1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at ___3:02______ PM__ by James Lowry.

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Dinah</th>
<th>Payne (SE)</th>
<th>(13-16)</th>
<th>present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Zingoni</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie</td>
<td>Trumbach</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Miestchovich</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Speaker (SE)</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kieff</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>La Motta</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose</td>
<td>Hajra</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos</td>
<td>Xiros</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios</td>
<td>Charalampidis</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Striffler (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Montjoy</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kiefer</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Yaukey</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Blankenship</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Beriss</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Goss</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Renia</td>
<td>Ehrenfeucht</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Laszlo</td>
<td>Fulop</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Jairo</td>
<td>Santanilla (SE)</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Approval of minutes from the 4.25.13 meeting

Elaine Brooks moved and Richard Speaker seconded to approve the minutes of the 4.25.13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Election of officers for 2013-14 (Andrew Goss)

1. Prior to election process taking place, Andrew yielded the floor to Dinah Payne for outgoing president’s remarks. Dinah outlined the difficult and challenging period of time in UNO’s history due to the extensive change occurring. She articulated she did her best to be an advocate for the faculty and encouraged everyone to work together as a team for the betterment of UNO.

2. Election started with the office of president
   - One nomination to begin which was Polly Thomas
   - Cherie Trumbach nominated Elaine Brooks
   - Derek Rodrigues nominated John Kiefer
   - Polly requested the opportunity to make remarks which was granted. All of those nominated made remarks.
   - First election no majority was reached so a runoff election between Polly and Elaine was held.
   - Elaine won the runoff election and therefore was elected president of the senate

3. Election for vice president was held next
   - One nomination to begin which was James Lowry
   - Polly Thomas was nominated but declined the nomination
   - John Kiefer and Cherie Trumbach were nominated
   - It was brought to Andrew’s attention that the bylaws state there can only be two members of the SEC from each school. This eliminated James Lowry and John Kiefer from contention.
   - Cherie Trumbach was elected vice president

4. Election for Secretary
No nominations were listed to start
- Marie Morgan was nominated by Connie Phelps.
- Connie Phelps was nominated but declined
- Marie Morgan was elected Secretary

5. Faculty Advisory Council representatives for the UL system was elected next
- Elaine Brooks was nominated by James Lowry for primary representative
- Elaine Brooks was elected as primary representative.
- Cherie Trumbach was nominated by James Lowry as alternate
- Cherie Trumbach was elected
- Discussion about making the senate president and vice president automatic representative took place. This would require changes in bylaws which may take place at a later time.

Dr. Goss indicated that other by-laws changes were also needed.

Dr. Goss announced that, as with last year, people will be asked to nominate themselves for the various Senate committees, but everyone should assume that they are on the same committee until further notice.

Dr. Brooks had to leave to teach her Monday class at the Jeff Center but said that she would be available to lead the meetings for the rest of the semester. Dr. Trumbach ran the remainder of the meeting. Before proceeding, Dr. Goss thanked the outgoing officers for their service: President Dr. Dinah Payne; Vice-president Dr. James Lowry; and Secretary Dr. Matt Zingoni.

4. Committee reports.

**Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee - Resolution on UNO Faculty Workload Policy (Dr. Vern Baxter; see Appendix 1):**

Provost Jim Payne sent out the proposed workload policy originally on June 18 and a slightly revised version on July 17. Senate Vice-president Lowry called for a joint meeting of the Senate Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee and the Senate Executive Committee on July 29. The committees decided to draft a list of concerns and met on August 1 with President Fos and Provost Payne to discuss the workload policy. After that meeting, the committees decided that they still needed to draft a resolution and met on August 19 to finalize the resolution, distributing it to the faculty on August 20 (see Appendix 1). That same day, Provost Payne drafted a revision that incorporated the requested changes.

Today, we see that our role as a committee is to consider the workload policy. The initial plan was for the Senate to take up the resolution, but what does the Senate want to do with the workload policy as written? Discuss it at the next meeting or move ahead as rewritten? It is up to this body to decide if this is the workload policy that we want or if we want to discuss it further.
Question: Did the previous discussion deal with both documents or just the workload policy? Dr. Baxter: Both documents.

Question: How will the policy affect instructors? Dr. Baxter: Good question. I would be happy to take it back to the committee.

Question about the 4/4: Dr. Baxter: One of our concerns was the language.

Question about the workload percentages of 40/40/20 and how we spend our time: The concern is the difference between the evaluation rate and the workload rate. How does the Provost feel about that difference in rates? Dr. Baxter: He thought that 45/45/10 was appropriate. Comment: My concern is that you cannot have 40% of your time devoted to research. Dr. Trumbach: It is more the weighting of importance and not the time.

Comment: If I remember, if you have grants that will buy out your time, you might end up teaching far less, so it would shift. Dr. Baxter: It is not a monolithic policy that fits everybody.

Question: Where does Ph.D. production fit in? Dr. Baxter: More with service; one of the reasons why we thought that 10% for service was too low.

Question: What about workload for the administrative piece? Dr. Baxter: The Provost built into the policy that you can adjust your workload for administrative duties. That did not seem problematic to us.

Question: Nowhere do I ever see M.F.A.s addressed. Don’t forget us. Dr. Baxter: It was included.

Does the Faculty Senate want more deliberation on this policy or to accept it as presented? Our resolution is mostly moot, but we can revise it.

Comment: I would like for the committee to provide us with a resolution on the workload policy and the evaluation policy.

Dr. Baxter: We will meet and produce something for the next Senate meeting and come up with a new resolution. Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht: We will definitely take up the question of instructors and the percentages. If there is anything else, let her or Dr. Baxter know.

**Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee (Dr. Trumbach):**

A few weeks ago, we were called into a meeting with the Senate Executive Committee and the Committee that did the workload policy. At that time, it was clear that we needed to meet with the Provost and with Greg Lassen (Vice-president for Business Affairs). Both meetings lasted over three hours and were very detailed. We asked a lot of questions and got a significant amount of answers. We were given details about the budget and RCM. We talked about the colleges being in the red and asked questions about restructuring. On the restructuring side, it is clear that the discussions are happening more on the administrative side (deans and chairs).
RCM is activity-based budgeting in a university setting; RCM does not dictate restructuring. We talked about the overhead and money going to non-academic places. Both are high-priority items. They’re looking at various contracts, and a number of things are in the works, such as what was done with leasing the bookstore (instead of the university paying money, we are getting money). There was discussion about adjuncts, as there are rumors going on about that. Dr. Trumbach encouraged everyone to attend the Provost’s open forum. At the meeting, the Provost said the intention was to save people’s jobs. For the past few years we have been operating $5 million in deficit; there was extra money, but it had been sheltered in the past, and we have reached the end of that pot. Their objective is that we are no longer operating in this manner. Greg Lassen spoke to us about how we have to understand how the model has changed over the past several years, from the state funding 70% to funding now only 28%. There is a much more market-driven approach, and we have to be in a position to survive that. That is not going to change, and we have to adjust our thinking accordingly.

Question: There is clearly a lot going on. Is there a timeline when we will learn something from the Administration? Dr. Trumbach: We asked for two things, and they are progressing a little more slowly than what the Provost had originally envisioned: (1) A plan of when things would happen (and Dr. Trumbach’s impression is that the plan has not yet solidified); and (2) a calendar of the budget cycle.

Comment: At the last Chair’s meeting, the Provost gave the numbers for non-academic overhead at 62%, and he would like to get it down to 45%. Dr. Trumbach: That is correct.

Question: There is a rumor floating around that people in Administration got raises. Did the committee ask that? Dr. Trumbach: Not at this time.

Dr. Baxter: The President told him in a meeting that there is the possibility of a hiring freeze, so it might be two years before he has a staff person, and within two years, he is not sure how much he will have left in his department. This year, we need to unravel those non-academic overhead costs and support the academic mission.

Dr. Trumbach: Greg Lassen has been here for a month, and they have a lot to unravel about the budget. Where they thought the money was, it is just not there. That cushion does not exist. The objective is that there will be an open process, and we will be able to see where the money is going.

Question: Is there an electronic version of the budget? Trumbach: Not yet. Morgan confirmed that the Provost thought that we should be able to have one.

Question: Will the committee be pursuing this overhead issue? There needs to be transparency at all levels. Dr. Trumbach: I would say that we are going to look at everything.

Dr. Trumbach strongly encouraged all committees to put language in their charges as to how they need to operate.
The biggest thing now is the overhead. If anyone has any issues that they want this committee to address, let her know.

5. Old Business. None.


7. Announcements.

2013-2014 Strategic Agenda (President Peter Fos):

President Fos sent an email at 3:30pm today about his 2013-2014 Strategic Agenda (see Appendix 2 handout) and his decision to form a Strategic Agenda Implementation Committee. He would like three representatives from the Faculty Senate, three from the Staff Council, and three from the students. He will contact Dr. Brooks regarding the faculty representatives.

UNO Cares (Christy Heaton, Enrollment Services):

UNO Cares is the university’s early alert system. Ms. Heaton introduced Nicole Ralston (First-Year Experience), who announced that, as of today, there was a new UNO Cares System that was now in our roster in WebSTAR. It is really intuitive, with a tab, where, once submitted, the report on the student goes directly to them.

Academic Affairs Update (Provost Jim Payne):

(1) He needs the help of the Senate to constitute the Academic committees. Contact Bill Sharpton to get that underway.
(2) They are slowly processing the fuller curriculum mapping.
(3) They audited all policies this summer. Policies are all over the place.
(4) The Academic Affairs Website was redone this summer. On the left-hand side are links to policies and procedures of the UL System and the Board of Regents. He wants to make it easy for people to find policies and procedures.
(5) They went through as assessment of GenEd this past spring and will start looking at revising guidelines.
(6) They are doing peer analysis, not just for the strategic plan but also looking for peers for legislative purposes and another set of peers for aspirational schools.
(7) President Fos mentioned the Business Planning piece and strategy. They want faculty, staff, and students involved in that process.
(8) He wants to promote and profile faculty and programs on the Academic Affairs Website. He also wants to get a list of faculty expertise and a profile by college and department of current initiatives and community partnerships. He will send a template to fill out and will put the information on the Website.

8. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42pm
Respectfully submitted,
Matt Zingoni (through elections),
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2012/13
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Sept. 18, 2013

Appendix 1:

August 26, 2013

Faculty Senate Resolution about Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policies

The UNO Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure offers the following resolution for consideration of the UNO Faculty Senate:

Whereas, the University of New Orleans (UNO) Faculty Senate agrees that a fair faculty workload and evaluation policy is essential to fulfillment of the university’s mission; and whereas, the UNO Faculty Senate agrees the current faculty workload and evaluation system makes inadequate distinction between sufficient/insufficient rating and insufficiently aligns performance evaluation with faculty workload policy, the UNO Faculty Senate agrees that reform of current faculty workload and performance evaluation policies is sensible and appropriate.

However, the Faculty Senate has serious concerns about the faculty workload policy proposed by Provost Payne on June 18, 2013 (revised July 17, 2013) and about the performance evaluation policy proposed by Provost Payne on June 24, 2013. There are four main areas of concern: (1) inadequate time for department and faculty transition to a new workload/evaluation system; (2) lack of clarity about how to resolve disputes between departments, Deans, and the Provost over department faculty evaluation criteria; (3) implications of language about teaching loads contained in the workload policy (p. 2); and (4) distribution of effort proposed (45% research, 45% teaching, and 10% service) does not accurately reflect the typical distribution of duties performed by UNO faculty members.

(1) Not enough time for department and faculty transition to new workload system.

Major changes are taking place across the UNO campus, most specifically transition to Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budgeting process and new policies about apportionment of indirect costs that materially affect many aspects of the proposed faculty workload and evaluation policy. The very mission of the university is under review, discussions are underway about reorganization of colleges, and recent trends suggest increases in class size and curriculum changes in many departments.
Departments and faculty need flexibility, more time to transition to new workload requirements and shifting obligations within departments. The proposed policy implies a shift of emphasis from service to additional research and it will take time for some faculty to ramp up research programs. It is not fair to change the rules of the game so quickly.

(2) Resolution of disputes over department faculty evaluation criteria.

A balance must be struck between the authority of the President and Provost to manage the academic mission of the university and the province of assembled faculty to establish performance expectations in the various disciplines of the university. The Faculty Senate affirms that expertise and experience in the various disciplines reserves primarily for faculty the autonomy to establish performance evaluation criteria in their respective disciplines. Recognition of this balance suggests that some sort of arbitration process should be written to clarify how disputes will be resolved between departments, Deans, and the Provost over faculty evaluation criteria.

(3) Language about teaching loads.

The Faculty Senate is concerned about the implications of the following language on page 2 of the proposed UNO faculty workload policy: “Any adjustments from the standard 12 hour load must be funded by departments/schools.” The stated mission of UNO is a “comprehensive urban research university” committed to conducting research and service in a variety of humanities, arts, sciences, and professional programs. The Faculty Senate is deeply committed to upholding this mission while acknowledging the standard teaching load expected of full-time faculty in the UL system is 24 credit hours in fall and spring semesters combined. UNO has upheld its mission by granting a six credit hour reduction in teaching load per year for engagement and productivity in scholarly and creative work. This is a core element of the public mission of the University of New Orleans and should not be sacrificed to budgetary fluctuations.

UL System Bylaws (chapter 3, sec. 1) also allow for adjustment of standard teaching load based on number of course preparations, number of students taught, and balance between graduate and undergraduate students taught. Adjustment of teaching loads depends on much more than department funding, it reflects a larger university research mission and larger considerations regarding proper pedagogy.

(4) Proposed distribution of effort is 45% research, 45% teaching, and 10% service.

The proposed weights of research, teaching, and service do not accurately reflect the distribution of effort expended by or expected of UNO faculty members. Informal surveys of departments and universities reveal very few examples outside Business Schools of the 45-45-10 weights. Many examples of 40-40-20 weights were discovered, many of which apply at Research I universities. Many peer institutions also weighted teaching higher than research. The University of Louisiana at Lafayette has a tiered workload system where each course taught equals roughly 20% of total workload.
The Faculty Senate is particularly troubled by the low weight granted service. Active scholars are expected to perform service to the profession that might include review of journal submissions and organizing sessions at professional conferences. Service to the university is also expected of every regular faculty member. Service to the department includes committee service and supervision of independent study courses and internships, undergraduate honors, MA/MS theses and Ph.D. dissertation research. Community service and outreach are also required.

Therefore, be it resolved that the UNO Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the proposed UNO Faculty Workload/Evaluation policies that will be written into the UNO Faculty Handbook:

(1) The new UNO Faculty Workload/Evaluation policy will be implemented in January, 2015 to provide faculty adequate time to transition to changed workload requirements;
(2) Work out a clear division of responsibilities between departments, Deans, and the Provost to govern approval process for department evaluation criteria and establish an impartial arbitration process in case of unresolved disagreement;
(3) Revise teaching load language on page 2 of the proposed faculty workload policy that currently reads; “Any adjustments from the standard 12 hour load must be funded by departments/schools,” to read instead, “Consistent with the mission of The University of New Orleans the typical teaching load is 9 hours per semester for each regular faculty member with a three hour equivalent in research time provided they are actively engaged in research/creative activity and maintain a sustained level of research/creative productivity;”
(4) Adjust standard weights of faculty workload to 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service.

Appendix 2:

2013-2014 STRATEGIC AGENDA

Goal 1: To increase our enrollment through retention and recruiting
Goal 2: To establish and launch "Global UNO"

Goal 3: To continue the preparation for the SACS/COC reaffirmation self-study and campus visitation

Goal 4: To formulate and implement the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) Budgeting Approach

Goal 5: To conclude the implementation of the Privateer Enrollment Center (PEC)

Goal 6: To Increase Alumni involvement with Student Programs

Goal 7: To increase Philanthropic Fund-raising

Goal 8: To continue promoting the image of the University of New Orleans in the community

Goal 9: To Complete and Implement the University Strategic Plan

Goal 10: To Increase Research Funding
UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, September 24, 2013
Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at ___3:07______ PM__ by_Elaine Brooks_

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th>Kincaid</th>
<th>(13-14)</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc.</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>(vacant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>Payne (SE)</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Zingoni</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie</td>
<td>Trumbach</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Miestchovich</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Speaker (SE)</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>La Motta (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose</td>
<td>Hajra</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos</td>
<td>Xiros</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios</td>
<td>Charalampidis</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Striffany (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Montjoy</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kiefer</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Yaukey</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Blankenship</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Beriss</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Goss</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Renia</td>
<td>Ehrenfeucht</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Laszlo</td>
<td>Fulop</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Jairo</td>
<td>Santanilla (SE)</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Shirtcliff</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Seab</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Shalit</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Kulp</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Spinu</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Vassil</td>
<td>Roussev</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Shengru</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Phelps (SE)</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Approval of minutes from the 8/26/13 meeting:**

   ___Dinah Payne________ moved and __Greg Seab________ seconded to approve the minutes of the 8/26/13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Elaine Brooks):**

   a) Dr. Greg Seab agreed to serve as the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian; Rachel Kincaid agreed to return as the representative from the Administration.

   b) Dr. James Payne has initiated a monthly roundtable discussion with seven senators. Dr. Payne elaborated that the whole point of the roundtable is to try to get information out to the faculty and to have an open discussion of issues that faculty have not vetted through their chairs or dean. It will be informal, with a different group each semester. The first meeting is Thursday, October 3 at 3:00pm.

   c) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be proposing several changes to the Faculty Senate By-Laws and will send something out around ten days before the next Senate meeting. One thing will be to change elections to the last meeting in the spring to allow the transition team the entire summer to work with the leadership team. There were so many issues this time that Senate Executive Committee hit the ground running; there needs to be a few more months to prepare. Connie Phelps, Marie Morgan, and Dr. Brooks are on this Senate Executive subcommittee. Hopefully, voting will take place at the November meeting. The idea is to put things in order, including the Website and SharePoint.
d) Dr. Brooks attended the University Council meeting this morning and invited Dr. Gregg Lassen to give an update. Dr. Lassen thanked Dr. Brooks for being invited and would like to be invited back so that we can have a conversation. There is a lot going on, and they are trying to be as transparent as possible – communication, communication, communication. He will come as often as he can to have these discussions. We have some challenging times ahead of us; the budget situation is difficult with cuts over $14 million in the last few years, and we would like to grow ourselves out of it. He has recast the three R’s to recruitment, retention, and reduction in expenses. We are making progress in recruitment; it is not where it needs to be, but we believe that we are turning a corner and we can grow. Retention is an everyday issue; we can do better. He acknowledged that we have been working on the third R, reduction in cost exposures, for a long time. He is not going to be Pollyannaish about it – he cannot say that we are done cutting costs, but they are going it make it as transparent as possible.

The President has created two committees in which he will be involved. Both are action-oriented. The President asked him to chair the Strategic Agenda Implementation Committee. We have to convert these great ideas into action, and he is optimistic about our future. We have great faculty members, great staff members, and a great location. We have been moving from a state-supported model to a self-funded model. Our success is not guaranteed, but we can thrive in that new environment. We are dealing with change management in a change-resistant organization, and this is hard. The first two R’s are easy; the third R is scary.

He will also be co-chairing the Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee with the Provost. They are still in the process of naming members, upwards of twenty. We cannot wait for the committee to do everything. RCM is a tool to let us analyze and reduce our expenses. He does not want to give details about areas that might be affected because staff in those areas have not yet been informed of any decisions. He looks forward to a team-oriented approach. He would like to hear about cost-saving measures and would like to implement some of them. Some things are nonthreatening, such as utilities and property issues, and we will do as much as we can with these. But some things will involve human beings. Of $100 million in the budget, 75% is salary. His intent is to protect human beings first and foremost. They will cut unoccupied positions first, and there may be a freeze before they cut something else. There will be the least impact on human beings as much as possible, but it would be a lie to say that they might never have to impact human beings. They will focus on mission-critical. For some things that are not mission-critical they will have to make an item-by-item analysis to reduce costs. He is committed to the process. We will grow ourselves out of the problem. His door is always open.

5. Resolution on establishing a Lactation Room on UNO’s campus (see Appendix 1):

Dr. Dinah Payne moved and Dr. Christine Day and Beth Blankenship both seconded to accept the resolution. Discussion followed. Dr. Greg Seab asked what the legal obligations are. Ms. Blankenship replied that the Affordable Care Act requires it. They already have a room (bottom floor of Milneburg Hall), and the resolution will allow them to get some funding for it and possibly a second room. No special equipment is required. Dr. D. Payne then moved and Dr.
Robert Montjoy seconded to suspend the rules, for which there was unanimous agreement. Dr. Vern Baxter wondered why the resolution was kind of vague than more specific, but the resolution was not changed. Dr. D. Payne called the question, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

6. Employee Recognition Program:

Dr. Brooks, along with Ms. Phelps and Ms. Morgan, were at a meeting with Ranzy Montet and others with the idea to create an Employee Recognition Program, and Dr. Brooks asked Mr. Montet to give us some information as to what this might entail. Mr. Montet said that one of the things that he was looking for when he got here was an Employee Recognition Program. We used to have one. He would like to partner with Faculty Senate and Staff Council to revitalize the program. We could start small, get buy in, and grow, possibly starting with an employee of the month and year, and possibly free parking also. Dr. Lassen had told him that he might be able to get him money. Dr. Brooks added that she will be sending out a written charge to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

7. RCM:

Dr. Brooks stated that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had met three times and had been discussing issues with the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee. It became clear that the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee should be charged with understanding the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM model as used in the University and compare to our peer institutions that also use RCM. Dr. Brooks expects that the committee will meet and bring their ideas of what RCM should be back to the Senate.

8. Committee reports: Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee on UNO Faculty Workload and Evaluation Policies (Dr. Vern Baxter; see Appendix 2):

Hearing no objections from Faculty Senators, Dr. Brooks invited everyone in the room to participate in the discussion.

Dr. Baxter reminded the Senate that a draft resolution was proposed at the first Senate meeting, and the committee was charged with drafting a revised resolution. Committee members decided that they needed to have a discussion of issues before they could put together a new resolution. They hoped to close out the deliberations and propose a new resolution at the next meeting.

The first issue has to do with distribution of effort. Several senators had raised issues about that, and the committee proposed three options:

- Option 1 is pretty much what is in the current workload policy sent out by the Provost on August 20.
- Option 2 is that the distribution of workload should be reflective of effort and that suggests a larger standard weight for teaching and a smaller standard weight for research while affirming the current university research mission.
Option 3 is that the distribution of workload varies across disciplines and programs and any policy regarding that distribution must originate at the college level in collaboration with the impacted departments and the Provost. The actual statement of workload may or may not include percentage distributions associated with research, teaching, and service.

The committee would like to have some discussion of these options.

Dr. Polly Thomas stated that her preference is option 3 because we are not one size fits all. She wanted to know what a director is, and it was determined that a director is roughly equivalent to a chair. She believes that Option 3 acknowledges that we are different across disciplines and that we as faculty, in conjunction with chairs and deans, should set the policy.

Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht gave a summary of the comments that the committee got. There was confusion about how the weights are linked to our actual workload; the 40/40/20 is not a direct reflection of how we spend our time. The College of Business prefers the 45/45/10 that the Provost initially proposed. Other faculty think that the weights should reflect the amount of time that we spend. The reason for not doing that is that it shifts what we value and may undervalue teaching and research. Some departments are producing research, but the latest realities have minimized the research in some departments, especially with the reduction in size.

Provost Payne asked if he could clarify some things. There are two pieces, the workload policy and the annual evaluation. The link is the weights. The reason that he placed the weights there initially is that they used them where he previously worked. The Colleges of Business and Sciences want 45/45/10. His concern is from the SACS viewpoint. Our mission says that we are an urban research institution; if you have weights not at least equal in teaching and research, it is problematic. The Board might start questioning if we are an urban research institution. But if one looks at the policy, one can shift the weights; the flexibility in the weighting scheme is really up to the departments. His only concern is that if weights are not reflecting substantial or equal amounts of research to teaching, if SACS comes they could say that we are not valuing research – are we a research institution?

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if it would it be possible if different colleges had different weights?

Provost Payne responded that he was not discounting teaching, but he was worried about SACS looking at our mission and questioning how we align what we do with our mission. He reaffirmed that is up to departments to decide on the weights. Variability is built into the system and substitutions are allowed. His big hurdle is trying to get us over the SACS piece.

Dr. John Williams said that the 45/45/10 model is in their accreditation (Business), but it can still be addressed by department chairs.

Dr. Laszlo Fulop asked about the difference between a research institution and UNO.

Provost Payne answered that SACS looks at our Carnegie classification and at our research activity. The UL System has already put us in a high research category, and the Board of Regents sees us as a high research institution. Most of our peer institutions are urban research
institutions. SACS comes in and asks the question if we are maintaining our research status. Our tuition is so low. The UL system wants us to look at peer institutions. He thinks that we should look at the input side also, e.g., tuition. We need to price programs differently and get more resources for research priorities.

Dr. Steve Striffler stated that he was at an institution that had 40/40/20. We have to start somewhere.

