Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 6 October 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 6 October 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order:** 5:03 PM

The Speaker of the Faculty, without objection, changed the order of the agenda to accommodate the Interim Provost’s travel needs. The Interim Provost delivered his report and took questions (see below). The meeting then proceeded according to the agenda.

2. **15 September Regular Meeting Minutes** were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and Information:** none.

4. **Reports**

   A. **Interim Provost McGee** (Topics - [PDF](#))

      The Interim Provost thanked all those who worked long hours over the weekend to address weather-related facilities issues and to make sure students were safe, cared for; and fed, with praise due especially to those in the offices of the Provost, Academic Experience, and the Registrar. The academic deans and program and department chairs also deserve praise, he added, for their work in identifying classrooms and faculty offices that had been affected.

      The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of last month’s reports from the President and himself in relation to budget cuts this year, which total $1.5 million from the general and instructional funds of the College. He added that Academic Affairs, as the largest division, has been asked to find the largest cuts, $1,055,000 in recurring budget cuts this year, minus $250,000 which, he said, he was able to convince the President to defer until next fiscal year. He stressed that protection of faculty lines and creating flexibility going into next academic year have been paramount in his proposals. He added that the President will have to convince the Board of Trustees that the cuts are appropriate and necessary. The Interim Provost promised further budget updates in the near future.

      The Interim Provost reported that SACSCOC reafﬁrmation work is coming along apace, but a great deal still needs to be done. Policies that should be periodically reviewed and updated, for example, have not been over the years and still need to be for the reafﬁrmation. The work on assessment continues, as well, and the Interim Provost said that he wanted to "heap praise" on the many faculty who have not only served in their departments’ assessment efforts but who have also served in the college-wide general education assessment. The Interim Provost said that there will be further updates on the SACSCOC reafﬁrmation efforts at each future Faculty Senate meeting this year.

      He noted that the Senate agenda for the night includes a report from the Faculty Budget Committee and said that he will provide his perspective on the budget at the November Senate meeting. In the interest of allowing Q&A before he had to leave, he opened the floor at this point to questions.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked how many vacant faculty lines will be cut.

The Interim Provost replied that there are three faculty line vacancies that, per his proposal to Randolph Hall, will be cut. He added that there are far more vacant staff roles that are not on the upcoming agenda.
positions will not be refilled, on which he said there is more consultation with the academic deans needed before he discusses those staff lines. Each of the academic schools and the library, he said, contributed either a faculty line, staff lines, or operating money or a combination of two or all three of those toward the budget cuts—all made sacrifices.

**Beatriz Maldonado**, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (SLCWA), asked about positions that might be cut next year.

The Interim Provost said that positions currently occupied this year but that are anticipated to be vacant the following year would be “fair game” in budget discussions for next year’s reductions. He reported that discussions planned for the next Academic Counsel meeting will begin a "somewhat longer and more thoughtful process" for meeting budget goals in the next fiscal and financial year; but he added that the process must also take into account the time-sensitive need to let academic units know of the fate of such lines soon so that they can begin recruitment for positions that will not be cut.

There were no further questions.

### B. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

The Speaker added his thanks to the Interim Provost’s for all those who worked to minimize the inclement weather’s impact on our mission and our students, and he counseled patience and accommodation in working with students who may have been adversely affected due to location and cannot come to class.

He reminded faculty that Saturday 10/10 is the class makeup day for the missed day on 10/5, and that Reading Day 12/8 will be the makeup day for missed classes on 10/2.

The Speaker also introduced the Senate to our new Faculty Secretariat, Jessica Wolcott, who joins us from her last position working at Blackbaud. The Speaker noted that Wolcott will be working not only with the Senate at large but also with particular committees.

The Speaker also offered an update on the Trustee faculty-shadowing program established by Speaker Lynn Cherry about three years ago. The program continues this fall with four faculty-Trustee pairs. He expressed appreciation for these faculty's participation, invited any other faculty interested to talk with him, and expressed hope that the program will continue.

Finally, the Speaker reminded the Senate that Yammer launches on October 12, noting that it is fairly easy to use, and pointing out that [resources for Yammer](https://example.com) are available online.

### C. Faculty Budget Committee (Presentation: [PPT](#) | [PDF](#))

Julia Eichelberger, Chair

Eichelberger called attention to the other members of the Faculty Budget Committee (slide 1) and thanked the committee for their significant efforts.

