

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Florida State Conference Center
September 11, 1991
3:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the April 10, 1991 meeting
 - II. Approval of the agenda for the September 11, 1991 meeting
 - III. Welcome to the Florida State Conference Center, M. Pankowski
 - IV. Report of the Steering Committee, F. Leysieffer
 - V. Remarks by the Faculty Senate President, A. Mabe
 - VI. Reports of Standing Committees
 - VII. Unfinished Business
 - VIII. University Welfare
 - IX. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
 - a. Report on Salary and Budgetary Issues, T. McCaleb
 - X. Announcements of the President of the University
-

ANNOUNCEMENT

Interim Provost and Mrs. Glidden and the University Club will host the University Club Wednesday Social in the Florida State Conference Center immediately following the Senate meeting. The University Club will collect \$1.50 to help defray their expenses. Everyone is welcome!

THE NEXT SENATE MEETING WILL BE OCTOBER 9, 1991
N MOORE AUDITORIUM



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate R9B
904-644-6876

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Florida State Conference Center
September 11, 1991
3:45 p.m.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 1991-1992 Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, September 11, 1991 at 3:45 p.m. Alan Mabe convened the meeting.

The following members were absent. Alternates who were present are listed in parentheses. T. Anderson (J. Lovano-Kerr), B. Banoff, D. Boroto, T. Campbell, R. Chapple (W. Cloonan), T. Clark (A. Hollander), P. Dean (T. Barkley), G. DeVore, A. Dzurik, P. Elliott, J. Franceschina, M. Frumkin, P. Gielisse, R. Hobbs, T. Edwards (P. Kohler), W. Landing (W. Dewar), P. Maroney, B. McHugh, J. Mundy, R. Pestle (S. Hansen-Gandy), M. Ponce, D. Rasmussen, M. Roeder, K. Shelfer (C. Morris), G. Suarez, D. Sumners, R. Tate (W. Wager), G. Thompson, C. Tolbert (A. Imershein), J. Torgesen, L. Walters.

II. Approval of the minutes

The minutes of April 10 were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the agenda for September 11, 1991

The agenda was amended to add a report from the Library Committee under item VI. The amended agenda was approved.

**IV. Welcome to the Florida State Conference Center,
M. Pankowski**

Associate Vice President Mary Pankowski stated that it was a privilege to have the first fall meeting of the Faculty Senate at the Florida State Conference Center (FSCC) each year. The FSCC

brings national and international conferences each year, as well as local and campus related activities. Without the faculty of this University, there would be no conference center. There are no CPD courses as such. Every course taught through the center is an approved FSU course. "I welcome you today and hope this is the best academic year yet."

V. Report of the Steering Committee, F. Leysieffer

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee met throughout the summer months. Since our last Faculty Senate meeting, it met with President Sliger, President Lick, and Interim Provost Glidden. I will list the major issues considered by the Steering Committee during this past summer.

***The FSU Press.** The status of the FSU Press has changed. After considerable discussion the Chancellor has decided that the State University System will have a single press based at the University of Florida. It will be called the University Press of Florida. All works will carry the System imprint and where appropriate a university designation on the title page. The press will have an editorial board consisting of one member from each campus, chaired by a university provost - rotating in the system. This was not our recommendation. We are still hopeful that a change in name will at least indicate that the press is a system-wide press, not one associated with only the University of Florida.

***Budget.** The Steering Committee discussed university budget concerns. A report on the status of our current fiscal situation will be made later in this meeting by Associate Vice President Tom McCaleb.

***Enrollments.** The Steering Committee discussed the problems being experienced by academic units brought on by the combination of increased enrollments and limited resources with President Lick and Interim Provost Glidden.

***Library.** The Steering Committee discussed concerns of the university libraries in view of the current fiscal stress. Professor Jack Waggaman, chair of the Library Committee, will present a report later in this meeting.

***Parking.** The new policy concerning the enforcement of parking restrictions until 10:30 p.m. has drawn considerable attention. The parking committee is in the process of conducting public hearings on the policy and is seeking to work out problems that arise on a case-by-case basis. The new policy would require that each car parked in a non-metered place up to 10:30 p.m. be registered on campus, and that non-registered cars be required to pay parking meters. The minimum cost for such a registration is \$15 per year, the cost of a permit to park at the stadium. The problems being addressed now concern the numerous special events taking place on campus at night, which require parking facilities for guests to the university. Such events include plays, lectures, concerts, athletic events, and activities at the Developmental Research School, CPD, and CPE.

