

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, April 23, 2015

Innsbruck Rooms—University Center 211 A-B

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins, who acknowledged that the former senators were in the right place and that the new senators would replace some of them when we get to the elections.

2. Roll Call

Current Roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Present
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Present
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Present
Adjunct			(14-15)	
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Present
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Absent
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(14-17)	Present
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business			(13-16)	
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Absent
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	(13-16)	Present
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Present
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Malay	Ghose Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolas	Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Absent
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Present

Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Pam	Jenkins	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Shengru	Tu	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 3/25/15 Meeting

Dr. Schluchter moved and Dr. Logan seconded to approve the minutes of the 3/25/15 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Faculty Senate End-of-Year Committee Reports

Each committee chair or representative presented an oral report. See **Appendix 1** for their written reports. There were some comments/questions.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee (Dr. Gill):

Dr. Jenkins read from President Fos' email response regarding the termination of Geography faculty. He was asked, in the spirit of transparency, for specific information about how policy AP-AA-18-2 was followed. Dr. Fos responded that all of his recommendations were vetted by the UL System staff and the UL System outside legal counsel before he made his recommendations to the Board in December. Dr. Jenkins suggested that the Committee think about the strategy that they want to do and if they want to recommend further action to the Senate at the May meeting.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee (Dr. Roussev):

Dr. Roussev's report was actually the group's initial response to the February 24 request to look into the use of the student technology fee. Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Roussev if he saw the need for

the committee to continue to work on this. He replied that it is student money and maybe we can work with them to help them, but this is not an easy question to answer since we are not directly responsible. Dr. Beaton noted that there is a lot of good stuff out there that is free. Dr. Roussev added that the University has a site license for MS, and he thinks that it is a good deal. Even with free software, you have to pay for maintenance.

Dr. Jenkins thanked everyone for their work.

5. Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) Report and Evaluation (Dr. Matt Tarr)

Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Sharpton if we can have more time to do the evaluation than May. Dr. Sharpton responded that we have to do the faculty evaluation by the end of this semester. The UL System policy requires faculty evaluations based on the academic year, but we moved to a calendar year because we moved to the UL System in December. SACS did a substantive change review that said that we are out of compliance with our policy because the schedule changed. The evaluation for this year will have three semesters instead of two. Dr. Jenkins said that we feel that people need more time and asked if we can use the old form for May. Dr. Sharpton replied that it will not help us because we have already said that we are changing our process, and he strongly recommends that we use the new form this year. Dr. Jenkins thanked Dr. Tarr for doing yeoman's work on the FGC Evaluation Subcommittee, and there was a round of applause.

Dr. Tarr then spoke about the Faculty Evaluation document (see [Faculty Evaluation Policy draft](#) and [Faculty Evaluation Policy Overview](#)). He discussed why we are doing this and the accelerated timeline, which causes some issues. The first year is a transition year where the policy is going to be evolved, developed, and further refined. The policy was written to allow generic guidelines. He listed the changes and cited the concerns on which he has gotten feedback, noting that the criteria in the document are already in place – we all know that we have to teach, etc. He also reviewed the advantages.

Dr. Tarr explained the four different tables: one for scholarly work, which needed to be broad; one for teaching; and one for service; and a table for the Library that has performance of duties in place of teaching. Under “Specific Behaviors ...,” you can populate the boxes independently. There is a place for some overall comments, an overall score, and the percentage of effort from the workload policy. The weighted score is the product of the two divided by 100. “Unsatisfactory” actually talks about negative behavior, as in teaching. The last table is for overall performance.

After Dr. Tarr's presentation, Dr. Jenkins asked senators to think about the conundrum that we face. Dr. Fulop said that he has an issue with the teaching, service, and librarian evaluations under “Needs Improvement” and “Unsatisfactory.” He looked them up and “Infrequently” and “Rarely” mean the same thing. Dr. Nuccio-Lee asked how the chairs know that. Are they observing? Dr. Tarr responded that there are a number of ways that we go about this, and observation is one of them. He thinks that peer evaluation and chair observation are mechanisms, and we are also required to use student evaluations. Dr. Nuccio-Lee said that student evaluations are good, but if her emphasis is on teaching, and if someone is going to score

her on teaching, she would like for the chair to observe her teaching. Dr. Tarr said that that is something that the chairs need to develop with the approval of the faculty. Dr. Payne noted that it has been discussed in the Evaluation Subcommittee that we look at the evaluations that students fill out. Dr. Mokhiber said that his concern is that with everything that has happened to us this year, we have not been able to ask questions or get buy-in from people outside of this group.

