



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, April 26, 2019

1:00 p.m.

Jack Stephens Center, Legends Room

I. Welcome and Roll Call

President Nolen calls the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

President Nolen calls the roll

Present: **CALS** – Al-Shukri, Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Cheatham, Condran, Deiser, Douglas, Law, LeGrand, Smith, Stone. **CB** --- Felan, Hendon, Leonard, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Fletcher, Franklin, Grover, Otters, Reeves, Riley, Robinson, Sedivy-Benton, VanderPutten. **CSSC** --- Blevins-Knabe, Giammo, Golden, Jensen, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Jovanovic, McMillan, Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** --- Cain. **EX OFFICIO** --- Drale, Faller, Nolen, Wright.

Absent: **CALS** –Heil, Nguyen. **CB** --- None. **CEHP** --- None. **CSSC** --- Craw, Flinn. **CEIT** – Milanova. **LIBRARY** --- None. **LAW** --- Boles, Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Dicus, Rogerson.

II. Review of Minutes

Sen. Cheatham moves to accept the Senate’s March 29 minutes as presented.

Sen. Hendon seconds the motion.

Motion to accept the minutes passes.

President Nolen introduces Steve McClellan, Vice-Chancellor for Finance and Administration, to speak in lieu of the Chancellor’s report.

McClellan: I don’t have a formal presentation, but was asked to give a quick overview of the

budget situation and to answer questions. The Chancellor noted at the open forum that our budget for next year has a \$12 million deficit. We've been making cuts in the budget to reduce that – as of about an hour ago, we have made budget changes that reduce this to a \$6.2 million deficit for the upcoming year. Our budget is due to the system office today, though we may make a few more adjustments before submitting it to UA System office. Most of our estimates are based on data from our budget and finances over the past three years. Originally we had expected \$3.8 million in savings from frozen positions. We have since unfrozen some of those positions (such as deans positions) that the Provost indicated must be filled, so that leaves \$2.8 million in reduction in salaries and benefits associated with frozen positions. We also expect to save \$1.8 million in lapsed salary or turnover in the upcoming year, i.e. salary and benefit savings from people who retire or leave mid-year and are not immediately replaced (which is about what we expect given past experience). We also expect to pay out \$500,000 less in scholarships in the upcoming year from lower enrollment. We can revisit that if there is more need for scholarship funds than we expect. In addition, we expect to shift some of our expenses in maintenance and upgrading from operating expenses to capital expenses. This makes it possible for us to consider these expenses as investment rather than as operating expenses.

Jensen: I listened to these reports and have trouble following what you said. You & the Chancellor keep throwing out numbers. But the numbers are totally decontextualized – some are related to this fiscal year and others are projections for next fiscal year. We need a framework to understand this. Maybe some definitions in writing?

McClellan: It used to be the case that when we talked about budget, the conversation mostly focused on E&G [Education and General Expenses fund]. We were not concerned with such things as physical plant – we talked strictly about E&G. And the campus is used to hearing about the budget in terms of E&G. This model has changed. When we present our budget to the UA System, there is an E&G figure, but we also need to discuss the University's other funds too. We are expected to provide a more comprehensive picture of the budget and in our financial statements than just E&G.

Jensen: You need to educate us some more about your terminology. For instance, I don't know what E&G means.

McClellan: E&G encompasses most of the university's operating expenses. Most of your salary that does not originate from grants is E&G money. In addition to E&G, we have a plant fund that we use to manage money used for physical plant (such as construction). Salaries and expenses associated with physical plant then are not part of E&G but of the plant fund. In addition, we have about \$5 million in designated funds, which are under the control of particular units on campus for designated purposes, and so can't be used for general expenses. That is a large amount in designated funds for a campus like ours. When we send in the budget and it gets approved, it goes online and becomes public. Over the course of the year, we make quarterly reports to the Board of Trustees on how well we are meeting the budget and we make adjustments over the course of the year to the budget as revenues and expenses become realized in order to keep us within budget.

Jensen: So I'm a bit confused about what the Chancellor is talking about when he mentions a \$2 million shortfall in our budget this year.

McClellan: That refers to an expected shortfall in the E&G fund for this year [based on expenses and revenues realized over the course of the year.]

Jensen: We heard from the Chancellor that it had to do with SSCH's. We had a final count of SSCH's in January. Why are we only now hearing about a shortfall in April?

McClellan: We know we had an enrollment drop in the fall. That's what SSCH's represent, and I know the Chancellor gives you regular reports on enrollment. UA Little Rock really has three main sources of revenue, the largest of which is tuition and fees (47%). When we have a drop in SSCH, that affects tuition and fee revenue. When we consider we had a 12% fall in SSCH's and the fall in state appropriations, that's why we have less revenue than expected this year.

Jensen: The Chancellor though seemed surprised by the \$2 million shortfall this year. We don't understand why he would be surprised in April if he had enrollment numbers in January.

McClellan: When the Chancellor announced our budget for next year was falling short by \$12 million, that shortfall he referred to was when we take all the funds together. We did not expect to have a shortfall in the E&G fund this year. But it is turned out that when we looked at the E&G fund for this year that revenues were falling short of expenditures there too [Hence the \$2 million shortfall this year].

Matson: I think the question from George is that we don't understand why we found out about this \$2 million in the middle of April and not sooner.

S: Because the University and the System officers and auditors really only routinely track the totals across all funds together. We do not usually look at whether the E&G fund alone is in deficit. But the Chancellor asked for the E&G figure on its own, which is when we discovered it.

Matson: The reason why we are asking questions about this \$2 million shortfall is that it is the reason for the hiring freeze. And this hiring freeze has disrupted the whole institution. And it seems to us that no one recognized the problem earlier and so we are now having to take more drastic steps to address the budget. People who had nothing to do with recognizing the problem are being asked to deal with the problem.

McClellan: The Board of Trustees isn't interested in the E&G fund on its own because they know they know I could move money between funds.

Matson: We are questioning the timeliness with which we receive information about budget and the university's finances.

Scranton: We knew on the 11th day of the semester that we saw that we had a drop in SSCH's

and that some classes were cancelled. Why didn't we use that second part of the semester to offer more classes to make up for SSCH's we didn't get at the beginning of the semester?

McClellan: That would be a good question for the Provost. I am not involved in class scheduling decisions.