She outlined how the 2015-16 Academic Affairs Budget was created and how the 2014-15 Faculty Budget Committee participated in the process (which changed over the summer), provided perspective on revenue trends and the College’s growth, discussed the committee’s consultative role over the summer in discussions about the shortfalls and budget priorities, and posed questions about the budget that the committee feels remain unanswered.
I. **How 15-16 Budget for Academic Affairs was Created** (slides 3-11)

Eichelberger gave the budget figures decided upon last year (College budget of $255,494,000, Academic Affairs’s share, $103,500,000 [40.5% of total]), and explained that the Interim Provost hoped at that time for an increase of around 3%, half of which would go toward inflationary expenses, the other half of which would go toward strategic investments (slide 3).

She outlined the new, open process for budget requests that was instituted last year and the consultative role of the committee on the Academic Affairs budget up to the time that the request went to the President and the senior leadership team, who did no consult with the committee (slide 4).

Eichelberger provided an image of a slide presented by Interim Provost McGee in January (slide 5) that in part listed items that the requested budget would cover, which included eight new faculty lines, five new permanent staff lines, and support in a variety of places. She countered this with a second slide (slide 6) that lists what survived from that January list in May, after a shortfall (“shortfall, part 1,” as the slide has it). The shortfall became apparent in the spring as a result of a number of non-resident students not staying at the College (transferring out) and a lower than expected yield for non-residents coming in the fall. The pared-down list from the Interim Provost’s requests (slide 6) included a LCWA line (CofC would begin funding an existing line initially funded by donors, as previously agreed), a line supporting the MFA in Creative Writing (for a program predicted to generate revenue), four temp-to-permanent line conversions, and library serial cost hikes. Together, these additions cost about 300K.

While Eichelberger stipulated that she was still in the process of trying to nail down the latest figures on the total current budget for Academic Affairs, all indicators seem to suggest that the net total is down from last year (slide 7). Within that total figure, recurring revenue is up and nonrecurring revenue is down. She suggested that some new expenses may help explain the difference between last year’s and this year’s net and listed them at the bottom of slide 7.

To fill in the context of the May shortfall (slide 8), Eichelberger pointed out, in addition to the drop in revenue vis-a-vis nonresident students, a directive from external auditors that software licenses, instead of being paid for out of nonrecurring funds, as has been the practice, must become recurring costs. This created a new recurring budget expense of $427,000.

The budget committee met twice in May and offered recommendations to the Interim Provost to offset the shortfall (slide 9) and thereby try to protect the faculty lines that were proposed. These recommendations included shifting monies for software from non-recurring to recurring over several years, not all at once, and using non-recurring funds to help meet critical faculty staffing needs for the short term. The committee also expressed concern that the College not fall behind on living up to the Senate-approved salary raise goals of the Faculty Compensation Committee.

In their 27 May meeting with the President and the Interim Provost, the committee, Eichelberger said, indicated their concern that Academic Affairs appears to have “just gotten the leftovers.”

Eichelberger reported that in August there was a further “melt” of non-resident students when many of these students who had paid their deposits decided not to come (slide 10). The President, faced with this and with the strong
recommendation of the Board of Trustees, has asked for cuts in the recurring budget to offset the revenue loss and, assuming that the loss of non-resident students will be permanent, has asked for a “right-sizing” of the budget. Cuts to the recurring budget will be $1.5 million. The difference between recurring and non-recurring costs is explained at the bottom of slide 10.

Academic Affairs must cut $1.055 million, 70% of total cuts required of the College (slide 11), a situation with which the committee is unhappy. The committee has been consulting with the Interim Provost, who has shared his rationale for which vacant lines might be cut, and the committee offered advice for how to mitigate negative affects on departments that might experience cuts. The committee expects to be fully involved in the budget process for next year. Eichelberger explained that one feature of next year’s budget may be reallocation of lines. For instance, hypothetically, if one department is losing a faculty member due to retirement, another department may be allocated that line to offset a prior loss of a line.

II. Long-term Contexts for Current Situation (slides 12-21)

State support, Eichelberger noted, has, from 1990 to 2012 (slide 12), declined from 41% to 8%. A graph on slide 13 plots declining state support in roughly the same time frame against the relative rise in tuition revenue.

Meanwhile, the College has increased our faculty and staff and added programs and facilities in line with the Strategic Plan (adopted 2009, revised 2013). Slide 13 graphs growth in part-time (PT) and full-time (PT) staff, 2009-13, and slide 15, shows “major gains” in total FT and PT staff and faculty between 2008 and 2013. Eichelberger reported that we added 31 FT faculty between 2009 and 2013 (the most recent year for which the committee had data) and 181 FT staff in the same period. Paying for the growth in faculty and staff has been where part of the tuition revenue has been going, she pointed out.