***Provost Turnbull.** Since our last Faculty Senate meeting, Dr. Turnbull has resigned as provost. Faculty Senate President Alan Mabe has written Dr. Turnbull a letter expressing our appreciation for his contributions to the university as provost.

***Evaluative and Electoral Procedures.** The Steering Committee has received a copy of the final report of the University Committee on Evaluative and Electoral Procedures, chaired by Professor Joseph Beckham. This was the committee established to study the tenure and promotion process, faculty peer review evaluations, matters regarding students which are required to be confidential, and elections to faculty committees and positions at the university. This committee was created following a controversy over the use of secret ballots at the College of Law. The committee essentially advocated a policy of openness with recommendations that "matters of personnel evaluation be exempted from disclosure and protected by the secret ballot." There were additional recommendations.

***Salary Policy.** The Steering Committee discussed the policy for salary raise distributions used this year. As you know, the bulk of the discretionary money this year was used to fund the so-called market equity/compression increases. Very few discretionary funds were left for other purposes. In view of this scarcity of funding the committee recommended against a \$300 minimum salary raise. This minimum was later changed to \$100.

***SACS Accreditation.** In 1994 the University will undergo an accreditation process with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. A self-study report must be submitted in July of 1993. Committees to work on this project will be appointed later this semester.

***Productivity Enhancement Funds.** Florida State University is eligible for about three quarters of a million dollars in productivity enhancement funding from the state. A proposal is going forward from the university today for the use of such funds. Areas to be emphasized are software improvement in administrative systems and in energy management. There may be some funds available for academic support in places such as the mathematics lab.

***Memorials and Courtesies.** After considerable discussion this past year, the Steering Committee proposes that an appropriate form for memorials is the purchase of books for the library. A subcommittee of the Steering Committee composed of Pat Martin, Tim Matherly, and Fred Leysieffer as chair will work out details of this proposal and will present it to the Senate later this year.

***Dean Daisy Parker Flory.** The Steering Committee concurred with the recommendation that Dean Daisy Parker Flory be accorded Dean Emerita status.

***Auxiliary Overhead.** The committee continued to discuss the auxiliary services issue. The issue here is one of not requiring educational auxiliary accounts to be subject to an assessment. The issue is on the agenda for the Auxiliary Services Board meeting on Friday.

***Accountability.** The Board of Regents is establishing guidelines to measure university performance. A system-wide task force has been appointed and has been working this summer. Vice President Jon Dalton is the FSU representative to that task force and is keeping us informed on the activities of that task force.

***Committee Chairs.** The following faculty will serve as chairs for the committees indicted: Professor Paul Wilkins,

Professional Relations and Welfare Committee; Professor Bonnie Braendlin, Grievance Committee; Professor Fred Standley, Senate Budget Committee; Professor Jayne Standley, Graduate Policy Committee; Professor Jack Waggaman, Library Committee; Professor Mae-Louise Baker, Elections Committee; Professor Douglass Seaton, Honors Program and Policy Committee and Fred Leysieffer, Memorials and Courtesies Committee.

***Meeting Times.** The Faculty Senate Steering Committee will meet weekly with regular meetings this semester on Monday afternoons at 2:15 to 3:45 p.m. in the first floor lounge of the Kuersteiner Music Building. These are open meetings.

***Committee Appointments.** The Steering Committee submits the following appointments to committees for Senate approval: Professor Peter Ray to fill out a one-year term on the Computer and Information Resources Committee, Professor Kathy Kemp to the Honors Program Policy Committee, Professor Tom Hart to fill out a two-year term on the Library Committee and Professors Pat Martin, Tim Matherly, and Fred Leysieffer to the Memorials and Courtesies Committee. These appointments were approved by the Senate.

VI. Remarks by Faculty Senate President, A. Mabe

How much change has occurred at this institution since I stood before you a year ago. The joining of the Atlantic Coast athletic conference, the resignation of President Sliger, the articulating and carrying out of the Presidential Search Process, the selection of an outstanding President, Dr. Dale W. Lick, who assumed the office a little over a month ago, the appointment of John Carnaghi as the new Vice President for Finance and Administration, the resignation of Provost Turnbull, the appointment of Robert Glidden as interim Provost, the appointment of new deans in Arts and Sciences, Business and Law, Larry Abele, Melvin Stith, and Don Weidner respectively, the staggering budget cuts we have faced in the past year, and the initiation of a state-financed land purchasing program for enlarging the campus. Not only is this an astounding amount of change in itself for such a short period of time, but each one of these changes will generate multiple additional changes in this decade. While we both express our heartfelt gratitude for

those who went before, and welcome these changes as bearers of new opportunities and new horizons, I am not sure we have fully assimilated the magnitude of these changes.