It was asked if there is a way to do something as an intermediate step. Dr. Tarr asked why the Senate does not approve an interim policy for a year and then come back in a year and evaluate it. Dr. Mokhiber said that the thing that concerns him in the short term is that every day we are hearing about the possibility of exigency. We are producing bad data in a variety of ways. Dr. Tarr responded that the University Administration has to be very careful how it makes decisions on terminating people, and there are guidelines in place. Mr. Teagle asked Dr. Tarr if he had not said that the terminations that took place violated policy. Dr. Tarr replied that he said that the Administration needs to be very careful in following policy. Dr. Corey questioned the timeline because the spring student evaluations would not yet be available. Dr. Tarr replied that they changed the time frame from which student evaluations will be taken, from the previous fall and spring.

Dr. Sharpton stated that, whether we accept this particular protocol or not, we still have two standards that we have not passed, and he has to submit something this summer that tries to get these conditions improved. Dr. Striffler said that the impending budget cut changes things a bit. We are going to possibly be laid off and these evaluations are going to be used to lay off people. He is not comfortable under these circumstances with the idea that it is just a trial run. We finished the faculty workload policy a year ago, and if the need for this was that imperative, why did we wait so late? Maybe a committee could have taken it on?

Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Sharpton to speak to the timeline and if there is some way that the Senate can have more time and still be compliant. Dr. Sharpton stated that we have zero instances across departments where evaluations have been used to show improvement. We could repeat the same tool, but he does not know how we are going to use that in a meaningful way to get out of the situation. Dr. Jenkins added that we never closed the loop and asked if we can take the old document that everybody is still comfortable with, add a piece that shows improvement, and use the summer to work on the new policy. Dr. Tarr said that that will not satisfy people who are concerned that they will get terminated because of the evaluation. Dr. Sharpton said that we could do as Dr. Jenkins suggested.

Dr. Bourgeois said that we cannot control the budget issue, but we can control the SACS issue. Do we not need to get this done to protect our institution? Dr. Roussev said that his department developed a policy last year that is not too far from this, but there is subjective judgment. He also said that we could not have closed the loop this year because this is our first time working with this. Dr. Tarr noted that this policy includes a statement that departments are encouraged to develop their own criteria with a few limitations: (1) the dean, Provost and President have to approve it; and (2) you have to convert any scoring system used to a 5-point score. Dr. Sharpton added that a few departments have created their own tool, and he sees no problem using our own tool to populate this one.

Dr. Jenkins reiterated that Dr. Sharpton said that we could use the old form and use this new form to close the loop. Dr. Mokhiber asked how that works. Dr. Sharpton replied that he would hope that the chairs would use it give feedback to the faculty, and he hopes that the former would report it to the deans. Dr. Jenkins suggested that it would be nice if we could have the summer. Dr. Sharpton said that if we do that, he would strongly encourage that we use the time to develop the evaluation for our disciplines. We could use the tool as developed or if a department has already developed a tool, use a 1-5 score. What we would report is the old form with the two categories. Dr. Striffler stated that the problem for him is the numbers; that is the record and that is what would be used if there are layoffs. Dr. Tarr said that his impression is that that information cannot be used. UL System policy says that you have to terminate non-tenured faculty first, then tenured faculty by rank.

Dr. Rick asked what faculty can do if they do not agree with the evaluation. Dr. Tarr responded that each faculty member can submit written comments (section 1.4). From the gallery, Dr. David Gladstone said that he shares the concerns and suggested that we go with the old document, drop the points from the new one, and give comments back as in the new document. He sees the point system as only potentially hurting faculty, not helping them. It behooves the Senate to help faculty, and coming up with a point system does not do that. Dr. Schluchter said that that is what we do with the students. But, Dr. Striffler responded, we do not change it in the middle of the semester.

Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Roussev if what they created has numbers. He replied yes, that it is a 4-point scale, but he asked what closing the loop is. Dr. Tarr answered that it is making/ implementing a plan to improve. Dr. Sharpton explained that you take the data, decide what the data shows, and come up with an action statement – that is closing the loop. The next year, you go back and see if the action was completed. Dr. Roussev said that on this schedule, we cannot possibly do the second part, only the first one. Mr. Teagle stated that typically, when you have a rating system, there is a reward. What is the reward for the “great” category? We should not put numbers on our system.

At this point, Dr. Jenkins asked if whoever is elected would be willing to have a meeting in May to vote on this. Drs. Starr and Trumbach both said yes. Dr. Jenkins added that, in the meantime, we think of a way to make this work. She thanked Dr. Sharpton, and there was a round of applause.

6. SACS and Other Updates (Dr. Bill Sharpton, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)

- a. **SACS:** Dr. Sharpton reported that we are still out of compliance with two standards: (1) administrative support; and (2) academic student support services. The bottom line is that we were not able to show in WEAVE strategies or targets, actions, dates, etc. We did not have three cycles of data, but they could tell that we worked on it. QEP passed with no official recommendations, just a list of suggestions to which we do not have to respond. We have the summer to get those two standards under compliance. His plan is to get it all together by July to send to SACS. Two people look at the report, and they decide if they have sufficient

evidence to get the non-compliance removed. There were two other areas where we almost did not pass: (1) post-baccalaureate academic majors; and (2) around distance education. We now have programs that are all distance, and they would like to see that we compare the online students with students in traditional programs.

- b. **Graduate School:** One of the things that became apparent is that we do not have a mechanism in place to review programs. A plan has been developed for the Graduate Council, and to make that work, we need to let University Courses and Curricula be the Committee for all courses and make sure that you have people able to do graduate and undergraduate courses. Noting that we discussed this at the last meeting, Dr. Jenkins asked for a motion to move the review of graduate courses to Courses and Curricula. Dr. Brooks so moved, there was a second, and the motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Day had a question about the SACS requirement for faculty evaluations. There is a lot of concern about section 2.11 as a statewide attack on tenure. Does SACS require us to move forward immediately? Dr. Jenkins replied that there can be a discussion on that in May.

7. Statewide Resolution (Dr. Jenkins)

Dr. Jenkins presented two statewide resolutions and asked for motions to suspend the rules and approve them. The first one is the UNO version (see **Appendix 2**) of one passed by the LSU, ULL, and Southeastern Senates. Ms. Phelps said that to wait until May is kind of pointless. Dr. Payne moved to suspend the rules to vote, and Dr. Easterlin seconded. The motion was approved unanimously, and the resolution passed unanimously.

The second resolution is UNO support for [The Legislator's Pledge and the Citizen's Pledge in Support of Louisiana Higher Education](#). All the other campuses have passed a resolution to support this pledge. Dr. Schluchter moved that we approve the resolution, but Mr. Teagle suggested that we needed to change some words before voting to approve. See **Appendix 3** for the UNO resolution as amended by our Faculty Senate. Dr. Payne moved to suspend the rules, and Dr. Easterlin seconded. The motion was approved unanimously, and the resolution passed unanimously.

8. Student Update (Mr. David Teagle)

Dr. Jenkins stated that Mr. Teagle is to be congratulated for all of the work that he has done, as frustrating as it has been. Mr. Teagle reported on three things:

- (1) The student self-assessed fee plan was pulled by the President of UNO on the recommendation of the UL System staff. They felt that all self-assessed fee plans need to take place at the general election in the fall. Student Government is going to use the time in the next couple of months to get more students involved and develop a plan where students will feel more comfortable with it.
- (2) Student Government has also proposed a change in their constitution to change their name to Student Government Association.

