

Middle Tennessee State University
Faculty Senate
March 16, 2009

Action Items:

- Please review the minutes from the last meeting as posted online; they will be presented for approval at the next meeting.
- Please send email to colleagues to respond to appointments (and volunteers) on Standing Committees.

Faculty Senate Meeting:

- 1) Roll Call
 - a) Members Present – F. Amey, M. Arndt, M. Balachandran, D. Belcher, C. Bratten, J. Brickey, L. Burriss, N. Callendar, J. Carter, W. Cribb, J. Dowdy, L. Fisher, M. Foster, G. Freeman, C. Frost, B. Haskew, J. Hausler, C. Higgins, W. Ilsley, N. Kelker, A. Lutz, J. Marcellus M. Martin, T. McBreen, R. McBride, W. Means, A. Miller, K. Nofsinger, J. Oliver, J. Pennington, T. Perry, M. Rice, K. Rushlow, S. Seipel, L. Selva, K. Smith, C. Stephens, S. Taylor, R. Untch, P. Wall, B. Wallace, L. Warise, W. Warren, J. Wermert
 - b) Members Excused - J. Cain
 - c) Members Absent - S. Daughtery, J. LeBlond, J. Maynor, L. Mulraine, D. Penn
 - d) Additional attendees-
- 2) Approval of February 2009 Minutes - To be posted online and approved next meeting
- 3) Treasurer's Report- (February figures)
 - a) Operating Budget: \$1,849.64
 - b) Travel: (\$183.74)
 - c) Discretionary Account: \$**
- 4) President's Report –
 - a) New evaluation instrument – Vic Montemeyer will give presentation in the fall; this will be sufficiently timely given the context of the budget cut.
 - b) Full-time temporary faculty want representation. The consensus of the faculty senate steering committee is that this not necessary at this time because faculty representatives represent all of the faculty.
 - c) Summer school changes are very drastic; the faculty senate needs to add information to this process. Please address issues to A.Lutz
 - d) Amendments to the By-Laws need to be sent forward to the faculty; we will do this by email at this time if there is no objection. Protocol – Preferred is that we use pipeline. Lutz will report back on April. Unanimously agreed that online methodology of some sort is preferred.
 - e) Conversation with MTSU legal council re: tenure cuts
 - i) Merging with another department could be considered an elimination of your department for consideration of tenure protections; both departments are abolished and a new department is formed.

- ii) If your department were eliminated and you leave prior to the end of the year, could the university take legal action? ...”this has never happened and it would be unlikely” ...but not a guarantee.
 - iii) Compensation for sick leave- if your department is eliminated, you will not be compensated for your loss of sick leave.
 - f) Dean’s cabinet meeting – The Dean’s believe that all reports were based on quantitative and almost no qualitative data. The Dean’s disagreed with all measures that were recommended by Oversight Committee.
 - g) President’s cabinet meeting – The Preliminary report will be released on Thursday in a press conference. The report will be on web-site shortly before the press conference.
 - i) There will be four categories: seriously considered, not to be recommended, inclined to accept but needing additional information.
 - ii) The stimulus money will give us slightly more time to consider what we want to do.
 - iii) Thursday is not the final word; there will be continuing discussions. First forum on April 1 and second on either April 2 or 6.
 - iv) At the end of two years, the Governor expects the worse \$19.3M cuts. The stimulus package is temporary funds but it does buy us time to be more deliberative and phase in actions.
 - v) Attrition, retirements, and incentives to retire might take care of reduction of employees over two years. Incentives to retire are back on the table.
 - vi) There is interest in increasing the number of foreign students on-campus due to differential in tuition rates.
 - h) Senate Steering Committee has recommended a letter from the senate before his preliminary report. This statement of general principles would include the following:
 - i) First statement: In light of the importance of EVERY academic dept to the life of the academy the faculty senate strongly urges that no dept be merged or eliminated until a thorough study of the impact of the intangible values and losses can be made and included in the analysis of the cuts.
 - ii) Followed by the statements: 1,2,3 and followed by a request for information a,b,c, and comparison to peer groups.
- 5) Discussion with Faculty Senate
- i) Motion – approval of making a pre-Thursday statement as coming from the Faculty Statement -
 - (1) New structure should include a new mission statement and new short-term and long-term goals. With these cuts, we would no longer be a comprehensive liberal arts university and there are no replacement goals for writing a budget and choosing departments.
 - (2) We are looking for greater awareness of outcomes and consequences.
 - (3) There needs to be justification for deviation from the Master Plan.
 - (4) All the decisions are made in the name of short-term savings instead of looking at the global planning and goals.
 - (5) The criteria used in the Oversight Committee were unrelated to the value of the of the department to the academic mission. The Oversight Committee was charged to NOT consider intangibles. Academic Mission statements were presented but not considered.
 - (6) Motion was approved unanimously to make a statement
 - ii) Contents of statement –

- (1) The process that has taken place so far has left out the direct voice of the constituency of the individuals most involved. We should have a better voice in this process.
- (2) Part of this picture is missing. It is not the quantitative data is correct nor complete. We respectfully request the time that the Governor says has been given by the stimulus package.
- (3) Elimination of department is not being supported by a representative faculty body. The TBR guidelines require this input be obtained. The faculty senate has not had an opportunity to provide thorough input. We were given "some" representative body....but the guidelines say THE representative body. The majority of the Oversight Committee was not a faculty committee – a majority was NOT faculty. So the faculty senate needs time to make a meaningful statement and that statement needs to be fully considered as co-equal or more important than other information.
- (4) How is it possible for the state to make \$19M in cuts when a pre-condition for receipt of the stimulus money is that the funding for Higher Education be returned to 2006 funding levels?
- (5) There needs to be an appropriate balance between the cuts and our academic integrity.
- (6) We need other comparison to the actions of other TBR institutions and our peer institutions to look for innovations and to look for warnings of bad ideas.
- (7) We are not fundamentally opposed to changes, but these need to take in to account all the implications of the individual change.
- (8) The Senate trust Lutz and steering committee to encapsulate this discussion in to a document to be sent to Dr. McPHee before his presentation. The motion passed.

iii) Called meeting on March 23, 2009.

- 6) Action Items
 - a) Review minutes as posted online.
- 7) Discussion Items
 - a) None
- 8) New Business
 - a) None
- 9) Adjournment