I cannot fulfill my charge to reflect on the state of the University and to articulate the goals and directions for the year without addressing the issue of change and continuity in the University. It is clear we have changed, and will change even more, driven both by external and internal forces. Change can be anxiety producing, perhaps to a considerable extent unavoidably so. But there are mechanisms of stability which can be invoked. On this campus I believe the system of shared governance is a mechanism of stability, but a mechanism which can respond to and accommodate change. Our system of shared governance has its critics from time to time, but also its supporters beyond the campus among our alumni and friends, and in other places as well. As Leo Sandon said two years ago, "Our system of governance is the envy of every informed faculty member at other universities in the system." As we experience necessary and welcome change, it is appropriate to pause and reflect on our system of shared governance, how it functions and what its benefits are.

Our system of shared governance has in place well-established and widely accepted procedures for setting policy and addressing issues which may arise under those policies, and for making recommendations which reflect the views of the faculty and other constituencies. Our commitment is to make these procedures fair and representative, and I believe we succeed. For the most part our procedures are the result of thoughtful, deliberate decisions, and the procedures themselves are open for examination should the need arise. The Constitution and Bylaws cover the operation of the Senate, the Steering Committee, promotion and tenure and the standing committees of the Senate. This means that when we have difficult issues to address we can attend to the substance of the problem and not have to divert valuable time to considering how we are going to decide. Shared governance extends well beyond the Senate committees. For committees appointed by the President, the Provost and most of the vice presidents, the Committee on Committees, composed of faculty, staff, and students recommends two names for each vacancy according to the categories of faculty, staff, students, and in some cases

community members. The relevant administrator then chooses from those recommended. With ad hoc committees, which are sometimes necessary, there is usually consultation regarding membership.

Shared governance generates common discussion among faculty, staff, students, and administrators. This simply brings more intelligence and experience to bear on problems or issues. Top-down policy making simply cannot anticipate the nuisances and possibilities in the particular case. The involvement of faculty and other constituencies ahead of time forestalls the need to remake the policy later to account for unanticipated results. The more creative and experienced people involved with an issue, the more likely it is that the results will not seem ill-thought-out. We regularly offer the expert services of the university to the wider world. Shared governance invokes the wealth of talent in the University and directs it at our own issues and problems. Still, we probably underutilize this wealth of talent for solving our own problems.

Shared governance promotes a university perspective. As many points of view become involved in a discussion one learns not only to appreciate other points of view but also to participate in formulating a view of what is best for the university. This takes many forms, faculty working with other faculty, faculty working with administrators, etc. The Faculty Senate and the Steering Committee have been significant forces in promoting a university perspective on this campus.

The extensive participation of faculty in the Senate, Senate committee and joint committees has lead to a faculty knowledgeable about university-wide issues.

Effective shared governance generates responsible participation by faculty, staff, students and administrators.

An effective system of shared governance forestalls suspicion of administrators by faculty and vice versa.

A hallmark of effective shared governance is constructive criticism and - shudder - praise of administrators for a job well done. Even in our bad times last year, the Faculty Senate was very appreciative of the openly consultative way Tom McCaleb

and Ralph Alvarez developed the proposals for reductions and the clarity and detail with which they were presented to the Senate. Yet with our University Welfare period for each Senate meeting and through other means, faculty are encouraged to express their concerns in whatever way they are perceived. It is then the task of the Senate through its committees and leaders to formulate the issue or problem so that it can be appropriately addressed.

There is a nexus of the liberal arts basis of this university, shared governance, and innovative research and program development. The liberal arts tradition sees the range of knowledge it imparts as a kind of empowering of the individual to better understand his or her world and to have more control over and self-direction in his or her affairs. Shared governance is the putting into practice the fruits of the liberal arts tradition in the university setting. Without shared governance our practice would belie our profession of the value of the liberal arts tradition. Shared governance is symbolic of an attitude toward the role of the faculty, indeed toward the role of everyone in the University. Where faculty have a feeling of independence and self-direction, where they believe they can be innovative, great things will be accomplished. A few years ago, Cliff Madsen reported to us the words of John Gardner, "In higher education, as in everything else, there is no excellent performance without high morale." Shared governance is an essential ingredient in maintaining high morale.