(3) The Council of Student Body Presidents had a very successful participation at the Capitol Building; more than half the students were from UNO. They gave some really angry speeches and they were invited to speak before the State House Appropriations Committee, who had no idea how this was affecting all of us.

Mr. Teagle said that he really appreciates the support that the faculty and staff have given them this year, and there was a round of applause on his behalf. Dr. Jenkins thanked him for coming and for his work on the University Budget Committee.

9. Thanks to Dr. Jenkins (Dr. Schluchter)

Dr. Schluchter stated that she wanted to give some brief comments from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to thank Dr. Jenkins for devoting the last year of her life to the Faculty Senate and the massive amount of work over the last year. Dr. Jenkins brought her skills to do work that no one has been asked to do before. Dr. Schluchter is sorry to say that Dr. Jenkins is leaving in May, but we would not be in this place if not for her, and we have a level of transparency that we have never had before at UNO.

Dr. Schluchter briefly reminded everyone about the University Budget Committee meetings on Wednesdays, 9:30-11:00am in the Library, and referred to the Committee's email account for people to send comments: ubc@uno.edu.

Returning to Dr. Jenkins, Dr. Schluchter noted that the former worked with three Provosts this year: Payne, Sharpton, and Nicklow. She is one of the reasons why we have a Budget Committee and one of the reasons why we have a bigger place at the table with Administration. This was followed by a big round of applause. Dr. Schluchter concluded by presenting Dr. Jenkins with a gift as a token of gratitude.

Dr. Jenkins said to those coming on the Senate that one of the best things is the friends that you make. She has read all 80 narratives; some of it is astonishing, and some of it is very sad. She offered encouragement.

10. Old Business. None.

11. New Business. None.

At this point, Dr. Jenkins asked the old Senate to leave the table and the new Senate to stay, and she asked for the second roll call.

12. Roll Call of Newly Elected and Continuing Senators

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Present
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Absent
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Present

Adjunct	(vacant)		(14-15)	
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(14-17)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(15-18)	Present
Business	Tarun	Mukherjee	(15-18)	Present
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	(13-16)	Present
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Excused
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Engineering	Ting	Wang	(15-18)	Excused
Engineering	Christine	Ikeda	(15-18)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Pam	Jenkins	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(15-18)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(15-18)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Robert	Dupont	(15-18)	Present
Liberal Arts	Juliana	Starr	(15-18)	Present
Liberal Arts	Jeffrey	Ehrenreich	(15-18)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(15-18)	Present
Sciences	Shengru	Tu	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(15-18)	Present
Sciences	Kenneth	Holladay	(15-18)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(15-18)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

At this point, Dr. Jenkins turned the meeting over to Ms. Morgan for the officer elections.

13. Election of Officers—President, Vice President and Secretary (Ms. Morgan, Chair, Nominations and Elections Committee; see Appendix 2)

Voting was done by ballot.

President:

Juliana Starr

Cherie Trumbach

No nominations from the floor. Dr. Speaker moved and Dr. Payne seconded to close the nominations.

Dr. Trumbach was elected President.

Vice President:

Dinah Payne

Vassil Roussev

Dr. Speaker nominated Juliana Starr from the floor, and she accepted the nomination.

Dr. Trumbach moved and Dr. Logan seconded to close the nominations.

The conundrum occurred that Dr. Roussev had the most votes but not unanimous, and the two other candidates were tied. To avoid a revote, Dr. Payne said that she was willing to declare Dr. Roussev the winner and asked Dr. Starr if she agreed, which the latter did.

Dr. Roussev was elected Vice President.

Secretary:

Jim Mokhiber

Dr. Speaker moved to elect Dr. Mokhiber as Secretary by acclamation, to which all agreed.

Ms. Morgan congratulated all of the new officers.

At this point, Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Trumbach to come to the podium and adjourn the meeting if she had no additional items.