Charts on slides 16-18 demonstrate long-term and recent trends in enrollments broken down by resident and non-resident figures.

Turning to data available in the College’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for 2014 (slides 19 & 20), the committee charted trends in instructional and research expenses (Eichelberger stipulated that it is not clear what is covered in the latter expense category) against revenue from student tuition and fees from 2004 to 2014 (slide 21). The graph reveals the research spending in the period has been essentially flat and instructional expenses have gone down, while tuition revenue has gone up in relation to decreasing state support, as previously established.

III. Some Unanswered Questions (slides 22-24)

The committee, Eichelberger said, has several questions for which they would like to find answers.

• Why is Academic Affairs, whose budget is around 40% of the total College budget, now being asked to take 70% of the cuts? (slide 22)

• What is the basis for continued increases to budgets in other units? (slide 22)

Eichelberger asked how Academic Affairs is asked to take budget cuts when other units are apparently getting budget increases. With all respect to the work done and people doing the work in such other units, she asked how these unit’s needs are deemed more critical than those of Academic Affairs.
• Does the new budgetary regime for software costs in IT coming out of recurring funding free up some non-recurring funds that would have been used for software? If so, could this money be used elsewhere? (slide 23)

• Based on figures available in NCAA reports, Eichelberger pointed out shortfalls in Athletics of $1,432,000 in 2012-13 and $547,000 in 2013-14 and queried how such shortfalls were handled. How were these shortfalls made up? (slide 23)

> The committee has additional questions related to the above regarding the student fee for athletics ($1200 annually or about 11% of their total fees). What benefits are secured by the fee? Could they come at a lower cost? If so, perhaps, Eichelberger speculated, the remaining margin could be applied to academic costs without adding to the student's total fees.

• How will Academic Affairs' budget requests be treated in future years? Will Academic Affairs' portion of the College's budget be diminished further? (slide 24)

• How is the performance of other units assessed, and how will this assessment affect the funding they receive? (slide 24)

> Here Eichelberger noted the numerous ways in which the performance of academic departments is measured (peer reviewed publications, service, student evaluations, student credit-hour production, etc.). The committee, she said, does not know by what metrics other units' performance is assessed and what the relation is between such measures and funding for those units.

• Will principles of shared governance and transparency apply to President McConnell's budget planning in the future? How will the Faculty Budget committee participate? (slide 24)

> Eichelberger said these last questions are rhetorical, perhaps, but it is a concern of the committee that it be involved in budget deliberations before the fact.

Questions/Discussion

The Speaker explained that, as Eichelberger pointed out at the outset, this is a committee report requiring no specific action by the Senate, but he suggested, given the relative lightness of the night’s agenda, that the Senate take a few minutes for questions, discussion, and conversation.

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), said that there is a tradition of exclusion of the Faculty Budget Committee in deliberations on the College budget as a whole, yet the by-laws, ratified by the Board of Trustees, specify that the committee is charged with advising the President on the budget, which is not limited to the Academic Affairs budget alone. Senator Kelly suggested that with a relatively new President not steeped in the way things have been done in the past, there is an opportunity to do things differently. He said that he would like to see the Senate try to solve the problem of the committee’s exclusion from advising on the College’s overall budget. He added that the urgency for this was laid bare in the committee’s report, citing in particular the disturbing shortfalls in Athletics. An over half million dollar shortfall last year amounts to about a third of this year’s shortfall. If Athletics is losing a large amount of money annually, other units, such as Academic Affairs may be paying for it. He cautioned that he doesn’t know if this is the case, but
he would like to know. We need the budget committee’s full involvement in the College’s entire budgetary process, he argued.

Kelly closed by saying that he is not sure what action the Senate should take but that the need to act is apparent.

The Speaker replied that the Senate could take action, if it so desired, in the form of a motion from the floor. Kelly replied that he would make a motion, but he doesn’t know exactly what to move.

Hector Qirko, Department of Anthropology, asked Eichelberger what steps are being taken to get answers to the committee’s open questions.

Eichelberger replied that the committee’s report is the first step. She said that the committee did meet with the President in the May, the first time in her memory a budget committee has ever met with the President, and she had hoped he would be present at this meeting. She said a meeting with the President and, perhaps, Steve Osborne (Executive Vice President for Business Affairs), might be able to help the committee understand some of the other budgets.

She added that the committee has requested to see the Athletics budget a couple of times but has not gotten a response. In the absence of that information, the committee used the NCAA report.

