



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Faculty Senate



AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FLORIDA STATE CONFERENCE CENTER
Everglades Auditorium
September 18, 1985
3:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the April 17, 1985, meeting
- II. Approval of the agenda for the September 18, 1985, meeting
- III. Welcome to the Florida State Conference Center, Mary Pankowski
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee and presentation of appointed members of Senate Committee for 1985-86, John J. Carey
- V. Remarks by Faculty Senate President, Merrill B. Hintikka
- VI. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Committee on Memorials and Courtesies, Joe White
- VII. Unfinished Business
 - a. Proposal to the Faculty Senate on Administrative Evaluation, David Gruender
- VII. New Business
- IX. University Welfare
- X. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
 - a. Vice President Turnbull: Topics of importance for 1985-86
- XI. Announcements of the President of the University

ANNOUNCEMENT: Vice President and Mrs. Turnbull and the University Club will host the University Club Wednesday Social in the Fireside Lobby at the Florida State Conference Center immediately following the Senate meeting. All University friends are invited. A charge of \$1.50 will be collected to help defray expenses.



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Faculty Senate

Senate
Book

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Florida State Conference Center
September 18, 1985

I. Regular Session

The 1985-1986 Faculty Senate met in regular session on September 18, 1985, at 3:45 p.m. in the Florida State Conference Center. Ms. Merrill Hintikka, Senate President, presided.

The following members were absent. Alternates who were present are listed in parenthesis following the member they represent.
R. Chatel, M. Cowart, G. DeVore, P. Elliott, H. Fletcher, G. Gorniak, H. Hawkins, W. Heard, P. Johnson, C. Lilly, C. Madsen, J. Markarian, D. Robinson, C. Schluck (L. Hafner), E. Schroeder, M. Schwartz, R. Smith, J. Standley, C. Steele, J. Steen (J. Pitts)

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of April 17, 1985, were approved with the following correction; page 16, last paragraph, middle of eighth sentence should read "No candidate received a majority of votes cast on the first ballot".

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Welcome to the Florida State Conference Center, Mary Pankowski

"It is my pleasure and privilege to welcome the 1985-86 Faculty Senate to the Florida State Conference Center. We feel very honored by the developing tradition of holding the first Senate meeting of the academic year in our facilities.

It may interest you to know that in the past year our Conference Center has accommodated 575 programs for 24,925 participants. We are particularly proud that so many of those meetings fall within the mainstream of our University community life--this Faculty Senate, the President's Fall Address to the Faculty, Honors Night, Employee Recognition Day, Council of Deans, Fall and Spring Deans and Department Chairs' Meetings, Student Government Inauguration, and many more.

In addition, we have had many conferences of major significance to the academic richness of our University. These include the 1984 Nursing Conference, the first national Super Computer Conference, the Sonneck and College of Music Society Conference, the Genesis of Neogene to Modern Phosphrites Conference, Advances in Lattice Gauge Theory, Conference on Research and Industry, and so many more!

The 24,925 participants we have hosted this past year come to the Florida State Conference Center for the personal and/or professional enrichment of their lives. We are glad we will be able to count you among that number again this year. We bid you welcome."

V. Report of the Steering Committee, John J. Carey

"I believe it is wise to preface this report of the Steering Committee on its activities from last April to the present time with a brief description of the responsibilities of the Steering Committee that may be helpful for new Senators.

The Steering Committee is an elected group from the Senate membership. It is chaired by the President of the Faculty Senate, and according to the by-laws of the Senate must have representatives from at least four different schools and colleges of the University. Its present membership is made up of Merrill Hintikka of the Philosophy Department, who serves as Chair; Fred Standley of the English Department; Cliff Madsen of the School of Music; Ross Heck of the College of Business; Elizabeth Mann of the School of Library and Information Studies; DeWitt Sumners of the Mathematics Department; Patricia Martin of the School of Social Work; and myself. The Steering Committee usually holds a two hour weekly meeting throughout the calendar year, exempting only those weeks when the University is closed between terms. (For the Fall term the Steering Committee meets on Thursdays, 11:15 to 1:00 in 150 BEL.) It meets to discuss issues of general concern to the Faculty Senate and refers many matters to appropriate Senate Committees. It acts as a liaison with the Administration concerning matters of interest to faculty. It is a clearing house of information for faculty and expresses faculty concerns to appropriate administrative officers. Administratively, the Steering Committee is assisted by Janis Sass, who serves as secretary to the Faculty and who is housed in the Office of the Dean of the Faculties. The Steering Committee meets monthly with President Sliger, usually a few days before the regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate in order to review items on the Senate agenda with him and to share concerns of the Senate.