14. Adjournment

Dr. Trumbach asked for a motion to adjourn, which was moved by Dr. Jenkins and seconded by Ms. Phelps. The meeting adjourned at 4:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Morgan

Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15

May 6, 2015

APPENDIX 1 (Faculty Senate 2014-15 End-of-Year Committee Reports):

Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Dr. Jenkins):

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The FSEC met every week from the middle of May 2014 until elections April 23, 2015. From April 23rd to May 13th, the former FSEC is meeting in transition with the newly elected members.

The FSEC committee developed the agenda for the meetings each month, plus the two additional meetings this year. Moreover, the FSEC worked closely with the Faculty Council to hold several Faculty Council meetings throughout the year.

As well, the FSEC populated the three relatively new university wide committees- the Faculty Governance Committee, the University Budget Committee, and the Panel on Enrollment Management. Each of these committees also involved participation in subcommittees and all three met weekly. Further, members of the FSEC met regularly with the President and all the provosts over the course of the year.

The discussions in the FSEC were wide-ranging and helped to bridge the differences among the group. The group helped to fill vacancies on committees in their colleges.

The FSEC group worked collaboratively to refer issues to the most appropriate committee. Most importantly, the FSEC worked through some of the hardest issues faculty have ever faced at UNO. These issues are by no means resolved; the discussions within the group were helpful.

The work that is not finished is the revising of the university committee structure. This work was started in 2013, and is still not completed.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee (Dr. Gill):

Report to Faculty Senate
Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure etc
For: Vern Baxter (Chair), Marie Morgan (Secy)
From: Ivan Gill (Pee-on)

Please review and edit for accuracy.

30Apr2015, presented at 23Apr2015 Senate meeting.
The major actions of the committee this term were to:

1. Provide clarification to the Senate on the meaning and nature of *exigency*, as it is used in the context of universities. Source for the report came from UL System documents. Some major points:

- exigency can be declared at a range of levels from the departmental to system-wide. This has implications as to the mechanism and scope of faculty termination.

- rules for termination of faculty, once exigency is declared, are weak. Ground rules generally contain advisories, but few enforceable mandates, in the opinion of the committee.

2. Author a resolution for the Senate concerning the process used in the dissolution of the Geography department:

- Terminations should cease until faculty input obtained, guidelines followed

- Actions should follow university system guidelines, for example:

 - consultation w faculty

 - equivalent positions within the university system must be sought

- This resolution was passed by the Senate. No response from the President at the time of reporting, although President of the Senate did read a response from President Fos after the committee report on 23Apr2015. The Senate President has the text of President Fos' response.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee (Dr. Roussev):

Budget Allocation of Student Tech Fees

(Annual Report of the UNO Faculty Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee)

Apr 23, 2015

The UNO Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee (*the committee*) was charged by the Senate to report on the allocation of funds from the student tech fees. Of particular interest is the apparent lack of funding allocation for much needed hardware upgrades in student labs.

Background

In accordance to the charge, the Budget Committee met with Mr. David Dupree (CIO) and Ms. Alicia Hord (UCC Business Manager) on Apr 17, 2015. Present at the meeting: Marie Morgan, Marla Nelson, Vassil Roussev, Peter Schock, and Cherie Trumbach (via telephone).

The student tech fee is in the amount of \$5 per credit hour with a maximum of \$75 per semester per student. For the FY 2015, the expected total amount collected and spent is about \$953k (see Appendix). As per ULS regulation, the funds are allocated by committee in which student representatives are in the majority. Currently, the committee meets 2-3 times per semester and budget line items are approved in separate votes.

Findings

As detailed in the Appendix, the biggest line items in the budget are:

- *Software purchase & licensing* (\$275k, 28.9%). Primarily covers annual licensing fees for software packages such as *Microsoft Site License* (\$163k), *Turnitin* (\$29k), *Wolfram Mathematica* (\$23k), *SAS* (\$17k) and others.
- *Student salaries* (\$244k, 25.5% of the budget). Used to staff labs accessible to all students on campus. This number is generally in alignment with the ULS-recommended cap of 25%.
- *Software maintenance* (\$168k, 17.6%). Support and/or perpetual licenses for a variety of widely used software, such as *Moodlerooms* (\$85k), *ESRI* (\$25k), and *Qualtrics* (\$12k).
- *Internet Bandwidth* (\$120k, 12.6%).
- *Equipment maintenance* (\$80k, 8.4%). Supports hardware maintenance and related management software maintenance fees.