Linda McKe, Senator - School of Business (SB), commented that one of her concerns when we moved to the Colonial Athletic Association was that it was going to be more expensive due to the farther travel required of the athletes. She wondered if this has added to the budgetary problems in Athletics.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, thanked the budget committee for their efforts and commended them, especially, for locating information that is essential in understanding our situation but not necessarily easy to get.

Alex Kasman, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked what the Interim Provost may have meant when he said that Academic Affairs is taking the largest amount of the cut because it is the largest division. Did he mean “largest” in terms of the number of people in the division? In which case, Senator Kasman added, this might be analogized to a regressive tax.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, replied that her understanding is that the budget cuts were apportioned based on “personnel dollars associated with each division,” with each division’s share of the cut to be determined based on their portion of personnel dollars of the College as a whole.

Senator Kasman asked for clarification: this is based on salaries alone, not accounting for other expenses? Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker agreed.

Senator Kasman followed up, asking if there is a rationale for that method.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker said she was not privy to that conversation and, therefore, does not have an answer to the question.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he had a number of short items to add to the discussion.

He commented that as Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, he will inquire about the President meeting with the budget committee.

He asked if the athletics fee charged to students, because it is a fee, is not subject to the same legislative capping as tuition is.
Eichelberger explained that Athletics is an "auxiliary enterprise," and such enterprises are supposed to be self-funded, but because the athletics fee is a universal fee (a fee paid by all students), the athletics fee is factored into how much we can raise tuition on students.

Speaker McNerney added here that this year's increase in tuition of around 3% did not include a relative increase in the athletic fee. That was specifically not done.

**Senator Krasnoff** also noted that, while he has not seen any public conversation of this fact, we now pay stipends to athletes. Speaker McNerney added that these are for cost of event attendance. Krasnoff said that the bigger the name of the athletic conference, the more pressure there is to provide stipends in addition to scholarships for athletes. This relates to the discussion earlier of our membership in the Colonial Athletic Association, he said. The stipends may be welcome, but they are another financial commitment to consider.

**Senator Krasnoff** also asked about staff hiring as represented in slide 15 of the presentation, seeking clarification on the ratio of faculty to staff hired between 2009 and 2013, which he thought was about 6:1.

Eichelberger replied that the figure was 181 FT staff to 31 FT faculty, verifying the 6:1 ratio.

Senator Krasnoff further inquired if he saw correctly that in 2010, 100 full-time and part-time staff were hired. Eichelberger confirmed this (slide 15).

Krasnoff said that this was a remarkable amount of hiring and said that he would like to know more about it.

Eichelberger replied that this was not among the things that the committee specifically had questions about, but she thinks it bears further investigation. She noted that part of the Strategic Plan was to hire more staff and speculated that perhaps this uptick might be explained as part of that effort.

**Senator Krasnoff** closed by asking whether the figures that Eichelberger provided in slide 12 (state support from 1990 to 2012) expressed spending in absolute dollars (and not dollars adjusted for inflation).

Eichelberger confirmed this and a brief discussion ensued as to how cost-of-living adjusted figures would paint and even bleaker picture of state funding for the College over the years.

**Brian Lanahan**, Senator - School of Education, Health, and Human Performance (SEHHP), inquired whether anyone has approached the state legislature about how they have financed us into an "artificial budget freeze" with the various limitations they have put on the College, such as in enrollment. Presenting the budgetary state of affairs now, might we ask the legislature to free up some control over what we do?

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, thanked the committee for their work and asked Eichelberger if there are any figures from other colleges available, anything like national figures, to which we might compare our budget.

Eichelberger replied that this would be a good idea, but the committee has not looked into it yet. She thought perhaps the AAUP might be helpful to this end. Such figures, she said, are probably available.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator - German and Russian Studies, commented that, based on an email he has recently read from the Dean of Humanities at Trident technical College, Trident is experiencing an $8 million shortfall. He assumes, he said, they are experiencing issues similar to ours.
Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, said that at this point, it is probably premature to offer a motion, but he did recommend that the budget committee return in November with any follow up they may have on their questions. The Senate might also invite Steve Osborne to speak at the December meeting, Senator Kelly said.

The speaker agreed.

There were no further questions.