By most measures faculty morale should be significantly lower than it is. I think the explanation why it is not lies in the ownership the faculty feels in the institution, and the perception that we are doing about as well as we can under the resource restraints we face externally. While there is unhappiness with where we are there is optimism that when reasonable resources are again available we are poised to make great new strides as a university.

Shared governance gives the University a way to have a more powerful presence than any one group or individual can have. If the faculty, administration, students, alumni, and other friends of the university are united for some purpose, our chances of success are multiplied many times over.

The importance and consequences of shared governance is clear, I believe. It offers an avenue of continuity and stability through which the extensive change we are experiencing and anticipate can be assimilated. Dialogue, discussion, and consensus-building are the life blood of the University. We anticipate vigorous new leadership from the President's office; we expect to be challenged to move this university toward even greater achievements. We should not fixate on every current structure or process, but rather we should be guided by the underlying principles and consequences of shared governance. The President has asked the Steering Committee reflect on how we are to set priorities in the University. Answering that question should be at the heart of our dialogue. We should be open to doing things differently, whether it is a matter of procedure or substance, but we should remind ourselves that shared governance is fully capable of managing and assimilating change. In fact, it may provide the context in which change can most successfully occur in the University.

The Office of the Dean of the Faculties has a special role to play in facilitating the operation of shared governance. It plays a central role in many committees, especially in its management of the promotion and tenure process. Further it is the depository for the policies and rules applicable to all aspects of the academic processes and is charged with seeing that those policies and procedures are followed throughout the University.

Several items emerge as concerns for this year and beyond.

The University will gear up for the SACS accreditation review this fall. Apparently we must do a conventional self-study which will require the participation of every unit in the University. Most of you will be involved in this to some extent.

We will continue to review courses for the multicultural requirement. We will begin to look for balance in offerings from various areas, and perhaps encourage departments to offer additional courses. The Senate will likely be called on to continue to define the requirement in terms of specific courses. You might be interested in some external reaction to our new requirements. Journalists are a little surprised that this has already occurred without some blowup of the magnitude of Stanford's. Randolph Pendleton, writing in the Times Union,

our current lack of resources discourage you from thinking about new possibilities for your teaching, research and service. The ultimate measure of the quality of the University is what we provide through teaching and research to our individual students, and through research and service to society at large.

This will be a mixed year. Even as we suffer the pain of budget cuts, there will be an air of excitement and anticipation as we plan for our very bright future. I wish you and all our colleagues a successful and rewarding year.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Library Committee, J. Waggaman

This report covers three items related to the consequences of the financial squeeze affecting the University and its libraries.

1. The Library Committee met September 4th and voted to implement the first phase of its financial contingency plan passed last spring. At that time it was agreed that if the share of the library materials budget for periodicals exceeded 70 percent of the 1991-92 budget, we needed to cut \$200,000 from the periodicals budget. A conservative estimate (because prices may continue to rise) is that the periodicals budget would exceed 75 percent. After reviewing again all the circumstances, the committee voted to implement the cut. This cut will reduce the share of the budget for periodicals to about \$2.2 million, which is 68 percent of the total. That percent is still considerably above the historic average of 50 percent of just three years ago, when price increases and allocations of \$50,000 a year for new journals began affecting this ratio.

Our contingency plan required that each academic unit (college, school or department) receive a list of the journals and other materials assigned to it and that the items be reviewed by faculty members. In the review, a sufficient number of items were to be cut from each department's list to meet the unit's share of the \$200,000 goal. With the excellent cooperation of Mr. Charles Miller, his library staff, departmental faculty, and especially the faculty members who serve as the liaison persons with the Strozier Library, this financial goal was met. Representatives from several departments indicated that this kind of review was overdue and was beneficial in and of itself.

To ensure that faculty were given a chance to review the potential impact of the journals recommended to be cut throughout the University, a full cut-list was distributed to all academic units in late spring. As a result of this step some journals have been taken off the cut-list and some journals and other materials transferred to departments that wanted to retain them. Those units which had exceeded their financial quota were able to add journals marked for deletion by other departments. Some additional journals were added to the cut-list. Even after this last round of changes, the financial goal was met. This was a difficult task, but accomplished with great cooperation.

2. The first round of the contingency plan helped purge the journals that could be removed without significantly affecting the academic resources of the library (some faculty still report that the periodical collection is inadequate). Unfortunately, if revenues for the library materials budget decline below \$3.1 million or if subscription prices continue to escalate excessively, a second round of cuts totaling another \$200,000 will be necessary. This possibility was anticipated during the spring review when departments were asked to designate an additional number of journals equal in value to the first cut; most departments were able, with considerable pain, to do this.