The most notable observation is the complete absence of funding for hardware upgrades; this is the second FY in a row in which the budget allocation for new hardware is zero. This situation is result of two primary negative trends:

- *Declining revenue*. Due to continued reductions in enrollment, the amount raised has been declining.
- *Rising software costs*. Maintenance and licensing fees for software have a tendency to rise almost annually. In rare occasions, the UCC has been able to convince vendors to reduce the fees (mostly as a result of per-seat payments); however, these have been relatively small and vendors are rather inflexible.

Together, these two developments have squeezed the new hardware budget down to zero. The UCC is well aware of this issue and is trying, by making small adjustments to line items, to free up *some* funds for needed upgrades. However, even if successful, these would be small and are not expected to exceed \$20k—a very modest sum relative to needs.

Additional challenges stem from the fact that fee revenue is collected and made available on a semester basis, whereas most licensing expenses are paid annually, and in advance. This creates substantial budgetary uncertainty, which hampers planning beyond immediate needs.

Potential Improvements

During the discussion, a couple of ideas emerged that could potentially help reduce the burden of maintenance and lower the cost of upgrades:

- Consider cooperating with the UL System to negotiate higher-volume licensing, presumably at a lower cost to UNO.
- Consider exchanging experience with the Computer Science Department and other units on campus that have experience running labs. The goal would be to make hardware upgrades cheaper and more sustainable.
- Consider raising the cap on student fees from the current \$75 to the maximum allowed by the ULS, \$100. This would only affect students taking more than 15 credits per semester.

Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee

Marie Morgan

Marla Nelson

Mark Reid

Steven Rick

Vassil Roussev (convening chair)

Peter Schock
Cherie Trumbach

Appendix: UCC Budget 82192 (TechFee) FY 2014-15

Document obtained from:

<https://sharepoint.uno.edu/committee/StudentTechFee/Shared%20Documents/October%2031,%202014/FY%2014-15%20Approved%20STF%20Budget.pdf>

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee (Dr. Corey):

The APSC committee worked to resolve several SACS related issues with a goal of completing them by February 2015. We (1) further detailed the roles and responsibilities of this committee, (2) developed a description of the roles and duties of Academic Program Coordinators, (3) created a university policy that undergraduate degree-seeking students must complete 50% of the course work required for a major and/or minor at UNO, (4) made recommended changes and approved Academic Calendars for 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18, and (5) developed standards for course level descriptions which explain the expected rigor by lower level, (1000-2000), upper level (3000-4000) undergraduate courses and lower (5000) and upper level (6000-7000) graduate courses. Regarding these changes, the APSC chair, Christy Corey, met with a SACS representative during their Spring 2015 site visit and all changes regarding SACS issues were acceptable. We also worked on several changes to the course catalog including rules for when changes in degree program, major, and/or minor take effect, and (2) rules governing mid-semester changes from a course audit to for-credit enrollment and vice versa.

Christy

Nominations and Elections Committee (Ms. Morgan):

Report from Nominations and Elections Committee

During the 2014-15 academic year, the members of the Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections committee (Marie Morgan, Elaine Brooks, Matt Lyons, and Leonard Spinu) met once face-to-face, and several times via email. We have dealt with the following:

- 1) We have maintained the senator electoral roll.
- 2) We are overseeing the nomination and elections process of the April 2015 Faculty Senate officer elections.
- 3) We presented a Faculty Senate Bylaws change, which was amended and approved
- 4) We are in process of populating the Faculty Senate Committees.
- 5) We have asked the colleges and library to update their rolls for some standing University Committees to allow for elections of new members.

Faculty Welfare Committee (Dr. Striffler):

The Faculty Welfare Committee dealt with a couple of issues:

- 1) the need for AC in buildings after hours where classes are being held. We got a thorough answer and solution from Warren Davis.
- 2) We also dealt with the issue of the Academic Calendar, length of semesters, Mardi Gras and Spring breaks, etc. I'm not sure if we got an entirely satisfactory answer but there is now another committee that deals with it and meets with Matt Moore.