A Liberal Arts professor said that he does not want to start at 40/40 but rather 60/20. The expectations of 40/40 match up with a 2/2 schedule, and they are on a 3/3 schedule. We will still be a research institution.

Dr. Dimitrios Charalampidis expressed his concern about the percentages used to weight the evaluation.

Dr. Andre Goss had two concerns about the policy: (1) One rigid policy that we all have to adopt. Some flexibility in colleges seems prudent at the departmental level; and (2) that .667 number is the one that he likes the least because it suggests that we can only move so far. It does not reflect the reality of being a chair. There needs to be more flexibility in colleges creating their own numbers, and the buyouts need to be weighted differently.

Another faculty member wanted to respectfully disagree on the reality of workload vs. evaluations. We are already competing for funding on a national level. We cannot produce papers and competitive grants on a 40-hour work week. For colleges that have a far higher teaching load it reflects a fundamental imbalance.

Dr. Montjoy stated that he has spent almost his entire career doing 40/40/40. There is no way to do a precise formula, even at the college level, because an individual’s research patterns change every year. Even if we reduce it to the departmental level, an absolute rule would not work. He thinks that we need a benchmark. He did a site visit this spring where each chair worked it out with individuals, but the university as a whole was 40/40/20. It seems that a standard like 40/40/20 is a good one. The committee might want to deal with schools like Business separately.

Provost Payne said the .667 for the calculations was not just random; it is based on the teaching load.

Dr. Thomas asked if SACS require percentages of teaching/research/service.

Provost Payne replied that they do not require assignment of percentages, but they want to see that we are fulfilling our mission. The point of the weights is that we are lining up what we say we are going to do with what we do. There has been a disconnect in that happening. There is a second reason to do the weights that involves the issue of compression/inversion; if there is more of a ranking, we can prioritize and do some calculations, which would allow allocation of free resources sometime in the future.
Dr. Peter Schock’s concern as chair of a department of 21 members who have research commitments is that if they do not meet the 40%, it pulls a person down. This is looked at as a punitive issue. He has successfully used evaluations in recent years in moving faculty to become more research productive, and most of them are back on track with research projects.

Dr. Eliza Ghil stated that they had a policy of differentiated percentages for tenured, tenure track, and instructors, and they thought that it was a method of acknowledging accomplishments of all types of faculty members. Since we have not had raises in years, this new policy looks punitive. Because there have been no merit raises in a long time, this numeric evaluation produces a feeling of persecution.

In concluding the discussion, Dr. Baxter did not sense a complete consensus.

Dr. Brooks added that there are many good opinions from which to work.

Dr. Baxter said that the committee will take the comments and come up with a resolution for the next meeting.

Dr. Baxter moved on to issue two: There should be a workload policy for instructors, and the committee believes that there should be two parts, one for full-time instructors and one for part-time. What is the mechanism for developing a policy?

Ms. Blankenship stated that we need a policy and it needs to be crafted.

Dr. Thomas said that in her college there are professors of professional practice who are not tenured and not expected to do research.

Dr. Goss added that there are a series of job descriptions like that. These include artist in residence and teacher in residence. He wondered if we are going to have something that comprehensive that encompasses all positions.

Ms. Phelps offered that the Library has a separate workload policy.

Dr. Richard Speaker wondered if maybe we should try to get all the workload policies in place so that we can look at them and possibly place them in SharePoint so that anybody can see them and talk about them.

Dr. Janet Smith, an instructor in the English Department, hopes that instructors are involved with the Academic Freedom Committee to have a voice. She also strongly expressed that we define what we do at the University, and our mission should reflect that. Telling the truth about what we do is very important.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if we could move forward with the proposal. The answer was yes.

Dr. D. Payne added that she finds that instructors are a high asset in the College of Business.
Dr. Baxter then introduced issue three regarding the committee’s recommendation that the evaluation policy be accepted as written.

Dr. Goss said that he read the finding by the committee to say that basically the framework works for us, but he believes that it is overly rigid for developing evaluations. They have been working in the History Department all summer, and he has not found any other institution that ranks journals. Most use 1-5, but 1-10 might be okay. The rigidity is not making their task easier.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht explained that the committee’s reading is that those examples are not required, but that we need to have a 1-10 ranking.

Dr. Thomas asked if the document that we are referring to is the September 20 one, to which Dr. Brooks replied yes. Dr. Thomas then asked why grade distributions and samples of exams are important. What distributions are we looking for? The sharing of exams is pedagogically unsound. Also, there are no references to external funding. She thinks that this is a grave omission, and she is not ready to go forward.

Dr. Baxter asked Dr. Thomas if they could invite her to their next meeting, to which Dr. Thomas replied okay.

Dr. Goss referred to a letter from one of his colleagues that went back to the punitive aspect. This is going towards post-tenure review; UNO has post-tenure review, but it has never been part of the discussion.

Dr. Brooks stated that Provost Payne wants to make a change in the policy.

Dr. Goss responded that we have already made that change. He believes that our policy is in compliance with the UL System, and Provost Payne needs to know that.

Dr. D. Payne said that she does not feel that it is punitive. But the number of faculty that she has seen who do not work for a living – she finds that punitive. She would prefer to be unbelievably positive because the folks who are not doing their job will finally have to be rated for not doing their job.

Dr. Striffler said that it was not clear to him what is punitive. Do people want the numbers changed? Is there some process that would be better?

Dr. Schock said that what bothers him is that the existing post-tenure review is broken down into three areas, and he feels that the percentages put people on a track towards remediation. He appreciates everything that the Provost said about SACS and reaffirms the research mission, but he thinks that we can do without the weights.

Dr. Goss added that the document in front of us contradicts the faculty handbook on post-tenure review. Some awareness of existing policy maintains continuity.
Dr. Ehrenfeucht would encourage any other additional comments. Please send them to her to or to Dr. Baxter. It is difficult to separate those feelings of being under attack. What is a more effective method to do what the Provost wants to do? Evaluate people across disciplines, across departments?

Dr. Brooks added that Provost Payne extended his deadline to January to come up with a policy, and she feels that we should not be rushed to come up with the right decision.

9. **Old Business.** None.

10. **New Business.** None.

11. **Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:50pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Oct. 16, 2013

**Appendix 1** *(Resolution on establishing a Lactation Room on UNO’s campus):*

Whereas applicable law encourages and/or mandates the availability of lactation facilities and

Whereas the University of New Orleans wishes to comply with applicable law and best practices of ethical business,

The Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans is fully supportive of measures to be taken to provide compliant facilities to satisfy legal and moral obligations to familial health and wellbeing for students, faculty and staff at the University of New Orleans.

**Appendix 2:**

Issues for Faculty Senate Discussion of Proposed Workload and Evaluation Policies, 9/24/13

To: UNO Faculty Senate Members

From: Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Professional Ethics (AFTPE)

Re: Issues for Discussion regarding Proposed Faculty Workload and Evaluation Policies
The UNO Faculty Senate, at its meeting of August 26, 2013, charged the AFTPE committee with preparation of a revised resolution for the President and Provost regarding a proposed faculty workload and evaluation policies, the latest version of which were offered by the Provost on August 20. The AFTPE committee met September 11 and decided that, in light of input from several Senators, further discussion of the proposed workload and evaluation policies is warranted before another resolution is prepared. The committee offers instead of a resolution several issues for consideration by the full Senate.

**Issue 1:**

The first issue has to do with the distribution of faculty effort in the proposed workload/evaluation policy. Committee review of input from several Senators suggests a discussion is warranted of three main options regarding the distribution of faculty effort (see below). The implications of this discussion go beyond simple agreement about workload distribution to engage deeper issues of faculty governance and the mission of the university.

Option 1: Accept as written that the standard weight of regular faculty duties is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Deviation from the standard will be articulated in workload assignment letters issued annually by Chairs/Directors to each regular faculty member.

Option 2: Distribution of workload should be reflective of effort and that suggests a larger standard weight for teaching and a smaller standard weight for research while affirming the current university research mission.

Option 3: Distribution of workload varies across disciplines and programs and any policy regarding that distribution must originate at the college level in collaboration with the impacted departments and the Provost. The actual statement of workload may or may not include percentage distributions associated with research, teaching, and service.

**Issue 2:**

The AFTPE committee recognizes that both full-time and part-time instructors are essential to fulfill the instructional mission of the university and they should have a workload/evaluation policy. That policy should have two sections; one for full-time instructors and another section for part-time instructors.
The AFTPE committee proposes that departmental chairs and instructors work with the Provost to craft the policy. Whether a workload policy for instructors should be crafted as sections of the regular faculty workload and evaluation policies or whether separate workload and evaluation policies should be crafted for instructors can be determined through the process.

**Issue 3:**

The AFTPE committee reviewed the evaluation policy. It found that the policy requires a 1-10 rating scale to facilitate comparison among individuals and departments, but allows enough flexibility for departments to develop evaluations tools consistent with their disciplines’ expectations. It also includes a mediation process if departments, deans and the Provost do not agree. The AFTPE recommends accepting the evaluation policy as written.
UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, October 23, 2013
Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at ___3:02______ PM__ by_Dr. Elaine Brooks_

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th>Kincaid</th>
<th>(13-14)</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council For</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc.</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct (vacant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>Payne (SE)</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Zingoni</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie</td>
<td>Trumbach</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Miestchovich</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Speaker (SE)</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>La Motta (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose</td>
<td>Hajra</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos</td>
<td>Xiros</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios</td>
<td>Charalampidis</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Striffler (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Montjoy</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kiefer</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Yaukey</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Approval of minutes from the 9/24/13 meeting:

    ___Dr. Ivan Miestchovich________ moved and __Dr. Greg Seab________ seconded to approve the minutes of the 9/24/13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Elaine Brooks):

   a) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee subcommittee is working on the By-Laws; some changes are cosmetic, some are more substantial. They will be brought to the next meeting, and there will be two months for review before we vote on them at the first spring meeting (January 27, 2014).

   b) President Fos is in Baton Rouge, so she wanted to announce that, beginning this year, the two recipients of the teaching awards given by the Alumni Association will receive a $2,000 increase in their base salary.

   c) There has been a proposed addition to the transfer policy that only 20% of a major’s course requirements may be transferred. The proposal has been presented to the Advisors Council, the Dean’s Council, and Courses and Curricula. All faculty will be polled about this information by receiving an email through their deans; the results will go to Courses and Curricula, which will meet on November 6 and make a decision whether to use the proposed new language. In response to Dr. James Lowry’s question, Dr. Brooks said that there will be a separate meeting on when this would be implemented.
Dr. Christine Day asked if this was a University decision. Dr. Andrew Goss said that he would be happy to send out the results of a survey, and that there is no UL System mandate about this specific rule. He had looked at various peer and Louisiana universities and found a lot of differences. Many have the policy at the college level, which UNO has right now. Only Jackson State has anything as stringent as this; most universities that he looked at have between twelve and eighteen credits required of the major in residence. Dr. Goss is happy to go on record that he is opposed to the 80% as there are all kinds of repercussions on our transfer students. LSU has 25%; SLU has 50%; ULL has college-level rules. He has a document that outlines this that he will be happy to send to anyone who asks. Dr. Vassil Roussev asked Dr. Goss to send it out to the whole Senate. Dr. Cherie Trumbach added that she is on Courses and Curricula, and most think that the number is too high, with too high an impact. The latter are in the midst of trying to figure out various scenarios to see how much students would be impacted and to what extent. Dr. Lowry suggested that if all faculty are going to be asked, why not send the afore-mentioned document to Dr. Brooks to send out to all faculty. Dr. Brooks has a copy, and she will send it out today. Dr. Seab requested that it be included in the minutes so that we can find it three years from now (see Appendix 1).

5. Committee reports:

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee – Report on faculty work load policies, including a work load policy for instructors, and annual faculty performance evaluation (Dr. Vern Baxter; see Appendix 2):

Dr. Brooks asked if the Committee has a chair, and Dr. Baxter replied that Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht is the chair, but that he wrote the resolution so he will present it. The Committee met after the last Senate meeting and had reason to believe that the Senate does not want quantification, but that certain colleges could use quantification if they wanted to do so. The Committee came up with two resolutions: (1) Elimination of the required quantification of distribution of faculty effort; and (2) development of an instructor policy.

Regarding the first resolution, Dr. Polly Thomas said that since we got this today, she did not have time to compare the original document with the proposed changes, but in general she likes what the Committee has done. Dr. Trumbach also did not have time to go back to the original document, but she stated that typically the weight is a measure of importance and the rating is a measurement of effort. She would feel more comfortable if the resolution said “the distribution of faculty effort” wherever it says “faculty effort” and wanted to make such a motion. Dr. Baxter accepted this as a friendly amendment, so no vote was necessary. Dr. Trumbach also asked if the resolution specifically says that colleges and departments will come up with their own policy, and the response was yes.

Dr. Brooks then asked if everyone felt that they had enough time to review and vote on the resolution. Dr. Thomas moved and Dr. Christy Corey seconded to suspend the rules and take it up today. Dr. Seab expects that we will have to look at this again after it is redrafted, but he accepts it.
There was a vote to suspend the rules, followed by a vote on the motion to approve the resolution. There being only one “no” vote to approve the resolution, the motion carried.

Dr. Baxter moved on to the second resolution, which called for a committee to develop a workload and evaluation policy for full-time and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach.

Dr. Thomas asked for a friendly amendment to include one professor of professional practice as well. Mr. Steven Shalit asked Dr. Thomas how many professors of professional practice there are, to which she responded six. He replied that there are fifteen instructors. Ms. Alison Arnold stated that she was not opposed to the addition as they all have the same job classification. Dr. Goss asked if there was a minimum number for the committee, and Dr. Ehrenfeucht said no. Dr. Thomas would really like to have that kind of professional on the committee; there are about twenty-four or twenty-five faculty in her college and one-fourth of them are professors of professional practice. She is not sure that what they do is different from instructors or not.

Dr. Baxter had no objection to the friendly amendment. Dr. Seab suggested another friendly amendment that the resolution read “Be it resolved that Provost Payne be asked to convene a committee ...” since we cannot order him to do so. Dr. Seab moved and Dr. Thomas seconded to suspend the rules and vote, which was done. The motion carried with all in favor.

**Academic Procedures and Standards Committee – Report on veteran’s advocacy at UNO, which also includes students who are on active duty (Dr. Christy Corey, chair; see Office of Veterans Affairs website: [http://www.uno.edu/registrar/veterans/](http://www.uno.edu/registrar/veterans/):**

Dr. Corey pulled up the website and remarked that the current number of students in this population is 406 military students and dependents. UNO is recognized as a VA School of Excellence. Right now, the Office of Veterans Affairs is located in the Privateer Enrollment Center and is headed up by Dedrick Raby, who keeps up with changes and what is being covered. It still causes students a bit of frustration.

The Committee invited Dedrick to its last meeting to hear how the process works when students ask questions. One thing that came up was how the GI bill works with studies abroad. Right now, there is no student organization to deal with these students. Dr. Corey has had problems in the past when students get deployed. Right now, if a student is deployed or sent out on active duty, it is the student’s responsibility to take care of all of the paperwork, but problems arise. The Committee has discussed some better service when these students are deployed; there is no firm answer yet but perhaps some Q&A on the website to help students understand what they need to do. The Committee is also looking at how to lay out some Global UNO outreach initiatives to help students. Dr. Corey would like to know if there are other issues that they need to take up.

The Committee also talked about waiving the UNIV Experience requirement for these students, or maybe just for the over twenty-five. Mr. Shalit asked if there would be a separate UNIV Experience for them, and Dr. Corey responded that they could possibly do a quick survey on this. Mr. Shalit then asked if some sort of mentoring program would help, and Dr. Corey replied
that they had also talked about that. Dr. Roussev said that we might be talking about two populations, veterans and dependents, with different experiences. Dr. John Kiefer suggested that perhaps a council of veteran faculty as advisors could be explored. Often when the students are deployed there is no time to do everything, and pairing them up with a veteran could help with the process. Dr. Corey agreed that a mentorship program would be helpful, but deployment is something that she has struggled with. She would like to know if any of the colleges have any outreach programs for veterans that could be posted on the website.

Dr. Day thanked the Committee for its work and asked if there is someone in Admissions specifically dedicated for veterans. Dr. Matt Moore said that, when identified, they send them to him, a veteran. They document an individual who has to leave – if a veteran has a problem, they can see Dedrick at any time, including if they are deployed on short notice. Dr. Corey asked if Dedrick can do course withdrawals, and Dr. Moore reaffirmed that Dedrick can let them know.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee – Report on the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM model as used in the University and compare to our peer institutions that also use RCM (Dr. Vassil Roussev, vice-chair; see Appendix 3):

Dr. Roussev, who drafted the report, stated that it was very preliminary – it would be version 0.1 if it were a piece of software. So far, the Committee has managed to meet with Dr. Lassen for 90 minutes, where he explained the situation, and there were some questions. The Committee ran out of time before getting to the questions that it wanted answered, and some questions may not be answerable at this time. Dr. Roussev went through selected sections of the report.

RCM was the part that the Committee did not quite get to in detail. Dr. Roussev added some quotes in his report from the reference document, which is not really a prescription but rather some examples of how it has been implemented at large institutions and how it would be deployed at the school or college level and larger universities. He does not know whether UNO is large enough. There needs to be a mechanism to determine the formula, but there is no consensus at this point at the administration level as to what RCM is going to look like. And it seems that there needs to be a feedback mechanism to all of this. We cannot use RCM to go to the state and ask for more money. Baton Rouge looks at the budget request process – we may be able to use something internally, but it will always look the same to Baton Rouge. There were more questions than answers. Another meeting is scheduled with Dr. Lassen next week, and perhaps the Committee will meet with others in Administration.

In response to Dr. Steve Rick’s question, Dr. Roussev said that there is no timeline, and this may be pushed to next year, January 2015. Some sort of timeline would be helpful. In order to start budgeting for next fiscal year, we need to start now, but there seems to be no mechanism yet as to how this will happen.

Dr. Brooks then stated that she was opening Senate discussion to the audience as well. Dr. Peter Schock commented that regarding the structural deficit, a few months ago it was $5 million and now $6 million, and it must be cleared by June 30th? Dr. Roussev agreed that the impression the Committee has is yes.
Dr. Rick said that in the spreadsheet that went around there was no accounting for indirects, and Dr. Roussev confirmed that indirects were not included. Dr. Moore stated that he wrote the spreadsheet so he could probably answer the question. Revenue basically comes from four sources: Tuition, state allocation, indirects, and fees. RCM takes two of these primary sources into account, which are approximately 95% of the revenue. Tuition in mandated by the State of Louisiana; it goes through a matrix that defines the degree of multiplier based on the subject, $141.05 per credit hour. The number has been discounted twice by the state model, and we basically get 43% of that figure. We generate roughly $23 million from the state, and roughly $43 million is generated by tuition. Last year, our budget generated about $67 million from these two sources. RCM is a tool that allows us to track by CIP codes exactly how much money is generated through state and through tuition allocation. We have CIP codes in our system that have not been touched since 1976, and we lost roughly $6 million last year because of this, so the first thing that we did was to go back and regenerate our CIP codes. If we do not hear anything bad, we are hoping that our allocation will be better next year. The model that generated that spreadsheet has been discussed by the deans since last summer. Right now, the model is being used strictly as a tool to show where we are and where we generate the money and to find out where we are using money. Dr. Brooks asked if there will be a stream of communication. Dr. Moore replied that he thinks Jim Payne has been meeting with the deans since last summer and now with the chairs to show the information, but no decision is being made. Dr. Goss said that there are still a lot of problems with it, an example being with endowed chairs, and he is hoping that we can get some accurate numbers. Dr. Moore agreed that there are flaws in the system. He does know that the student account predictor is tied to tuition and tied to state allocation of accounts. Dr. Trumbach asked who made or who will be making the decisions that determine who is generating the funds and how those funds are generated, Dr. Moore or the Provost. Dr. Moore replied that they used as a basis the percentage and cuts decided by the Board of Regents. If we could charge for more than twelve hours it would be different. He also referred to the 80/20% model. Dr. Roussev summed it up by saying that there is a model and there are allocations.

Dr. Darrell Kruger reported that he has shared that information with each of the department chairs. He believes that the model is based on last year and shows how faculty members are performing, but it does not mean if a faculty member is not generating money that they are not performing. The whole RCM approach is to look at where revenues are being generated or not being generated and try to make decisions on, for example, program array. He is going to sit down with each of his department chairs and look at all the information that they have. He is looking at approximately 60% loss of tenure track faculty in his college and 9% loss if students. They need to look at program array to make decisions on where they can grow.

In response to Dr. Shengru Tu, Dr. Trumbach answered that even when we are looking at ways to generate funds, it is not in the discussion as to how we get our research dollars back. We are on a path to becoming a teaching university. Why is that not on the list of top priorities to generate more funds?

Faculty Welfare Committee – I. Criteria for establishing an Employee Recognition Program (Dr. John Kiefer):
Dr. Brooks stated that she hoped that all would participate in the discussion.

Dr. Kiefer reported that they had been approached by HRM as to what kind of recognition HRM could supply for faculty. There is already the Jazz Program. Certainly the most meaningful thing would have to do with money, but what would be dignified and professional for faculty? The Committee did not think that there was something out there for community outreach and engagement; an award could be made along the same lines that the University does for teaching professors. Dr. Goss inquired if the teaching award was still around, to which Dr. Kiefer replied that he thought it still was.

Faculty Welfare Committee – II. Closure of UNO Children’s Center (Dr. Elizabeth Shirtcliff; see Appendix 4):

Dr. Shirtcliff reported that she had gone to the Senate Executive Committee with her concerns over the closing of the Children’s Center; then she convened an emergency meeting of the Faculty Welfare Committee. She does not have children at the Children’s Center; it is a personal issue to her in so far that she cares about faculty welfare and well-being.

Dr. Shirtcliff displayed her PowerPoint. Since October 10, there has been a very powerful response opposing the decision that was made. She went over the reasons “Why Should We Care?” Most Children’s Centers are supported by the College of Education, and we have a College of Education that could support it here. A 2012 focus group identified 27 effective policy changes, including access to site-supported childcare. Affordable on-site childcare is the easiest policy to implement. The Children’s Center has the potential to be a profit center. They are not doing it yet, but the UNO Children’s Center would like to have to opportunity to do that. The UNO Children’s Center actually has a waiting list. It could easily raise tuition from $650 to $800 a month, which is the New Orleans rate and which would work to close the budget gap. Closing the Center could affect foreign students and result in $853,638 annual loss of tuition alone. This is one of the few things that people love to give grants to. The goal of Save UNOCC is to have a zero impact on the UNO budget, and they would like to grow to start giving back to the University. “What the Senate Can Do”: They need the Senate as their advocate to delay the decision so they can put together a proposal to allow the Center to reopen. At this point, there was a rousing hand of applause from the senators and the audience.

Dr. Brooks added that the Committee had not come with any resolution, but they would like to write a letter and have the Faculty Senate Executive Committee support it. Dr. Miestchovich inquired what would be in the letter. In response to Dr. Shirtcliff’s mention that it would include getting grants, Dr. Miestchovich asked what kind of grants, and how do we know that the Center will be successful. Dr. Shirtcliff replied that they are organizing a parent/teacher organization. Ms. Beth Blankenship added that there was an advisory board before the storm. The problems have built up since the storm, plus the student fee was dropped. It sounds like what they are proposing is an advisory board. Dr. Shirtcliff responded yes, they are looking for an energetic and enthusiastic group. Dr. Miestchovich then asked if that is a purely operational deficit or if it includes the overhead. Dr. Shirtcliff replied that she had no idea where the number that she had been given was coming from. Dr. Trumbach said that the number she had heard was $200,000, but $150,000 is what it would take to upgrade the facility. Ms. Sarah Debacher stated that the
$150,000 number was the one given by Dr. Lassen to keep the Center open until May 15th. Dr. Trumbach asked Dr. Shirtcliff if she had been able to talk to Dr. Lassen since she talked to the Senate Executive Committee, to which Dr. Shirtcliff replied that they had cancelled the meeting. Dr. Lassen was only willing to talk to them one by one and not as a group.

Dr. Zhengchang Liu, a tenured professor for six years, spoke. He pays $7200 a year to keep his child here, but he is not being given the opportunity. He finds the Center critical for development of faculty. On-site children’s care is central to his effort, and it is not acceptable to be given a two-week notice. Why cannot a Senate committee with powerful voices do something about keeping quality children’s care? Dr. David Beriss mentioned that Tulane could recruit Dr. Liu. If we take away benefits, how likely is it that we will lose people? Ms. Arnold thinks that it is appropriate that the Senate pass a resolution that Administration stay on closing until other avenues are sought. Dr. Roussev suggested that we could ask Administration to commit to a number and open the books. If raising the tuition would fill the gap, he does not understand why Administration would not do that.

Dr. Steve Striffler offered a motion that Dr. Shirtcliff’s Committee write a letter and run it by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht suggested that maybe the Faculty Welfare Committee could look at other faculty welfare policies, for example, stopping the tenure clock. Dr. Brooks replied that the Committee has two charges now, so she will send them this charge in January.

Dr. Striffler’s motion: That Senate Executive Committee approve a letter on behalf of the whole Senate that the Senate endorses keeping the Center open and slowing down the process. The motion was carried unanimously.


Dr. Brooks reported on an email that she had received from Mallory Moore regarding the Office of External Affairs looking for volunteers to serve on city boards (see Appendix 5).

8. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Nov. 13, 2013

Appendix 1:
Residence requirements at UNO peer group and some Louisiana colleges, especially at it relates to residence requirements for courses in the major.

**UW-Milwaukee**

Colleges set residence requirements. The rule for the College of Letters and Science:

“At least 15 credits of advanced work in the major, and 9 credits of advanced work in the minor (if applicable), must be completed in residence at UWM. Departures from this rule due to extraordinary circumstances require a recommendation, including evidence of equivalent work completed elsewhere, from the major or minor department to the Office of Student Academic Services.”

**SDSU**

University policy: “Residence Requirements

To qualify for a bachelor’s degree, each of the following unit requirements must be completed at this university:
A. A minimum of 30 units total, of which at least 24 units must be in upper division courses (numbered 300-599).
B. At least half of the upper division units required for the major, unless waived by the major department; however, in no case shall the unit total be fewer than 12 upper division units.
C. If a minor is completed, a minimum of six upper division units in the minor.
D. At least nine units in General Education courses”

**University of Maryland at Baltimore**

UMB is public health, law and human service university. It is made up of distinct professional schools (and graduate programs). It does not have a single catalog, and it appears that each make their own residence requirements.

**Old Dominion** – “A student who seeks a bachelor’s degree from Old Dominion University must, in addition to meeting other requirements of the University, earn a minimum of 25 percent of the total number of credits required for the degree (for example, 30 credits in a 120-credit degree program) through on- or off-campus instruction. This must include a minimum of 12 credit hours of upper-level courses in the declared major program. Some program residency requirements exceed the University minimum.”

**Ball State** – There does not appear to be a general rule about courses in the major, although it appears that their Business College does have requirements to that effect (but none of the other colleges do).

Residency requirement: “Bachelor's Degrees - For students pursuing a baccalaureate degree, at least 30 of the last 40 credits must be residence credit.”
Florida Atlantic

“4. Earn the last 30 upper-division credits in residence at FAU. In programs requiring more than 120 credits, at least 25 percent of the total number of credits required for the degree must be earned in residence at FAU.

5. Earn at least 75 percent of all upper-division credits in the major department from FAU (effective for students who entered FAU in fall 2010 and going forward). Some major departments may require more than 75 percent. Consult the degree requirements section of the major for details. (The previous requirement, earn at least 50 percent of all upper-division credits in the major department from FAU, is still in effect for students who entered FAU prior to fall 2010.)”

Univ of Missouri at St. Louis

Different colleges appear to have different rules. College of Arts and Sciences:

“Transfer students must complete at least 30 of the last 36 hours of their degree program in residence at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Unless otherwise specified, a transfer student must complete 12 hours of graded work at UMSL at the 2000 level or above within the minimum number of hours required for each major.

Unless otherwise specified, a transfer student must complete at least six hours of graded work at UMSL at the 2000 level or above within the minimum number of hours required for each minor. Students should consult the minor department for specific residency and grade requirements.”

University of Memphis

“A student will satisfy residence requirements for graduation by earning at least twenty-five (25) percent of credit hours required for the degree at the University of Memphis. At least thirty (30) of the final sixty (60) hours required for the degree must be completed at the University of Memphis. ... In addition, the student must meet the residence requirements for the specific degree as established by the college or school in which it is offered. Exceptions to residence requirements can be authorized by the appropriate dean.”

College of Arts and Sciences:

“A transfer student in The College of Arts and Sciences must earn at least 6 semester hours in residence in the major subject and at least 3 semester hours in the minor. These credits may be earned only through regular class enrollment for a letter grade

UNLV

I could not find any further residency requirement beyond the following last 30-credit rule.
“A candidate for the baccalaureate degree must complete the last 30 UNLV semester credits in uninterrupted resident credit as a declared major in the degree-granting college. A student must declare a major prior to enrolling in their last 30 UNLV resident credits.”

**Wichita State**

This is the only policy listed, and a search through college requirements revealed nothing further. “At least 30 hours of course credit (A, B, C, D or Cr) must be earned at Wichita State. Also, at least 24 of the last 30 credit hours or 50 of the last 60 credit hours must be completed at Wichita State.”

**Jackson State**

“Complete, in residence, not fewer than 30.0 semester hours of upper-level course work required in major field.”

**Bowling Green**

Earn a minimum of 122 semester hours of credit. At least 30 credit hours must be BGSU courses. There are no exceptions to either the "122 total hour" rule or to the "30 hours BGSU courses" rule. In addition, to ensure that the program of study is complete, coherent, and satisfies BGSU standards, specific courses that are integral to the degree, as identified in the check sheet for the major, must be taken at BGSU (e.g., capstone courses or similar culminating experience).

**Northern Illinois University**

A minimum of 40 semester hours of the total number must be in courses numbered at the 300 and/or 400 level. These must include at least 12 semester hours of major departmental courses taken at NIU.

**UT Arlington**

“Each candidate for a degree must complete and receive credit in residence* for:

1. 25 percent of the semester credit hours required for a degree (some colleges or schools may have additional residency requirements)

2. at least 18 semester hours of advanced (3000/4000 level) course work, to include 12 hours of advanced courses in the major subject

**Cleveland State**

To earn a bachelor’s degree at Cleveland State University, there is a residence requirement which is: the last 30 credit hours, and 24 credits of upper-division course work, must be earned in residence at Cleveland State. The smaller of 16 credits or 50 percent of the departmental credits comprising a major must be earned in residence at Cleveland State. The smaller of nine credits or 50 percent of the departmental credits comprising a minor must be earned in residence at Cleveland State University.
 LSU

“Candidates for a bachelor’s degree must earn at least 25 percent of the total number of hours required for the degree at this university and meet the residence requirements of their college as stipulated in each college’s and school’s section of this catalog.”

One example: College of Humanities and Social Sciences:

“A minimum of 15 semester hours in residence in the major field, including at least nine semester hours in courses numbered 3000 or above.”

Southeastern

“Earn the semester hours listed below at Southeastern Louisiana University. No time limitation in years or weeks will be set. A. Candidates for a Baccalaureate Degree 1) at least the final 30 hours 2) at least one half of the hours required in the major field or fields 3) at least 25 percent of credit semester hours must be earned at Southeastern”

ULL

College apparently sets rule:

College of the Arts: “The College of the Arts requires students to complete in residence a minimum of twelve (12) semester hours of credit in their major area; six (6) of which must be at the 300/400 level.”

Louisiana Tech

No overall rules for courses in major. Note that item 5 below refers to correspondence courses.

“3. If he/she is a transfer student, no fewer than 36 weeks in residence at Louisiana Tech are required, during which at least 25% of the semester hours required for the curricula are earned with a minimum 2.0 GPA.
4. He/she must spend the senior year in residence. Exception: A student who has fulfilled the minimum residence requirements may be permitted to earn 9 of the last 36 semester hours out of residence.
5. Three fourths of the hours required for graduation must have been completed in college residence. Louisiana Tech does not permit a student to apply more than 6 hours of correspondence study toward the pursuit of a degree”

Appendix 2:

Faculty Senate Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy

October 23, 2013
The UNO Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure offers the following resolution for consideration by the UNO Faculty Senate:

Whereas, the University of New Orleans (UNO) Faculty Senate believes that faculty are central to the university and their contribution is essential to achievement of the university mission, we agree that a clearly stated and fair faculty workload and evaluation policy is necessary to achieve that mission. The UNO Faculty Senate also agrees the current faculty workload and evaluation system makes inadequate distinction between sufficient/insufficient ratings and does not adequately align performance evaluation with faculty workload policy, the UNO Faculty Senate agrees that reform of current faculty workload and performance evaluation policies is sensible and appropriate.

However, the Faculty Senate has reservations about the revised faculty workload and evaluation policy proposed by Provost Payne on August 20, 2013. Two main areas of concern remain and two resolutions are offered to further revise the workload and evaluation policy: (1) eliminate required quantification of distribution of faculty effort; and (2) establish a committee to develop a workload/evaluation policy for full and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach (e.g., instructors, professors of professional practice).

(1) Eliminate required quantification of distribution of faculty effort.

It is the sense of the UNO Faculty Senate after extensive discussions among faculty, committee deliberation, and open debate at the last Senate meeting that there should be no required quantification of the distribution of effort associated with the new faculty workload and evaluation policy. A more flexible approach is warranted to determining the distribution of faculty workload and its subsequent evaluation. Departments, in consultation with respective Deans and the Provost, should develop unique statements of faculty workload and evaluation policy in line with the goals of the various departments and the university mission. The resolution in no way precludes departments from developing a quantitative distribution of faculty effort, it simply does not require quantification of effort.

Resolution 1:
Be it resolved that the following changes be made to eliminate the requirement for quantification of faculty effort dedicated to teaching, research, and service in the new revised faculty workload and evaluation policy proposed by Provost Payne (August 20, 2013):

Workload policy, p. 2, first full paragraph.

1. Delete, “The standard weight is 0.40 (Teaching), 0.40 (Scholarship), and 0.20 (Service).”
2. In the next sentence, replace “relative weights to be attached to” with “relative importance of the faculty member’s ratings in each of the areas of teaching, research/creative scholarship productivity, and service.”
3. In the next sentence, replace “The weights, which are a function of” with “The distribution of faculty effort will vary across departments but generally depends on such factors as number of courses and preparations, new course preparations, extraordinary service commitments, special research assignments and so on, will be used in the evaluation process described in the department’s annual performance evaluation.”

Workload policy, p. 4, under “Other Forms of Activity and their Credit-Hour Value.”

1. Delete, “For assignments that differ from the typical assignment weights of 0.40 (Teaching), 0.40 (Research), and 0.20 (Service), the adjustment in assignment weights for a 3 credit hour course is 0.0666. For instance, if a faculty member is assigned 3 credit hour release from teaching for administrative duties, such as graduate program director, the faculty member’s weights will be 0.3334 (Teaching), 0.40 (Research), and 0.2666 (Service). As another example, if a faculty member buys out a course from a research grant, the faculty member’s weights will be 0.3334 (Teaching), 0.4666 (Research), and 0.20 (Service).”

Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation policy, p. 2, second bullet point.

1. In the second sentence, replace, “identifying weights to be attached to” with “relative importance of faculty member’s ratings in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative productivity, and service.”
2. Next sentence, delete, “The standard assignment of weights is 0.40 (teaching), 0.40 (scholarship), and 0.20 (service). Deviations from these weights are outlined in the new workload policy. The weights will be used in the evaluation process described.”

Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Policy, p. 13, “Overall Evaluation”

1. Revise first sentence to read, “The above scores for teaching, scholarship, and service are applied to evaluate each faculty member’s performance in line with the assignment letter.”
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2. Delete second sentence, “For instance, a faculty member has the following weights teaching (0.40), scholarship (0.40), and service (0.20) and is evaluated on a 0-10 scale in each area as teaching (7.0), scholarship (6.0), and service (7.0), their overall evaluation is 0.40(7.0) + 0.40(6.0 + 0.20(7.0) = 6.6.”

(2) Establish a committee to develop a workload/evaluation policy for full and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach (e.g., instructors, professors of professional practice).

The Faculty Senate recognizes that the many full-time and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach are essential to fulfillment of the instructional mission of the university. These faculty members perform a variety of tasks and they should have a workload and evaluation policy.

Resolution 2:

Be it resolved that Provost Payne convene a committee before the end of fall semester, 2013 to develop a workload/evaluation policy for full and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach (e.g., instructors, professors of professional practice). The committee is charged with development of a policy that covers hiring, workload, evaluation, and retention of part-time and full-time faculty members hired primarily to teach. The committee should include the chairs of English and Mathematics, two currently employed instructors, and a representative of Academic Affairs.

Appendix 3:

The RCM Model & UNO
(draft report, Oct 23, 2013)

The UNO Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee (the committee) has been charged by the Senate with “understanding the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM Model as used in the University and to compare our RCM Model to our peer institutions that also use RCM.”
Status Quo

As a first step towards fulfilling its charge, the committee met with Dr. Gregg Lassen, VP for Business Affairs, on Oct 16, 2013. Dr. Lassen gave a review of the overall fiscal situation faced by the university, which can be summarized as follows:

- **Declining income.** Over the last four years support from the State of Louisiana has declined from $54M to $32M; we’ve had a parallel decline in enrollment and the corresponding tuition income. Although costs have declined as well, the rate of decline has been slower leading to a primary imbalance between income and expenses.

- **Structural budget deficit.** UNO, following poor budget practices, has had a structurally unbalanced budget, with operating expenses exceeding revenue from tuition and the State, for the past several years. The difference had been covered with existing reserves, ORSP funds, and other unsustainable sources. At present, there are no more funds available to cover the gap and UNO has no choice but to balance its books. The budget gap is in the order of $6M: $100M in income vs. $106M in expenses.

- **Cost structure.** Approximately 70% of the expenses are payroll related; following years of persistent cuts, the usual “easy” targets outside of personnel (such as travel) have already been shrunk to a rounding error. UNO is locked into some external contracts that could be improved but timing and success of such efforts are uncertain at this time.

The essential takeaway is that, over the medium-to-long term, the university cannot simply cut its way out of the current situation—the proverbial “fat” is long gone. UNO needs (urgently) to bring in more income in order to sustain itself and compete successfully with other universities.

Income Initiatives

The main focus of the administration at presents is twofold: a) stop enrollment decline and improve retention rates; and b) begin investing in initiatives that would bring future growth.

- **Improve retention.** Currently, UNO is at the bottom of its peer group in terms of student retention and any success in improving that will have an immediate impact on the bottom line and will also improve our reputation.

- **Recruit out-of-state students.** While UNO will always serve the needs of the Greater New Orleans area, we need a larger pool of potential students. One strategy would be to use New Orleans and low tuition to attract students from large metro areas, such as Houston, Dallas, and Chicago, which are one short flight away. Given the large populations of these metro areas, up to 1/3 of our future student body could come from out of state.

- **Recruit internationally.** With its international initiatives, UNO is well positioned to attract international students, which (over time) could account for up to 1/3 of our students.

The takeaway is that these initiatives are in the process of being implemented now but, even in the best case, the returns on investment—especially recruitment—would take in the order of 3-5 years to make a notable impact on our budget situation.
**RCM**
The purpose of the *Responsibility Center Management* (RCM) approach to budgeting is to attribute both income and costs to individual units (colleges/schools) of the university, thereby creating a more direct connection between decisions made and budget reality at the individual units; it is a more decentralized approach to budgeting.

“As typically implemented, RCM prescribes revenue and indirect cost allocation (ownership) rules and then gives schools and other revenue-generating units the responsibility to cover the total costs of their programs indirect, as well as direct from the revenues generated by their teaching, research, or business service activities. Program revenues include tuition, gifts, endowment, research and service income, and indirect cost recoveries.”

The budgeting process that the State mandates is request-driven and all requested funds from the State will continue be submitted and justified in its current form; the university is not in a position to replace that. Internally, UNO can decide to use RCM (or any other model) but the final request coming out would still need to be translated to the required format.

At this point the committee does not have enough information to report on the substance of how RCM might be implemented at UNO.

**Open Questions**
The committee has another scheduled meeting with Dr. Lassen and will pursue meetings with the administration in an effort to clarify the RCM implementation. Below is a non-exhaustive list of the questions we will try to answer:

*What is the envisioned budgeting process?*

The reference document sketches out a multi-step budgeting process; at this point it is unclear what shape that would take at UNO.

*What principles will be used for attributing SCH and other income?*

In the reference document, the following example suggests that some principled choices would have to be made:

“We will suppose that tuition revenues are allocated in proportion to credit hours taught. Thus School A generates 67 percent of total credit hours (100/150) and School B, 33 percent (50/150). An alternative algorithm might recognize that the majoring school should receive some direct portion of tuition revenues to represent the fact that it attracted the student’s interest (and tuition payments) and incurs advising costs. Thus one might allocate 80 percent of total tuition revenues in proportion to credit hours generated, and 20 percent in proportion to total numbers of majors.”

---

Who will determine the RCM formulas, and based on what principles? What is the process by which adjustments would be made?

“Develop broad-based involvement and acceptance for the underlying principles early on. They will guide intelligent evolution of the system.”

What is the relationship between the numbers produced by the RCM formula and actual budgets?

The committee had the distinct impression that no specific decisions have been made at the administration level, yet. Dr. Lassen pointed out that, in its pure form, RCM would likely show all units in the red as the whole university has a sizeable fiscal imbalance; it is unclear what individual colleges could practically do to balance their budgets on their own. The administration is working on relieving some of the non-personnel costs to achieve a more balanced starting point.

At this point, it appears that there will be a difference between the budget that comes out of the RCM process and the actual budgets. In that sense, the formula would be more of an analytical and advisory tool rather than a prescriptive one. We have no clarity on how the gap would be filled.

What is the decision/implementation timeline for the introduction of RCM?

The lack of clarity on how RCM would be implemented is compounded by the lack of clarity on when the necessary decision be made and put into place.

Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee

Mark Kulp
Ivan Miestchovich
Marie Morgan
Marla Nelson
Mark Reid
Vassil Roussev (vice-chair)
Polly Thomas (chair)

Appendix 4:
Faculty Welfare Committee Report

Employee Recognition

UNO Children’s Center Closing

- Oct 10th → decision was already made.
- Dec 20th → 20 year old center will shut its doors.
- Economic reasons including a $150,000 budget gap.

- Powerful response
  - Nearly 600 Facebook likes within 1 week.
  - Hundreds of signatures.
  - 452 change.org supporters.
  - Over $10,000 in pledged funds within 2 days.
  - Save UNO CC.
  - SPOCC = student and parent organization for the children's center.
Why should we care?

- This decision affects faculty → faculty welfare.
- 71% of faculty members cite work-life balance as single greatest challenge.
- 20% of female academics have stay at home spouse.
- 36% of males have stay at home spouse, % dropping quickly.
- Dual academics is increasingly norm in US:
  - 83% of female dual.
  - 58% male faculty dual.
- Childcare disproportionately affects young & female scholars.
- "Pipeline" breaks at end post-doctoral training level.
- Impact is felt before family or career decisions are made.
  - Majority of faculty leaving academia cite work-life challenges as reason for departure.
  - Disproportionately, the most productive faculty leave.
  - Major reason informing choice of where to attend school, accept offer.
  
From Spalter Roth, 2005

- Supported faculty = productive faculty.
- Mothers are the Most Productive faculty members, only if they have support from their institution.

College of Education includes 49 faculty members, 60 undergraduate degrees conferred, 116 master's, and 19 PhDs conferred in 2013.
Why should we care?

- 2012 focus group (n=10)
- Faculty
- Community Members
- External Experts
- UNO Administrators
- "easy pickings" ➔ increase awareness (7 out of 27 effective policy changes) of current resources
- On-Site Childcare = Highest ranked policy
- Empirical evidence for Enhanced Recruitment, Retention, & Promotion.

Why should we care?

- Budget shortfall ➔ Children's center has potential to provide revenue stream.
- Shortage of available, safe childcare.
- UNOCC has a waiting list
- Tuition rate in New Orleans = $800+ per month
- Tuition at UNOCC ➔ $650.
- Increase tuition to community rate = $145,800 GAIN
- Closing center, drop-out ➔ $853,638 annual LOSS of tuition alone.
- Grants available
  - NSF Advance = $1mil
  - CBA grant
  - Childcare.gov
  - National Coalition for Campus Children's Centers
- Fundraising opportunities
- Zero Dollar Impact on UNO Budget
- Intangibles...

Families Directly Affected

- Faculty
- Staff
- Alumni
- Affiliates

Students

Families

- Faculty
- Staff
- Alumni
- Affiliates
Good afternoon, Elaine and Derek! I am writing to you about a request received by President Fos from the Jefferson Parish Council. Local university presidents often play a role in filling seats on local government boards by providing a list of nominees to council members or parish presidents, who will then make appointments based on the university president’s recommendations. This is the case for many boards and the process is usually outlined in state law.
Most recently, UNO received a request from Jefferson Parish requesting a list of four nominees to serve on the Fire Civil Service Board (copy attached). This is a volunteer (unpaid) board that oversees the operation of the civil service employees in the local fire department. They help to establish the exams that determine qualifications for various positions and deal with other employment issues affecting the fire department and its employees. Ideally, we would like to be able to offer four individuals with something to offer in this arena, either experience in employment issues, experience in government operations, knowledge of firefighting, knowledge of Jefferson Parish, etc. – in other words, we are looking for folks with one or two of these strengths who would also be willing to volunteer the time and effort to serve on a local board.

Here is an agenda from the meeting held in March 2013. This will give you an idea of the issues this board deals with:


I am contacting you as leaders in the University Senate and Staff Council in hopes that you can help me get the word out to the campus about this opportunity. At your next meeting, would you be willing to make a mention of this opportunity and ask folks to contact me for information? I would be happy to attend the meeting and talk about this opportunity if you like, or I can help prepare a PPT slide that fits into your meeting agenda. Please let me know your thoughts! I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Mallory Moore
The University of New Orleans
Office of External Affairs
(504) 280-7060
mmoore@uno.edu
UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, November 21, 2013
Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at ___3:03______ PM__ by_Faculty Senate Vice
President Dr. Cherie Trumbach (Senate President Dr. Elaine Brooks was out of town)

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Rachel Kincaid (13-14)</th>
<th>Excused Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>Brian McDonald (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon Bonds (13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc.</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>(vacant) (13-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (SE) (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James Logan (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt Zingoni (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie Trumbach (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark Reid (13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy Corey (13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan Miestchovich (13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard Speaker (SE) (13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus Watson (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly Thomas (13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt Lyons (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul Bole (11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique La Motta (SE) (11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose Hajra (12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos Xiros (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios Charalampidis (13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve Striffler (SE) (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert Montjoy (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John Kiefer (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine Day (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine Brooks (12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter Yaukey (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Approval of minutes from the 10/23/13 meeting:
   _____Dr. Greg Seab _________moved and ___Dr. Jim Logan__________seconded to approve the
   minutes of the 10/23/13 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Vice President Dr. Cherie
   Trumbach for President Dr. Elaine Brooks):

   a) Dr. Trumbach announced Provost Payne’s response to the Faculty Work Load and Faculty
      Evaluation Resolutions 1 and 2: Dr. Payne will send a written response concerning the first
      resolution on Faculty Work Load and Faculty Evaluations before the end of the fall 2013
      semester; concerning the second resolution about the need to empanel a committee to create
      an evaluation policy for instructors and part-time instructors, the Nominations and Elections
      Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are populating that committee now,
      and the committee should expect to meet once before the end of the fall 2013 semester.

   b) Dr. Trumbach read a letter outlining Vice-President for External Affairs Rachel Kincaid’s
      report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Wednesday, November 13 (see
Appendix 1). Ms. Kincaid wanted to update everyone on what she has been doing and what is going on in the Legislature. If anyone has something to ask Ms. Kincaid while she is in Baton Rouge, Dr. Trumbach has her cell phone number.

c) Dr. Trumbach read Dr. Fos’ written response concerning the closure of the UNO Children’s center. Dr. Elizabeth Shirtcliff’s brief statement: That summarizes the response very well.

d) Dr. Trumbach announced that the Faculty Senate was co-sponsoring the Holiday Food Drive with the Staff Council and thanked everyone for bringing donations. She added that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had been asked to publicize the color flyer and would send out the electronic version.

5. Committee reports:

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Bylaws Sub-Committee - Review of Faculty Senate Bylaws and proposed emendations (Ms. Connie Phelps; see Appendix 2):

Ms. Phelps acknowledged Committee members Dr. Brooks and Ms. Marie Morgan and thanked Ms. Morgan for doing the bulk of the work. One of the reasons that we started with this was because the person just elected as President had never been on the Senate Executive Committee, plus she had a class and had to leave right after being elected. Ms. Phelps went over the compilation of changes, with the first major change regarding elections. The Committee looked at other Senate Bylaws; some had Vice-chair/Chair-elect, but that had a few problems. The Committee is proposing that Senators be elected by their units no later than April 1, which would allow new officers to be elected at the last meeting of the year. The pool of nominees would come from newly-elected and continuing senators, but only those senators at the last spring meeting would be doing the voting. The new officers would not take office until the fall, but they would become part of a transition team over the summer. The second major change involves representatives elected to statewide groups, with the proposal that the Faculty Senate President, or his/her designee, be the representative. Other changes include adding a retiree to the Faculty Senate, which was an idea proposed by a Senate Executive Committee member; changing the distribution of agendas and minutes; clarifying whether the reference is to the Faculty Senate President or the University President; and other clarifications and cosmetic changes. Any changes to Committee structures have to wait until other changes occur.

Dr. Andrew Goss wanted it clarified that when the officers are elected, the people who get to be on the ballot are for the next year, but the people who do the voting are the current senators. Ms. Phelps explained that the reason for that is that some colleges have way more senators than others. Suppose that there is a weird year when all of the former get elected – we end up with more people voting, which creates a more unequal vote. Dr. Goss had no objections to the
process, but he thought that it is not clear in the way that it is written. Dr. Dinah Payne thanked the Committee for its work, but she also said that Dr. Goss deserves a huge credit, too; that he and those who worked with him to begin with did a huge job putting it all together. Dr. Seab added that it never explicitly says that officers serve a one-year term. Article II, Section B, point 7 defines the end of the term, but not the beginning of the term.

Faculty Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee – Continuation of the study on the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM model as used in the University and as compared to our peer institutions that also use RCM (Dr. Vassil Roussev, vice-chair; see Appendix 3):

Dr. Roussev explained that since the last time, the Committee had a follow-up meeting with Dr. Gregg Lassen and a two-hour meeting with Dr. Matt Moore yesterday. This is Dr. Roussev’s best effort to synthesize the discussions.

The first charge was to understand and get to the RCM model. The model has been there all alone, but nobody knew it. The Committee has been fleshing out our financial misfortune. The main sources of income are tuition and state allocation. The base state allocation is $141.05 per credit hour, with that rate adjusted according to a matrix that subtracts 63.83%, followed by an additional reduction of 43%, which leaves $29.00 per credit hour. Right now, everyone is focused on the 43% and that it does not go up. $21M is our state allocation. The structural budget update: Close to $4.88M this semester and projected for $2.44M next semester, which is more than $6M. The University does have some reserves, but they have mostly vanished; what remains are mostly restricted. According to Commissioner of Higher Education Dr. Jim Purcell’s presentation the previous week, even that $21M is overfunded – it should be more like $17.6M. We are the sickest patient.

We have been hearing about the long-term income initiatives for some time, so Dr. Roussev elaborated on the immediate income initiatives. There are two legislative initiatives in Baton Rouge – variable rate tuition and removal of the cap. Whether they will go through is anybody’s guess. By law, we cannot offer more than 120 scholarships, and we have over 2,600. Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht asked if that was graduate and undergraduate. Dr. Moore clarified that that was 120 scholarships coming out of the general fund. Dr. Seab added that it looked like a good way to lose 4,280 students.

Dr. Roussev continued by saying that cost containment is probably the operative word for the rest of the fiscal year. The Cost Containment Committee might be charged with a lot of stuff about which to make a difficult decision. The first thing that the Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee noted is the communication breakdown between Administration, the deans, and the chairs. A lot of time has been lost. The people in Baton Rouge are impatient, and if we do not do it ourselves, they will do it for us, a worrisome thing. There is no strategic plan by which the Cost Containment Committee can operate. There seems to be no established or clear mechanism for working together to make decisions in this budget cycle.
RCM is on WebSTAR, which Dr. Moore demonstrated yesterday. Most of the queries are available through WebSTAR for anyone to see. There is a 50/50 split of academic and non-academic cost (previously 40/60) and an 80/20 split for student credit hours between the college teaching a course and the student’s major college.

Dr. Roussev said that in some sense, this is a call for the Senate to tell the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee what the former wants us to do next. If faculty wants to be part of the discussion, maybe there could be more discussion about the formula.

In response to Dr. Vern Baxter’s question about where the money goes, Dr. Moore explained that there are five sources of revenue – tuition, state allocation, indireccts, fees, and earmarks. We say that we have $106M budget, but a lot of it is funny money; e.g., waivers for out-of-state tuition is money we never really have. If they were to go, our budget is legitimately $92-95M.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht stated that when we were first told about RCM, we did a number of changes, but they were not effective immediately. She is a little bit confused about the timing of these exercises. On one hand, we have $6M deficit to cut by June, and, on the other hand, we are going to be cutting graduate programs. Yesterday we were told that there is no proposal to cut graduate scholarships, but today we are told that the majority of our scholarships are illegal. Dr. Goss commented that the UL system does not make law, they make policies. They approved our scholarship practices, so, apparently, they can contradict their own policies.

Dr. Roussev stated that he was not clear on where we are supposed to go next. Dr. Trumbach said that it is two-fold decision-making: We want to get rid of the whole $6M deficit this year; we have one to two years before we hit the brick wall, but the Cost Containment Committee has to look at the short-term this year to get us better under control.

Dr. Ivan Miestchovich added that part of the issue we are dealing with right now is the result of financial mismanagement of scholarships over the years, and the University picked up for the mismanagement of the Foundation side of the house.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht’s immediate concern is that financial is really the key, but we were told yesterday that scholarships are not going away next year. We are getting very inconsistent information, which is impacting lives of graduate students. More consistency is necessary. She is concerned that the Cost Containment Committee is going to be making decisions based on unclear information that will be shaping how we go forward and the strategy that we are having in our department.

Dr. Peter Schock said that he spent yesterday trying to calm down 100 graduate students who are unclear about their future. After a question as to how the budgetary pie is sliced up, Dr. Moore replied that we can put our hands on up to $73M. Dr. Schock had tallied up everything in all academic colleges, including all salaries and fringe benefits, and found that it did not cost more
than $45M. He suggested that this number should be borne in mind as we prepare for cuts to programs and personnel that are the source of UNO’s self-generated revenue.

Dr. Roussev stated that the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee has pretty much put out everything that they have been briefed on. The 40/60 is now 50/50. The Committee’s understanding is that the University is trying to wiggle out of commitments downtown. Dr. Lassen’s priority is to cut as much as possible from the non-academic side.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht commented that we do not have any breakdown of the non-academic side; the detail that we have is on the academic side. Dr. Moore responded that the original numbers from ULS showed 61% overhead. When the Provost came, he immediately switched 10% to academics. Dr. James Lowry asked where it went, as we have not seen anything, and Dr. Trumbach replied it was because we are operating on a deficit. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that we do not have any information on where that money is going and that money goes out the door. In response, Dr. Trumbach mentioned various buildings that the University owns and said that nobody has told us no about seeing specific line items. Dr. Moore confirmed that it is all available, but a spider web. Dr. Trumbach added that for the longest time they were still unraveling it. Dr. Ehrenfeucht mentioned that electricity was another area. Dr. Trumbach affirmed that those things are a priority for the Cost Containment Committee to look at, but they also have to look at the array.

Ms. Alison Arnold asked what is the charge of the Committee? To recommend? Dr. Trumbach replied that they have only met twice. One meeting was to look at the non-academic services and make recommendations. The next meeting is not until December 6. There has not been much in the way of decision and problem-solving at this point. Dr. Miestchovitch added that communication between deans and chairs is very uneven across campus. Dr. Dinah Payne stated that they have been told that the College of Business is fine, but that is not true. Dr. Goss suggested that there is a knowledge problem, and for us to get through this, there has to be a lot of good information. He is afraid that we have to move in a hurry.

Dr. Roussev thinks that there is going to be a short deadline and everything will be dumped on the Cost Containment Committee. This is why the concern about clear lack of priority. There is no strategic plan so how can colleges make decisions? We need to be able to support the decision-making. So far, it has been question and answer sessions. On the one hand, we are a research university; on the other hand, we are graduate student heavy. Does UNO want to move to fewer graduate students? Dr. D. Payne retorted that there is a strategic plan and that the colleges and departments are supposed to develop their own strategic plan based on the University one. Is the timeline our enemy now? We need to challenge our deans. She thinks that the Provost is frustrated with the deans. Who is going to make the decision to cut? If programs are to be gone, some of us will be gone. She would like to know who and when.
Dr. Roussev commented that the University of Monroe is cutting 30% of its budget. Dr. Moore pointed out that it is posted on their website. It is a good model because it shows what could be done. Dr. D. Payne asked Dr. Moore to forward the link.

It seemed to Dr. Baxter that we are up against the timeline and that the Faculty Senate should have a role in the Cost Containment Committee. He appreciated the Senate Budget Committee’s work to make it clear, even though Administration has been pretty transparent. Dr. Trumbach explained that all of the faculty representatives on the Cost Containment Committee come from the Senate. Dr. Baxter then asked if there will be a representative from each college. Dr. Trumbach responded that there are a lot of non-academic people to deal with academic issues. The deans are supposed to have colleges come up with whatever plan, but that is not being done, or that is not being sufficient. Her impression is that what was supposed to have been done at the college level was not done, but it will be on the Cost Containment Committee to make sure that we are protecting our programs. There is a good cross-section, but there needs to be a lot of communication. Dr. Miestchovich added that there are 27 people on Cost Containment, and five of them are at the table here. We are on a collision course with the UL System – if we do not do it with a scalpel, they will do it with a meat cleaver. Dr. Baxter wanted to make sure that the Senate is involved.

Dr. Steve Striffler commented that it does not seem that the Committee is functioning. It seems that we have to make cuts very quickly. Dr. Trumbach’s concern is that she cannot see sitting on something like this over the holidays.

Dr. Roussev then excused himself as he had a class to teach.

Dr. Ehrenfeucht asked if she understood that this model is the one that has the 50/50 split. Dr. Trumbach responded that right now, the model is just producing information. It was still not that clear to Dr. Ehrenfeucht what are the parameters of the cuts that we have to make. What do we want to get to and how? If we had that, then possibly those in Liberal Arts could sit down and discuss. But how do we get in that discussion if we do not have the parameters of what we are discussing? Dr. D. Payne was also concerned about the timeline and the fact that we are getting started so late, but she does not think that it is the Provost’s fault. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that in COLA, some departments are in the black, but there is still a lot of pressure on their programs. Departments in the red are not feeling the pressure. If we are going to be part of the discussion, we need to know the parameters.

It seemed to Dr. Baxter that June 30th is too soon to have to make the cuts, but on the other hand, we have to. He likes the fact that we are communicating and moving forward, but by June 30th? Dr. Trumbach added that it is pretty much a given that we are not going to hit the $6-7M by the end of the year. Another senator suggested that there are easier ways to have a budget cut, such as a cause and effect analysis. Are we in a death spiral? It should be high priority to have a cause and effect analysis.
Dr. Logan surmised that what is probably going to happen is that everyone is going to have a list of what they can cut, and then by mid-April/May, we are going to get a budget from the Legislature and will have to cut even more. It happens every year. We truly do not know what the number is. He agrees with Dr. Baxter that the Administration has been amazingly transparent, but they do not know what to do either. The Cost Containment Committee will have to be able to move on short notice. They should do some scenario generation.

**Faculty Senate Evaluation of Administrators Committee - Procedures concerning the evaluation of Dean Sharon Mader and Dean Steven Johnson in spring 2014 (Ms. Phelps):**

Ms. Phelps explained that university-wide administrators and deans are evaluated on a broad basis every three years. This spring, they are Dean Mader, Library, and Dean Johnson, College of Sciences. There is a Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators composed of one person from the Library and one from each college. The Committee puts together an appropriate survey that goes out to all. The survey is used as feedback to advise the Provost.

**University Committee on Courses and Curricula - Report on recent decisions and discussions regarding policies that affect faculty and students (Dr. Trumbach):**

Dr. Trumbach read a letter from Committee Chair Carla Penz (see Appendix 4) and added that a lot of issues have come up this year having to do with our change to the UL System. There have been a lot of crackdowns on things that have not changed for 20 years and also because of SACS. There have been issues that have come up when faculty are not sure that they have been informed about the decision. She encourages us to know who are representatives are. She also encourages Administration to indicate when the decisions have been vetted. We have a lot to be worried about from what has been done in the past and it is all coming down on us.

6. **Old Business.** None.

7. **New Business.** None.

8. **Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:40pm

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
Jan. 16, 2014

**APPENDIX 1:**

Letter from Vice-President for External Affairs Rachel Kincaid:
President Fos and I began working on a legislative strategy for the 2014 session early this summer. Since that time we have met with key legislators, the Governor's staff, Dr. Woodley and her staff, and our higher education colleagues in the UL and LSU Systems. Dr. Fos has also assigned me to temporarily assist Dr. Woodley from now until the end of session July 1, 2014.

Our goal is to seek the support of the Governor for inclusion in his Executive Budget, the maintenance of the current level of funding and the retention GRAD ACT tuition fund increases. UNO's current level of state funding is $30 million. Under the provisions of the GRAD Act, UNO has the authority to raise tuition by 10%. Last year, UNO exercised its option to increase tuition by 10%, which totaled $4.3 million. If we are successful, UNO would expect to see an increase in revenues in that range, adjusting for any changes in enrollment.

Additionally, we are working with all of the higher education community on the establishment of an incentive fund for higher education. We are still working on the details of the fund and garnering consensus with all systems and campuses, which will be key moving forward. This proposal would in the form of a legislative bill during the regular session which begins March 10, 2014. I hope to have more information soon.

On the Federal Level, Crystal Ellerbe, Director of Governmental Affairs, has been monitoring President Obama's higher education policy initiative entitled: "A Better Bargain for the Middle Class: Making College More Affordable Paying for Performance."

Specifically, the plan proposes to:
- Tie financial aid to college performance, starting with publishing new college ratings before the 2015 school year.
- Challenge states to fund public colleges based on performance.
- Hold students and colleges receiving student aid responsible for making progress toward a degree.

**Promoting Innovation and Competition**

- Challenge colleges to offer students a greater range of affordable, high-quality options than they do today.
- Give consumers clear, transparent information on college performance to help them make the decisions that work best for them.
- Encourage innovation by stripping away unnecessary regulations.

**Ensuring that Student Debt Remains Affordable**

- Help ensure borrowers can afford their federal student loan debt by allowing all borrowers to cap their payments at 10 percent of their monthly income.
- Reach out to struggling borrowers to ensure that they are aware of the flexible options available to help them to repay their debt.

The U.S. Department of Education is seeking public input about these proposals, and in particular the development of a college ratings system. The Department has held three forums to date including: California State University, George Mason University and the University of
Northern Iowa. The final forum will be held on Thursday, November 21, 2013 on the campus of Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge at the Lod Cook Alumni Center from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Additional details about the plan can be found here: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/08/22/fact-sheet-president-s-plan-make-college-more-affordable-better-bargain-

At the forum, a senior Administration official will provide an overview of the plan and receive feedback about the development of a college ratings system. Forum participants are welcome to share their views on measuring value and affordability, and in particular on the metrics and weighting of the ratings system.

You may also submit comments regarding the Administration’s proposals by electronic mail or by U.S. Mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Electronic mail comments can be sent to: collegefeedback@ed.gov. If you mail or deliver your comments, address them to Josh Henderson, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 7E313, Washington, DC 20202–0001.

APPENDIX 2:

Here is an outline of the proposed changes to the “Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans” (last amended April 30, 2012). The changes and additions are highlighted in red; the deletions are indicated with strikethroughs.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Bylaws Subcommittee: Elaine Brooks, Marie Morgan, Connie Phelps

A. **Major changes regarding elections:**
1) That unit elections for senators be held no later than April 1 of each year
   a) Article II, Section C, item 2

2) That election of Senate officers be moved from the first meeting of the academic year to the last meeting of the academic year
   a) Article III, Section B, item 1

3) That Senate officers be elected from continuing and newly-elected senators
   a) Article III, Section B, item 2

4) That newly-elected Senate officers form part of the transition team with the current officers over the summer
   a) Article III, Section B, item 4

B. **Major changes regarding representatives elected to statewide groups:**
1) That attendance at the UL System Faculty Advisory Council or other statewide groups be made a duty of the Senate President or designee
   a) Article III, Section A, item 1

2) That all references to other specific statewide meetings and all references to elected faculty representatives be removed:
a) Article II, Section C., item 2
b) Article III, Section A, item 1
c) Article III, Section A, item 5
d) Article III, Section B, items, 1,3, 6, and 7

3) That the reference to the Senate President’s reporting on any statewide meetings be moved from Article III, Section A, item 5 to Article III, Section A, item 1

C. Other substantive changes:
1) That a retiree be added as a member of Senate
   a) Article II, section A, item 5
   b) Article II, section B, item 5
2) That notices of meeting and agendas go out to the entire UNO community, along with changes in the method of distribution
   a) Article III, Section A, item 1
   b) Article VI
3) That the time frame and routing paths of the Senate minutes be altered
   a) Article III, Section A, item 3

Clarifications/rewordings:
1) Clarified whether “President” refers to Senate or University President (except in the section about Senate President’s duties)
2) That Senate will recommend faculty to serve on University-wide committees when appropriate
   a) Article I, 2nd paragraph
3) That it is the elected Executive Committee representative from each unit who must be full-time faculty, etc.
   a) Article II, Section A, item 6.a
4) That the Senate Executive Committee will forward the number of full-time faculty to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee after it is received by Senate Exec.
   a) Article II, section A, item 6.c
5) That all terms run until the convening of the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year
   a) Article II, Section B, item 7
6) That Secretary be added to the list of officers being elected
   a) Article III, Section B, item 2
7) That the term of officers be clarified
   a) Article III, Section B, item 3
8) That only faculty Senators serve on Senate Standing Committees
   a) Article IV, Section B, 1st paragraph
9) That the statement about the Nominations and Elections Committee electing its own chair be moved from Article IV, Section B to a statement covering all Senate Standing Committees in Article IV, section B, 1st paragraph

Essentially cosmetic changes:
1) Re-ordered items 1 and 2 in Article III, Section B
2) Made changes under Senate Standing Committees and University Standing Committees for wording consistency
   a) Article IV, Sections B and C [NOTE: We have left any changes to the actual descriptions of the Senate Standing Committees charges for another time/group]
3) Removed all notations of the Arabic numeral in parentheses after the spelled-out form of the numeral, such as ten (10)
4) Other minor cosmetic changes to standardize language, capitalization, etc.

BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

ARTICLE I. NAME AND PURPOSE
The name of this body shall be the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans. As an authorized, representative body of the faculty under the administration of the University of New Orleans, the Faculty Senate is constituted to promote and implement, consistent with the purposes of the University, maximum participation of the faculty in university governance. In this capacity, the Faculty Senate will assist the administration in such matters of primary faculty responsibility and interest, such as academic standards and curriculum, student affairs, and administrative policy as it affects faculty welfare. Further, the Faculty Senate shall have authority in all matters affecting more than a single college, school, or a division and involving the establishment of curricula, the fixing of standards of instruction, the determination of requirements for degrees, and generally the formulation of the educational policy of the University in such matters.

The Faculty Senate will recommend, when appropriate, faculty to serve on university-wide committees, including the search committees for University-wide administrators. The Faculty Senate shall establish, set charges for, and supervise University and Senate Standing Committees. It shall be responsible for populating membership of Faculty Senate Standing Committees.

The Faculty Senate will advise the administration in the formulation and execution of policy with respect to the broadly defined goals, priorities, and financial needs of the University. The Faculty Senate shall serve as the forum for meetings between University administration and faculty regarding relevant issues for debate and discussion. This body will also serve as a forum for advocacy of faculty prerogative and position on important academic and University matters.

The Faculty Senate shall assist in the dissemination of appropriate administrative information to faculty. The Faculty Senate will also communicate faculty interests to the public and public officials as deemed appropriate.

ARTICLE II. REPRESENTATION
Section A. Composition. The Senate shall be composed of the following:
1. Students. The student body shall be represented by the President of the Student Government Association (or by his/her designee).
2. Alumni. The alumni shall be represented by the President of the Alumni Association (or his/her designee).
3. Staff. The staff shall be represented by the President of the UNO Staff Council (or his/her designee).
4. Administration. Administration shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.
5. Retirees. Retirees shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.
6. Faculty
   a. Each academic unit (each college or the Library) shall be represented on the Senate Executive Committee, elected in a manner to be determined by that unit. This election shall precede and be separate from that for the remaining faculty Senators. Elected representation membership on the Senate Executive Committee from each unit is limited to full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrators of rank of Dean or above, with at least five (5) years of full time academic service at UNO, or tenure.
   b. The remaining faculty members of the Senate, elected from full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrator of rank of Dean or above, shall be divided among units to be one representative for every ten faculty members. Each unit shall determine the manner in which their representatives are elected. Each unit with ten or more full-time faculty members at the rank of Instructor will have at least one Instructor representative to the Senate at all times.
   c. The chief academic officer shall by December 1 of each year forward to the Senate Executive Committee the number of full-time faculty for each major unit, using the methods employed in IPEDS reporting. The Senate Executive Committee will forward that information to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee, which will then compute the number of seats to be elected by each unit for the next year and shall notify each unit.
   d. At the beginning of each academic year, the Senate Executive Committee will nominate one adjunct faculty of the University to be a Senate member.
   e. Vacancies shall be filled in a manner to be determined by the respective electoral unit.
   f. If there should exist full-time faculty members who are not accorded representation on the Faculty Senate under the procedures outlined above, and if these faculty are associated with administrative units not large enough to merit individual Senate representation, the Senate Executive Committee shall develop a mutually satisfactory agreement by which these faculty will be attached to an appropriately represented unit for purposes of Senate representation, and for purposes of being eligible to be candidates and to vote in Senate elections. Such agreements will be subject to ratification by the full Senate.

Section B. Terms of Service.
1. Students. The student representatives shall serve a one-year term.
2. Alumni. The alumni representative shall serve a one-year term.
3. Staff. The staff representative shall serve a one-year term.
4. Administration. The administrative representative shall serve a one-year term.

5. Retirees. The retiree representative shall serve a one-year term.

6. Faculty. Full-time faculty shall serve staggered three-year terms. The adjunct faculty representative shall serve a one-year term.

7. All terms shall run until the convening of a new Senate and the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year.

Section C. Timing of Elections.
1. The elections of faculty Senators shall be staggered so that one-third (1/3) of the elected representation from each unit shall be chosen each year.
2. Senatorial elections shall be held in the spring semester no later than April 1. The elected officers of the Senate shall be a President, Vice President, and Secretary. The elected faculty representatives of the Senate shall be the faculty representative to the U.L. Board of Supervisors and an alternate, and two delegates to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities. The Parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Senate President from faculty Senate members.

ARTICLE III.
OFFICERS
Section A. Duties.
1. The President shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate. The President shall have the primary responsibility for preparing the agenda for each meeting and shall circulate notices of meetings and agendas to all faculty members, the entire UNO community. The President shall maintain a Senate calendar of business in committees and shall publish an updated calendar with the agenda for each regular Senate meeting. The President shall monitor the status of all resolutions passed by the Senate that request action and take appropriate steps to expedite implementation of such actions. The President shall report on the status of all actions passed by the Senate but not yet implemented or rejected. The President shall serve as the faculty’s representative to the U.L. System Faculty Advisory Council and other statewide groups. Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates or may designate another member of the Senate to serve in his/her place. The President or his/her designee shall report to the Senate on issues being considered by any of these statewide groups that have an effect on the UNO campus.
2. The Vice President shall assume the responsibilities of the President whenever the President is absent or otherwise unable to perform these duties and shall handle all correspondence of the Senate other than that specifically assigned to the Secretary. The Vice President shall keep minutes at the meetings of the Senate Executive Committee.
3. The Secretary shall keep minutes of each meeting of the Senate and send them to the Senate President for inclusion with the meeting notice and the agenda for the upcoming meeting. The Secretary shall ensure that the approved minutes are posted to the Faculty Senate website page and SharePoint sites within one week after each Senate meeting. shall send an email notice that the minutes have been posted on the UNO University Senate website page (senate.uno.edu) to senators, appropriate members of the Administration, and the Driftwood. Two paper copies will be sent to the Library for inclusion in the Louisiana Collection. The minutes for the year
just ended will be archived on the web page by the beginning of each new academic year. Such
distribution shall take place no later than ten (10) days prior to the following Senate meeting.
Reports made to the Senate shall be made available to the Secretary by electronic means within
one week of the Senate meeting at which the report was made.
4. The **Parliamentarian** shall ensure that all meetings are conducted in accordance with
5. The **Faculty Representative to the UL Board of Supervisors** shall report to the Senate
on issues being considered by the Board that have an effect on the UNO campus. The
Alternate Faculty Representative shall fulfill these duties when the Representative is not
able to attend.

**Section B. Elections and Terms of Office.**
1. The President and Vice President shall be elected from faculty Senate members.
   1. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall be nominated and elected by
      majority vote of members present at the first last regular meeting of the Senate during each
      academic year.
2. The Senate President, and Vice President, and Secretary shall be elected from continuing and
   newly-elected faculty Senate members.
3. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall serve until their successors are
   elected the convening of the first Senate meeting of the academic year.
4. The newly-elected Senate officers will form part of the transition team with the current
   Senate Executive Committee members between the spring and fall academic semesters.
5. Elected officers of the Senate shall be eligible for reelection but shall not serve more
   than three consecutive terms.
6. The Faculty Representative to the UL System Board of Supervisors will be elected by
   the Senate to serve a two-year term. The Alternate Representative to the UL System
   Board of Supervisors will also serve a two-year term and will be elected in alternate years.
   The Representatives and Alternates may be either a senator or non-senator.
   Representatives and alternates will serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.
7. Faculty Representatives to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities will be
   elected from the Senate members for one year terms, one of whom is also the representative
   to the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates.

**ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES**

**Section A. Executive Committee.**
The Senate President, the Vice President, the Secretary, and representatives elected by each
college and the Library shall comprise the Senate Executive Committee. There shall be no
more than two members from each of the colleges and Library serving on the Senate
Executive Committee at any one time. The President shall chair the Senate Executive
Committee. The Senate Executive Committee represents the faculty as an advisory committee
to the University President, making recommendations and stating faculty viewpoints
concerning the policies and proposed policies of UNO.
The Senate Executive Committee shall meet following each Senate meeting to review proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate for action and to determine whether the matter should become an item of Senate business. The Senate Executive Committee may seek clarification of the submitted item from the senator who originated it. If the Senate Executive Committee agrees that the matter deserves Senate attention, it shall assign the item to a Senate Standing Committee, a university committee or an ad-hoc committee, with a specific written charge, a tentative timetable for action, and a recommendation to work with another University committee if appropriate. If the Senate Executive Committee chooses not to accept an item for Senate action, it may refer the matter to the administration. Decisions by the Senate Executive Committee not to accept a proposal may be appealed to the entire Senate at the next regular meeting. The Senate President shall report the actions of the Senate Executive Committee to the Senate.

Section B. Senate Standing Committees.
It shall be the duty of the Senate Standing Committees to study proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate and to recommend appropriate action on them to the full Senate. Each faculty Senator shall serve on at least one Senate Standing Committee. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee. Each committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee.
This Committee shall concern itself with the academic privileges and responsibilities of all members of the University community.

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee.
This Committee formulates and reviews policies, rules, and regulations governing the admission, readmission, academic standing, and dismissal of all students for academic deficiency. The Committee examines policies and procedures for academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and registration. Additionally, the Committee creates and analyzes policies to be observed by the instructional faculty in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee.
The Committee shall review the University-wide budgets in cooperation with appropriate officers of Administration. The Committee shall apprise itself of the general financial position of the University and of significant policy and priority aspects of budget decisions. The Committee shall report all significant plans to the Senate, with recommendations when appropriate. The Committee will include a representative from each college and the Library.

Evaluation of Administrators Committee.
This Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators shall be composed of the Senate President, one Senate member from each college and the Library, and one staff member from the University Computing Center. The Committee will conduct the surveys which are part of the evaluation of the Deans for the Office of Academic Affairs, and surveys of other administrators, as directed by the University President. The Senate President shall accompany the Provost or other administrator to faculty meetings to report the results of such surveys.

Nominations and Elections
The This Committee functions as a committee on committees, and shall be responsible for populating Senate Committees. This The committee will also make recommendations to the University President concerning the selection of individual faculty members whom the University President will appoint to the appointed University Standing Committees and ensuring that vacancies on elected University Standing Committees are filled. The Committee runs the election for Hearings Committee pool at-large members. In addition, the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee submits a slate of candidates for the Senate transition meeting elections. The Senate relies on the good judgment of the members of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee to present candidates that reflect the quality and diversity of the campus community. The President of the Senate President serves as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee. The committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.

Faculty Welfare Committee.
This committee shall strive to secure for faculty members those services which will contribute to their welfare or convenience, including orientation to the University, housing, payroll deductions, insurance, health services, and they shall communicate annually with the University President regarding policies governing faculty perquisites and the structure of salaries. The committee shall, acting of its own volition, upon the request of the Senate and/or others, study, evaluate, and report on faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; act in an advisory capacity with the University administration in ascertaining desired changes in faculty compensation; provide information to the faculty on available fringe benefits; solicit faculty suggestions, information, and advice regarding faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; and maintain and keep current committee website.

Section C. University Standing Committees.
University Standing Committees shall be composed of faculty members appointed by the University President on the recommendation of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee or elected by the colleges and the Library. The Senate will establish, set charges for, and supervise the University Standing Committees. Reports from the committees will be discussed in the Senate before being formally communicated to the Administration or other body as appropriate. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee.
Current appointed University Standing Committees are:
- Committee on Courses and Curricula
- Committee on Recruitment & Retention Committee on Student Affairs
- Student Publications Board
Current elected University Standing Committees are:
- Committee on Distance Learning
- Committee on the Library
- Committee on University Honors and Awards
Section D. Disciplinary Committees.
All disciplinary-related committees, including the Charges Committee, Hearings Committee Pool, Grievance Review Committee, and the Peer Review Oversight Committee, are elected from the faculty, and work under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs. The Senate Nominations and Elections Committee will assist in the elections of members, and in the functioning of the disciplinary committees where appropriate. In particular, the chair of the Senate Committee on Nominations and Elections shall direct the election of the Peer Review Oversight Committee chair by the voting members.

Section E. Senate Ad-hoc Committees.
The Senate Executive Committee may establish ad-hoc and temporary committees for the purpose of addressing specific and major faculty and/or institutional concerns. Upon activation of a specific committee, the Senate Executive Committee shall prepare a specific charge for the committee and include the form and timing of the response requested.

ARTICLE V. MEETINGS
Section A. A regular meeting of the Senate must be held monthly on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday rotation, except December, during the fall and spring semesters. Special meetings shall be convened on the call of the Senate President or on the request of four members of the Senate addressed to the Senate Secretary.
Section B. All meetings shall be open to members of the UNO faculty, staff, student body, and alumni, except when the Senate, by majority vote of those present, designates a meeting or portion thereof as an executive session.

ARTICLE VI. NOTICE OF MEETINGS
One week before the date of regular meetings, written notice shall be sent to members of the Senate and to department chairs, the Administration, the Student Government Association, the Staff Council, and the Alumni Association for public posting the entire UNO community. Notices of special meetings must precede the meeting date by a reasonable time and shall be circulated as indicated for notices of regular meetings. All notices of meetings must contain as complete an agenda as possible. Members of the Senate may have items included on the agenda by forwarding them to the Senate President two weeks in advance of the regular meeting.

ARTICLE VII. QUORUM
A majority of the voting membership of the Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any regular or special meeting of the Senate.

ARTICLE VIII. RULES OF ORDER
When not in conflict with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the University of Louisiana System, Robert’s Rules of Order (latest revision) shall constitute the rules of parliamentary procedure applicable to all meetings of the Senate.

ARTICLE IX. ACTIONS OF THE SENATE
Any action taken by the Faculty Senate may be overturned by a majority of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote.

**ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS**

Amendments to sections I, II, and X of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (1) week having been given to all members of the Faculty Senate of the proposed amendment, or by a majority vote of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote. Amendments to sections III through IX of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of one-half (1/2) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (1) week having been given to all members of the Faculty Senate of the proposed amendment.

[Faculty Senate approved by the Faculty Council on December 7, 2011; Amended by approval of Faculty Senate on April 30, 2012]

**APPENDIX 3:**

**The RCM Model & UNO**

*(Draft report, Nov 21, 2013)*

The UNO Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee (*the committee*) has been charged by the Senate with “understanding the policies that drive the assignment of revenues and costs in the RCM Model as used in the University and to compare our RCM Model to our peer institutions that also use RCM.”

**Status Quo**

As part of its charge, the committee met with Dr. Gregg Lassen, VP for Business Affairs, on Oct 16 and Oct 30, 2013, and with Dr. Matt Moore, Assistant Provost and University Registrar, on Nov 20, 2013. Based on the discussions, the overall fiscal situation faced by the university, which can be summarized as follows:

- **Sources of income.** Tuition ($42M) and state allocation ($21M) constitute 95% of our current income. Fees (1.5%) and indirect cost recovery from research grant (3-3.5%) comprise the rest.

  The base state allocation rate is $141.05 per credit hour; that rate is adjusted according to a matrix of parameters, such as level of student, program of study, and CIP codes. The rate is then adjusted by subtracting 63.83% of it and, from the result, an additional 43% are subtracted; this leaves ~$29 per credit hour.

- **Declining income.** Over the last four years support from the State of Louisiana has declined from $54M to $21M; we’ve had a parallel decline in enrollment and the corresponding tuition income. Although costs have declined as well, the rate of decline has been slower leading to a primary imbalance between income and expenses.
• **Structural budget deficit.** UNO, following poor budget practices, has had a structurally unbalanced budget, with operating expenses exceeding revenue from tuition and the State, for the past several years. The difference had been covered with existing reserves, ORSP funds, and other unsustainable sources. At present, there are no more funds available to cover the gap and UNO has no choice but to balance its books. The budget gap as of last years was in the order of $6M: $100M in income vs. $106M in expenses.

Updated numbers show an estimated gap of $4.88M for the Fall 2013 semester and a projected $2.44M for the Spring 2014.

• **Cost structure.** Approximately 70% of the expenses are payroll related; following years of persistent cuts, the usual “easy” targets outside of personnel (such as travel) have already been shrunk to a rounding error. UNO is locked into some external contracts that could be improved but timing and success of such efforts are uncertain at this time.

• **Vanishing reserves.** As of the beginning of the FY 2014, UNO has approximately $14 million in reserves (down from $19 million in FY 2013). The vast majority of these are restricted and access to them to cover any shortfalls is difficult and complicated, at best.

• **View from the top.** According to Dr. Jim Purcell, Commissioner of Higher Education, during his Nov 14, 2013 campus visit, UNO is overfunded as per the State’s allocation formula, which points to funding at $17.6M. UNO has the lowest student-to-faculty ratio of 20:1 among our peers; the next closest institution is at 26:1. State allocations assume an average size of 26.

The essential takeaway is that, over the medium-to-long term, the university cannot simply cut its way out of the current situation—the proverbial “fat” is long gone. UNO needs (urgently) to bring in more income in order to sustain itself and compete successfully with other universities.

**Long-term Income Initiatives**

The main focus of the administration at presents is twofold: a) stop enrollment decline and improve retention rates; and b) begin investing in initiatives that would bring future growth.

• **Improve retention.** Currently, UNO is at the bottom of its peer group in terms of student retention and any success in improving that will have an immediate impact on the bottom line and will also improve our reputation.

• **Recruit out-of-state students.** While UNO will always serve the needs of the Greater New Orleans area, we need a larger pool of potential students. One strategy would be to use New Orleans and low tuition to attract students from large metro areas, such as Houston, Dallas, and Chicago, which are one short flight away. Given the large populations of these metro areas, up to 1/3 of our future student body could come from out of state.

• **Recruit internationally.** With its international initiatives, UNO is well positioned to attract international students, which (over time) could account for up to 1/3 of our students.
The takeaway is that these initiatives are in the process of being implemented now but, even in the best case, the returns on investment—especially recruitment—would take in the order of 3-5 years to make a notable impact on our budget situation.

**Immediate Income Initiatives**

Currently, the most immediate path to improving the income rests with:

- **Variable tuition rate** and **per-hour tuition pricing**. Variable tuition rate would allow the university to charge different tuition rates for different specialties (thereby, better aligning them with actual costs); per-hour pricing will remove the current cap on tuition charges per semester (which forces the university to subsidize student taking more than 12 credit hours). There are active legislative initiatives that would implement these (potentially) in time for next fiscal year.

- **Reduction of scholarships.** By law, the university should not be offering more than 120 scholarships at any one time; currently, UNO offers upwards of 2,600 of them at a total cost of $10.9M. Normalizing the scholarship level would take several years but some results, in the form of smaller future commitments, will begin to show up next fiscal year.

**Cost Containment**

Cost containment will be the major task for the university for the remainder of the fiscal year, and for the foreseeable future. The Board of Regents has made it clear that fiscal discipline will be imposed on the university should the internal process fail to deliver the necessary results in the form of a balanced budget.

The main concerns on part of the committee are that:

- There seems to be a breakdown of communication between the administration and the faculty body. Faculty have had difficulty in obtaining direct, relevant information regarding the transition process and the decisions that would have to be made at the department/college level. The administration has not received the expected response from the departments and colleges. Much valuable time has been lost in this untenable situation.

- It appears that the Cost Containment Committee is expected to bear the heavy burden of making some very critical decisions, yet there is currently no strategic plan clearly outlining the priorities for UNO. There seems to be no concerted effort to understand UNO’s current (and potential) program capabilities at different funding levels.

- Although the new administration has been responsive and forthcoming with respect to information requests, there seems to be no clearly established decision-making mechanism by which faculty and the administration can work together constructively and efficiently through this difficult period.
**RCM**

The purpose of the *Responsibility Center Management* (RCM) approach to budgeting is to attribute both income and costs to individual units (colleges/schools) of the university, thereby creating a more direct connection between decisions made and budget reality at the individual units; it is a more decentralized approach to budgeting.

“As typically implemented, RCM prescribes revenue and indirect cost allocation (ownership) rules and then gives schools and other revenue-generating units the responsibility to cover the total costs of their programs indirect, as well as direct from the revenues generated by their teaching, research, or business service activities. Program revenues include tuition, gifts, endowment, research and service income, and indirect cost recoveries.”

1

The budgeting process that the State mandates is request-driven and all requested funds from the State will continue be submitted and justified in its current form; the university is not in a position to replace that. Internally, UNO can decide to use RCM (or any other model) but the final request coming out would still need to be translated to the required format.

Currently, UNO has a fairly detailed implementation of the RCM, which accounts for all tuition and state allocation income (but not indirects) and all expenses down to the faculty level. Most aggregate queries related to the model are available to all faculty via Webstar.

Two of the main parameters that are being used in the current model are:

- 50:50 split between academic and non-academic costs (vs. the prior 40:60)
- 80:20 split for SCH between the college teaching a course and the student’s major college

Dr. Moore has committed to explain/demonstrate the live model as it currently stands.

**Open Questions**

There are a number of open questions that the committee has identified that go beyond the technical implementation of the RCM and into issues of policy and decision making mechanisms:

*What is the envisioned budgeting process?*

The reference document sketches out a multi-step budgeting process; at this point it is unclear what shape that would take at UNO.

*What principles will be used for attributing SCH and other income?*

---

In the reference document, the following example suggests that some principled choices would have to be made:

“We will suppose that tuition revenues are allocated in proportion to credit hours taught. Thus School A generates 67 percent of total credit hours (100/150) and School B, 33 percent (50/150). An alternative algorithm might recognize that the majoring school should receive some direct portion of tuition revenues to represent the fact that it attracted the student’s interest (and tuition payments) and incurs advising costs. Thus one might allocate 80 percent of total tuition revenues in proportion to credit hours generated, and 20 percent in proportion to total numbers of majors.”

Who will determine the RCM formulas, and based on what principles? What is the process by which adjustments would be made?

“Develop broad-based involvement and acceptance for the underlying principles early on. They will guide intelligent evolution of the system.”

What is the relationship between the numbers produced by the RCM formula and actual budgets?

The committee had the distinct impression that no specific decisions have been made at the administration level, yet. Dr. Lassen pointed out that, in its pure form, RCM would likely show all units in the red as the whole university has a sizeable fiscal imbalance; it is unclear what individual colleges could practically do to balance their budgets on their own. The administration is working on relieving some of the non-personnel costs to achieve a more balanced starting point.

At this point, it appears that there will be a difference between the budget that comes out of the RCM process and the actual budgets. In that sense, the formula would be more of an analytical and advisory tool rather than a prescriptive one. We have no clarity on how the gap would be filled.

Senate Budget & Fiscal Affairs Committee

Mark Kulp
Ivan Miestchovich
Marie Morgan
Marla Nelson
Mark Reid
Vassil Roussev (vice-chair)
APPENDIX 4:

Nov 21, 2013

From: Carla Penz, Chair
University Committee on Courses & Curricula

Greetings to all,

We are glad that the Senate has requested information on the work we do at the UCCC. The committee membership includes:

- two members from each college
- one from the library, and
- two student representatives (non-voting)

We also have representatives of the Advisor's Council, Academic Affairs, and the Registrar Office. Furthermore, when appropriate, we invite faculty to discuss topics of importance to their programs and/or the university as a whole.

The diversity of our members helps to ensure that all matters discussed are clear to faculty and students of different academic backgrounds. Our work dynamics includes bi-monthly meetings. Interpersonal synergy is important to us and it brings up issues that might have been otherwise overlooked.

One of the functions of the UCCC is to evaluate proposed additions, changes, or the dropping of undergraduate courses and curricula. The committee considers these proposals only after both the faculty of the initiating department and the college-level Courses and Curricula Committee have approved them. As such, the UCCC can be viewed as an Inter-college organization that bridges faculty to Academic Affairs and the Registrar. As a group, we aim at operating parsimoniously and within the guidelines of the BOR and UL systems.

The UCCC also provides a meaningful faculty voice in general academic matters. For example, this past month Academic Affairs presented a proposal for new Residency requirements to the UCCC. We discussed the proposal and deliberated that faculty input should be requested at the departmental level. We received departmental feedback and composed a consensus summary, which was sent to the Advisors Council for their opinion. Yesterday we examined the Advisors Council recommendation. The UCCC vote was to approve the policy with proposed faculty and advisors input.
Finally, it is also important that Senators and faculty are aware that the UCCC is working very hard towards a smooth SACs review process and UNO accreditation. This has led to many improvements to our curricula that will be directly beneficial to our students.

Thank you for your interest and attention, and feel free to contact us at any time.

Carla
UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, January 27, 2014
Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Dr. Elaine Brooks.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Rachel Kincaid</th>
<th>(13-14)</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>Derek Rodriguez</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon Bonds</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc.</td>
<td>Dinah Payne</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>(vacant)</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (SE)</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James Logan</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt Zingoni</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie Trumbach</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark Reid</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy Corey</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan Miestchovich</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard Speaker (SE)</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus Watson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly Thomas</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt Lyons</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul Bole</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique La Motta (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose Hajra</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos Xiros</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios Charalampidis</td>
<td>(13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve Striffler (SE)</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert Montjoy</td>
<td>(13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John Kiefer</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine Day</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine Brooks</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter Yaukey</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James Lowry</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla Nelson</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern Baxter</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Beth Blankenship</td>
<td>(12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Connie Atkinson</td>
<td>(11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Approval of minutes from the 11/21/13 meeting:**

Dr. Brooks asked Faculty Senate Secretary Ms. Marie Morgan to read two corrections that had been submitted via email:

a) Bottom of p. 5 (from Dr. Peter Schock):

“Dr. Schock had tallied up everything in all academic colleges, including all salaries and fringe benefits, and found that it did not cost more than $59M. $45M. He suggested that this number should be borne in mind as we prepare for cuts to programs and personnel that are the source of UNO’s self-generated revenue.”

b) Second-to-last paragraph of p. 7 (from Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht):

“Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that in COLA, the college is some departments are in the black, and feeling but there is still a lot of pressure about the on their programs.”

There being no additional corrections, Ms. Beth Blankenship moved and Dr. Vern Baxter seconded to amend the sections of the minutes as read. The motion passed unanimously as did the vote to approve the amended minutes of the 11/21/13 meeting.

4. **Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Brooks):**

a) Dr. Brooks announced that the cafeteria would be open tomorrow and Wednesday if necessary for the students who live on campus.

b) Dr. Brooks read a report sent to her by Dr. James Lowry re the State’s anti-smoking law and its implementation at UNO (see Appendix 1). As of August 1, 2014, UNO will be a smoke-free environment.

c) Dr. Brooks read part of and summarized the remaining part of a report re the General Education Committee (see Appendix 2), which we had already received in a memo sent out to all of us. Dr. Brooks highlighted the four reasons why the changes are being made and
emphasized that the deadline to return feedback is January 30. A quick turnaround is necessary in order to implement the changes for fall 2014.

d) Dr. Brooks asked for and received permission to let Dr. Schock talk. He announced that the committee charged with the responsibility for creating the workload policy for instructors met December 20 and will meet again Tuesday, January 28.

5. Committee reports:

Dr. Brooks mentioned the memo on the Faculty Workload Policy (see Appendix 3) that she had sent out the same afternoon, which was a response from Provost Payne and Dr. Bill Sharpton to the two resolutions passed at the October Senate meeting. She asked for and received permission to amend the agenda to let the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee speak briefly on its meeting the previous week with Provost Payne and Dr. Sharpton (in lieu of reporting on the Online Teaching Policy as listed in the agenda).

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

Dr. Baxter stated that we were not here to vote or respond to anything. Academic Affairs responded to the Committee last week, and everyone should have received a copy of the policy today. He would like to highlight some of it (see Appendix 4), and the Committee would like to have a response to it at the next Senate meeting.

Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee (Drs. Cherie Trumbach and Marla Nelson) followed by open faculty discussion concerning UNO’s future:

Dr. Brooks asked the senators if, once the reports were made, could we open the discussion to everyone in the room. Dr. Polly Thomas so moved and Ms. Blankenship seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Dr. Brooks stressed that the discussion should proceed in an orderly fashion.

Dr. Trumbach read her statement (see Appendix 5), which summarized the process that had taken place. Dr. Nelson read her statement, which added some additional insight and emphasized that committee members had raised issues and questions. Dr. Brooks then said that there was now the chance to ask questions.

Dr. Polly Thomas asked whether or not it is permissible to get rid of programs absent a declaration of financial exigency. Dr. Trumbach believed that it can be done for low-completer programs. Dr. Nelson said that it is an HR issue, but tenured faculty cannot be gotten rid of unless we declare financial exigency; that is consistent with the UL bylaws. Dr. Trumbach added that there is a 12-month notification (she believes, two semesters) if a program is cancelled that tenured faculty can be laid off. Dr. Greg Seab stated that there are general rules that you cannot cut a program for financial reasons but you can cut for academic reasons, therefore the 12-month notice, and you have to give priority for re-hiring to those cut. Various universities have contested this but have lost their case.
Dr. Thomas then asked if low-completer was a reason. Dr. Andrew Goss replied that that it is fairly vague as to what is allowed regarding low-completers. Ms. Blankenship said that the last time we cut programs the Board of Regents looked at low-completers across the state. How is this determined by the Cost Containment Committee if it cannot be done because of costs? Dr. Nelson explained that there is a special subcommittee, and it is within that subcommittee that these decisions have been made.

Dr. Baxter stated that it seems that the Cost Containment Committee is kind of a joke. It seems like faculty have not been involved. He inquired of the two representatives if they felt that the process has engaged faculty, and what did they think about the process. Dr. Nelson responded that on the Committee there had been no discussion about RCM. Dr. Trumbach’s impression was that the focus of completing that information was to identify low-completers, but if a program had other strengths, there might not be a reason to do away with that program. There was also a desire to streamline programs and reinvest in strong programs. She does not know which programs were considered for cuts; only those on that subcommittee were involved in that discussion. The Provost has reiterated over and over again that cost containment is on the non-academic side. The idea is to protect faculty, but instructors and adjuncts might be cut.

Dr. Baxter understood that the Provost had already met with the deans and will meet with the chairs. It seems like the process is top-down and not square with faculty involvement. Dr. Trumbach said that the College of Business had had significant discussions about that issue the last few days, but they did not necessarily make a fuss about that. In her college, they already had a meeting with the dean, and they felt that the concerns that they had were met, but that might be reflection of her college. She would have hoped to have more input on the academic side and more eyes to look at the proposal, ultimately knowing that the decision rests with the Provost. It was initially presented that the Cost Containment Committee would be more involved. Dr. Nelson added that even if there had been more involvement, it might have been problematic due to the composition of the Committee and the tight turnaround time.

At this point, Dr. Brooks opened the discussion to the gallery.

Dr. Seab had a concern when he sees rubrics like the ones that he saw to evaluate programs when they do not pay attention to the consequences of the decisions. For example, the decision not to have graduate assistantships or to reduce them costs the university money because of the drop in 700 level hours for the summer. The people who understand this are the faculty. It ends up costing money rather than saving it. Ms. Alison Arnold had been hearing in her college about the lack of faculty input, the rubber stamp issue. She would like to have more faculty input. What kind of power do we have as a Senate? Dr. Brooks suggested perhaps a resolution of some sort about the lack of faculty input.

Dr. David Beriss was concerned that, given that we are supposed to be shared governance, and that the Provost and Gregg Lassen were not at this meeting, he has a lack of confidence in the data; it is not what he would consider an essential element of his program. How can it possibly be meaningful? It would be great if the people who put this together could report to us. Dr. Brooks replied that actually the Provost did ask to speak to us, and the Provost was here.
Provost Payne stated that the University is not good on data collection. The template is going to be revised, and there will be annual progress reviews every year. There have been a lot of suggestions on how to streamline the programs, and a number of recommendations have been put out to the deans. In some cases, the deans are sharing that information. How can we be proactive in looking at low-completer programs? He thought that it was first fair to share with the deans initially and then get it into the pipeline. He is going to report to the Cost Containment Committee. But given the time constraints? The intent is not to eliminate programs but to strengthen programs.

Dr. Brooks asked if that means that in the information being disseminated this week there will be reports on what has been communicated through the deans to the faculty. The Provost responded that he has encouraged the deans to talk to department chairs. A lot of what they have shared with the deans has to do with ADA compliance and cost information to try to improve the programs. Dr. Brooks asked if we will then have a report of what is being streamlined, to which the Provost answered yes. Dr. Brooks asked if those decisions will have been made. The Provost responded that these are recommendations. Dr. Brooks asked if the Senate will have a chance to review his report and comment on it, and the Provost said yes and that he was right now trying to schedule one-half hour meetings with the deans and chairs. Dr. Brooks asked again if we would be able to review that material and provide feedback. The Provost responded yes, but it would go to the Cost Containment Committee first. Dr. Brooks asked if we would get a report two weeks before the next Senate meeting on February 25, and the Provost replied that he hoped to get it finalized in two weeks.

Dr. Richard Speaker stated that is seems that we very often lose focus on what is going on. A lot of faculty are frightened, worried about their job and about program cancellations. More importantly, we need to articulate a view of what we see the University to be in the future, and he does not see that stated very often. Our programs were being discussed today on the radio. Dr. Thomas explained that it was President Fos and five successful business people who graduated from UNO. Dr. Speaker replied that we need to hear again what the vision is. Mr. Derek Rodriguez thinks that the vision is the 5-year strategic plan, and he asked if the strategic plan is being looked at on the committees. Dr. Nelson responded that it was not in the subcommittee that she is on. Dr. Speaker suggested that maybe we need to bring the 5-year plan back.

Ms. Blankenship asked that if scheduling needs to start next week, how can we have feedback on these decisions. Dr. Trumbach said that the advice she would give is to start scheduling as before with the chair; the deadline is not actually until mid-February. Dr. Matt Moore explained that there would be a meeting on February 4 on strategies for building scheduling for next fall. The process will start on February 4 and runs through February. We should start with things that we know we can do and not wait until the last second. Dr. Brooks said that it sounds like a good goal, but in the document that was just sent out about the workload pilot, it looks like the actual implementation would not be until January 2015. The Provost stated that fall 2014 is the pilot. They are not looking at the evaluation piece, just the workload. People wanted more flexibility. Within the departments, they will be looking at four areas. They want to run a pilot and clarify policy.
Dr. Thomas asked if the Cost Containment Committee is discussing restructuring and what are the dollar amounts associated with restructuring. Dr. Trumbach responded that they have not got into the dollar amount or talked about restructuring at all on the academic side. They are still in the data-gathering piece of the non-academic side. She has been documenting problem areas, particularly in background processes, such as hiring and purchasing. They are still very much data gathering. Each group sent out their own survey. A lot of information in HR is not really accurate. She would like to identify priorities. Dr. Thomas replied that she was thinking more of the merging of colleges and schools. Dr. Trumbach’s understanding is that the Cost Containment Committee will have an opportunity and the Senate plenty of time to discuss.

Dr. Christy Corey was worried about the timeline of June 30. When can we expect some of these major mergers and changes when there is a 12-month requirement? The Provost explained that the burden really is on the non-academic side. On the academic side, the priority is to get scheduling for the fall. The whole idea of restructuring will come after we build the schedule, which will not be done in two weeks. We are looking at the University of Louisiana at Monroe, which is what the ULS would like us to do. There are no decisions about the colleges, no smoke and mirrors. It might be a timing issue. It is not just about administrative savings; part of revitalization is how can we reposition the programs. Once we go through this exercise, there needs to be a marketing program. Having been here a year, to establish some accountability, he is going to develop a work plan for administration and will be breaking down this coming year what offices are responsible for what.

At this point, Dr. Brooks announced that she had a 4:30pm class at the Jefferson Center and that Dr. Trumbach would continue the meeting.

Dr. Schock referred to the $6M structural deficit and asked Dr. Payne to confirm that he had heard him correctly: that most of the budget cuts required to reduce the entire deficit to zero will be made on the non-academic side. The Provost replied that he wants to get with the others and see where they are on the non-academic side. Dr. Schock continued by saying that he was aware that it was difficult to make academic cuts in the duration of this fiscal year, and that he and many others had the impression that we would have to plan for academic cuts next year in order to entirely zero out the structural deficit. In fact, in the run-up to today’s meeting, he said, the prospect of cuts to programs and academic personnel next year has terrified many. He said: if it turns out that it is not possible to retire most of the deficit through cuts to the non-academic side, then his modest proposal is that the Faculty Senate request information. Specifically, we need to know the amount that has to be cut this fiscal year and the next to convince the ULS that we have done our due diligence. Those budget cut targets seem necessary for planning. He concluded by saying that he strongly believes that we need to be looking not only at cuts, but at encouraging enrollment growth as well: academic departments can work in partnership with the Office of Enrollment Services to recruit new students for the fall. He forwarded a proposal today to the academic deans that asks them to consider directing department chairs to build student recruiting activity into departmental strategic plans. Last semester, English brought 58 high school students to campus for a two-day recruiting event, and we will continue the effort this semester. Dr. David Meredith, Director of Enrollment Services, has pledged to assist any department willing to take on student recruiting activity; his staff has provided essential support to English.
Ms. Arnold was curious if the Cost Containment Committee or the Senate Executive Committee had ever seen a breakdown on where the money in the deficit is from, and, if not, cannot the Senate request to see it. Dr. Trumbach explained that a number of presentations were given. In past years, we based our budget on student projections, and when the money did not come in, we took it out of Reserves, for many years. Now, there is not much wiggle room in the Reserves.

Dr. John Gery said that he would like to reinforce and add to Dr. Baxter’s earlier statement about faculty participation. He had written something down but not really a whole statement. He was not sure in the January 9 memo which changes had been made and which were proposed, and he would like in writing a clear indication of how decisions were made and what faculty members were consulted. Dr. Gery read from the first page of his draft statement (see Appendix 6) and emphasized question #23 re minimum class size. Dr. Trumbach requested that Dr. Gery give Ms. Morgan his document and perhaps the Cost Containment Committee can address it. A lot of it is related to SACS, and they had talked specifically about class size. We have been told that if a minimum class size did not make, the class would be cancelled, but we have also been told that is not true. Ms. Michelle Esposito asserted that if we have this minimum, we cannot reach it, and we cut classes before they begin, people will not be able to graduate and we are set up to fail. She concluded by stating that people should not talk about adjuncts – they are real people, too.

A faculty member from the Sociology Department said that waiting a month to have more conversation about this is really too long and asked if we could have a UNO community meeting. Dr. Speaker responded that there are several mechanisms: The Senate can have additional meetings; there is also the Faculty Council, but it needs the signatures of 50 people to call a meeting and it can be called on short notice. He said that he is also frustrated by the deliberate slowness when the Senate meets only once a month. He is the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council Committee. Dr. Goss suggested that we might write up what we want, address it to Ms. Connie Phelps, Faculty Council President, and request her to call a meeting at the earliest possible date according to the bylaws. Another faculty member who works with graduate students asked if it is appropriate to invite Administration to come, and students and staff as well. Dr. Speaker replied that the Faculty Council Committee can invite anyone it wants to invite. Dr. Baxter stated that he is in favor of a Faculty Council meeting and added that in about two weeks we should have more knowledge of the proposal and the fall schedule will be in progress. The numbers do not really add up, clarity is not there, and it does not add up to him if we can close a $6M budget deficit by June 30. Communication is very important.

Dr. Christine Day stated that she came in late and someone might already have asked this question: Is the Cost Containment Committee trying to cut costs without knowing what costs what? Dr. Trumbach responded that they had pretty good information; no targets, but how much each unit is costing. In response to Dr. Spinu’s question, Dr. Trumbach replied that they had not seen any proposals yet. She does not know how far along they are in putting things together, but she has heard rumors. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that it would be useful to have more information. Dr. Trumbach explained that the non-academic side was 62% of the budget; it should be flip flopped to 40/60 (academic/non-academic). There has been a lot of work on the non-academic side, and they discovered a lot of places where people are doing duplicative jobs. Dr. Ehrenfeucht said that it would be nice to have a breakdown of which divisions cost what. Dr.
Trumbach closed by saying that she would like to see questions by Friday so they could address those questions at the meeting.


8. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Dr. Enrique La Motta and seconded by Dr. Speaker. The meeting adjourned at 4:44pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
February 18, 2014

APPENDIX 1 (Announcement re Anti-smoking Law and Its Implementation at UNO):

Since I will miss the Senate meeting (class) I wanted to send you a short report on the anti-smoking law and its implementation at UNO. The LA legislature enacted Senate Bill 36/Act #211 in 2013 which mandates Louisiana public colleges and universities be smoke-free by August 1, 2014. The law allows us to also be tobacco-free if we desire and that is the direction the implementation committee has taken from President Fos. We’re currently working on devising and implementing a tobacco-free policy for UNO, to take effect August 1, 2014 and have been asked to tell our colleagues (in my case faculty) that the policy is coming so nobody is surprised on August 1. Can you please make a short announcement about this for me?

APPENDIX 2 (Announcement):

General Education Notes

Faculty Senate Meeting

January 27, 2014

The General Education Committee has worked diligently since Spring 2013 to ensure compliance with related SACSCOC standards. The existing menu of 1725 courses that satisfy general education requirements creates a number of problems, not the least of which are conducting student learning assessment and supporting the curriculum in a cost effective manner. In light of cost containment measures and in an effort to responsibly allocate critical faculty resources, a proposed course menu has been developed.

In summary, changes to the general education curriculum are being made for the following reasons:
1. Improve general education assessment (which in turn will inform program improvement)
2. Reduce cost associated with the general education component of the programs of study
3. Ensure compliance with SACSCOC standards associated with general education
4. Build capacity to thread critical skills across general education courses in the future

While menu decisions must be made very quickly in order to implement for the 2014-15 academic year, please note that the menu will evolve and general education discussions will continue. A two year plan is being developed to ensure that assessment specific to the general education student learning outcomes will be conducted in the selected courses.

Faculty should review the memo and proposed course menu, then send feedback to the Office of Academic Affairs by Thursday, January 30.

More information: [www.uno.edu/general-education](http://www.uno.edu/general-education)

**APPENDIX 3**

Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy

January 23, 2014

The Office of Academic Affairs has reviewed the resolution developed by the UNO Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Our office recognizes the importance of all faculty members to the fulfillment of UNO's mission including tenure track and non-tenure track faculty hired on a full or part time basis.

We recognize that the draft policy developed by the Office of Academic Affairs did not address the workload circumstances of all faculty employed at UNO as it primarily was conceptualized as a model for faculty in tenure/tenure track positions. We are committed to developing an effective model of assigning, reporting, and evaluating workload for all faculty.

This response is organized in three parts: a response to each Resolution and an outline of our plan to develop a faculty load policy.

**Resolution 1**

*Elimination of the requirement for quantification of the distribution of faculty effort dedicated to teaching, learning, and service.*

The Office of Academic Affairs endorsed the concept of using a single metric to assign faculty workload but supports the ability of individual weights for specific faculty tasks (e.g., teaching, research, service) to be adjusted for individual faculty. We concur with the resolution that a "more flexible approach is warranted to determining the distribution of
Resolution 2

Establish a committee to develop a workload/evaluation policy for full and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach.

The Office of Academic Affairs is committed to developing a workload policy that encompasses the needs of both full and part-time faculty engaged in differing levels of teaching, research and service responsibilities. (see plan outlined below). Appointing a specific committee comprised of part time faculty and faculty primarily assigned to the role of teaching will not support our effort to develop an inclusive policy.

The Office of Academic Affairs will appoint a committee to assist in the implementation of a new Faculty Workload Policy and ensure representation of full and part-time faculty as well as faculty more heavily engaged in teaching, research, and/or service. In addition to faculty, the committee will include other constituencies relevant to successful implementation of the workload policy (see plan outlined below).

Outline to Develop a Revised Faculty Workload Policy

Part One: Workload assignment

The first step is the design of the framework used to assign faculty workload. Initial work has begun to develop a working model based on a percentage metric. Following are principles informing the model:

- Model should be developed to apply to all faculty
- Model should address the three main responsibilities of faculty: teaching, research and service
- Model should allow flexibility to adjust to individual responsibilities assumed by faculty in a given semester

Part Two: Evaluation

The second step is the design of the specific procedures to be used by each unit to establish expectations and evaluation targets for each of the three areas of faculty work: teaching, research, and service. Following are principles informing the model:

- Performance targets should be individualized to meet the need of each unit
- Performance targets should align with expectations of for each critical faculty role: teaching, research, and service
- Performance targets should be stated in a manner to support accurate reporting and effective evaluation of faculty efforts
- Policy should include accountability measures to ensure that faculty productivity is reported, measured and recognized
Development and Adoption of New Workload Policy

**Phase 1 – Pilot**

With input from the Office of Research, the Office of Academic Affairs is in the process of adjusting the original model presented in the initial policy statement.

Working procedures need to developed to support pilot implementation.

Draft procedures will be piloted in Fall 2014.

**Phase 2 – Adoption**

Draft workload policy and procedures will be revised/finalized based on Fall 2014 pilot and adopted for Spring 2015 implementation.

To prepare for the pilot activity, the following actions must take place during the Spring 2014 semester:

- Assignment of unit-specific teaching, research, service weights by deans to use for the purpose of the fall 2014 pilot
- Charge of a committee to support the pilot
- Development of draft procedures to support the pilot
- Alignment of pilot work with implementation of Faculty 180 to report faculty effort

**APPENDIX 4 (Report from Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee re “Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy”):**

January 27, 2014

I. Senate Committee on Academic Freedom met last week with Provost Payne and Bill Sharpton to discuss response of Academic Affairs to Senate workload policy resolutions passed last October.

   A. We did not discuss on-line teaching policy. That will happen at a later meeting

   B. Each Senator should have a copy of Academic Affairs’ “Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy, 1/23/14.” [see Appendix 3]
1. I will briefly summarize the meeting and then the entire Senate can decide at our next meeting if we should respond in any way to the proposed policy.

II. Summary of Resolution

A. Response to resolution 1 about workload policy: Academic Affairs proposes a single metric to assign faculty workload (each unit must propose percent teaching, research, and service) that generally applies to all faculty.

1. However, the Provost supports flexibility, including individual weights for each task adjusted for individual faculty members.

B. Response to resolution 2 about workload policy for non-regular faculty: Academic Affairs proposes a single committee charged with implementation of workload policy for both full-time and part-time faculty.

C. Academic Affairs proposes a 2-phase implementation process:
   1. Pilot program in Fall, 2014
   2. Full adoption of workload policy in January 2015

APPENDIX 5 (Dr. Trumbach’s Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee report):

The CCRC is co-chaired by VP of Business Affairs Gregg Lassen and Provost Jim Payne. Gregg Lassen has spearheaded the efforts to review the non-Academic units at the University as the primary areas for Cost Containment. The Provost has been in charge of all efforts related to restructuring the Academic units as a means to improve efficiency and position the University for revitalization. The Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee consists of approximately 20 individuals from throughout the University, with 2 Deans from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Education, 2 Department Chairs from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences and 4 other faculty members from the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Sciences and Business. The Committee met three times last semester for broad information gathering meetings, one of which was with the Deans and Department Chairs. From those meetings we learned that there would be sub-committees to consider Cost Containment options. Department Chairs were asked to submit information to fit into a rubric to be used to evaluate programs. I believe that as faculty members, we were all under the impression that our main responsibility was to be to sort through that information and contribute to a plan for the restructuring of the Academic Units. We were also wary that we may end up as a “rubber stamp,” committee but hoping that the decisions would not happen that way.

The committee has met every Friday since January 11th. On January 11th, Dr. Lassen assigned members to one of six subcommittees: a) evaluation of academic programs; b) evaluating student worker assignments; c) evaluation of graduate assistant assignments; d) evaluation of assignments of periods of appointment; e) evaluation of assignment of probationary classified employees; and f) evaluation of assignment of unclassified staff appointments.
Some of us were surprised to learn that only Dean Graves from Liberal Arts and Dean Kruger from Education were on the Academic Restructuring Sub-Committee. However, the committee assignments were handed out at the end of the meeting and there really was not time for questions or discussion on the matter.

Since then the committees have been interviewing departments around campus, focusing on identifying cost savings on the non-Academic side of the institution. Our recommendations will be turned in this week. In general, on Academic side, the faculty members on the CCRC have had opportunities to discuss the process by which decisions were made but have not been involved in the decisions making at all. The document that the Provost sent out last week with all his many points was discussed at great length with the CCRC committee.

APPENDIX 6 (Dr. John Gery’s draft statement):

For Questions from the floor, UNO Faculty Senate, Monday, 27 January 2014

[This is a draft statement only]

In whatever way it is appropriate, I would request that members of the Faculty Senate propose and vote on a resolution to be presented to the relevant UNO administration as an effort to address the following statement of concern:

John Gery, Research Professor of English

As a member of the faculty in the Department of English since 1979, I appreciate the critical situation of the “current financial situation” of the university. Also, I appreciate the Provost Payne’s concern (stated in his Memorandum of 16 January 2014) about the difficulty of finding “a common time by which we might meet to best disseminate information” addressing the situation. Further, I appreciate his wish, stated in the same memorandum, of making a “continued effort to be as transparent and communicative as possible.”

Furthermore, as far as I understand it, by the longstanding policy of shared governance of the university, I as a faculty member have not only the right but the obligation to participate in
matters that affect the day-to-day operation of the university – in particular as pertain to all academic and curricular matters. In order to exercise that participation, it is important that I as a faculty member be as informed as possible about pending proposals and changes in these matters and that I offer my views on these matters as part of the process of their being implemented – before they are implemented.

Having considered with some care the three recent electronic memoranda received from the Provost dated 9 January, 16 January, and 24 January, I have a list of questions related to what I consider to be significant academic and curricular matters for which greater transparency and communication is needed before I can understand their efficacy. I think I also may be speaking for other colleagues on the faculty who are not currently serving in administrative positions and who share with me a wish more fully to understand both the nature of the deliberations and the full rationale as to how each of the “efforts towards Cost Containment and Revitalization” listed by the Provost in these memoranda will “reflect not only cost savings but will also enhance the academic integrity of the institution in the long-run.” But whether I am alone in these having questions or not, I am asking the Faculty Senate to consider a resolution to request specific information in response to these questions, according to my reading of the memoranda:

9 January 2014:

1. [para 1] Is it possible to provide an outline or detail how the “major culture shift” proposed is “a result of years of fiscal mismanagement and lack of willingness on the part of the academic leadership [in the past] to make tough decisions”? I do not have such a memory of past leadership behaving this way.

2. [para 1] Which academic committees and/or members of the faculty* participated in determining how the items listed in this memo “will...enhance the academic integrity” of UNO “in the long-run”?

[*I recognize that members of the administration are also members of the faculty, but when I use that phrase here I intend it to refer to those not serving in administrative roles.]
3. **General education**: Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining the “streamlining” of enrollment in general education courses with a minimum of 30 students. What specific courses are included in this number?

4. **Scheduling policy**: Were members of the faculty consulted in advance of the new university scheduling policy as relevant to the appropriate course of study in their separate fields? If so, who?

5. **Annual Program Reviews**: Which members of the faculty participated in the process of “developing databases and analyzing data” relevant to the widely diverse programs of study and research at UNO?

6. **Scholarships from General Revenue**: Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining to “reduce the amount of scholarships funded from general revenue”?

7. **Graduate Assistantships and Tuition Waivers**: Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining the “decoupling” of Graduate Assistantships and Tuition Waivers, and was any study made of what the impact such a “decoupling” will have on recruitment of students in the fields where this decoupling will take place?

8. **Advising**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in the evaluation of advising and the effectiveness of the current procedures?

9. **Additional Compensation Policy**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in revising “the additional compensation policy to control costs”?

10. **College Administrative Restructuring**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate before the fact in the proposed realignment of the administrative structure within colleges and departments? Will Deans do more than “discuss” these proposed changes with faculty, or will faculty members be given the opportunity to propose changes, to advocate for changes that will “effectively position programs for growth with the appropriate support staff and marketing of programs,” and to vote on those changes, if necessary?
11. **Library Restructuring**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the Library and the long-term advantages and risks of its evolving into a “Library as a Teaching and Learning Commons”? Will that term be defined?

12. **Study Abroad Programs**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the “financial transparency, efficient use of resources, and appropriate credentialing of participating faculty” in UNO’s Study Abroad programs?

13. **Jefferson Center**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the role of the Jefferson Center as a teaching resource and facility relevant to UNO’s urban mission?

14. **Centers and Institutes**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees are participating in the evaluation of “all centers and institutes,” not only in terms of their “cost-benefit” but also in their role in the city, the region, the state, the nation, the world, and the profession?

15. **INTO Joint Venture**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in composing and approving the “Letter of Intent with INTO”? What will be the role of faculty in evaluating potential international students, as well as in determining whether their eligibility for undergraduate and graduate study at UNO might not qualify them to be competitive for financial support or “tuition discounting”?

16. **Substitutions**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the policy that no more than 5 substitutions of coursework prescribed can be used toward the satisfaction of degree requirements?

17. **Waivers**: Is the requirement that all waivers be approved through Academic Affairs a change in policy? If so, what alternatives for appeal or other means will students and faculty have, in the event that a waiver is approved by faculty in the field but denied by Academic Affairs (or the other way around)? How is this policy change a change from the current policy, exactly?
18. **Waivers of Degree Requirements**: How is this a policy change? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in changing this policy?

19. **Percentage of Coursework toward Undergraduate Degree**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in the deliberations of these figures? What rationale was provided for these figures to be set? Was there any dissenting view? What alternatives were discussed? By whom?

20. **Undergraduate Second Degree**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that the SAP toward a first degree completion should be “frozen” never to be re-used? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that “new/second degrees should be at least 30 hours of unique coursework within the major of the new/second degree” and was any discussion held concerning different degrees with varying requirements and options? Was any study made of the potential impact of this change on efforts to recruit students interested in earning two degrees? If so, by whom?

21. **Cross Listed Coursework Applied as Graduate Credit**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the policy that no more than 25% of hours taken at the 5000 level can be applied to graduate graduation requirements? Was any discussion held concerning the widely varying current requirements in different fields for graduate degrees, the ability of individual departments and faculty members to meet this policy effectively while also meeting the new requirements for minimum class-size (see No. 23 below), and other issues related to the academic content of 5000-level courses?

22. **Graduate Students Taking Undergraduate Courses for Credit**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the graduate students will be restricted to enrolling for credit no more that [sic: than] 10% of their graduate program hours with undergraduate hours”? Was any discussion held concerning the widely varying current requirements in different fields for graduate degrees, or the ability of individual departments and faculty members to meet this policy effectively while also meeting the new requirements for minimum class-size (see No. 23 below)?
23. **Minimum Class Size:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the numbers for all courses on minimum class size? Was any research conducted in various fields to determine whether these minimum numbers have proved effective, not only in terms of the academic success of students, but in terms of retention, in terms of recruitment, in terms of graduation rates, and in terms of success of students in gaining employment after university? If so, can we see the results of that research, as well as study the rationale for these class sizes, specifically as related to the “academic integrity of the institution in the long-run” as expressed by the Provost in the lead paragraph of this memo?

24. **Change of Grade:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this policy change? How is it a change from the preceding policy?

25. **W Policy:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this policy? To what, exactly, does the directive, “Faculty need to consider some evaluation before mid-term” apply? Are faculty to consider the revised process of evaluation to be used before midterm in the current term? Or are faculty members being directed to evaluate students before midterm in some fashion this term? Clarification is needed.

26. **Defining Excused Absence:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in developing a “university-wide excused absence policy”?

27. **Intellectual Property:** By what means is it proposed to enforce the current intellectual property policy?

28. **Posting of Syllabus in Moodle:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this requirement? What is the rationale for instituting this as a requirement for courses not taught on Moodle? What if an individual faculty member prefers not to post a syllabus on Moodle?

29. **Changes of Major, Minor, Concentrations:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that no changes to these can be made in the final term of enrollment? What if a student discovers a full compliance with one of these areas during the last term?
30. **Academic Amnesty**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in reviewing (and revising or deciding not to revise) the current policy of academic amnesty?

31. **Placement Exams**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that placement exams will not be accepted beyond 2000 level courses and/or will not be allowed in the final term of a student’s enrollment?

32. **Variance Model**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the use of variance funds and their impact on department’s curricular efficacy?

**Memorandum of 16 January 2014:**

1. [para 2, point 1]: With what members of the faculty and/or with what faculty committees did the Office of Academic Affairs consult before “beginning to compile recommendations for program restructuring to be more cost effective”? Were programs, departments, and/or colleges given an opportunity to identify for themselves how to become more cost efficient, as well as to determine their necessity to the core mission of UNO?

2. **General Education Committee**: What rationale was discussed by this committee in determining the need for courses as 1000-2000 level? Were faculty consulted in studying the importance of these courses to the core mission of the university? Are the minutes of their meetings available for review by the faculty?

3. When UL President Karla Hughes visited the UNO campus, was she invited to meet with or consult any members of the faculty? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees were consulted beforehand in determining which efforts toward cost containment need to be emphasized in discussions with the UL Board?
4. **Scheduling policy**: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the new scheduling policy?

5. **Workload policy**: What timeline is being considered to develop a workload policy that involves faculty participation in its design and implementation?

6. **Evaluation of academic programs**: What procedure will be followed in the evaluation of academic programs that will precede any proposals for restructuring of academic units? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in both drawing up the procedure and evaluating programs to assure a knowledgeable and informed evaluation of UNO’s widely diverse departments and programs?

I am certain that some of these questions may be moot or may be considered outside the purview of faculty or of shared governance. I also suspect many further questions are unanswered, as I have drawn up these questions in a short time without a chance to consult colleagues for responses and insight into the particulars. Please forgive the oversight or my lack of sufficient knowledge of the by-laws of shared governance at UNO. Still, I do hope the spirit of this document is clear and that it can be seen to express the wishes of UNO’s faculty (especially those of us with a lifetime of commitment to the sustenance, growth, academic and professional success, personal well-being, and cultural empowerment of UNO’s remarkable students and alumni) to nurture and strengthen the university for the foreseeable future, in keeping with the distinctive, honorable, and substantive character of its past. While all of us I recognize, I think, the financial realities which the times have imposed on our day-to-day efforts to educate and build a rich long-term future for this city, the region and the world outside us, to lose sight of our fundamental vision, our stellar record of diversity of every kind (socially and ethically, as well as intellectually), and our steadfast commitment not to agencies or institutions but to the people who come to us eager to improve their lives is to render “cost containment” as an empty gesture on behalf of those who may not be unaware of what we actually do here. Without careful consideration of the full impact of each of these proposed or mandated changes, we risk abandoning the fundamental interests of those in our community (namely, our students and fellow citizens), without whom we have no purpose.

Thank you for your consideration.
UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, February 25, 2014
Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at 3:09 PM by Dr. Elaine Brooks.

2. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current roster of Faculty Senators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Rachel Kincaid  (13-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>Derek Rodriguez (13-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon Bonds (13-14) Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc. Adjunct</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (vacant) (13-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (SE) (13-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James Logan (12-15) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt Zingoni (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie Trumbach (11-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark Reid (13-16) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy Corey (13-16) Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan Miestchovich (13-16) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard Speaker (SE) (13-16) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus Watson (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly Thomas (13-16) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt Lyons (11-14) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul Bole (11-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique La Motta (SE) (11-14) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose Hajra (12-15) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos Xiros (12-15) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios Charalampidis (13-16) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve Striffler (SE) (11-14) Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert Montjoy (13-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John Kiefer (11-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine Day (11-14) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine Brooks (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter Yaukey (12-15) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James Lowry (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla Nelson (12-15) Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern Baxter (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Beth Blankenship (12-15) Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Connie Atkinson (11-14) Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Approval of minutes from the 1/27/14 meeting:**
Ms. Connie Phelps moved and Mr. Derek Rodriguez seconded to approve the minutes of the 1/27/14 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Brooks):**

   a) Dr. Brooks stated that because Faculty Senate had been so busy since November, we have had to table voting on the bylaws. She encouraged everyone to reread the bylaws revisions, which will be discussed and voted on at the March meeting.

   b) Dr. Brooks announced that the Faculty Welfare Committee will be charged with doing a faculty survey on morale and welfare. Dr. John Kiefer from the Committee added that the Committee had spoken about creating a short survey on the most important things that the Faculty wants the Committee to pursue.

   c) Dr. Brooks read from a Department of Foreign Languages announcement on its International Conference AIZEN/University of New Orleans on “Emile Zola and Naturalism,” *(see Appendix 1)*, which will take place at UNO from March 6-8, 2014. People will be coming from around the world. We can go to the Foreign Languages website for more details.

   d) Dr. Brooks read the email that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee sent President Fos the past Wednesday about the draft of a proposal to establish a Faculty Governance Committee *(see Appendix 2)*. The memo was well received, but there is a lot to do put it in place, including how to manage the committee, policies, logistics, and membership. Dr. Fos responded that he approved such a committee and suggested that someone from Research and Sponsored Programs be a member. This is an ongoing process, as we have to continue to work together as a UNO community to make the changes necessary and involve faculty in shared governance.
5. Update on Faculty Council Resolution of February 14, 2014 and other issues (President Peter Fos):

President Fos read his response to the Faculty Council resolution (see Appendix 3), handing a copy to Dr. Brooks and Ms. Phelps. Dr. Brooks asked Dr. Fos if he wanted to discuss what he had said at the morning’s University Council meeting. Dr. Fos replied that the Provost had come to him on Tuesday asking to step down on March 14 and be assigned to two very important tasks. First, to do the Louisiana Grad Act report, which was 66 pages long last year and shepherded and mostly written by the Provost. It is most important this year because of the Governor’s executive budget proposal allowing institutions to keep their Grad Act monies. Outside reviewers gave us 100 last year; we were one of three schools receiving the highest rating. Secondly, to do the narrative for the SACSCOC compliant certification document. Provost Payne had also asked if he could maintain the title of Provost since he was doing job searches. After talking to his bosses in Baton Rouge and consulting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Dr. Fos agreed to the request. His bosses in Baton Rouge suggested that he hire Dr. Rich Hansen as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Hansen agreed to come and will begin probably March 10 or 11. This was very well received by the UL System Office and the Board of Regents. Dr. Hansen is very calm and easy to work with, and he will be a very different Provost. Dr. Fos will start a search for a permanent Provost sometime in March, and he will ask Dr. Brooks for faculty members for the search committee. Ideally, there will be a new Provost by April 2015 when SACS comes.

Dr. Fos referred to the meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and he was very happy with the proposal that came from that committee. He never had the intention not to have shared faculty governance and will try to do things bottom up. But we are not going back to how it used to be. We need to look at efficiencies, make the workload better, and do evaluations, but he wants the faculty to help him decide how to do it.

Dr. Polly Thomas thanked Dr. Fos for listening to us, and Dr. Fos responded with a thank you. He wants to hear what we have to say as he was not hearing it before. He emphasized that he will definitely be a better President going forward, which was followed by a round of applause.

6. WISE Report (Ms. Rachel Kincaid, Vice-President of External Affairs):

Ms. Kincaid discussed the 2014 Legislative Agenda (see her WISE Fund Overview, Appendix 4 and PowerPoint, Appendix 5). She and Dr. Fos have been working very hard on the proposal, with three aggressive outcomes. She also passed out a copy of a Letter to Governor Jindal from Higher Education Leaders re the Workforce and Innovation for a Stronger Economy (WISE) Plan, signed by all 46 public college presidents in the state. She anticipates UNO’s allocation to be somewhere between $2.3 to $2.5M. Each plan would have an industry partner. There is list of 4- and 5-STAR jobs in the “Legislative Agenda” document, but it is really the campus’ decision on which ones to focus; the larger the degree production, the bigger the share. The plan is currently just for the public universities.
There was a question from the gallery if it included oil-industry jobs; Ms. Kincaid replied yes. Dr. Thomas expects that Ms. Kincaid will keep us informed on what the bill number is and when we can email using our private emails. Ms. Kincaid said that it was from House Communications and, so far, there has been no push-back at all. Someone else from the gallery asked if Dr. Kincaid could describe how she envisions the implementation. That is one of the things she is working on now. They would like to have these policies done first, mindful of the pitfalls from the Grad Act, but proposals are to come from the campus.

Dr. Vern Baxter asked why our legislative goal is to have the same state funding as last year when we have lost so much in the past. Why ask for level funding? Ms. Kincaid responded that their goal was to maintain Grad Act funding and create additional funds. They are going to be sitting down with the gubernatorial candidates and talk about funding. She wishes that it could be more. They will be asking new administrators to include it in their platforms. In response to Dr. Tu Shengru’s question, Ms. Kincaid said that our goal is to have more funding. Dr. Christine Day asked Dr. Kincaid if she finds that current legislators and current government are aware that Governor Blanco’s funding was based on pre-Katrina. Ms. Kincaid replied yes, they remember it very well, but it is very difficult for them to give UNO an extra 10% without the other schools in the system being affected.

7. QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Report (Dr. Donna Dickerson, Executive Director, The Graduate School):

Dr. Brooks announced that there will be an open forum on March 20 in KH122, sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Graduate School.

Dr. Dickerson explained that we are in the process of preparing the reaffirmation for SACSCOC. There are two parts: One is the compliance report led by Drs. Bill Sharpton and Leslie Culver; the second part is the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) (see her PowerPoint, Appendix 6). The definition by SACS of QEP: “Focused plan of action that enhances student learning.” It is a very broad definition because it recognizes the entire student. We need to be mindful of the urban mission of the University. The Steering Committee for SACS also established some criteria for UNO. SACS does not care about how big the QEP is, so we have to be mindful of budget limitations and try to leverage the resources that we have. Implementation is for 2016, and she is hoping to have a topic by the middle of April. The written plan has to be 75 pages with 25 pages of appendices, is due to SACS in February 2015, and would be approved in December 2015 along with the UNO reaffirmation. Dr. Dickerson mentioned the names of members in the Topic Selection Committee and added that the easiest way to get to the website is from a link on the Faculty/Staff Resources page to the QEP page. There is a “Suggest a Topic” button with a very short Qualtrics survey. Some suggested topics are included, but the plan is to submit ideas of our own; there are just three topics from faculty groups so far. If we are not comfortable doing it in the survey, we can send her an email, give her a call, or write it on a napkin. The more topics, the better choices from which to choose. The main question: If there is anything that you could do to improve student learning at UNO, what would it be? As soon as the topic is selected in April, another committee will be put together to write the plan, calling upon those with expertise in what the topic will be.
8. Committee reports:

Evaluation of Administrators—Evaluation of Dean Sharon Mader and Dean Steven Johnson (Dr. Brooks):

Dr. Dinah Payne, Ms. Phelps, and Dr. Brooks will be working on the Qualtrics Surveys of the evaluations of Deans Sharon Mader and Steven Johnson. The evaluations will be sent out sometime between March 15 and March 30, and it all needs to be completed by May.


Ms. Phelps reminded everyone that at the Faculty Council meeting on Valentine’s Day [February 14], there was an interest in having another Faculty Council meeting. A proposed meeting is tentatively set for Tuesday, March 11 in the afternoon, and she will send out more information. There are two things on the agenda: Dr. Andrew Goss’ proposal to shift the authority of some committees to the Faculty Council and the proposed Faculty Governance Committee since it reports to Faculty Council.

11. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Ms. Beth Blankenship and seconded by Dr. Richard Speaker. The meeting adjourned at 4:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
March 14, 2014

APPENDIX 1 (Department of Foreign Languages announcement on the International Conference AIZEN/University of New Orleans on “Emile Zola and Naturalism”):

Emile Zola and Naturalism Conference - Dear colleagues and friends,

It is our pleasure to announce that the program of the International Conference AIZEN/University of New Orleans on “Emile Zola and Naturalism” (March 6-8, 2014) is now posted on our website, at the following address:

http://www.ualberta.ca/~aizen/events/

AIZEN- International Association for Multidisciplinary Approaches and Comparative Studies related to Emile Zola and his time, Naturalism, Naturalist Writers and Artists, Naturalism and the Cinema around the World
During Spring Break 2014, the UNO College of Liberal Arts and the Department of Foreign Languages will co-host the International Conference on Emile Zola and Naturalism (March 6-8, 2014, right after Mardi Gras). Dr. Juliana Starr, Associate Professor of French, is the Chief Organizer and other sponsors include Center Austria, the Diversity Committee. Professors Olivier Bourderionnet in Foreign Languages and Hamp Overton in film are members of the organizing committee.

The sessions will be held on the second floor of the University Center, the opening cocktail will be at the UNO main campus art gallery and will feature "Southern Women at Work", a photography exhibit in conjunction with the conference, a film screening of the Louisiana feature "Low and Behold" will be in the Robert E. Nims Theater in the PAC, the banquet will be a river cruise on the Steamboat Natchez, and there will be an optional tour of Laura Plantation. 110 participants will be coming from 19 different countries including the USA, Norway, Portugal, Brazil, France, Germany, Austria, Canada, Switzerland, India, Lebanon, Tunisia, Finland, China, Senegal, and Japan. Most participants will be lodging at the Hampton Inn in the CBD, but approximately 25 graduate students will be lodging in the TRAC building on the UNO main campus.

13 people associated with UNO will be presenting papers: 3 faculty in Foreign Languages, 3 faculty in Film Studies, 2 faculty in English, 2 faculty in History and Women’s Studies, 2 graduate students in English and 1 former graduate student in Foreign Languages. All UNO faculty and students, as well as the general public, are invited to attend the sessions for free.

APPENDIX 2 (Faculty Senate Executive Committee memo to President Fos re a Faculty Governance Committee):

Dear Peter,

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met today and discussed a number of issues pertinent to the departure of the Provost. One very strong sentiment that was expressed was the idea that we greatly value the initiatives developed by the Office of Academic Affairs regarding a variety of issues. As a result, the Executive Committee developed a proposal for better shared governance between administration and faculty.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has proposed the establishment of the Faculty Governance Committee under the authority of the Faculty Council. This Committee is to be charged with the ongoing efforts, initiated by the Office of Academic Affairs, in the areas of program evaluation and review, performance evaluation, workload policy and unit restructuring.

We have determined membership of this committee to represent primarily faculty. As such, we constitute the committee to include all members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Officers of the Faculty Council and the members of the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee.

Additionally, we value chair and administrative faculty knowledge and insight; thus, we have determined to include two Deans and one Chair to be invited to join with the faculty in the commission of these efforts of this committee. We propose to include the Dean of the College of Education, the Interim Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Chair of the English Department.

While this is a proposal that awaits acceptance by all of the Officers of the Faculty Council, we have confidence that this proposal will go forward. As we greatly value your leadership in the efforts to
facilitate truly effective shared governance, we would value your recommendations for additional members of this Committee. Please let me know, at your earliest convenience, who you would recommend as being pro-active, positive influences on the formation of our own recommendations regarding program evaluation and review, performance evaluation, workload policy and unit restructuring.

Thank you for your continued good faith efforts to lead this University to the great heights our students deserve: we appreciate your efforts on our own behalf and especially on behalf of our students.

Elaine S. Brooks
Faculty Senate President

APPENDIX 3 (President Fos’ response to Faculty Council resolution of February 14, 2014):
Date: February 24, 2014

To: Faculty Council

From: Peter J. Fos, Ph.D., M.P.H. President

Re: Response to Resolution

I appreciate receiving the resolution from the Faculty Council passed on Friday February 14, 2014. I can sense the passion, dedication, and commitment of the Faculty Council for the University of New Orleans in the resolution. I commend the work of the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee in developing the resolution which was passed by the Faculty Council. I particularly agree with the words “Without increasing the number of students and improving student retention, the university will not be able to solve its budget problems.”

I have decided the following: further development and implementation of policies will stop immediately and will begin very soon after I am ensured that formal faculty involvement occurs through working with the Faculty Senate.

I feel that we must continue to work on the policies which have been under discussion for the past several months to identify efficiencies which do not affect accepted pedagogy. In effect, I have decided to lengthen the time horizon for instituting needed policies and policy changes. I did wish to include all policies that have been under discussion in our collective future discourse.

I welcome input and advice for all parties, especially for faculty through the Faculty Senate.

Cc: Dr. Elaine Brooks
APPENDIX 4 (Ms. Kincaid’s WISE Fund Overview):

WORKFORCE AND INNOVATION FOR A STRONGER ECONOMY (WISE) FUND

- Collaboration between higher education, economic development, and workforce commission
- Strategically aligns $40 million of NEW investment in higher education with emerging economic growth sectors
- Incentive fund is IN ADDITION to state base funding and tuition revenues
- Distributed competitively via defined performance measures:
  - 20% - Federal research expenditures
  - 80% - Degree production in 4- and 5-STAR jobs as indicated by the LA Workforce Commission include:
    - Computer Science
    - Construction Crafts
    - Data Analytics
    - Education
    - Engineering
    - Finance and Accounting
    - Healthcare
    - Industrial Production
• Requires 20% industry match to spur private investment in colleges and universities
  o New partnership between higher education and private industry to produce graduates with high-demand degrees, and enable students to link their coursework to projected workforce demands
  o Match could include scholarships, value of internships, in-kind contributions, facilities, equipment, software, technology and cash

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
• Creates a dedicated source of funding for higher education
• Multi-year commitment by the state to invest in higher education
• Spurs research innovation
• Unprecedented combination of education pipeline, workforce demand, and outcomes based funding
• Makes Louisiana a leader in the country in performance-based incentive funding tied to state policy for workforce initiatives
• Recognizes higher education’s role in growing Louisiana’s economy

PROPOSED BILL LANGUAGE:
• Would establish a NEW FUND in the state treasury as a special fund
• DIRECTS the state treasurer to deposit funds at the beginning of each fiscal year
  o Funds are treated the same as state general fund
  o Unexpended and unencumbered funds at year end are “rolled over”
• Funds are IN ADDITION TO all other funds allocated to higher ed
• Louisiana Board of Regents and the higher education management boards shall distribute the funds
• Funds will be monitored by the Chair of the Louisiana Board of Regents, Presidents of each System, Secretary of Louisiana Economic Development, and Executive Director of Louisiana Workforce Commission

APPENDIX 5 (Ms. Kincaid’s PowerPoint):
2014 Legislative Agenda

2014 Legislative Session: March 10 – June 2

Desired outcomes:

- Maintain level of support for UNO from State General Fund ($32 M)
- Allow UNO to retain revenue attributable to tuition increases authorized by LA–GRAD Act ($4.6M)
- Establish and fund new account in state treasury to incentivize workforce development partnerships between public higher ed and private industry ($2.5M)
2014 Legislative Agenda, cont.

Workforce and Innovation for a Stronger Economy (WISE) Fund:

- Gov. Jindal includes $40 million in his proposed budget for this purpose and plan has support of LA higher education leaders (joint letter).
- Awarded competitively based on federal research expenditures (20%) and degree production in targeted sectors (80%).
- Requires universities to identify 20% private sector match (facilities, internships, scholarships, equipment, etc.)
WORKFORCE AND INNOVATION FOR A STRONGER ECONOMY (WISE) PLAN

Examples of 4- and 5-STAR jobs:

- Computer Science
- Construction Crafts
- Education
- Engineering
- Finance and Accounting
- Healthcare
- Industrial Production

This DOES NOT de-emphasize the importance of liberal arts and other degrees.
WORKFORCE AND INNOVATION FOR A STRONGER ECONOMY (WISE) PLAN

Proposal from higher education and supported by all 46 statewide public universities and community colleges

Strategically aligns $40 million of NEW investment in higher education with emerging economic growth sectors

Distributed competitively via defined performance measures:
  • 20% – Federal research expenditures
  • 80% – Degree production in 4- and 5-STAR jobs as indicated by the LA Workforce Commission

Requires 20% industry match to spur private investment in colleges and universities
WORKFORCE AND INNOVATION FOR A STRONGER ECONOMY (WISE) PLAN

Proposed bill language:

- Establishes a NEW FUND in the state treasury
- Directs state treasurer to deposit funds at beginning of each fiscal year
- Funds are IN ADDITION TO all other funds allocated to higher ed
- LA Board of Regents and management boards shall distribute the funds
- Funds will be monitored by Board of Regents, Higher Ed Systems, LED, and LWC

APPENDIX 6 (Letter to the Governor re the Workforce and Innovation for a Stronger Economy (WISE) Plan.):

Letter to Governor Jindal from Higher Education Leaders

APPENDIX 6 (Dr. Dickerson’s PowerPoint):
Quality Enhancement Plan

Focused plan of action that enhances student learning

*SACS defines student learning broadly: knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, attitudes
SACS Criteria for the QEP

- Linked to University’s Mission
- Significant Impact (Transformative)
- Measureable Outcomes
- Capacity to Implement
- Broad-based involvement of the University

UNO’s Criteria for the QEP

- Not continue last QEP
- Budgetary Limitations: Leverage Current Resources
  - Ex: Brown Grant (Service Learning)
  - Ex: WISE Funding (Workforce Initiative)
- Relate to our urban mission
- Involve Academic and Student Affairs
- Include Innovations in Pedagogy
QEP Time Line

► April 2014: Topic Selected and Approved
► February 2015: Plan due to SACS (75 pp + 25 pp appendices)
► Evaluated by an External Evaluator
► April 2015: On-site Review Team will “quiz” us on the QEP
► Before Leaving UNO: On-site Review Team makes recommendation to accept, revise or reject QEP.
► December 2015: UNO is reaffirmed and QEP is approved
► Fall 2016: Begin implementation

Topic Selection Process (Spring 2014)

► QEP Topic Selection Committee
► Web Page
  http://www.uno.edu/quality-enhancement-plan/
  ► FAQs and other resources
  ► Link to QEPs at other universities
  ► Schedule for QEP presentations to various groups
  ► “Suggest a Topic” button will take you to a survey
► Meetings and Open Forums
► Solicitation of topics through web
► Evaluation of topics against SACS and UNO criteria
How to Participate

- Entire campus is invited to participate in forums
- Everyone is invited to submit QEP topics (April 1) at a meeting, by e-mail, or survey on website, napkin…
- Topics will be evaluated against a rubric that includes both the SACS and UNO criteria

Answer the Question

If there is one thing you could do to improve student learning at UNO, what would it be?
Suggested Topics to Date

- Global Citizenship
- General Education Reform
- Qualitative Reasoning
- Professional Communication Skills
- Engaged Learning in the Community
- Sophomore Year Experience
- Hazard and Disaster Resilience

---

The Survey

Thank you for taking the time to give feedback about the topics for UNO's Quality Enhancement Plan (2015-2020). We are in need of your input in order to narrow down the list of topics developed by the QEP topic selection committee. Below you will find a list of 7 possible topics. Please rank the topics in terms of how important they are to the University's mission, student learning, and student experiences. Then, if you wish, suggest your own topic.

For additional information, please contact Dr. Omena Dickerson at idickerson@uno.edu

Q1 - The following topics have been identified by the topic selection committee as having potential impact on student learning and student experiences at UNO. Please rank them with 1 being the least important topic for the QEP or, "having the least important topic for this plan."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Professional Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement through Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard and Disaster Resilience and Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Year Experience (FYE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 - Recognizing that the above topics may overlap each other, do you have any suggestions for a topic that might combine two or more of the above suggestions?

Q3 - What other topic(s) have potential impact on student learning and experiences at UNO that have not been mentioned above?
http://www.uno.edu/quality-enhancement-plan/
1. Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Dr. Elaine Brooks.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Rachel Kincaid (13-14)</th>
<th>Excused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>Derek Rodriguez (13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG President</td>
<td>Brandon Bonds (13-14)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Assoc.</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>(vacant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dinah Payne (SE) (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>James Logan (12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Matt Zingoni (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cherie Trumbach (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mark Reid (13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Christy Corey (13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ivan Miestchovich (13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Richard Speaker (SE) (13-16)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Zarus Watson (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Polly Thomas (13-16)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Matt Lyons (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paul Bole (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Enrique La Motta (SE) (11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Malay Ghose Hajra (12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nikolaos Xiros (12-15)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Dimitrios Charalampidis (13-16)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Steve Striffer (SE) (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Robert Montjoy (13-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>John Kiefer (11-14)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Christine Day (11-14)</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Elaine Brooks (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Peter Yaukey (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>James Lowry (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Marla Nelson (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Vern Baxter (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Beth Blankenship (12-15)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Approval of minutes from the 2/25/14 meeting:
Ms. Connie Phelps moved and Dr. Vern Baxter seconded to approve the minutes of the 2/25/14 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Brooks):

a) Dr. Brooks asked Dr. Dinah Payne to speak first since Dr. Payne had to leave early. Dr. Payne is the Senate representative from the UNO International Alumni Association, and they are looking for opportunities to get alumni engaged and for volunteers. A new program that they have is CASE Network (Connecting Alumni and Student Experience Network). Crawfish Mambo is scheduled for Saturday, May 10, and a sign-up sheet will be showing up shortly in an email from Dr. Brooks. Lakefront Service Day is Saturday, April 5, 9:00-11:00 AM. SUCbAUUF is also coming up.

b) Dr. Brooks said that a few weeks ago she sent out a document that listed the members of the Faculty Governance Committee. The Committee has met twice and is meeting again on Friday, March 28. The workload policy guidelines will be reviewed by every single faculty member on campus. A draft of overarching guidelines from a subcommittee will go to the full Committee on Friday. The draft will go to the Provost for approval, then to the deans, and then to the department chairpersons. Each chairperson of an academic unit will develop a discipline relevant guideline for determining workload equivalents. Each guideline per academic unit will be ratified by a vote of the faculty members in that department. The guidelines will then go to the deans who will subsequently report to the Provost. Once the
workload policy draft is completed, the Committee will begin work on policies for faculty evaluations.

Dr. Steven Shalit asked if the dean has to approve it or is simply reporting it. Dr. Brooks thinks that the dean would be reporting. Dr. David Beriss complemented the Committee on the process that departments would actually be working on this, which is a breath of fresh air compared to the previous process. Dr. James Lowry asked Dr. Brooks if she meant to keep saying “Provost.” Dr. Brooks replied that by the time we get it all done, we should have a new Provost. Dr. Shalit asked if we wanted to amend the language if there is no Provost. Dr. Brooks responded that it is just a draft right now.

c) Dr. Brooks reminded all Senate Standing Committees that the Faculty Senate Bylaws state that “Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee.” Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee, Academic Procedures and Standards Committee, Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee, Evaluation of Administrators Committee, Nominations and Elections Committee, and Faculty Welfare Committee will all submit an annual report in a written format for the next Faculty Senate meeting on Thursday, April 24th.

d) Dr. Brooks announced that Enrollment Services will be holding an open forum on the state of UNO’s student enrollment on April 9th from 3:00-4:30 PM in Kirschman 220 and encouraged everyone to attend. This forum is an updated report on UNO’s enrollment from the last forum that was held in December.

e) Dr. Brooks announced that the Evaluation of Administrators Committee will meet next week, and faculty will receive the evaluation surveys for Dean Mader and Dean Johnson in April. We will have two weeks to respond.

5. Vote on Faculty Senate Bylaws Revisions (Ms. Phelps; see Appendix 1):

Ms. Phelps reminded everyone that she had presented the revisions in November and went over why we made the major changes. The subcommittee proposed that we change the time of elections of senators to a little bit earlier, i.e., by April 1, and change election of officers from the first meeting of the year to the last meeting of the year so that they can be part of a transition team over the summer. Two people made suggestions at the November meeting: (1) That the Bylaws specifically state that Senate officers serve a one-year term; and (2) that it be clarified that people eligible to run are those who have just been elected and those who are continuing, but only the current senators can vote (Article III, Section B1).

Dr. Polly Thomas questioned the previous point and provided a different scenario that proposed that the people going off the Senate are not allowed to vote, but the new people are. Ms. Phelps and Dr. Cherie Trumbach attempted to explain why the original proposal would work better. While she understood fully what they were saying, it still did not make sense to Dr. Thomas. Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht said that the way in which it was worded made a lot of sense to her. Ms. Beth Blankenship said that we basically hit the ground running. Dr. Baxter also questioned why non-continuing members can vote. Ms. Phelps responded because they are still on the Senate. Dr. Baxter stated that it reinforces the reason why we have elections at the first meeting in August and agreed with the objection. We may have to stick without
having any transition period. Dr. Trumbach said that the whole point was trying to avoid what happened last summer when so much was going on and there were new officers who had never served before. The point was to try to correct that scenario from happening. Dr. Steve Striffler said that neither way is perfect. In the fall, we could potentially elect a whole group of officers who have never been on the Executive Committee – imperfect voting in the spring and imperfect method of electing officers in the fall. Dr. Lowry said that he was Vice President last year and had to serve most of the summer as President. No one ever asked him a thing, and the transition would have been much smoother if someone had.

Dr. Laszlo Fulop suggested that one solution is that new people would not be allowed to run for office. Dr. Brooks responded that we were trying to be more democratic. Dr. Fulop mentioned another solution: That there is always a transition period when there is a President and President-Elect. Ms. Phelps replied that we had talked about that. Dr. Striffler asked what happens if someone was formerly on Senate and is re-elected; the response was that that person is not continuing but new.

Dr. Thomas suggested that language that might be acceptable is that no first-year senator can be elected an officer. Dr. Fulop added that senators must have at least one-year of service to be elected. Dr. Shalit said that he was not sure why we are having restrictions at all. He likes the idea of a new Senate being able to vote. There was a proposal that the new Senate be allowed to vote. Dr. Brooks said that this would then be the last meeting. Dr. Baxter proposed that we elect people in April or leave it as it is. Dr. Brooks stated that we would want to meet with the new officers. Ms. Blankenship asked if we wanted to have some language where we require a transition meeting with the old and the new.

Dr. Thomas proposed, in the form of an amendment, that we change the term from August-August to April-April and that all new and continuing senators are eligible to vote and to run. Dr. Striffler stated that the assumption is that people who are going off as officers would be willing to help the new officers. We are moving the problem from one date to another. Dr. Brooks added that we are not always going to have a President who is willing to continue to work even though no longer President.

Ms. Phelps reiterated that we had an amendment to move the entire election process to April so that we have new senators present, and people who vote and who are eligible to run for office is a given. Dr. Thomas so moved, and Dr. Baxter seconded. The vote was 12 for, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention. The amendment passed.

Ms. Phelps asked if were ready to vote on the original motion as amended, but Dr. Thomas asked about other changes. Ms. Phelps referred to the section about representatives to statewide groups in section B. of the outline of changes and to other substantive changes in section C. of the outline of changes. Dr. Paul Bole questioned if it was appropriate to ask about retirees. Where does that come from? Ms. Phelps responded that it came from a member of the Senate Executive Committee. Dr. Bole asked if that person would be non-voting, to which Ms. Phelps replied that the person would be a senator. Dr. Beriss stated that
retirees do not work here anymore. Dr. Striffler added that the real trouble would be to find someone.

Dr. Trumbach made a motion to make an amendment to remove the retiree. Dr. Baxter seconded. Ms. Blankenship asked if we have any input on state benefits with the UL System Board. Dr. Brooks replied that they were supposed to be talking about that today, but the meeting was cancelled. Ms. Phelps reiterated that the vote was to strike the retiree as a member of the Senate. The vote was 13 for, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions. The amendment passed.

Ms. Phelps then asked if all were in favor of a proposal to accept the Bylaws as amended. The vote was 14 for, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The motion passed. Dr. Brooks asked if we will review the Bylaws and send them out again, to which Ms. Phelps replied “of course.”

6. Committee reports:

Faculty Welfare Committee—Faculty Welfare Survey (Dr. John Kiefer; see Appendix 2):

Dr. Kiefer showed a copy of the Committee’s Qualtrics survey. The Committee wants the faculty’s feedback to see what things are important and what the Committee should be working on. They explored other university websites to see what other faculty are thinking. The survey will come out this week. He will report back to the whole faculty what the hot topics are, and they will develop a plan to address them.

At this point, Dr. Thomas announced that she had to leave and that this was her last Senate meeting as she is retiring in the fall. She wanted to thank everyone for listening to her.

Nominations and Elections Committee (Dr. Brooks):

Since chairperson Dr. Andrew Goss was not at the meeting, Dr. Brooks announced that the colleges had either already voted for their new senators or were doing so this week.

7. Old Business. None.


A motion to adjourn was moved by Ms. Phelps and seconded by Ms. Blankenship. The meeting adjourned at 4:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
April 14, 2014
APPENDIX 1 (Faculty Senate Bylaws revisions; Ms. Connie Phelps):

Here is an outline of the proposed changes to the “Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans” (last amended April 30, 2012). The changes and additions proposed for the Nov, 21, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting are highlighted in red; additional changes and additions made since that meeting are highlighted in green; the deletions are indicated with strikethroughs.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Bylaws Subcommittee: Elaine Brooks, Marie Morgan, Connie Phelps

A. Major changes regarding elections:
1) That unit elections for senators be held no later than April 1 of each year
   a) Article II, Section C, item 2
2) That election of Senate officers be moved from the first meeting of the academic year to the last meeting of the academic year
   a) Article III, Section B, item 1
3) That Senate officers be elected from continuing and newly-elected senators, but newly-elected members do not vote
   a) Article III, Section B, item 2
4) That newly-elected Senate officers form part of the transition team with the current officers over the summer
   a) Article III, Section B, item 4

B. Major changes regarding representatives elected to statewide groups:
1) That attendance at the UL System Faculty Advisory Council or other statewide groups be made a duty of the Senate President or designee
   a) Article III, Section A, item 1
2) That all references to other specific statewide meetings and all references to elected faculty representatives be removed:
   a) Article II, Section C., item 2
   b) Article III, Section A, item 1
   c) Article III, Section A, item 5
   d) Article III, Section B, items, 1,3, 6, and 7
3) That the reference to the Senate President’s reporting on any statewide meetings be moved from Article III, Section A, item 5 to Article III, Section A, item 1

C. Other substantive changes:
1) That a retiree be added as a member of Senate
   a) Article II, section A, item 5
   b) Article II, section B, item 5
2) That notices of meeting and agendas go out to the entire UNO community, along with changes in the method of distribution
3) That the time frame and routing paths of the Senate minutes be altered
   a) Article III, Section A, item 3

Clarifications/rewordings:

1) Clarified whether “President” refers to Senate or University President (except in the section about Senate President’s duties)
2) That Senate will recommend faculty to serve on University-wide committees when appropriate
   a) Article I, 2nd paragraph
3) That it is the elected Executive Committee representative from each unit who must be full-time faculty, etc.
   a) Article II, Section A, item 6.a
4) That the Senate Executive Committee will forward the number of full-time faculty to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee after it is received by Senate Exec.
   a) Article II, section A, item 6.c
5) That all terms run until the convening of the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year
   a) Article II, Section B, item 7
6) That Secretary be added to the list of officers being elected
   a) Article III, Section B, item 2
7) That the term of officers be clarified
   a) Article III, Section B, item 3
   b) Article III, Section B, item 5
8) That only faculty Senators serve on Senate Standing Committees
   a) Article IV, Section B, 1st paragraph
9) That the statement about the Nominations and Elections Committee electing its own chair be moved from Article IV, Section B to a statement covering all Senate Standing Committees in Article IV, section B, 1st paragraph

Essentially cosmetic changes:

1) Re-ordered items 1 and 2 in Article III, Section B
2) Made changes under Senate Standing Committees and University Standing Committees for wording consistency
   a) Article IV, Sections B and C [NOTE: We have left any changes to the actual descriptions of the Senate Standing Committees charges for another time/group]
3) Removed all notations of the Arabic numeral in parentheses after the spelled-out form of the numeral, such as ten (10)
4) Other minor cosmetic changes to standardize language, capitalization, etc.
BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW
ORLEANS

ARTICLE I. NAME AND PURPOSE
The name of this body shall be the Faculty Senate of the University of New Orleans. As an authorized, representative body of the faculty under the administration of the University of New Orleans, this Faculty Senate is constituted to promote and implement, consistent with the purposes of the University, maximum participation of the faculty in university governance. In this capacity, the Faculty Senate will assist the administration in such matters of primary faculty responsibility and interest, such as academic standards and curriculum, student affairs, and administrative policy as it affects faculty welfare. Further, the Faculty Senate shall have authority in all matters affecting more than a single college, school, or a division and involving the establishment of curricula, the fixing of standards of instruction, the determination of requirements for degrees, and generally the formulation of the educational policy of the University in such matters.

The Faculty Senate will recommend, when appropriate, faculty to serve on university-wide committees, including the search committees for University-wide administrators. The Faculty Senate shall establish, set charges for, and supervise University and Senate Standing Committees. It shall be responsible for populating membership of Faculty Senate Standing Committees.

The Faculty Senate will advise the administration in the formulation and execution of policy with respect to the broadly defined goals, priorities, and financial needs of the University. The Faculty Senate shall serve as the forum for meetings between University administration and faculty regarding relevant issues for debate and discussion. This body will also serve as a forum for advocacy of faculty prerogative and position on important academic and University matters.

The Faculty Senate shall assist in the dissemination of appropriate administrative information to faculty. The Faculty Senate will also communicate faculty interests to the public and public officials as deemed appropriate.

ARTICLE II. REPRESENTATION
Section A. Composition. The Senate shall be composed of the following:
1. Students. The student body shall be represented by the President of the Student Government Association (or by his/her designee).
2. Alumni. The alumni shall be represented by the President of the Alumni Association (or his/her designee).
3. Staff. The staff shall be represented by the President of the UNO Staff Council (or his/her designee).
4. Administration. Administration shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.
5. **Retirees.** Retirees shall be represented by a Senate Executive Committee appointed member.

6. **Faculty**
   a. Each academic unit (each college or the Library) shall be represented on the Senate Executive Committee, elected in a manner to be determined by that unit. This election shall precede and be separate from that for the remaining faculty Senators. **Elected representation membership on the Senate Executive Committee from each unit** is limited to full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrators of rank of Dean or above, with at least five (5) years of full-time academic service at UNO, or tenure.
   b. The remaining faculty members of the Senate, elected from full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrator of rank of Dean or above, shall be divided among units to be one representative for every ten faculty members. Each unit shall determine the manner in which their representatives are elected. Each unit with ten or more full-time faculty members at the rank of Instructor will have at least one Instructor representative to the Senate at all times.
   c. The chief academic officer shall by December 1 of each year forward to the Senate Executive Committee the number of full-time faculty for each major unit, using the methods employed in IPEDS reporting. The Senate Executive Committee will forward that information to the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee, which will then compute the number of seats to be elected by each unit for the next year and shall notify each unit.
   d. At the beginning of each academic year, the Senate Executive Committee will nominate one adjunct faculty of the University to be a Senate member.
   e. Vacancies shall be filled in a manner to be determined by the respective electoral unit.
   f. If there should exist full-time faculty members who are not accorded representation on the Faculty Senate under the procedures outlined above, and if these faculty are associated with administrative units not large enough to merit individual Senate representation, the Senate Executive Committee shall develop a mutually satisfactory agreement by which these faculty will be attached to an appropriately represented unit for purposes of Senate representation, and for purposes of being eligible to be candidates and to vote in Senate elections. Such agreements will be subject to ratification by the full Senate.

**Section B. Terms of Service.**

1. **Students.** The student representative shall serve a one-year term.
2. **Alumni.** The alumni representative shall serve a one-year term.
3. **Staff.** The staff representative shall serve a one-year term.
4. **Administration.** The administrative representative shall serve a one-year term.
5. **Retirees.** The retiree representative shall serve a one-year term.
6. **Faculty.** Full-time faculty shall serve staggered three-year terms. The adjunct faculty representative shall serve a one-year term.
7. All terms shall run until the convening of the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year.

**Section C. Timing of Elections.**

1. The elections of faculty Senators shall be staggered so that one-third (1/3) of the elected representation from each unit shall be chosen each year.
2. Senatorial elections shall be held in the spring semester no later than April 1. The elected officers of the Senate shall be a President, Vice President, and Secretary. The elected faculty representatives of the Senate shall be the faculty representative to the UL Board of Supervisors and an alternate, and two delegates to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities. The Parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Senate President from faculty Senate members.

ARTICLE III.
OFFICERS
Section A. Duties.
1. The President shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Senate. The President shall have the primary responsibility for preparing the agenda for each meeting and shall circulate notices of meetings and agendas to all faculty members the entire UNO community. The President shall maintain a Senate calendar of business in committees and shall publish an updated calendar with the agenda for each regular Senate meeting. The President shall monitor the status of all resolutions passed by the Senate that request action and take appropriate steps to expedite implementation of such actions. The President shall report on the status of all actions passed by the Senate but not yet implemented or rejected. The President shall serve as the faculty’s representative to the UL System Faculty Advisory Council and other statewide groups Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates or may designate another member of the Senate to serve in his/her place. The President or his/her designee shall report to the Senate on issues being considered by any of these statewide groups that have an effect on the UNO campus.

2. The Vice President shall assume the responsibilities of the President whenever the President is absent or otherwise unable to perform these duties and shall handle all correspondence of the Senate other than that specifically assigned to the Secretary. The Vice President shall keep minutes at the meetings of the Senate Executive Committee.

3. The Secretary shall keep minutes of each meeting of the Senate and send them to the Senate President for inclusion with the meeting notice and the agenda for the upcoming meeting. The Secretary shall ensure that the approved minutes are posted to the Faculty Senate web page and SharePoint sites within one week after each Senate meeting. shall send an email notice that the minutes have been posted on the UNO University Senate web page (senate.uno.edu) to senators, appropriate members of the Administration, and the Driftwood. Two paper copies will be sent to the Library for inclusion in the Louisiana Collection. The minutes for the year just ended will be archived on the web page by the beginning of each new academic year. Such distribution shall take place no later than ten (10) days prior to the following Senate meeting. Reports made to the Senate shall be made available to the Secretary by electronic means within one week of the Senate meeting at which the report was made.

4. The Parliamentarian shall ensure that all meetings are conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order (latest edition).

5. The Faculty Representative to the UL Board of Supervisors shall report to the Senate on issues being considered by the Board that have an effect on the UNO campus. The Alternate Faculty Representative shall fulfill these duties when the Representative is not able to attend.
Section B. Elections and Terms of Office.

1. The President and Vice President shall be elected from faculty Senate members. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall be nominated and elected by majority vote of members present at the first regular meeting of the Senate during each academic year. New incoming senators for the fall are eligible to be on the ballot but may not vote.

2. The Senate President, and Vice President, and Secretary shall be elected from continuing and newly-elected faculty Senate members.

3. Elected officers of the Senate and faculty representatives shall serve until their successors are elected the convening of the first Senate meeting of the academic year.

4. The newly-elected Senate officers will form part of the transition team with the current Senate Executive Committee members between the spring and fall academic semesters.

5. Elected officers of the Senate shall serve a one-year term and be eligible for reelection but shall not serve more than three consecutive terms.

6. The Faculty Representative to the UL System Board of Supervisors will be elected by the Senate to serve a two-year term. The Alternate Representative to the UL System Board of Supervisors will also serve a two-year term and will be elected in alternate years. The Representatives and Alternates may be either a senator or non-senator. Representatives and alternates will serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.

7. Faculty Representatives to the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities will be elected from the Senate members for one year terms, one of whom is also the representative to the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates.

ARTICLE IV.
COMMITTEES

Section A. Executive Committee.
The Senate President, the Vice President, the Secretary, and representatives elected by each college and the Library shall comprise the Senate Executive Committee. There shall be no more than two members from each of the colleges and Library serving on the Senate Executive Committee at any one time. The President shall chair the Senate Executive Committee. The Senate Executive Committee represents the faculty as an advisory committee to the University President, making recommendations and stating faculty viewpoints concerning the policies and proposed policies of UNO.

The Senate Executive Committee shall meet following each Senate meeting to review proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate for action and to determine whether the matter should become an item of Senate business. The Senate Executive Committee may seek clarification of the submitted item from the Senator who originated it. If the Senate Executive Committee agrees that the matter deserves Senate attention, it shall assign the item to a Senate Standing Committee, a university committee or an ad-hoc committee, with a specific written charge, a tentative timetable for action, and a recommendation to work with another University committee if appropriate. If the Senate Executive Committee chooses not to accept an item for Senate action, it may refer the matter to the administration. Decisions by the Senate Executive Committee not to accept a proposal may be appealed to the entire Senate at the next regular meeting. The Senate President shall report the actions of the Senate Executive Committee to the Senate.
Section B. Senate Standing Committees.

It shall be the duty of the Senate Standing Committees to study proposals and resolutions submitted to the Senate and to recommend appropriate action on them to the full Senate. Each faculty Senator shall serve on at least one Senate Standing Committee. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee. Each committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee.
This Committee shall concern itself with the academic privileges and responsibilities of all members of the University community.

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee.
This Committee formulates and reviews policies, rules, and regulations governing the admission, readmission, academic standing, and dismissal of all students for academic deficiency. The Committee examines policies and procedures for academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and registration. Additionally, the Committee creates and analyzes policies to be observed by the instructional faculty in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee.
The Committee shall review the University-wide budgets in cooperation with appropriate officers of Administration. The Committee shall apprise itself of the general financial position of the University and of significant policy and priority aspects of budget decisions. The Committee shall report all significant plans to the Senate, with recommendations when appropriate. The Committee will include a representative from each college and the Library.

Evaluation of Administrators Committee.
This Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators shall be composed of the Senate President, one Senate member from each college and the Library, and one staff member from the University Computing Center. The Committee will conduct the surveys which are part of the evaluation of the Deans for the Office of Academic Affairs, and surveys of other administrators, as directed by the University President. The Senate President shall accompany the Provost or other administrator to faculty meetings to report the results of such surveys.

Nominations and Elections
The Committee functions as a committee on committees, and shall be responsible for populating Senate Committees. This committee will also make recommendations to the University President concerning the selection of individual faculty members whom the University President will appoint to the appointed University Standing Committees and ensuring that vacancies on elected University Standing Committees are filled. The Committee runs the election for Hearings Committee pool at-large members. In addition, the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee submits a slate of candidates for the Senate transition meeting elections. The Senate relies on the good judgment of the members of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee to present candidates that reflect the quality and diversity of the campus community. The President of the Senate serves as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee. The committee elects its own Chair from within its membership.

Faculty Welfare Committee.
This committee shall strive to secure for faculty members those services which will contribute to their welfare or convenience, including orientation to the University, housing, payroll deductions, insurance, health services, and they shall communicate annually with the University President regarding policies governing faculty perquisites and the structure of salaries. The committee shall, acting of its own volition, upon the request of the Senate and/or others, study, evaluate, and report on faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; act in an advisory capacity with the University administration in ascertaining desired changes in faculty compensation; provide information to the faculty on available fringe benefits; solicit faculty suggestions, information, and advice regarding faculty compensation, including salary and fringe benefits; and maintain and keep current committee website.

Section C. University Standing Committees.
University Standing Committees shall be composed of faculty members appointed by the University President on the recommendation of the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee or elected by the colleges and the Library. The Senate will establish, set charges for, and supervise the University Standing Committees. Reports from the committees will be discussed in the Senate before being formally communicated to the Administration or other body as appropriate. Each committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Senate, and making more frequent reports if warranted or if requested by the Senate Executive Committee.

Current appointed University Standing Committees are:
- Committee on Courses and Curricula
- Committee on Recruitment & Retention Committee on Student Affairs
- Student Publications Board

Current elected University Standing Committees are:
- Committee on Distance Learning
- Committee on the Library
- Committee on University Honors and Awards

Section D. Disciplinary Committees.
All disciplinary-related committees, including the Charges Committee, Hearings Committee Pool, Grievance Review Committee, and the Peer Review Oversight Committee, are elected from the faculty, and work under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs. The Senate Nominations and Elections Committee will assist in the elections of members, and in the functioning of the disciplinary committees where appropriate. In particular, the chair of the Senate Committee on Nominations and Elections Committee shall direct the election of the Peer Review Oversight Committee chair by the voting members.

Section E. Senate Ad-hoc Committees.
The Senate Executive Committee may establish ad-hoc and temporary committees for the purpose of addressing specific and major faculty and/or institutional concerns. Upon activation of a specific committee, the Senate Executive Committee shall prepare a specific charge for the committee and include the form and timing of the response requested.
ARTICLE V. MEETINGS
Section A. A regular meeting of the Senate must be held monthly on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday rotation, except December, during the fall and spring semesters. Special meetings shall be convened on the call of the Senate President or on the request of four (4) members of the Senate addressed to the Senate Secretary.

Section B. All meetings shall be open to members of the UNO faculty, staff, student body, and alumni, except when the Senate, by majority vote of those present, designates a meeting or portion thereof as an executive session.

ARTICLE VI. NOTICE OF MEETINGS
One (1) week before the date of regular meetings, written and electronic notice shall be sent to members of the Senate and to department chairs, the Administration, the Student Government Association, the Staff Council, and the Alumni Association for public posting. Notices of special meetings must precede the meeting date by a reasonable time and shall be circulated as indicated for notices of regular meetings. All notices of meetings must contain as complete an agenda as possible. Members of the Senate may have items included on the agenda by forwarding them to the Senate President two (2) weeks in advance of the regular meeting.

ARTICLE VII. QUORUM
A majority of the voting membership of the Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any regular or special meeting of the Senate.

ARTICLE VIII. RULES OF ORDER
When not in conflict with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the University of Louisiana System, Robert’s Rules of Order (latest revision) shall constitute the rules of parliamentary procedure applicable to all meetings of the Senate.

ARTICLE IX. ACTIONS OF THE SENATE
Any action taken by the Faculty Senate may be overturned by a majority of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS
Amendments to sections I, II, and X of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (1) week having been given to all members of the Faculty Senate of the proposed amendment, or by a majority vote of the Faculty Council via an in-person vote. Amendments to sections III through IX of these Bylaws may be made by affirmative vote of one-half (1/2) of the Faculty Senate present and voting, prior written notice of one (1) week having been given to all members of the Faculty Senate of the proposed amendment.

[Faculty Senate approved by the Faculty Council on December 7, 2011; Amended by approval of Faculty Senate on April 30, 2012]
APPENDIX 2 (Faculty Welfare Committee report; Dr. John Kiefer):

Faculty Welfare Issues

Q1 Colleagues, The Faculty Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate is trying to focus our effort on the issues that are most important to you, the faculty of the University of New Orleans. In order to do that we need to hear what you're most concerned about. Specifically, what are the issues most important to you? In order for us to get to work, we'd ask that you complete your input to us by April 3rd. Thanks! -- Your Faculty Welfare Committee (John Kiefer, Ali Arnold, Paul Bole, Zarus Watson)

Q2 What is the issue, or are the issues (you can choose more than one) most important to you?

- Compensation (1)
- Health and Wellness (2)
- Benefits (3)
- Child Care (4)
- Tuition Benefits (5)
- Travel Support (6)
- Professional Memberships (7)
- Other issues? (8) ____________________

Q3 What issues, initiatives, or resolutions do you think that the Faculty Welfare Subcommittee should take up to increase faculty welfare?