Since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 17, the Senate Steering Committee has held regular meetings. The Committee met with Dean of the Faculties Steve Edwards on June 4; with Vice-President Turnbull on July 23; and with President Sliger on June 12, July 31, and September 16. The Committee met weekly except during the August interlude between the end of the summer session and the beginning of the fall term.

Major topics of discussion and action during this period of time were as follows:

1. The Problem of University Recruitment and Admissions. The Steering Committee has consistently taken the position that the strengthening of the Admissions Office and the expansion of our recruitment efforts should be a major priority for the Administration. Related to those matters have been our interest in the recruitment of National Merit Scholars and outstanding high school students in Florida and adjacent states, and our encouragement for more scholarship money to be made available for outstanding undergraduate students.
2. The Committee discussed the ambiguous status of faculty members who have chosen to take early retirement. This problem was created by the fact that the first group of faculty electing to take early retirement were designated as Service Professors, and their role and status rather clearly defined. That was not the case with the second group of faculty and after some discussion the Steering Committee recommended to the administration and to all academic units that faculty who have opted for early retirement be treated as Service Professors for the duration of their participation in this program.
3. The Committee discussed with Dean Edwards several problems related to promotion and tenure procedures for 1985-86. Some questions had been raised by United Faculty of Florida representatives as to whether or not the revised procedures issued by the Dean of the Faculties Office substantively changed the previously published guidelines. The Committee was persuaded that the editorial revisions did not substantially change our previous guidelines, and the matter was eventually harmoniously resolved.
4. The Steering Committee considered a proposal for a Faculty Assistance Program recommended to the Administration by the United Faculty of Florida. This proposal would in effect create an office of a faculty Ombudsman, who would be available to counsel faculty on personal, professional, and job related matters. The model for this type of professional assistance is drawn from industry. After considerable discussion the Steering Committee decided that there was no reason to ask the Professional Relations and Welfare Committee to reconsider their earlier action. The matter is currently in the hands of the administration.
5. We appointed Gregg Phifer of the College of Communication to serve as Parliamentarian of the Senate for 1985-86. It is a tribute to his sense of service, patience, and long-suffering that he accepted. Inasmuch as he is now a Service Professor, however, we are looking for someone to work with him this year and move into that position in 1986-87. Anyone interested should contact Merrill Hintikka.
6. The Committee met with Tom Desjardin of the Interfraternity Council concerning new plans and activities which that group wants to implement this academic year. Mr. Desjardin reviewed for us the positive accomplishments and contributions which the fraternities have

made to the campus through fund raising events and service projects, and he indicated that he hoped the fraternities could develop a better academic image in the current year. He described to us in June, by the way, the plans to have a dry rush in the fall consistent with new Florida legislation about the drinking age.

7. The Committee spent a good bit of time discussing and making nominations for various Senate committees, and in naming the chairs of selected committees. (A complete list of those appointments is available to Senators and will be appended to this report).

8. The Committee responded to requests from the Administration for recommendations to serve on special committees, such as the New Committee on Named Professorships and the New Committee on the Use and Future of PLATO.

9. In order to show continuity with all Senate Steering Committees for the last decade we again reviewed problems of parking on the campus and looked at data provided by the Office of Parking Services concerning the number of "R" stickers which were issued during the 1984-85 academic year. In what was perhaps its boldest move the Steering Committee recommended implementation of towing (and/or booting) of vehicles which are illegally parked in faculty parking places.

10. The Committee discussed at length the report of the discrepancies between FSU/UF salaries raised by Professor Martin Roeder at the April 17 session of the Senate. We discussed these matters at length with Dr. Turnbull, and recommend for general faculty reading and discussion the memorandum (dated July 18) of Assistant Vice-President Thomas McCaleb on the matter of FSU and UF salary differentials. Taking into account such factors as differences in years in ranks at each institution and comparing discipline by discipline Dr. McCaleb has concluded that (A) the typical Full Professor at FSU earns \$273.98 less than his or her counterpart at the University of Florida in the same discipline and with the same amount of experience. That difference he notes is not statistically significant. (B) That the typical Associate Professor at FSU earns \$397.01 more than his or her counterpart at the University of Florida in the same discipline and with the same amount of experience. That difference is also not statistically significant. (c) That the typical Assistant Professor at FSU earns \$1,717.91 less than his counterpart at the University of Florida in the same discipline and with the same amount of experience. That difference is statistically significant. We have been assured that salary scales between the two institutions will be regularly monitored by Our Office of Academic Affairs.

11. Throughout the summer the Steering Committee discussed various morale problems in the College of Education, many of which were relayed directly to the Steering Committee with a request for some action. Dr. Hintikka conveyed to the Administration our concern

about these matters, but on the whole we felt that this was a matter which was beyond the purview of the Steering Committee.

12. In response to a request by the Women's Studies Program, the Steering Committee passed the following resolution at its meeting on September 11: "Be it resolved that the Senate Steering Committee endorses and supports the "Stop Rape Week" scheduled for October 14-18 on this campus. We encourage all faculty members to bring this to the attention of their students, and particularly encourage male faculty and students to participate." Further information on the events of this week is available from Jean Bryant in the Women's Studies Office.

In and through all of these specific problems and concerns the Steering Committee has had four continuing concerns, and anticipates working on these during the current year:

1. The quality of the teaching learning environment at FSU. This concern grew out of a number of complaints made by undergraduate students which had been brought to the attention of the Steering Committee last year. We are currently discussing several strategies pertaining to this topic before making recommendations to the administration.
2. Personal and academic concerns over minority students. During the last year the Steering Committee met on several occasions with representatives of our Black student body. We recognize the types of problems that concern them--namely, of harassment, racial slurs, and discrimination within the undergraduate student community--continue to be present on our campus. We intend to pursue these matters with the administration and with the Division of Student Affairs.
3. We are interested in and concerned about Administrative evaluation of Deans and Vice-Presidents in this institution.
4. We are concerned about adequate support for graduate students and the need to retain a strong research focus in an institution at a time when the public at large seems to be more interested in the teaching role of the institution.

Hopefully future reports of the activities of the Steering Committee will be briefer, but I do want to remind all Senators that this report encompasses important matters of the last four months. Anyone who has a matter to be brought to the attention of the Steering Committee can communicate directly with Dr. Hintikka or with any member of the Committee.

The chair for the Professional Relations and Welfare Committee is John Simmons and vice-chair is Jane Perry-Camp. The chair for the Grievance Committee is Marilyn Young and vice-chair is Ruth Pestle.

The Steering Committee submits the following appointments to Senate Standing Committees for consent of the Senate. Mr. Carey moved confirmation of the newly appointed members of the Undergraduate Policy Committee, Graduate Policy, Curriculum, Elections, Student Academic Relations, Budget Advisory, Committee on Memorials and Courtesies. This motion was seconded and passed. The current memberships of these Committees are attached as addendum 1.

VI. Remarks by Faculty Senate President, Merrill B. Hintikka

"In 1974, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee charged the President of the Senate to begin the Senate year with brief opening remarks aimed to bring Senators up to date on the Steering Committee's goals and expectations for the year and to present the President's assessment of the state of the University. To look back at the remarks with which the past twelve Senate Presidents have begun their years is to be reminded of a consistent need for vigilance on the part of the Senate and of all faculty to maintain our vision of Florida State's mission as a comprehensive graduate and research university. And to look back is to be reminded of a consistent need for vigilance to implement our conviction that excellence in teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels and excellence in research and professional programs are mutually supportive and interdependent components of our standing as a university. And to look back over the remarks of past Senate Presidents is also to be reminded that strong faculty involvement in governance at Florida State has remained a crucial source of our vigilance and of our strength.

This year, the "Path to Excellence" program surfaced in the legislature. A key part of that program involves a differentiation in mission among universities in the State University System which is strongly supportive of our mission. Yet it was not long ago that we were hearing that such a differentiation among SUS institutions would not sell on the road in Florida. It is not, I believe, an exaggeration to say that the inclusion of differentiated missions would not have occurred without the involvement of the Florida State University Senate. Of course, not all of the "Path to Excellence" program was enacted, but neither is it dead. I am hopeful that Senator Betty Castor, President Pro Tempore of the Florida Senate, who chairs the Senate Education Appropriations Committee, will be able to meet with us this fall to discuss her goals for the "Path to Excellence" program in the upcoming legislative session. And, of course, not all of the implicit promises of past legislatures have been fulfilled, but neither are they dead: the concept of quality improvement funding remains, even though its recent implementation has been recognizable by name only; and the goal of "top quartile" salaries has not been renounced, even though we have slipped farther from its implementation than we were when it was announced. President Sliger's remarks to the faculty two weeks ago made clear his commitment to these important goals. As a faculty, we need to continue our support of his efforts by taking every opportunity to show the crucial role of quality improvement funding and of acceptable

salaries in making it possible for FSU to be competitive in its efforts to recruit and retain top faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students.

I emphasize here that this is to continue our efforts as faculty and as Senators in support of the steps necessary to promote quality within our faculty and our student body. Our past efforts surely have not been in vain. President Sliger also announced in his remarks to the faculty that the 25th Anniversary campaign of the FSU Foundation will focus on raising funds for scholarships, fellowships, and faculty endowment. We will be hearing more about this campaign during the year, and - yes - we will also be asked to participate to show our support for academic excellence at FSU in a way which is more easily identifiable to those outside the immediate University community than are the energies and efforts we all contribute each day to FSU.

Efforts of past Senates to support improvement in the quality of our undergraduate student body have also paid dividends. Admissions Office staff has been increased; an experienced Admissions Counselor has been assigned to work with applicants who are honors students; and equipment has been brought into the 20th Century. Our freshman class is, I believe, the largest ever, and it is drawn from an applicant pool which included an impressive number of candidates with truly amazing credentials, many of whom chose to attend FSU even though our scholarship offers remain far lower than we would like. The Admissions Committee granted fewer exceptions to admissions standards than have been sought in the past. A committee chaired by former Senate President Fred Kreimer has been asked to identify the full range of sources of scholarship dollars at FSU and to recommend procedures for their more effective use will be reporting this fall. It has become increasingly clear that the most straight forward way to improve the quality of our undergraduate student body is to increase the number of our best applicants who choose FSU. To that end, in addition to the University's quest for more scholarship monies, the Senate will be asked this year to support major revisions in the University Honors Program, especially concerning honors work in a student's major field.

The state of the University continues to be affected significantly by State rules which attend less to goals and more to details of implementation. In recent years, as you know, we were successful in integrating the requirement of FAC 6A-10.30 (the so-called "Gordon Rule") into our Liberal Studies program, which was already in place, thanks to heroic efforts on the part of members of the Senate and the cooperation of members of our administration with long experience in interpreting longer lists of regulations.

Presently the State University System is operating under mandated maximum class sizes in some of our courses; the resulting staffing and budgeting problems are debilitating. Although no solution has been left forward, this is surely a problem of the sort we should be working on as a university community. I cite it not because I think it is unique; it may not even be the most severe. I cite it rather because it serves as a reminder that as Senators, some of us may be familiar with problems which extract their most severe toll on particular segments of the University community, while others of us may be possessed of brilliant possible solutions to problems we don't really know exist. The Senate is surely the place to coordinate our efforts, whether through bringing matters to the attention of the appropriate Standing Committee of the Senate, identified in our by-laws, or through raising such matters first on the floor of the Senate under the agenda item of University welfare.

In citing some successes of past Senate goals and efforts, I am not donning a Pollyanna's dress. It is not good that we have had to be vigilant simply to have a hope of maintaining ourselves as a university; it is just true. And it is not good that we find ourselves in a bidding war for the best undergraduates; it is just true. But given such realities, it is good that our efforts have not been in vain.

This year's Steering Committee has set as its primary goal support of those steps necessary to our attracting top quality graduate students; we are aware that these steps will include some hard budgetary decisions, especially as we face the fact that there is an even greater bidding war on at the graduate level and that the size of the winning bid varies by discipline and program. So we are supportive of Vice President Turnbull's call for Deans to identify and defend their priorities and their funding needs. And we are supportive of the need to make hard decisions given the reality of inadequate funding. Beyond the possibility of budget reallocation within Academic Affairs, we are supportive of a charge to each of the four divisions of the University to identify and support its priorities and funding needs for its contribution to the mission of the University, taking seriously the possibility of reallocation of budget among these four major divisions of the University.

Napoleon is reported to have identified the three things necessary to wage war successfully as money, money, and money. We all know he could as well have been referring what is needed to run a university. But whatever monies are available, there is the paramount need to use them as effectively as possible in pursuit of our goals. The Senate has no direct or decisive role in the allocation process; the moral force of the Senate has, however, direct bearing. We can, of course, dissipate this force by thinking of ourselves primarily as representatives of the interests of those

who elected us. We will, I expect, instead think of ourselves as a body with Constitutional jurisdiction including the formulation of "measures for the maintenance of a comprehensive educational policy and for the maximum utilization of the intellectual resources of the University," charged also to "formulate its opinion on any subject of interest to the University..."

This year I expect also that the Senate will receive a proposal for changes in the University's Academic Honor System, including proposals for changes in faculty responsibility within that System. And I expect that the Student Government will at least encourage us to evaluate the +/- grading system, even though we have in place a call to evaluate that system after it has been in place for two years. But most of all I expect that we will have a number of issues before us which we do not now expect.