Hendon: I understand that we have the capability of generating expense reports over the course of the year [which compare actual to budgeted figures as expenses and revenues are realized over the year]. Getting these reports has been an issue in the past. When will department chairs and faculty get to have regular access to regular expense reports?

McClellan: This university has never produced a complete budget that included all its funds. The budget has been fragmented into many different pools and fund accounts. So we would spend a lot of time on making amendments to the budget over the year. We are committed to breaking this culture. If y'all had not come into this so strong, we would not have been able to do this for July 1, 2019.

Sedivy-Benton: We all have budgets at home. If we have a deficit, we have to adjust. Why has the budget problem at UA Little Rock been allowed to go on for so long? This seems catastrophic. How many years has it been since we didn't meet budget? How big is our deficit?

McClellan: This university has lost money (had negative net position) in nine of the past ten years. We did not lose money the year Windgate gave us \$20 million for the new fine arts building. In ten years, we've had one year with positive net position.

Comment: It seems like we could have adjusted the budget to address our deficit much sooner than this.

McClellan: The way to have done that would have been to fire people earlier. Our Chancellor has made a commitment to avoid laying people off.

Jovanovic: It seems we are in a death spiral. When we eliminate programs/faculty, we cut revenue. It gives current students less reason to come back and future students reasons not to come here at all. Running a deficit this year sets us up to have a deficit for next year instead of making necessary cuts now. We need to think strategically. We have a \$12 mil deficit and are proposing to fix \$6 million through cuts, and not address the other \$6 million of the deficit. What makes anybody think the Board of Trustees would accept that? What if the Board won't accept that?

McClellan: Our plan has not yet been approved by the Board. They could reject it. But my sense is they will accept it. If we cut \$6 million this year and another \$3 million next year, we will be in budget balance in three years.

Jovanovic: Another question. We had three faculty searches cancelled this year. We are down to one civil engineering faculty member. We are therefore set to lose 125 engineering students. We

have 25 courses with no instructor that could have been filled with students but instead are at risk of being cancelled. These students will have to change majors or leave UA Little Rock. We are adding to our revenue loss when we lose 125 engineering students and when three engineering programs lose accreditation.

McClellan: There is probably not a person in here who doesn't have a similar story. Our Chancellor has made a compassionate decision to avoid layoffs. We have a choice. If we need to reduce payroll, we can either cut vacant positions or cut filled positions. So we have chosen to reduce vacant positions before cutting filled positions.

Jovanovic: Across the board cuts hurt everybody. These freezes are worse because the departments that are shorthanded and cannot offer their courses are being hurt the most – departments that need resources the most are being affected.

McClellan: I do not disagree with you at all.

Barrio-Vilar: What Nick Jovanovic is describing is just one of many examples of departments losing students because we have lost faculty to staff the courses. Which means that we may have less revenue next year because we have lost those students.

Anson: I have two questions, If the Board does not accept our budget, what is our plan then? Second, where is the Chancellor? It seems he should be the one here to answer these questions.

McClellan: The Chancellor decided to get out of town early for the weekend. I cannot tell you the timeframe. I have a lot of numbers. I would say I do not have a plan, but I have a lot of options on the table to consider in that event. I would also come to the faculty for ideas on how we can make further cuts to the budget without laying faculty and staff off.

Woolridge: The hiring freeze makes up about 32% of the budget cut. But this hiring freeze also results in reducing our revenue. So 32% of the cut we are making is on faculty and staff who are generating revenue.

McClellan: Keep in mind that some positions turnover over the course of the year. From last April 1, I had HR measure faculty and non faculty positions between April 2018 and April 2019. We went down ten faculty positions and went down 71 non faculty positions in that time. You don't hear about this it because it happens during the year.

Woolridge: What percentage of the cut comes from these positions? Are they at a high pay level or moderately high pay level?

McClellan: I don't have that information

Hendon: How many of the 71 positions are director level or above?

McClellan: I couldn't tell you. I just asked for a quick overview.

Hendon: Have you personally seen us delete any positions from the budget that have titles like “director” or “assistant vice chancellor...”?

McClellan: Nineteen

Hendon: And isn't it the case that an ADHE report found that we had an administrative...

McClellan: You can't go by those reports. But I can extract information on those nineteen positions and give them to Rosalie [Cheatham].

Hendon: That would be valuable.

Wright: I'm concerned about dates, times and expectations.

McClellan: The due date for the budget is today.

Wright: When will you actually send it?

McClellan: Before Monday morning.

Wright: Can the Senate also get it when you send it to the Board?

McClellan: Yes

Wright: What happens if they reject our proposed budget?

McClellan: I will meet with the Cabinet to discuss options.

Anson: What would be the date that you would have to submit a revised budget?

McClellan: The Board meets on May 22nd or 23rd on this campus. Normally we need to give it to them at least two weeks in advance. I was assured that they would get it back to me as quickly as possible if the Board was not supportive of our original budget, possibly by Wednesday next week.

Wright: So the budget needs to be finalized roughly 2 weeks before the Board of Trustees meeting?

S: The Board staff assured me if they don't plan to accept our original budget, they will give me some turnaround time to revise it before the Board meeting.

Wright: Final action though happens at the May Board of Trustees meeting. What happens if they reject our budget at that point?

McClellan: We usually have some kind of feeling well before the meeting about whether they will accept it or not. If they don't accept the budget, we won't be able to spend money after June 30th. We will have between then and June 30th to develop a budget the Board will accept.

Wright: Is there a possibility the Board will make decisions on where to cut in our budget similar to what the Board did at UAMS?

McClellan: I don't think that is exactly what they did at UAMS. The Board gave them three months to make its cuts.

Wright: The Chancellor has told us on more than one occasion that we do not plan to cut filled positions in order to balance the budget. So I gather that the budget we submitted does not cut positions that are filled?

McClellan: Right.

Wright: But I also gather that the Board does want to see personnel cuts at UA Little Rock.

McClellan: The system office and the Board of Trustees has made it clear that they think we need to cut personnel, including live or filled positions. A point of comparison is ASU [Arkansas State University.] If you take ASU's financial statement, and look at tuition & fees and at salaries – they are \$6 million above us in tuition and fee revenues and \$6 million below us in salaries and benefits. Those two numbers together are \$12 million, which is equivalent to our budget shortfall. We've been saying we would grow out of this but it hasn't happened.

Anson: Didn't you tell the Planning and Finance Committee we were budgeting for only one percent growth?

