their budgets on their own. The administration is working on relieving some of the non-personnel costs to achieve a more balanced starting point.

At this point, it appears that there will be a difference between the budget that comes out of the RCM process and the actual budgets. In that sense, the formula would be more of an analytical and advisory tool rather than a prescriptive one. We have no clarity on how the gap would be filled.

Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee

Mark Kulp

Ivan Miestchovich

Marie Morgan

Marla Nelson

Mark Reid

Vassil Roussev (vice-chair)

Polly Thomas (chair)

APPENDIX 4:

Nov 21, 2013

From: Carla Penz, Chair

University Committee on Courses & Curricula

Greetings to all,

We are glad that the Senate has requested information on the work we do at the UCCC. The committee membership includes:

- two members from each college
- one from the library, and
- two student representatives (non-voting)

We also have representatives of the Advisor's Council, Academic Affairs, and the Registrar Office. Furthermore, when appropriate, we invite faculty to discuss topics of importance to their programs and/or the university as a whole.

The diversity of our members helps to ensure that all matters discussed are clear to faculty and students of different academic backgrounds. Our work dynamics includes bi-monthly meetings. Interpersonal synergy is important to us and it brings up issues that might have been otherwise overlooked.

One of the functions of the UCCC is to evaluate proposed additions, changes, or the dropping of undergraduate courses and curricula. The committee considers these proposals only after both the faculty of the initiating department and the college-level Courses and Curricula Committee have approved them. As such, the UCCC can be viewed as an Inter-college organization that bridges faculty to Academic Affairs and the Registrar. As a group, we aim at operating parsimoniously and within the guidelines of the BOR and UL systems.

The UCCC also provides a meaningful faculty voice in general academic matters. For example, this past month Academic Affairs presented a proposal for new Residency requirements to the UCCC. We discussed the proposal and deliberated that faculty input should be requested at the departmental level. We received departmental feedback and composed a consensus summary, which was sent to the Advisors Council for their opinion. Yesterday we examined the Advisors Council recommendation. The UCCC vote was to approve the policy with proposed faculty and advisors input.

Finally, it is also important that Senators and faculty are aware that the UCCC is working very hard towards a smooth SACs review process and UNO accreditation. This has led to many improvements to our curricula that will be directly beneficial to our students.

Thank you for your interest and attention, and feel free to contact us at any time.

Carla