The developing financial situation will be monitored by the Committee and arrangements for another review prepared. Should this next round of cuts be necessary, it would occur after July 1, 1992. You should be aware that the University of Texas-Austin and University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and several other state university libraries had to each cut more than 1500 journals in 1990 and reduce their operating hours.

3. Now there is some good news. We will have a book budget of about \$800,000 which will be divided about equally between individual orders and books received on approval. However, there may be a delay in the availability of these funds because of the way the State and the BOR staff distribute appropriations. All of these government officials are trying to be financially conservative in case additional cuts in University budgets must be made. At present, if library funds are kept on a quarterly distribution schedule, then the \$1.7 million of bills

**1991-92 Budget Status
Report to the Faculty Senate
September 11, 1991**

Two-Year Summary

Total Reductions = \$17,300,631

Recurring Reductions = \$13,605,911 and 180.52 manyear positions

Represents over 7% of the total state appropriated University operating budget.

Major problem areas

Summer Term: Summer reserve has been reduced by one-third. The impact was not felt in 1991 because of the use of converted STOCO to pay summer salaries and the use of faculty with administrative assignments and Board of Regents administrative personnel to teach summer classes. There are no currently-identified nonrecurring funding sources for replacement in 1992. The University anticipates using all remaining equipment funding and most of the anticipated carry-forward and salary surplus balances to underwrite budget shortfalls before Summer Term 1992 ever arrives.

Plant Operations and Maintenance: Over \$900,000 has been permanently deleted from the University's maintenance and utilities budgets. There is no prospect for replacement.

Library Materials: Of \$1.0 million deleted from the University's library materials budget in 1990-91, \$600,000 was restored by the Legislature. Along with Financial Aid, this was the only area in which some funds were restored. We had anticipated this and that was a major reason for our selection of the library materials budget as a target for budget reduction. The balance of \$400,000 will be replaced with nonrecurring funds for 1991-92. There is also the possibility of nonrecurring fund sources to make up part or all of the shortfall for 1992-93 in the event that the Legislature does not provide additional restoration funding. While this holds the library materials budget on an even footing, it nevertheless represents a real dollar reduction as it does not provide for cost increases or enhancements to the collection.

**1991-92 Budget Status
Report to the Faculty Senate
September 11, 1991**

1991-92 Faculty Salary Increases

Funds were appropriated by the Legislature to provide an average 3% salary increase for faculty. (Incidentally, when the University actually received its salary allocation a few weeks ago, only 76% of the required funds were actually provided.) Of the 3%, 1.5% was mandated for across-the-board increases and the remainder for "discretionary" increases. No funding was provided for "merit" increases as defined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

From the 1.5% discretionary, salary increases for promotions were taken first, requiring 0.28%. Next, funds were used for a "market equity adjustment" in an amount equal to 1.01%. The balance of 0.21% was available for salary increases based on performance, equity, and contribution to the University. For perspective, that amounts to less than \$100 per faculty member or between \$4.50 and \$5.00 biweekly before taxes; or, it amounts to a salary increase of \$300 (the minimum allowed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement) to fewer than 400 faculty members (less than one-third of the faculty). In fact, we were able to "spread" funds a bit further because (1) the Provost secured the agreement of the local UFF chapter to substitute a \$100 minimum in place of the \$300 minimum and (2) the available discretionary funds were enhanced by about 50% by diversion of funds from other sources by the Provost.

The "market equity adjustment" was mandated by the Board of Regents in conjunction with the UFF. It provided a salary increase sufficient to bring every faculty member to a level equal to 80% of the national average for his/her rank and discipline as measured by the annual Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey. In effect, it establishes minimum salaries by rank and discipline for faculty.

For purposes of comparison with the OSU survey, faculty were grouped into large discipline classes (using two-digit CIP codes) such as Visual and Performing Arts or Social Sciences, not into their departmental disciplines (using three-, four-, or six-digit CIP codes) such as art, music, history, or economics. The University proposed that we use faculty discipline groupings in the same way that we submit our own data to OSU, primarily by departmental

**1991-92 Budget Status
Report to the Faculty Senate
September 11, 1991**

discipline; that proposal was rejected, and we were mandated to use the alternative method of broad (two-digit CIP) discipline groupings.

*I051
WALLAT CYNTHIA
CHRPSN & PROFESSOR
FOUNDATIONS AND POLICY STUDIES
306 STB