Giammo: When you are ready to share what you're ready to submit, will that include or can you add a list of positions that are approved to search? There were 40 open positions. It would be nice to know what searches are approved to continue.

McClellan: That will be available.

Matson: In looking at how other institutions do budgeting, i.e. best practices, have you found any models to help us understand how our salary and compensation are out of whack? Is it? How? Across the board is not the way to solve this. Nobody thinks they are overstaffed, but there is a reason the Board of Trustees believes that we are overstaffed. What I would love to see is an analysis on where we are or are not overstaffed.

McClellan: That is very hard to measure. Even comparing similar institutions.

Matson: I am asking if there is there a model we can adopt to come up with an analysis?

McClellan: We could carry out this sort of analysis, but we have to be ready to make decisions

based on the results. Otherwise we are just wasting time.

Matson: It would make it possible for us to make decisions strategically.

Peggy: If you have a faculty member moving to administration, their salary goes up. If you can streamline and reduce administration, those faculty can be moved back into the classroom where they will generate SSCHs while we save money on salary.

Cheatham: For over a decade, we've been told that one of the reasons the system believes we are overstaffed is because of our class sizes. The system president has been quoted that classes less than 100 are small. We made a strategic decision thirty years ago to not offer those large class sizes. The system's mindset though comes in comparing us to Fayetteville, so we have to figure out politically how to tell our story better.

Jovanovic: The comparison the board makes is to UA Pine Bluff. Comparing us to UAPB makes it look like we are overstaffed because we are not teaching six courses per semester. We do not do that and so shouldn't be compared, but because we are all in the same system we get compared all the same.

McClellan: Of all the numbers the board has access to, there is only one document that is certified and audited and that is our budget. They look at whether campuses are positive or negative. That's what they make most decisions on.

Hendon: I recall that Amanda Nolen did a lot of work on a spreadsheet comparing UA Little Rock to 43 similar schools

Nolen: That compared us to other R3 institutions, but now we are an R2 institution.

John: That document shows that we are probably overstaffed. Perhaps overstaffed on faculty, but much more overstaffed on the administrative and staff side. That's probably part of what the board has as evidence. Peer comparison will show rough estimate on if we are overstaffed.

McClellan: What the board believes is that we have way more faculty and staff and way fewer students compared to other campuses.

AN: To put context to it, we have a much higher proportion of part-time students. We need to be compared to similar institutions – it takes more academic infrastructure to provide the flexibility and support for our kind of students. We can't pare down to a 250 faculty university and still be able to serve our students.

VanderPutten: Anything that tries to compare institutions in terms of staff-student ratios will be inaccurate.

McClellan: It is hard to find truly similar institutions.

DeAngelis: I appreciate the efforts to try and preserve jobs. But it seems to me that we are looking at inevitable cuts. I am looking at 20-25 years left in my career here. I think it will happen, and when it happens, I ask that it happens in a more respectful way than these budget cuts have been. I was unable to attend budget meeting last week and I so I learned from a text message that one of the possible cuts being made was to ATLE – text said “ATLE gone.” And I just thought it would have been a five minute conversation to let us know that this might happen before the budget meeting happened. It seemed disrespectful to the efforts we have all made. I ask for more than a public forum where this information gets thrown at us. We hear about cuts in the newspaper before we hear it from administration. If cuts have to happen, we want them to be done with good communication and respect.

Nolen: With respect to the current fiscal year and our \$2 million shortfall. How will this affect summer session 1?

McClellan: Last two weeks I’ve been tracking summer enrollment. But the only way I can compare it is from this year to last year. Other than that, I cannot tell you what you’re not doing – only what you are doing.

Nolen: It will make a difference if it turns out the shortfall is \$2 million or \$2.5 million or \$1.7 million.

McClellan: There are a lot of things we can do to temporarily move money from one fund to another so that we can meet expenses [until we receive the corresponding revenues]. I will look at every project to see what we can move from here to here.

Angela Hunter: I was on accreditation task force last year. I heard from Cody. Decker that with the new funding formula, we could recode some of our expenses to take advantage of the formula’s emphasis on research to get additional appropriations. Has this been done? Whose office is responsible for this? This might bring in \$1 million in revenue.

McClellan: I think you are talking about IPEDS. It takes a trained and experienced person to do that. We can’t hire a person at \$20,000 per year to develop those opportunities.

Angela Hunter: I don’t understand all the details involved, but it is frustrating to be forgoing opportunities to gain income as a university.

McClellan: You can change what we report on IPEDS, but it may not result in new money from the state.

Cody Decker: Under the funding formula, increases in our research expenditures give an increased appropriation. I think that a 2 percent increase in research spending corresponds to \$1.2 million more dollars in appropriation.

Daryl Rice: Cody is too humble. I know what he’s done on the side of enrollment. He’s now doing it for recruitment. He knows more about performance funding than anyone else on any

campus in the state. I'm convinced he can do it for finance if finance cannot do it. The proposal is let's look at the formula funding and work backwards. If there is some discretion in what expenses we code as research and if research spending is rewarded as a multiplier, let's do it. We do not need another \$120k person to do that.

Cody: Given the potential reward, this is something we should strategically prioritize and make time to do.

McClellan: I would be very supportive of that.

Douglas: There's got to be a person employed on campus that can do that. Maybe we can send someone for training.

Scranton: Why do you think this would take another full-time position? Why not a consultant to get the recoding up and running? Training our people so we can follow on? This doesn't have to be a twelve month position. Give us a contract. 6 months? 3 months?

McClellan: I'm very interested in that possibility.

Daryl Rice: There were a lot of questions about this year's deficit. Let's return to that: the \$2 million E&G shortfall this fiscal year. How is it that we don't know about this shortfall until April? The Chancellor speculated on this at the budget open forum, putting the blame on past practices in financial administration. And perhaps we did move from a ma and pa lemonade stand to a university in terms of financial administration. But those practices are now long gone. The Chancellor said one of the reasons we have trouble monitoring our budget is because we didn't buy the right part of Banner Finance. That's not true. We bought Banner Finance and Banner Vanilla includes a budgeting module. The problem is that somebody made a decision not to implement that module. How in the past 4 years has someone not said this module is software we could use to monitor budget. When I was a chair, I used to get spreadsheets in paper. Now at least they are distributed in Excel spreadsheets. This strikes me as the equivalent of working on 3X5 cards. Banner budget has workflow and position control. I can tell you the finance person in the Provost's office spends hours a week just tracking the budget positions of departments because we don't have the software. She does it on Excel spreadsheets. We could have implemented a better way of doing this long before now.

S: We have been more focused on building a budget that reduces the number of designated funds. We have 1,200 designated funds. The system office said we should have zero. The process they want is for all spending to be budgeted and approved through the Chancellor, with no designated funds. So we are in the process of breaking the Cabinet away from budgeting with designated funds.

Daryl Rice: With all due respect, I didn't hear an answer to my question. Why haven't we implemented software that will make it much easier to implement financial control? What I heard from you is that someone on campus resisted that change.

McClellan: A tool is no good until you're ready to use it. The process we have used for years has not been a true budget process. This year we have the first real budget the university has ever done.

Q: As a department chair in a research active department, I have some familiarity with budgeting with designated funds. What I'm concerned is that this \$2 million freeze has messed up my projections of what is going to be in our research accounts for next year. I will have more money in that account than I budgeted for, but I will need Chancellor approval to spend it. That's a major issue with this freeze. My faculty earned that money by writing proposals. Unless they can have access to it, they will not see any reason to write more grant proposals because it is too hard to spend the money

McClellan: You probably have enough to get you through the 1st quarter. Do you think I projected exactly right? Just give me your best estimate.

Drale: I want to clear the air on one thing. One of things people in this room are hearing from you is that one of the reasons we didn't have this all figured out is because of resistance to budgeting. People feel a little put off by that. People had charge of their budgets. Nobody ever called me and said I need you to project revenue for the Provost's office for the next year. I got a spreadsheet with my E&G funds and was told to update and make corrections. So that's what all of us were doing. If we were supposed to be doing something else, then who was supposed to tell us that?

McClellan: I apologize because the message I was trying to send was probably not as clear as it should have been during that time. We had a chancellor and a budget officer who did things in a certain way for 25 years. I should have anticipated the problems in changing a culture and way of doing things that was around for 25 years.

Drale: I think we should not imply that people in the trenches were somehow not cooperating. We were doing what we were told to do.

McClellan: It was not my intention to say that.

Drale: When we talk about budgeting, we lose sight about how that connects to revenue. When departments do their budgets they don't know what revenue will be. We trust Finance and Administration to tell us that. IF we need to make 5-10% cuts in budget, we depend on someone else to tell us that.

McClellan: We basically have two revenue sources: appropriations and tuition. We generally have a good idea about what appropriations will be over the next five years. For tuition, ideally, we take past enrollment data and make a projection of enrollment and tuition from that.

Drale: We have seen enrollment decline, but for the last several years, we just get rollover budget sheets. What I hear from people is that we probably should have started to make cuts before now.

McClellan: I agree.

Wright: Going back to our discussion earlier about possible personnel cuts. We may find out we have to do cuts of filled position in a relatively short time. You will presumably get a telephone call saying this needs to be done, Assuming that comes, what is our process to do the best we can to make rational and intelligent cuts that minimize impact on enrollment and revenue? That's not to say that not everyone is important, but how will we make these decisions?

McClellan: That is a question to pose to the Chancellor. A CFO cannot make those decisions.

Anson: Have you seen a plan from the Chancellor?

McClellan: I can't say that I have. But I can say that the Chancellor values your voice as a collective body.

Nolen: When you send us the budget proposal next week, can you also send us the auditor's reports?

McClellan: Much of it is on the System's website

Nolen: I want to know what the auditors are telling the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

McClellan: Auditors don't tell you how to fix things. Auditors just tell you that you have things that are broken. When those reports come out, I will be glad to share them with you. But they are not descriptive about what needs to be done to fix things.

Wright: Are the auditors going to weigh in on our budget proposal?

McClellan: In the past, they never did. But they may look at us as if we are seen as a risk.

Jovanovic: I would like to hear some assurance that if live-person cuts occur, at least 50% of those will come from administration.

McClellan: That's not my call

Robinson: On next year's deficit, what's your estimate of what the Board will accept?

McClellan: If it was a \$7 million deficit, they wouldn't accept it. Under \$6.5 million makes me comfortable they will accept it. We can come up with \$3 million more in cuts by next year. We have \$30 million of uncommitted and unrestricted reserves. We will lose \$10 - \$12 million of that this year, bringing us down to \$20 million. If we lose \$6 million more, we will be down to \$14 million in reserves. The Board doesn't want that number. It adds to the risk of the UA System.

McClellan: We are going through a budget reduction. The University is not going to simply go

away. But we are going through something that nobody likes. Many other universities are going through the same sort of process. Our job now is to take the old UA Little Rock and tweak it to make it a newer and more stable UA Little Rock. We are a \$170 million dollar university. These changes are very, very do-able.

III. Announcements

Smith: On behalf of the Research & Creative Works Expo, thank you to the Senate, colleges, departments, faculty who served as mentors or as judges for the expo. It was heartening to see such stellar examples of work all across the university. Thank you all.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

Wright: One of the things we started doing at the beginning of the year as a Senate is to see where we can give support. We have been asking the administration for years to provide a recruitment plan. I think now that the Senate should develop a recruitment plan on its own that it can recommend to the administration.

Giammo: The CSSC retention and recruitment committee decided that something we can do that is easy and free to support recruitment is to ask a CSSC marshal at commencement to document stories from graduates that we can use to publicize the good things happening here. This should be something all the colleges do.

Anson: I suggest that we provide the ACT data that we have on student interests directly to departments so that they can act on it to recruit students for their programs.

V. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

Wright: Yesterday in my class a student stopped me mid-lecture and said “Is our degree going to be worth anything once we go out of business?” It took quite a bit of class time to have that discussion. But it does indicate that students are worried that their degree is not going to be worth anything. We need better communication to students about the budget situation. If we do not start a serious message of our strength, damage will occur.

Douglas: The Chancellor needs to send out a letter. It would go a long way. Maybe pass a resolution of him doing that. Students are worried that tuition will go up.

Anson: Problem is for many students they don't know there is a problem. UAMS was there and

nobody think it's going away.

Jovanovic: We are in a bit of a box. The Faculty Senate cannot speak for university. If we had a strong faculty senate, the senate president could communicate information directly to students. But we are not. We are just ants on the ant farm.

Erin Finzer: For HLC, we MUST have a plan. It's ok to expect that a lot of institutions are going through budget problems, but we must have a plan for addressing it and show that we have taken initial steps that commit us to that plan.