5. Old Business (none)

6. New Business

A. Curriculum Committee
   Bonnie Springer, Interim Chair
   1. BA in Public Health, Change of Program
      Deletion of HEAL 495 from electives (PDF)
      There was no discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote.
   2. Data Sciences
      Change prerequisites for DATA 495 and change of Major – Remove Calculus 2 from the degree (PDF)
      There was no discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote.
   3. Mathematics
      Change prerequisites for MATH 440 (PDF)
      There was no discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote.
   4. Biology
      Change of minor, adding BIOL 314, Immunology to the list of general electives, change of course for BIOL 314 adding “or permission of instructor” to prerequisite statement (PDF)
      There was no discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote.

B. Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committee (Word | PDF)
   Heath Hoffmann, Department of Anthropology and Sociology

   Speaker McNerney explained that the motion is to change our by-laws, and it can be discussed, but the Senate can not take any action on the motion at the present meeting. It will be referred, per the by-laws, to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, who are charged with returning a report and any recommendations or amendments to the Senate by the next meeting.

   Heath Hoffmann introduced the motion.

   He explained that he is currently on the Academic Planning Committee, which at their first meeting were brought by Academic Affairs two items: a request to develop a new policy and to review a new policy developed in their office, but in draft form. The first of these was simultaneously charged to three different committees, the second to four separate committees.
This, he said, strikes him as a waste of faculty’s valuable and expensive time. He called attention to redundancies built into descriptions of faculty committees in the by-laws. He added that upon bringing the redundancy to the attention of the Interim Provost, the latter suggested that one way to address the issue was through bringing it to the Senate for consideration as a by-laws change.

**Questions/Discussion**

*Alex Kasman*, Senator - SSM, commented that he always assumed that redundancy in committee charges was due to the need for each committee to look at different aspects of the matter brought before them.

Hoffmann agreed that this is a reasonable argument for redundancy, but that in practice redundancy is not achieving that goal.

Senator Kasman asked for further elaboration, and Hoffmann replied that the three committees right now tasked with developing a new policy do not seem to be coming at that charge with uniquely different issues in mind.

The motion, he explained, would allow the Speaker to charge a single or multiple committees to a task if he saw the need for unique viewpoints from separate committees. The motion makes multiple committee charges optional, not de facto.

*Larry Krasnoff*, Senator - Philosophy, asked if such multiple committee tasking is mandatory now or is it just a matter of providing a courtesy review. It is not, he asserted, written into the by-laws that multiple committees need to be tasked in certain situations. He proposed that the Provost could simply consult with speaker prior to the former’s engagement with committees. Senator Krasnoff added that he is hesitant to change the by-laws when there doesn’t seem to be written rule already governing the situation the motion would remedy.

Hoffmann replied that Senator Krasnoff’s point is well taken but that our current Interim Provost seems to use the most conservative reading of the by-laws possible and given that we do not know whether or not he will become the actual Provost or who will, Hoffmann said he would rather err on the side of not relying on the personality of the person in office. The motion, he argued, would make us leaner and help eliminate the useless redundancy currently in place.

Krasnoff replied that it could just be a norm that the Provost always goes through the speaker.

Hoffmann replied that we tend to rely on informal norms, but later these can cause problems when personnel change. The by-laws, he added, are not like the Constitution and we need not treat them with that level of care.

Krasnoff said that it is Academic Affairs’s choice to bring these policy matters to the faculty, and we are not going to constrain them with rules.

There was no further discussion.

7. **Constituents’ Concerns**

*Margaret Cormack*, Senator - Religious Studies, expressed concern that images of “enthusiastic young frat guys” frequently appear on the College webpages. She reported that in conversations she had with a group of female Religious Studies students about these images, the students found them not appealing from a recruitment standpoint and, moreover, disconcerting—one student, who self-disclosed as a victim of sexual assault, said she found the image scary. The image of is of a group of white males, and Senator Cormack speculated that this might not be very appealing, either, to students of color we are trying to recruit.
She asked to whom she might express concern and was met by a chorus of "marketing," to which the Speaker added that Senator Cormack might try speaking to the Division of Marketing and Communications and offered to give her the name of a contact who might be able to help.

Jennifer Mantini, Senator - Adjunct, Department of Physics and Astronomy, informed the Senate that she has been in touch with a number of parties in the legislature and elsewhere regarding the State Legislature’s mandate that permanent, full-time state employees making less than $100,000 annually be given a one-time $800 bonus in November. Under this program, she added, a professor making $90,000 will get a bonus, while an adjunct working a full-time equivalent contact (we have around 90) will get nothing.

She pointed out that while the Senate cannot do anything about this, individuals might consider becoming a voice for adjuncts by contacting legislators and agitating on behalf of adjuncts, who despite the designation, are not add-ons to the College but essential to the College’s mission.

8. **Adjournment:** 6:08

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary