

Middle Tennessee State University
Faculty Senate
March 23, 2009 – CALLED MEETING

Action Items:

- Please review the minutes from the last meeting as posted online; they will be presented for approval at the next meeting.
- Please review the OSC recommendations and the President's response; plan to share recommendations and responses at the correct time.
- Faculty need to lobby for reasonable tuition increase, concerns of returning to appropriate levels of state funding.

Faculty Senate Meeting:

- 1) Roll Call
 - a) Members Present – F. Amey, M. Arndt, M. Balachandran, D. Belcher, C. Bratten, J. Brickey, L. Burriss, J. Cain, N. Callendar, J. Carter, W. Cribb, S. Daughtery, J. Dowdy, L. Fisher, M. Foster, G. Freeman, C. Frost, B. Haskew, J. Hausler, C. Higgins, W. Ilesley, J. LeBlond, N. Kelker, A. Lutz, J. Marcellus M. Martin, J. Maynor, T. McBreen, R. McBride, W. Means, A. Miller, L. Mulraine, K. Nofsinger, J. Oliver, D. Penn, J. Pennington, T. Perry, M. Rice, K. Rushlow, S. Seipel, L. Selva, K. Smith, C. Stephens, S. Taylor, R. Untch, P. Wall, B. Wallace, L. Warise, W. Warren, J. Wermert
 - b) Members Excused –
 - c) Members Absent –
 - d) Additional attendees-
- 2) Documents
 - a) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund policy statement as printed from ed.gov/print/policy/gen/leg/recovery/factsheet/stabilization-fund.html
 - b) Letter to Faculty Senate dated 3/19/09
 - c) President's response to Oversight Steering Committee Report from MTSU web site.
- 3) Discussion
 - a) From the floor: The President's response to the letter sent by A. Lutz represented the will of the senate. The President'sthis was inappropriately worded. We choose not to respond in any way other than officially This was not a personal letter, but responded to as if it were.*
 - b) OSC #1 (p.5) Addressing issues of staffing will begin with a committee review: 5 chairs, 2 deans, Lutz and K. Smith will be on committee that addresses staffing formula. This will examine Fall08 guidelines to determine Faculty Workload. ON this document, slight changes can make big difference. First meeting will be next week. This is new to the reports. Faculty comments:
 - i) Primarily, full time temps will be filled from lines that have been removed from
 - ii) Clearly, faculty lines will have to be cut in order to come up with real money
 - iii) Staffing formulas based on SCH but workload is based on number of classes.
 - iv) Using faculty but losing students – which is going to change staffing

- v) The changes undercut appropriate academic preparation by temps and by regular faculty.
- vi) Difference between evaluated vs implemented is an ominous difference in intention as worded.
- vii) The changes recommended here is causing a major problem with undergraduate education and its quality.
- viii) The President does not want a cut across the board; selective hiring is still continuing.
- ix) This will make us look like a lot of community college professors when it comes to workloads and yet offering PhD classes.
- x) Staffing formula – need to comment and express concerns about small lab courses and quality academic preparation by faculty – temp and regular. How is staffing formula evolving to address changes in academic PHD problems.
- xi) (B2 in president’s letter) Should we respond to “is there a crisis or are we using the crisis as an excuse to change the university”?
 - (1) There is a budget crisis
 - (2) McPhee’s intent is to remake the image of MTSU
 - (3) The document is meaningless without numbers coming out of it.
 - (4) DNJ – President McPhee is being commended at every opportunity. However, there is no info included about what is actually happening. Nor is it mentioned that the whole process has been demoralizing to faculty and students.
 - (5) NO other schools know anything about what is going on and are getting no information. Are we ahead of the curve or are our strings being pulled? What are other Presidents being told that is different from McPhee and why? Why is the \$ per student not changing at MTSU other than to go down.
 - (6) We need a real budget proposal so that we can see results of cuts.
 - (7) There is evidence that the requirements from the Federal government are being ignored (see ed.gov document); is Gov Bredesen giving Dr. McPhee marching orders because he has no intention of refunding higher ed even if the economy is better?
 - (8) If we want to be paid commensurate with the peer institutions, then we need to look like those institutions.
- xii) Our general response needs to be that there is no new information here and we need to know specific dollar amounts.
- xiii) You are looking at \$850 (-14%) per student per year from 22000 students. All students would agree to this. To take the stimulus money, they are attaching a cap on tuition. Can we use the stimulus money to bridge an incremental tuition raise?
 - (1) Why ruin undergraduate programs to support graduate programs when they can essentially pay for themselves.
 - (2) The agenda appears to eliminate money and then prepare for growth with a lot of money. Where are the realistic estimates of money and tuition and program growth?
- xiv) (OSC 6.1 -6.4)(p. 14) – We need to be proactive and encourage development of savings and reorganizing because we now have time to do so.
- xv) B2 – Lutz: there should be clear identification of cuts that save money and cuts for repositioning.

- xvi) This document does not clearly reflect the intent of the actions. What is the effect and intention of saving jobs beyond two years? How many people will retire or move during this time period?
- xvii) Motion with second-
 - (1) Thank you for not making draconian cuts.
 - (2) We need numbers so that we can depersonalize and make a budget instead of personal issue. Lutz (B2 crisis or repositioning? & B4 staffing)
 - (3) {1 -4 p. 14 new money issues – participation} – include later after we have the numbers.
 - (4) Participation in staffing reformulaion
 - (5) Clear identification of purpose of cuts.
 - (6) Where are the savings?
 - (7) Changing schedules drastically impact academic issues
 - (8) How are new college changes addressing AMP (instead of creation of College of Visual and Performing Arts)?
 - (9) If these are housed in the Provost's office, then we need to work at that level. We need to be actively involved in generating the numbers that will influence these outcomes. These 30 reports need to be produced by October and we to be aware of all progress.
 - (10) We need some guidance to be produced before April 1, 2 at open houses.
 - (11) Letter to McPhee
 - (a) Reconfiguring staffing
 - (b) Thanks for information and current involvement and lack of draconion measures
 - (c) Provide some of the numbers so we can make substantive recommendations
 - (d) Continuned meaningful and informed involvement in decisions during the next few months
 - (e) Preservation of tenure at all costs, especially with respect to merged depts and colleges.
 - (12) A letter from Steering Committee to be drafted on Wed at 3pm addressing these issues because quorum is gone. Will send to full senate for review so that we can provide letter to President on 30th.
- c) Thanks to Lutz and K. Smith and Steering Committee for their diligence.
- 4) Action Items
 - a) Review minutes as posted online.
- 5) Adjournment

Set us back 30 years and therefore sets up for failure in time for cuts 2 years from now. Where can people get degrees and jobs if these concetrations are cut? Is this window dressing for TBR? Numbers are incorrect and what about curricuar impact for students and numbers game when there are no savings.