DeAngelis: ATLE has been the primary unit providing professional development opportunities for faculty. In a climate where it has been difficult to retain faculty, cutting a low cost (\$50,000) program that provides those opportunities is surprising and possibly harmful as we move into accreditation review. It is important to find a way to continue this. The functions ATLE provides in professional development and community-building are really needed.

Hendon: The IEC plans on recruitment and retention are not really plans. To create successful strategies, we need measurable items, i.e. concrete objectives.

Past-President Wright moves to suspend the rules for new business in order to consider a motion on the communication issue.

DeAngelis seconds the motion to suspend the rules.

Motion to suspend the rules passes.

Past-President Wright moves that it be resolved that the Faculty Senate request that the Chancellor communicate with students as to the strength of the institution and 2) that it be further resolved that the Chancellor communicates to the Faculty Senate the plan and decision making process whereby personnel cuts will be made if they become necessary.

Anson: I don't like the first part of that.

Nolen: The resolution says that the Chancellor will communicate about the strengths of the University, not the problem.

Motion is seconded.

Hendon: I'd like to suggest that the motion say "continuing strength of the institution"

Anson: I'm still concerned that it does not stress communication about the budget problem.

DeAngelis: Students are already aware of the budget problem.

Rosalie: I would like to separate the two parts of the resolution because I have a different idea for

the second part.

Wright: I will accept division of the question into two resolutions

President Nolen recognizes Wright's original motion as two separate resolutions.

Woolridge: We need to quit making negative comments. A resolution from us to communicate the strength of the institution will not be credible unless we stop the negative comments. We need to be consistent in our message.

Jovanovic: Students that aren't aware of any problems are probably not going to read a letter from the Chancellor on it. But students who are aware of the problem will appreciate it.

Jensen: I suggest that the Senate executive committee draft a message that the Chancellor could send.

Nolen: I think the executive committee could do that.

Anson: We do say positive things, but this is not what gets reported in the press.

Nolen: Since you [Anson] are on the executive committee, you will be able to help shape the message.

Blevins-Knabe: Perhaps someone in the Communications office can help shape that message? If you have too much positive spin, people do not believe it. It will need some grit and honest communication.

Wright: The intent is to say that the institution overall remains healthy even as it deals with this budget problem.

Nolen: The first resolution on the floor is that it be resolved that the Faculty Senate request that the Chancellor communicate with students as to the continuing strength of the University, with commentary from the Senate executive committee to help inform that statement. Further discussion?

Rosalie: It might be better to frame the Chancellor's statement in terms of the faculty's recognition of the strength of the University. The Chancellor is in a position of having to deal with the Board.

Wright: Some of that would be in the executive committee's draft.

Giammo: Students don't want to hear from the Faculty Senate, they want to hear from the Chancellor.

President Nolen calls for a vote on the first resolution.

Motion passes.

Discussion moves to Wright's second resolution.

Rosalie: I would like to suggest that the resolution call on the Chancellor to work with the Faculty Senate on developing a plan rather than simply communicating a plan to the Faculty Senate.

Nolen: I would suggest even stronger language than that: that we exert the authority under the Assembly Constitution given to the Planning and Finance and Policy Advisory Committees to consider budgetary matters.

Wright: I am OK with that, but we need to figure out the wording. Be it resolved that the Chancellor will work with appropriate Senate committees (e.g. Planning and Finance and the Policy Advisory Committee) to develop a plan and decision making process whereby personnel cuts will be made if they become necessary

LeGrand: We need to remember that Senate committees do not meet over the summer.

Nolen: In the event the Board will not accept a \$6 million budget cut, but instead will ask for deeper cuts, then difficult decisions will need to be made quickly. Shared governance does not take summer off. The planning and finance and policy advisory committees may need to keep active over the summer in order to participate in these decisions. I recognize summer is a time for faculty to recharge and write. But I would like to be able to call on enough of you so that if there is a budget matter over the summer we are able to respond to it.

Wright: Under the constitution, the planning & finance committee can appoint a subcommittee that can act on behalf of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. And that committee does include the executive committee as part of its composition.

Nolen: The same is true of the policy advisory committee.

Wright: The resolution is, "Be it resolved that the Chancellor will work with appropriate Senate committees (e.g. Planning and Finance and the Policy Advisory Committee) to develop a plan and decision making process whereby personnel cuts will be made if they become necessary."

DeAngelis: is that an open-ended resolution, or is it limited to just the current budget crisis?

Wright: It is possible that this budget crisis will continue for several years, so I would keep it open-ended.

Sen. Leonard calls the question

Motion passes

Nolen: We can now move back to the Airing of Grievances.

Matson: I am constantly frustrated that we hear criticisms that UA Little Rock is overstaffed and we have no response to this. I would like Policy Advisory Committee to look at our actual staffing levels.

LeGrand: Math department instructors teach 4-5 classes a semester with 35-40 students each. And most if not all do service and professional development and teaching. And they bring in revenue in SSCHs. As an instructor I'm standing up for instructors and all the revenues that we bring in.

Comment: I would like to extend that to adjuncts.

Jovanovic: The expenses for summer teaching get paid out of Deans' budgets, but the revenues from summer teaching go directly to Steve [McClellan]. They are in two completely different pots.

VI. Reports

A. Provost's Report - Christy Drale

Drale: I told the executive committee that I would not have an extensive report because many things are on hold. All searches are on hold for the time being. When Steve was describing the budget for fiscal year 2020, I said I needed to know details. I need to let you know that as of now, open positions have been taken out of the fiscal year 2020 budget. Exceptions are positions where we have someone currently in the position or where we had a signed offer letter. We did maintain dean positions but the only ones we are moving forward on right now are the ones that are internal searches, i.e. the CALS dean, the Vice Provost for Research & Dean of the Graduate School, and the Associate Dean of EIT searches. We've kept the salary for the CSSC dean's position in the budget, but it was an external search and it is on hold. We have also kept the salary for the Business School dean since Jane Wayland is in the position until December, but that search is also on hold for now. We do not know how many of the visiting positions we will keep for next year, but all those positions with an active search have been taken out of the budget. I don't know how much leeway we will have with positions this coming year. We may not be able to move money easily from maintenance to salaries, for example. But my objective is to bargain for positions with whatever substitute dollars we can muster. I do not want to mislead anyone. Our system president wants us to prioritize cutting positions and particularly faculty positions. He believes we have too many. And that is the nature of the discussion we are having with the system office and Board of Trustees. Keep in mind that even if we are able to find some other kinds of cuts, we won't be able to make \$6 million in cuts without cutting positions. The Senate and IEC will look at those things. I am ready to recommend that ATLE not be taken out of the fiscal year 2020 budget at this time. But if the Board of Trustees comes back and demands \$12 million in cuts, then all bets are off. I feel like I'm going through stages of grief: denial,

anger, and now bargaining. Even if we were to agree with the board that downsizing is necessary, we want it to be strategic. We want to use rational criteria and think this through. I am gratified to hear ideas from everyone about how to address the budget gap. We should not wait for other people to figure out how we will do this. We have some departments that will lose three, four, or five faculty members under the current plan. I hope we can bargain out of some of these more extreme outcomes.