And as we conduct our business, I expect that we will be mindful of the four essential freedoms of a university, cited in a recent 'Point of View' column in the Chronicle of Higher Education by Thomas H. Kean, Governor of New Jersey and Chairman of the Education Commission of the States, and attributed by Kean to the late Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Harlan. These four are the freedom to determine who may teach, the freedom to determine what may be taught, the freedom to determine how it may be taught, and the freedom to determine who may be admitted to study. For at Florida State, guardianship of those freedoms is vested in the Faculty Senate. Through our responsible stewardship of these vital freedoms, we will continue--to use President Sliger's eminently apt phrase--to take charge of our own destiny."

VII. Reports of Standing Committees
a. Committee on Memorials and Courtesies, Joe White

"This Committee serves as a vehicle to extend sympathy to those members of the faculty who are ill and sympathy to the families of faculty members who have died. Very shortly I will solicit contributions from the General Faculty to fund this Committee. Please be generous with your contributions".

VIII. Unfinished Business
a. Proposal to the Faculty Senate on Administrative Evaluation, David Gruender

Mr. Gruender recounted that the 1984 Self Study recommended that there be an evaluation of administrators. An ad hoc committee consisting of faculty and administrators worked on the proposal presented here as addendum 2. Mr. Carey moved approval of this proposal, the motion was seconded. After a lengthy discussion in which many issues were raised, Ms. Martin moved to table the proposal. Her motion was seconded and approved.

IX. New Business

The Steering Committee knew of no new business for today's meeting.

X. University Welfare

Mr. Roeder voiced a strong concern for the welfare of the University over the problems with textbook orders placed with the bookstore. He asked that the Senate construct an ad hoc committee to look into complaints of losing orders, under ordering and the lack of communication between faculty and the store. He asked that this committee report to the Senate at the January 15, 1986, meeting. Ms. Hintikka asked if Mr. Roeder wanted the Senate as a whole to decide on this committee or could the Steering Committee make the selections. Mr. Martin suggested the Steering Committee take the matter up for the Senate.

Mr. Waggaman took this opportunity to thank the Dean of the Faculties and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs for remedying the administrative problems in the College of Education. Returning the operations of the College of Education back to the faculty shows a faith in faculty which had not been experienced in the past. This show of support for the faculty is appreciated by those in the College of Education.

Mr. Waggaman went on to read Article V, Florida State University Constitution which outlines faculty governance in internal policies of colleges or schools and asked that the Steering Committee monitor the provision that the Secretary of the Senate keep on file a copy of current bylaws for each college or school.

Mr. Harry Goldman announced that the United Faculty of Florida would have summary reports of the recent evaluation of department chairs available for faculty review starting Monday in 413 BEL. You must present a valid FSU identification card to review the report of your chairman.

XI. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
a. Vice President Turnbull: Topics of Importance for 1985-86

"Often my reports to the Senate contain a long laundry list of items, each hopefully of interest, but today, I will discuss only a single item, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING--PHASE II.

In his address to the general faculty earlier this month, President Sliger announced and gave the charge for this activity. My assignment this afternoon is to expand on his comments by reviewing the reasons for this unprecedented review and explain how we intend to develop the process by which it will be carried out.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING--PHASE II PURPOSE

The driving force behind SPB-II is painfully obvious to us all. Florida State does not have the resources required to maintain its current activities at their current level of quality--much less does it have what is needed to move toward the mythological upper quartile status which is the announced goal for public education in Florida.

One externally imposed reason for our budget problems is also obvious. Over the last 25 years the State has moved from three to nine universities with a vast expansion in degree programs and number of students while only providing the same (or even a bit smaller) percent of general revenue to the State University System in 1985 as it did in 1960. The admittedly substantial dollar increase in the size of the state revenue pie, has not kept pace with the size of the family that has to live off our slice of it.

A second reason is perhaps less obvious. The growing SUS budgets provided even with that steady state percent of general revenue has not been evenly distributed. Each year some significant portion has gone to salary increases rather than to campus operations. In many years the required salary increases have not been fully funded, thus forcing a shift of resources from operating budgets to salaries. Of even more significance, has been the exponential increase in the amount earmarked funds and off-the-top "special appropriations". These dollars, however useful or welcome, are not available to normal campus operations. They have ranged from massive, hundred million dollar investments in medical and engineering schools, to campus designed Quality Improvement Programs, to much more modest special projects that have caught the attention of state decision makers.

But they have one important thing in common--these earmarked dollars are not "new". They come from the SUS's same traditional 11 percent of the state's general revenue and thus reduce our regular operating budgets.

We have at times objected to the resulting lack of campus-level discretion in expenditure decisions, as well as to the painful impact on our normal departmental operating budgets. But we also need to remember, that in a University that has essentially the same enrollment today that it had 15 years ago--we would not have a dime of new dollars were it not for these "specials". And if we did not compete for specials, these now-earmarked dollars would not be automatically released to enrich our budget; they would be shifted to an even greater extent to the newer universities that have been given permission to grow.

A third reason for the intensity of the budget crunch is that we, like the State University System, have watered the soup. Faced with inflation, a higher student-faculty ration, demands for higher quality instruction and advisement and greatly increased expectations for research and public service activities, we have stretched and stretched the budget until there is no more give left. Somehow, we have coped rather than making fundamental adjustments.

In part that has reflected a conviction that the current programs of the University are sound. It has also reflected optimism that state resources would improve in time to preserve our current level and quality of programs. Despite upper quartile rhetoric events have proved otherwise.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET--PHASE II PROCESS

What we now must do is make fundamental decisions about the operational priorities of the University in the face of these resource shortages. We are calling this exercise STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING because to be effective, it should result in a strategic plan for accomplishing our priority objectives, and to be realistic, it must guide our budget decisions. As Phase II, it will build on the extensive analysis of needs developed last spring and summer as part of Phase I.

There are a variety of ways to conduct such a process. In my more optimistic days as a professor I wrote a textbook explaining some of them; in my more critical days as a professor I wrote articles explaining why they did not work. In my current administrative role I have tended to avoid such processes because without great care one can simultaneously raise great expectations that cannot be realized and great fears that can break apart the campus community.

Nonetheless, here I am and here you are. It is my intent to invent, with your help, a process that blends participative democracy and as necessary creative dictatorship. In a mature, graduate/research university such as ours there can be no effective planning and policy-making without the intellectual involvement and guidance of the faculty. But at the same time, the fundamental, tough priority decisions ultimately rest in the hands of the individual charged with that responsibility by the FSU Constitution and the Florida

Statutes--President Sliger. It is my task, as chair of the University Executive Council and of the University Budget Committee, to see that Dr. Sliger gets the very best advice possible from the University Committee. I also take seriously my role as chief academic officer with all that implies for the priorities to be developed.

It is imperative that we make sure every dollar in the current base budget is being used for the most important of our university priorities. Over the last several years much has been done to concentrate our attention on priorities and to assign our limited new resources to the most critical functions. We have also worked to improve our budget procedures and data systems.

Strategic Planning and Budgeting II is a major reexamination of the University's base budget to ensure that resources are being put into the most important programs. It is President Sliger's intention to involve every academic and nonacademic support unit in this analysis--along with all the relevant departmental, school/college and university committees.

This next phase of our ongoing strategic planning and budgeting effort will have the following objectives:

- informing the entire university community about what we are currently doing with our resources.
- requiring each operating unit to justify its base budget to its peers and to relate the importance of its current operations to its desires for improved and new programs.
- by January of 1986 reallocating the 1986-87 base budget according to the University's most important priorities and determining how any new legislatively-provided resources will be used.

As President Sliger has noted, we are conducting this review during the Fall semester so that faculty can participate and so that decisions can be announced in time for reasonable implementation in the 1986-87 year.

Please note that we are not doing this because we believe resources are being wasted on useless programs. The faculty and administration of this University have been better stewards of the taxpayers' dollars than that. What we have done is dream larger dreams than resources will support. We have begun more activities to enrich our students' education and to aid this community and the state's economic development than the state's current tax base will pay for.

This institution has a distinguished and well-deserved reputation that is threatened by a decade or more of malnourishment. We cannot wait for outside help--we must put adequate resources into our critical programs. To find those resources we may well have to defer or abandon development of less central activities.

In devising a process for this exercise at the President's direction, I have begun discussions with technical staff, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the Council of Deans, the Executive Council and now this body. Intensive work will be required by the University Budget and by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee. It is my intent to involve as fully as they are willing to be involved the members of all the bodies named above plus every department chair and the relevant departmental level committee structure.

We will be asking each department, school, college and the University as a whole to establish more specific academic priorities, within the overall mission of this University, as it has evolved over 40 years. We will then ask that a realistic range of projected revenues be matched against these priorities to set the framework for our future budget decisions.

Even in this rigorous analysis it is my considered judgment that the Florida State University should not give up any "franchises". We are a comprehensive University with a distinguished record of accomplishment in graduate education and research. Our undergraduate programs have been enriched by almost forty years of graduate program development.

There is no major program, no major unit, that we should abolish. Just over ten years ago this institution closed engineering science only to see other, lesser engineering schools created around the State. We should not repeat that mistake.

My current perspective on the review process, subject to continued advice and counsel, is that every program, every unit should put itself under the microscope and be subjected to peer review to make sure that only the most important activities are being continued, that resources--and that every possible measure of economy and effectiveness is being taken.

Beyond that self-analysis, each unit should have the opportunity to present its best case for additional funding for its priority activities. To create a pool for reallocation, within and across unit boundaries, we should establish a starting point for analysis at some level below current base budgets--perhaps 85-90 percent across all budget categories including salaries.

Units would first review how to live within that total dollar amount and would have the opportunity to suggest reallocations within budget categories at the new base level. Since positions are relatively inflexible, significant adjustments in that category would have to be phased in over more than one or two years.

Above the reduced base, units could seek restoration of dollars for priority programs and above the current base, units could seek new dollars. The first level of review would be conducted by departmental level peers and the second level would be by major organizational unit.

Starting with the second level and moving on to the university-wide review, the focus would shift from an intensive and comprehensive review of the unit budget to the unit's proposals for new funding for priority activities.

This process as outlined is certainly open to suggestion and constructive criticism. To be successful it will have to have the confidence of the faculty across the campus.

SOME PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

In closing, I would like to take the liberty of making some personal observations about this topic and about what we are undertaking. I do not anticipate any easy answers because I sincerely do not believe that the grass is greener on the other side of the fence or that we have pockets of resources being wasted over there. It is not profitable to put blame on the newer universities, on the SUS leadership, or even on the Legislature. The first two are struggling with their own problems--and certainly the universities are in rough equity--(we are all starving)--and the Legislature is caught between a revenue structure that is not producing enough dollars and a population, including ourselves, that is highly reluctant to raise taxes. And as I look around the country, the overall picture in higher education is not much better.

From time to time we castigate ourselves about not having a clearly-defined mission--to the contrary we have had one since the days of Doak Campbell, and it has been restated and emphasized as recently as the just completed Southern Association Self Study and the Board of Regents Master Planning exercise. We are so consistent in our understanding of needs that our legislative budget request for 1981-83 was essentially the same as that for 1985-87.

This current exercise in reallocation is by no means the first experience by this University. I have already alluded to the abolition of Engineering Science more than a decade ago. That was followed by the loss of some 300 positions and associated resources with no decline in enrollment. That was followed by massive shifts among student majors and a subsequent adjustment in institutional resources. Just this month we have completed a turnback of some 25 positions and almost a million dollars. Anyone who thinks we have not already put much time and energy into reallocation of resources to higher priority programs is simply uninformed.

But the current activity has a qualitative difference. We are asking each unit to put its best strategic foot forward--how can it best contribute to a better Florida State University and help the University maintain and enhance its state, national and international reputation--even at the price of elimination of less useful activities

The University's criteria for making these judgments will be refined as this process unfolds, but I would like to note some key criteria that I will be suggesting.

- we must first protect the current enrollment base of the University by meeting the instructional needs of our students. This includes successfully restoring our traditional number of upper division and graduate students as we have now succeeded with the lower division. I am not enamored with enrollment-driven funding formulae, but we have painfully learned that without students we do not have dollars. But I do not think the University has to grow significantly in the years ahead. We are about where we need to be in terms of the number of students.

- We should put our flexible dollars into programs that have a demonstrated track record of quality as measured by external observers. Fortunately, in this regard we have a proven record of accomplishment on which to build and it encompasses most of the campus.

- We have to be creative in taking advantage of targets of opportunity. This means maximizing our ties to state government, developing effective partnerships with Tallahassee Community College and FAMU, as well as meeting the needs of the private sector through relevant programs of research and public service.

- Simultaneously, we have to preserve the best of what has made us a distinguished research university while learning how to use those strengths to build an even better reputation in a rapidly changing and dynamic state.

Fortunately, we have had an established track record in doing just that ever since the days of Doak Campbell. There are still active members of this faculty who remember that this institution pulled itself up by its bootstraps. We did not get large, up front hand-outs because we were a developing institution. We had to scrape for every dollar and demonstrate that we were putting them to good use. This tradition continues.

I pledge to you that the Strategic Planning and Budgeting exercise will be given our very best effort in our long standing tradition, and I challenge you to participate fully. Thank you."

XII. Announcements of the President of the University

Dr. Sliger had no announcements for today's meeting

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:30



Janis D. Sass
Secretary to the Faculty



*NEWLY APPOINTED MEMBERS TO BE CONFIRMED BY SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 18, 1985
 **REAPPOINTED MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

UNDERGRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE

*DONNA CROWLEY, 1986
 (REPLACING SANDRA RACKLEY)
 TOM DENMARK, 1986
 JOE ICERMAN, 1986
 MARY SHANNAHAN, 1986

AMY BROWN, 1987
 JOHN DEGEN, 1987
 WALTER FOREHAND, 1987

*JAMES GAPINSKI, 1988
 *KAREN LAUGHLIN, 1988
 *CHARLES TOLBERT, 1988
 *PERRIN WRIGHT, 1988

GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE

STUART BAKER, 1986
 STEPHEN CELEC, 1986
 BONNIE GREENWOOD, 1986
 JAKKO HINTIKKA, 1986
 WILLIAM MARZLUFF, 1986
 JOSEPH McELRATH, 1986
 STEVE ROLLIN, 1986

SHIRLEY AARON, 1987
 MARIE COWART, 1987
 LAWRENCE GEORGE, 1987
 ROBERT GILMER, 1987
 DIANNE MONTGOMERY, 1987
 GEORGE PAPGIANNIS, 1987
 TIMOTHY VERDON, 1987
 (PATRICIA ROSE 1985-86
 FOR VERDON)

*JOHN ALBRIGHT, 1988
 *THOMAS BLOMBERG, 1988
 *WILLIAM HAAS, 1988
 *WILLIAM HILLISON, 1988
 *ALLEN IMERSHEIN, 1988
 *A. KROTHAPALLI, 1988
 *DAVID RASMUSSEN, 1988
 **JAYNE STANDLEY, 1988

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

HOMER BLACK, 1986
 BEVERLY YERG, 1986

JIM ORCUTT, 1987
 DONALD STOWELL, 1987
 (PAM COATS 1985-86 FOR
 STOWELL)
 MARILYN YOUNG, 1987

*DAVID AMMERMAN, 1988
 **FRED LEYSIEFFER, 1988
 *KARYL LOUWENAAR, 1988
 *JUDITH NANTELL, 1988

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

*MAE-LOUISE BAKER, 1986
 *MICHAEL LAUNER, 1986
 *TIMOTHY MATHERLY, 1986, CHAIR

STUDENT ACADEMIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

MARY ALICE HUNT, 1986
 WINSOR SCHMIDT, 1986
 *KATHRYN ANDERSON, 1987
 **RHODA ICERMAN, 1987
 *BRUCE THYER, 1987

BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

KEN BREWER, 1986
 FRED KREIMER, 1986
 FRANK SHERWOOD, 1986
 *JOHN PRIEST, 1987
 *JIM PITTS, 1987
 *WILLIAM SHRODE, 1987
 *PHIL SORENSON, 1987

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS AND COURTESIES

*GEORGE DEVORE, 1986
 *PATRICIA VANCE, 1986
 *JOSEPH WHITE, 1986, CHAIR

Tabled
9-18-85

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
Administrative Evaluation Committee
Proposal to the Faculty Senate
17 April 1985

BACKGROUND

The committee was formed in January of this year in response to the Self-study's recommendation that a system for evaluating administrators be developed by a joint committee of faculty and administrators. The faculty representatives were chosen by Professor David Darst, chairman of the Faculty Professional Relations and Welfare Committee; the administrative representatives by Professor Steve Edwards, Dean of the Faculties. Early in our deliberations we learned that this Senate, by its action of 22 October 1975, established the policy that there be both annual and five-year evaluations of administrators. With regard to the annual evaluations, the committee is actively at work and, with the help of everyone concerned, plans to bring a proposal for them to the Senate in time for it to be tried out next year in the Spring. The proposal below deals with the five-year evaluations, and is presented for information. We would expect to submit this as a motion for your action early next Fall.

PROPOSAL

1. Administrative units that award degrees.

That the University add to the instructions of the committees asked to review the degree programs that they also appraise the effectiveness of the academic leadership of a program and of the contribution of the professional and career staff toward achieving that program's academic goals.

2. All other administrative units.

That all non-academic departments and units be reviewed every five years with an eye to appraising the effectiveness of their contribution to the overall mission of the University; the review to be carried out by a committee appointed for that purpose by the President with the advice and consent of the Faculty Senate and with a membership appropriate to the task, to report its findings to the administrator of the unit, the next higher administrator, and the Senate; and with a signal part of the review to be an evaluation of the administrative leadership and the contributions of the professional and career staff toward achieving the goals of the unit.

17 April 1985
Faculty Senate

The committee would have available to it the results of annual reviews and such questionnaires or other occasional evaluative instruments as might be used. Each committee would have at least one representative of the unit being reviewed. And that, under the current administrative structure, the rolling five-year review be accomplished by taking all those units under one vice president in a single year--a four year task--and then taking the vice presidents themselves, all those units which report directly to the president, and the president's office itself, in the fifth year.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L Anderson
David H Darst
John J Fenstermaker
David Gruender (chairman)
Melissa A Hardy
Robert B Kimmel
Diana Scott
Margaret A Sitton
Tonya Toole