We also have another issue that we need to deal with but we have not had time.

APPENDIX 2:

Against Budget Cuts to Higher Education A Resolution of the University of New Orleans Faculty Senate

Introduced at the request of the Association of Louisiana faculty Senates and the of University of Louisiana Lafayette and Southeastern Louisiana University Faculty Senates

Whereas the 2015-2016 Louisiana State budget presented by the Governor's office has a potential cut of over 500 million dollars to higher education in Louisiana, resulting in a potential gap in funding of more than 600 million dollars to Louisiana's public colleges and universities, especially if the Legislature does not intervene to ameliorate the state of higher education, and;

Whereas cuts of this magnitude which constitute approximately 82% of state funding for higher education, would be devastating to the public universities and colleges of the state, including UNO , and;

Whereas higher education has already sustained damaging cuts of more than 700 million dollars (43%) in state funding over the past eight years which includes an especially sharp 55% decline in state funding for the University of Louisiana System, resulting in severely hampered the ability of universities and colleges to provide needed services because of layoffs and furloughs, unfilled positions, increased class size, reduced offerings, elimination of programs, delayed maintenance, and no faculty pay raises for seven years , and;

Whereas UNO has suffered significant state funding cuts in magnitudes similar to other universities in the University of Louisiana System both in total dollars and percentage, in part because of the base figures used during the period just after Hurricane Katrina , and;

Whereas Louisiana has had the second sharpest decline in state funding for higher education in the nation since the recession ended in 2009 and the highest reduction of dollars per student (over \$5500) of any state, and;

Whereas, Louisiana is already ranks in the bottom five states in the percent of its population with bachelor's degrees, resulting in a lack of educated workforce which hurts Louisiana's potential economic growth as most jobs in the future will require a degree, and;

Whereas, because the Constitution of Louisiana protects most of the budget from cuts, higher education and health care bear the brunt of cuts every year, and;

Whereas, shifting the funding from the state onto the students through higher tuition and fees (a 61% increase in tuition alone since 2009) has created hardships, especially for those students not on TOPS and scholarships, thus rendering college education unaffordable to many lower-income students out of the opportunity to afford a college education, and;

Whereas, every time tuition goes up the funding for TOPS also goes up and comes out of the higher education budget, thus reducing the effect of the increase of the tuition to the universities, and;

Whereas, business and industry in Louisiana receives over 20 billion dollars a year in tax credits, exemptions, refunds, and subsidies, including over a billion dollars per year in new tax cuts and subsidies since 2008, and;

THEREFORE BE IT NOW RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans strongly petitions the Governor and Legislature to find budget solutions that result in no further state budget cuts to Higher Education in Louisiana!

APPENDIX 3:

UNO Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas Louisiana now leads the nation in budget cuts to higher education while ranking at the bottom on many educational measures of academic performance;

Whereas the most threatened institutions in Louisiana include in their number the University of New Orleans (UNO);

Whereas the depreciation of the major public urban research university in a metropolis famous for its cultural life is a national disgrace;

Whereas UNO's recovery undertaken since Hurricane Katrina contrasts sharply with the damage inflicted by legislators;

Whereas, in Louisiana's premier city, students are trying to better themselves and are working in substandard facilities due to nearly a decade of neglect;

~~Whereas New Orleans, playing a major role in America's investigation of space [e.g., Freeport McMoran], is now in danger of having its public urban research university fall out of the funding orbit;~~

Therefore, be it resolved that:

The Faculty Senate of UNO, in coordination with the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS) and the Louisiana Statewide Colleagues Collaborative, two groups of higher education professionals who teach, conduct research, and perform service at Louisiana universities, urges citizens of Louisiana to ask their legislators — their state senators and their state representatives—to sign a pledge confirming their commitment to support Louisiana’s higher education institutions and to withhold their support from any further cuts to the higher education budget, and

The University of New Orleans Faculty Senate supports the Legislators Pledge and The Citizen’s Pledge in Support of Louisiana Higher Education, pledges that have been developed by Louisiana citizens to provide a constructive alternative to the anti-revenue pledge of conservative activist Grover Norquist, a resident of Washington, D.C., a pledge that Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal has cited when defunding numerous critical institutions in Louisiana, among them higher education.

APPENDIX 4: (2015-16 Faculty Senate slate of officers from 4/22/15 email to 2015-16 Faculty Senators):

Here are the accepted nominations for Faculty Senate Officers. The pre-meeting nomination period is now closed, but we will accept nominations during the April 23rd meeting as well. Please read their acceptance statements below. Thanks to everyone who agreed to run for office.

President

Juliana Starr, Chair of Foreign Languages, COLA

Cherie Trumbach, Associate Professor, COB

Vice President

Vassil Roussev, Associate Professor Computer Science, COS

Dinah Payne, Professor, Management, COB

Secretary

Jim Mokhiber, Associate Professor, History, COLA

Starr:

“I am honored to accept the nomination as President of the Faculty Senate. I accept the challenge of trying to make a difference during these critical times at our university. I think I am uniquely positioned to serve in this capacity and to try to bring people together. Last semester, as a brand new Chair, I fought hard to save the M.A. Program in Romance Languages as well as the jobs of four instructors in my department. I drove to Baton Rouge with three of my faculty on the last day of finals week to speak to the UL Board. We won the battle, for a while at least. I would be proud to serve.”

Trumbach:

“I am running for President because New Orleans is my heritage and the future of UNO and of education in Louisiana matters to me. I have served in various capacities at the University level on numerous committees, primarily because I became tired of the negative impacts that years of repeated budget cuts have had in the classroom and on the viability of UNO as an urban research institution. I have also worked both within my college and with other colleges to improve programs and preserve the capabilities that rests within our faculty in a more efficient manner. I have served on the Senate for several years and have also participated as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee: thus, I have experience to take on the significant tasks, both substantively and procedurally. My experience as a former VP of the Senate will serve me very well as I encounter Senate presidential challenges.”

Roussev:

“UNO is facing a truly existential crisis that threatens to permanently diminish the university's stature and mission. During the last three years much time, effort, and trust have been squandered by inept organizational efforts with virtually no positive results. There is an urgent and critical need for faculty and the administration to quickly get on the same page and push in the same direction--the next three years must be the ones that reverse the decline and set us for success in the future.

To that end, I believe that the three most important tasks for the Senate VP is to support the Senate President to:

- a) organize the work of the Senate and improve its effectiveness;
- b) facilitate timely communication between the Administration and the Senate; and
- c) push for the clear definition of shared governance and the building of effective organizational structures that support it on a permanent basis.

Last, but not least, I firmly believe that we must seek to work together in a collegial and cooperative manner despite the difficulty of the decisions that are dead ahead of us. The Senate leadership has a great responsibility to build consensus and channel the efforts of the faculty towards productive decision making.”

Payne:

“I am extremely familiar with the mechanisms by which the Senate and Senate Executive Committee are operated; this will enable me to be very helpful to the incoming President. I

LOVE the University of New Orleans; my students are the most important part of my job and my professional joy: all that we do as faculty, staff and administrators must be directed to the betterment of the student experience here at UNO. As an officer of the Senate, I believe that I would be in a great position help the University move forward to serve our students better.

Mokhiber:

“Past Secretaries in the Senate have done crucial work in keeping the record of the UNO Faculty Senate's business clear. The last year has shown that this is a particularly important function during a period of reorganization, as the Senate has sought to stress transparency so as to maintain the UNO community's faith in the "shared governance" process. I would be happy to work as Secretary -- or with any other elected Secretary -- to enhance access to Faculty Senate proceedings and records through technology already available to us, including audio/visual streaming, recording and archiving. Expanding the Senate's ability to quickly share information about its work could be of real benefit to us as we seek to develop unified approaches to confronting challenges on campus and throughout the UL system.”

Marie Morgan

Chair, Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections Committee