Jovanovic: As Provost, you serve on the Cabinet as the only representative of the academic side of the university. The Chancellor is hearing 7 or 8 voices that don't represent academics and only one that does. For instance, as a non-academic unit, athletics gets represented in the Cabinet. I don't whether net revenue is positive or negative for athletics, but it seems to me that if we are making cuts it makes more sense to cut things like athletics before academics. What is the discussion like on this subject?

Drale: I am not at liberty to speak about the discussions in the Cabinet meetings. The Chancellor maintains strict confidentiality in those discussions. I will say that discussion of athletics has some up.

Giammo: Are we at the point where we should be contacting candidates that the searches are off?

Drale: We will next week (Wednesday possibly) if the system office is on board with our budget. At that point I will know better how much bargaining room I have to unfreeze searches. I am suggesting that deans and chairs tell candidates who are waiting that due to budget challenges we have had to review all open searches and that we hope to get back to them in a week or two.

Jensen: Does the Board have a number on faculty overstaffing?

Drale: One stat the Board looks at is FTE faculty to student ratios. Last year we were at 14-1 and were lowest in the state and this year it is 12-1. So we are far below other institutions in the state. I realize we are not comparable, but this stat is hurting us at this point.

Question: I don't know how this works, and I have many questions about the UA system and the system president. I want to know if there is a way we can cut to the chase and find out what sort of institution the system expects us to be?

Drale: I would also like to have a conversation about the role and scope of this institution. Our role and scope are already defined with ADHE, and if we are changing that, then we need to know that. If we continue to make cuts, we can continue our role as a comprehensive institution, but the graduate studies and research roles of our university will be jeopardized by higher teaching loads.

Wright: What do we have in writing from the System about where it wants to see our faculty-student ratios? Is this verbal communication? It feels strange to be acting on hearsay from the UA system president with no documents supporting this.

Drale: I haven't seen anything in writing.

VanderPutten: Do you now whether we calculate FTE faculty-student ratio on just undergraduate students and faculty or everyone?

Drale: It is all faculty, and even includes lecturers since it is an FTE figure.

Cody Decker: It includes standalone graduate programs and adjuncts and professional staff that teach courses.

Jovanovic: What I am hearing is that if your program doesn't have four or five hundred students or doesn't offer core courses that serve lots of students, you are at risk. A program that graduates 20 seniors a year will never have the faculty-student ratio the system wants to see and so those faculty should make other plans for their career. Specifically I hear that EIT programs are in jeopardy. If the message is other than that, I need to hear it.

Drale: I don't mean to go that far. You could have a faculty-student ratio in the 14 to 15 range and without having enormous classes and be acceptable. I cannot speak for the system president and the metrics he is using. I can't confirm then that this is or is not the message that we should be taking. But that is not the way I see it.

Anson: Does the system president have a plan for us? Is his major concern simply that we have a deficit? Or is his concern that we need to be restructured more fundamentally?

Drale: I don't know the answer to that.

Wright: This is more of a comment than a question. There are only two departments that have more than 600 majors. If we have to have 600 or more majors per department, then it seems like the result for us is obvious.

Drale: We only have three or four majors with that many students, e.g. Nursing. If that is the threshold we are all in very big trouble.

Douglas: You mentioned that the internal searches for dean positions will go forward. What will happen to the lines they vacate?

Drale: It depends on where the person is now. For CALS, it won't change much. But in the case of the dean of graduate studies, we need to think about what happens.

B. Undergraduate Council - Mike Tramel

Nolen: The undergraduate council's March report is on the Faculty Senate website. Its April report will be up soon. Anything to add to that from undergraduate council?

Tramel: We have two items. We have a draft of our process for interpreting our decisions [per Senate legislation this year]. Second, we plan to bring forth a motion at our next meeting that deals with clemency in undergrad programs. This will use the same logic as for graduate programs.

Jovanovic: What is the deadline for submitting catalog changes for 2021?

Malissa Mattis: For 2021 changes need to be submitted by November 1, 2019.

C. Graduate Council - Karen Kuralt

Nolen: The Graduate Council's report is available on the Faculty Senate website. Anything from Graduate Council to add?

D. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies - Belinda Blevins-Knabe

Nolen: The Core Council's report is available on the Faculty Senate website. Anything to add, Belinda [Blevins-Knabe]?

Blevins-Knabe: This year we spent a lot of time on core course review. Those reports and the assessment reports are available.

E. Faculty Governance and Planning and Finance Committees - Wright/Cheatham

Cheatham: At this point, the governance committee report is short. I want to thank all the members this year. It meets weekly and takes the time, so please take the opportunity to thank your college representative. We are also continuing to work on policies. Being one of the longest-serving members on the Senate, I would say that this is the third significant challenging time the university has gone through. I was assembly president at a challenging time when the UA System was created. Andrew [Wright] has put all the assembly and senate agenda and minutes online. If you read the September 1981 minutes, you will find details about how the University Assembly and the City of Little Rock came together to remind the system we are a strong university. At another point in the 1980s, the state cut our budget four times in one fiscal year and we had major financial challenges. We were growing but never had enough resources to continue to grow. We came out of that as a stronger institution. If we come together now, we will get through this as a stronger institution on the other side of it. We first have to decide for ourselves what our future can and should be. We want to look for strategies that make us more proactive in recruitment and make it easier for students to matriculate. I have spoken with the Chancellor about a couple of recommendations.

The first recommendation relates to how we schedule summer classes right now. We recommend that the summer schedule accompany the spring semester schedule rather than the fall schedule

because students tend to plan summer when they plan spring, not when they plan for the upcoming fall semester. Malissa Mathis and I spoke about this and think it is doable. It would also help with financial aid and academic advising. We spend a lot of time over the past two years figuring out patterns of summer enrollment and funding for summer school. One of the things that would be an improvement would be to change the way summer school is funded to make it more of a profit-cost center that departments could use to act entrepreneurially. In recent years we have had more of a fixed model for doing summer school where the costs and revenues go to different units. Kudos to Denise [LeGrand] for finding a wonderful model for guidelines on cancellation of classes. Ed Anson & John Hendon worked the policy into UA Little Rock language. We do not have a traditional student body where students take courses in the fall and spring and then take summer off.. We can get closer to becoming a three term university to help our students be more successful in getting their degrees.

Sen. Cheatham reads the suggested summer policy.

Cheatham: The goal of this policy then is to give departments greater incentives at generating student interest in and revenues from summer courses.

Nolen: The report has been posted on the senate web page. As it is only just now introduced to the senate, who have not read the proposal, I am not inclined to have them vote on it today. We can merely vote to receive the report.

Wright moves to receive the report on guidelines for cancellation of classes.

Anson seconds the motion.

Motion to receive the report passes.

Cheatham: A couple of other comments. We do think that there are relatively simple things we can do that may make a difference in recruiting concurrent enrollment students. We have a lot of information about students who are taking our classes – if they are enrolled in world civilization, college algebra, etc. We know their ACT score and their grades. If a faculty member would write a letter of congratulations to those students, it personalizes the contact and gives us an opportunity to mention programs the student may be interested in at A Little Rock. In addition, faculty are at the front lines in recognizing when students are at risk for dropping out. On the issue of committee meetings over the summer, more often than not I have done committee work over summer. I have always found this valuable at making us a stronger university.

F. Executive Committee - Amanda Nolen

Nolen: I have a couple of matters. One is the strategic undergraduate recruitment report that has been posted for feedback. Speaking for the executive committee, we are not satisfied with that report. The plan needs to be flipped and the same level of detail given to first-time-in-college

freshmen needs to be given to returning, veteran, and non-traditional students, which represent growth areas for this institutions. Demographic projections show that first year freshman enrollment is diminishing. We need to capitalize on what we do well and the strategic recruitment plan needs to show it.

Second, you should note that we do not have academic calendar to approve. The calendar committee is working on a set of decision-making criteria on the calendar that the Senate that would approve. Those criteria would automate the process of creating the calendar so that we can approve a five year academic calendar rather than year-by-year.

VII. Old Business - None

VIII. New Business

- A. **Motion FS_2019_17** Executive Committee. (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required) 2019 Spring and Summer graduates

Be it resolved that those applicants completing all requirements for various degrees in the 2019 Spring and Summer Semesters shall be approved for graduation. (see ualr.edu/facultysenate for a list of candidates for graduation, current as of 04/19/2019).

Nolen introduces the motion on behalf of the Executive Committee.

Motion passes.

- B. **(Pending Interpretation of Senate Legislation: Interpretation I - FS_2013_7, FS_2013_8, FS_2013_11, FS_2013_12, FS_2013_13, FS_2014_16, FS_2014_17, FS_2014_18, FS_2014_19, FS_2015_1 as these apply to FS_2012-2013_10 as amended by FS_2014_9 and Interpretation II - FS_2017_3 as it applies to the authority of the Core Council to amend Learning Outcomes)**

Motion FS_2019_18 Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Remove Educational Goal: Values 3 - Global and Cultural Knowledge from the Mathematics Curricular Area

Be it resolved to modify the Criteria for Mathematics Curricular Area (approved 10/2013) as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

Criteria for Mathematics Curricular Area

Courses to meet the Area of Mathematics: Courses in this area focus on teaching students the concepts and methodologies, findings, and applications of mathematics while developing their inquiry and analysis skills. All courses in this area also address quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, problem solving, and a commitment to ethical behavior.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS	LEARNING OUTCOMES
Skills 1: Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - understand and use basic mathematical formulas and terminology - explain orally and in writing the mathematical “reasonableness” of a statement that is presented as being implied by data - communicate about mathematics precisely orally and in writing
Skills 2: Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, and Solving Problems Individually and Collaboratively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interpret , analyze, and identify appropriate applied mathematical models, data and graphs - develop abstract and quantitative reasoning ability
Skills 3 - Information Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - makes appropriate decisions regarding the use of technology when solving problems, recognizing both the insight to be gained and the limitation - use information resources like the Internet reflectively for inquiry, exploration, and communication
Knowledge 1 - Concepts, Methodologies, Findings, and Applications of Mathematics and the Social and Natural Sciences, Engineering, and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - understand mathematical relationships among quantities - understand fundamental mathematic/algebraic operations
Values 1 - Ethical Behavior and Personal Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - take responsibility for completing assignments in an ethical manner, working on their own when required and acknowledging resources when used - understanding the duty to be precise and accurate with data
Values 3 – Global and Cultural Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analyze “real world” implications and develop mathematical models that aid in the understanding of current global issues

Be it further resolved that upon approval the changes to the Criteria for Mathematics Curricular Area will be effective July 2019.

Commentary: The Mathematics Core Area Assessment Committee is requesting that the Core Goal *Value 3: Global and Cultural Knowledge* be removed from the core mathematics area. After a full round of assessment, the committee has determined that Value 3 is neither a reasonable nor assessable goal in the area of core mathematics. It is simply not addressed in core level mathematics courses.

Nolen: Before we can talk about this motion, we need to deal with interpretation of legislation. The Senate received an interpretation memo from me before the meeting. Previous legislation describes the general education curriculum. Since then the Core Curriculum has mapped learning outcomes to the goals of particular areas. It is implied that in making these changes, the Senate intended to change its original legislation. If that is not the case, then we would have conflicting pieces of legislation. I would entertain a motion to accept this interpretation of previous Senate action.

Cheatham moves accepting this interpretation.

Motion is seconded.

Motion to accept this interpretation to map changes in subsequent legislation onto the original general curriculum legislation passes.

Nolen: A second interpretation of legislation we are making is that the Faculty Senate retains authority over any changes in curriculum mapping that need to be made.

Wright: Just to make clear, the Senate retains specific authority over the definition of curricular areas and mapping, while authority to change learning outcomes remains with the Core Council.

Nolen: Yes.

Nolen: I went through every piece of legislation on core curriculum and did a word to word comparison.

President Nolen calls for a vote on the second proposed interpretation in the interpretation memo.

Motion passes.

Nolen: Motion FS_2019_18 comes from the Core Council. Belinda, would you introduce it?

Blevins-Knabe: The purpose of this motion is to remove Value 3 on Global and Cultural Knowledge from the criteria for the Mathematics Curricular Area.

Cheatham: I am assuming the math department supports this.

Nolen: I presume they do.

Blevins-Knabe: The math department didn't just ask us, they begged us to make this change. They found that it is not workable. The whole math department knows this change is proposed.

President Nolen calls for a vote on the motion.

Motion passes.

- C. **Motion FS_2019_19** Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings of the Faculty Senate - second vote verbatim to the first vote, no second required, first vote.) Modify Article III of the University Assembly to change AIGC committee member terms of service.

Be it resolved to amend Article III of the Constitution of the University Assembly as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee hears specific grade appeals and hears, on appeal and referral, cases involving certain academic offenses. The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee comprises fifteen (15) faculty and three (3) faculty alternates. New faculty members to be appointed each May annually in the spring by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly. ~~each May and~~ In addition, ~~seventeen (17) students and three (3) student alternates. to be appointed each May no later than the~~ beginning of the fall semester. Twelve (12) voting and two (2) alternate undergraduate students will be appointed by the Student Government Association and five (5) voting and one (1) alternate graduate students will be appointed by the Graduate Student Association no later than the beginning of the fall semester. The term of office begins with the fall semester ~~and continues for twelve months.~~ The faculty members shall serve three-year staggered terms and students shall serve a one-year term.

Be it further resolved that upon approval the changes to the committee members terms of service will be effective July 2020.

Sen. Macheak introduces the motion on behalf of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Wright: Anytime you have a committee of 20 or more members, many of whom are student members, it can be difficult to get it staffed and get it to meet. One year we never got a quorum even for it to elect a chair. We need to go further in making changes to this committee than this motion goes. For instance, it is hard to get people to agree to do one-year term much less a three-year term on this committee. It would be appropriate to refer this matter to the faculty governance committee for more consideration on how to structure it so it gets a quorum regularly at its meetings. The governance committee can bring this back at the beginning of next semester.

Nolen: An important consideration with this committee is achieving diversity in representation on the committee so that it reflects the diversity of students who appear before the committee.

Blevins-Knabe: Rather than allowing this committee to languish for another year, we should move forward with the current motion. We can address the other problems next year.

Matson: Is it a three year term for students on the committee?

Nolen: No, one-year terms for students, three-year terms for faculty.

Wright: I would vote against this motion as it is. We have to wait at least another month if we pass it now anyway. And as I said before, I think the three year term will make it more difficult to get faculty to serve on it. That could make the situation worse.

Wright moves to refer this motion to the governance committee.

Motion to refer is seconded.

Blevins-Knabe: In my experience with core council and three-year terms there is that people come and go as needed. I don't think that will keep people from agreeing to serve.

Nolen: Keep in mind this even if we approve the motion today, it would need a second vote at the August meeting. So it could not go into effect until July 2020, thus there is no rush. As the previous AIGC chair I can say that retention on the committee is not a problem. We had over 70% retention of returning members on the committee. Extending the term to three-years might actually hurt that. The governance committee could look more closely at this issue in the context of the overall committee structure of the senate.

Scranton: I would like to hear from someone on AIGC why they proposed this motion.

Macheak: One of the reasons is that we have to undergo training for this committee. So a longer term may reduce turnover and the need to continually do training. Another problem is getting

people to be available for hearings. People serving on the committee often are not available to serve on the hearings.

Wright: As a former Senate president, it was my job to get people to agree to serve on this committee. I am concerned that if we make this change that we will make it harder to get faculty to agree to serve. If we can reduce the number of people on the committee, it will be easier to get a quorum. Having people to serve as hearing panelists is a separate issue. We should be careful about creating a new problem as we fix an existing problem.

Barrio-Vilar: Could we make it a two-year term instead of a three-year term?

Macheak: Our committee considered that, but we decided to use the faculty governance committee as a model so we could do staggered terms.

Comment: I have served on this committee. Part of the problem is simply lack of communication, i.e. not asking people to serve. I do think we do need more training and I found it to be interesting. I do think it is beneficial to have terms longer than one year.

DeAngelis: I am not certain I understand the time commitment expected for this committee. Is it a lot of commitment for a short-time, or not a lot of commitment for a long time? How often does this committee meet?

Nolen: It meets at least once as a whole to elect a chair. Thereafter, it generally creates panels to hear individual grievances that are brought to the committee.

Macheak: Those panels are usually no more than about two hours. The difficulty is in getting them scheduled.

Nolen: Just a reminder that the motion on the floor is to refer this matter to the governance committee.

Sen. Anson moves to call the question.

DeAngelis calls a point of order

DeAngelis: Calling the question should not immediately move the motion to a vote. It requires a vote from the body on whether to end debate. We've been ignoring votes on calling the question a lot lately, at least twice today.

President Nolen calls for a vote on ending debate.

Motion to end debate passes.

President Nolen calls for a vote on referring motion FS_19_2019 to the governance committee.

Motion to refer passes.

- D. **Motion** Executive Committee (Procedural. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required). Amend a motion previously adopted on April 27, 2018 referring the matter of proposed revisions to the Policy on Tenure to the Committee on Tenure, Faculty Governance Committee, and the Executive Committee, to bring revisions back to the senate in the Fall 2018.

Be it resolved to rescind all other referrals to the Executive Committee, the Committee on Tenure, and the Faculty Governance Committee.

Nolen: This motion is procedural. It simply recognizes that we have addressed everything we intended to address in the referral of the motion on tenure last year to the executive, tenure, and governance committees. Anything we did not do, we intentionally did not do.

Motion to rescind passes.

IX. Open Forum

Nolen: Is there anything anyone would like to add to our discussion of the budget earlier?

Cheatham: Thank you for your leadership

Nolen: This was not the year that I had anticipated, but I am happy to have served and while it was a challenging year it was also a rewarding year. Thank you senators for your commitment and willingness to doing this very important work.

X. Adjourn

President Nolen adjourns the meeting at 4:16 p.m.