

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on February 28, 2018 at 3 p.m. in the Jefferson Room in Grawemeyer Hall, Vice Chair Krista Wallace-Boaz presiding.

### **Voting Members Present:**

Krista Wallace-Boaz, Enid Trucios-Haynes, Pam Feldhoff, Rob Barker, Roger Bradshaw, Terri Holtze, David Simpson, Chin Ng, Sherri Brown, Roy Fuller, JP Mohsen, Beth Willey

### **Also Attending:**

Tracy Eells, Ginger Brown, Jonathan Fuller, Susan Howarth, Dan Durbin, David Schultz, Reg Bruce, Sandra Frazier, Leslie Strohm, Bonita Black (videoconference) Dale Billingsley, John Karman, Joseph Lyell

### **Voting Members Not Present:**

David Owen

### **Call to Order**

Committee Chair Wallace-Boaz welcomed all and introductions were made.

### **PRESENTATION: BUDGETS – Susan Howarth, Dan Durbin**

**STATE BUDGET:** Ms. Howarth began with saying that both the state and UofL's budgets will most likely be out within a few days. In the past, the governor's budget was the worst-case scenario, but the House funded education. This House budget is the same as the governor's and will go to the Senate, where it will be cut even further. As always, we will just have to wait and see where it ends. The CPE has been quiet on what it will push and the Board of Trustees is not sure what it will do regarding tuition.

**INTERNAL OPERATING BUDGET:** There are no scenarios at this time. Dr. Postel is waiting on the Budget Forum feedback. Once that is assessed, scenarios will be developed using a performance-based methodology, not a full blown model.

**HSC BUDGET:** Mr. Durbin then began his presentation on the HSC Budget process. He defined HSC as:

- University – This includes the academic and residents on HSC in Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Public Health, and EVP-HA Office.
- University Medical Corporation (UMC) – This includes all inpatient services in the teaching hospital (University Hospital) and the Brown Cancer Center.
- University of Louisville Physicians (ULP) – this includes all outpatient services that facilitates physicians' practices.

Mr. Durbin then reported on what these entities do;

- Teach – Nearly 2500 faculty members teach 2200 students and 700 residents.
- Research – In 2017, there was \$100M in research grants.
- Clinical Activity – There are 700 providers. In Dentistry, there were about 2M individual procedures done.

Further, University Hospital has 400 beds and is the only Level I Trauma Center for western Kentucky. It is a safety-net hospital with nearly 17K admits per year. It covers the city, state and region and is the last resort for people who need help the most – Medicaid and the indigent. Mr. Durbin's presentation included slides outlining the intricacy of HSC budget operations. The Board of Trustees approves the budget for the University piece on HSC, but not for UMC or ULP. Mr. Durbin went through each slide and explained the revenues and expenditures.

- Question: From 2011-2015, the net revenue for UofL went from +\$96M to -\$7M, due to unrealized revenue. Funds did not flow back to the University. Is that correct?
  - Reply: Not sure. He has not gone back to review that information.

## FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

- Question: Heard that not following through on billing created the \$48M shortfall over the years.
  - Reply: It spikes over years. The \$90M from KentuckyOne was intended to start a project and get it to stand on its own and generate revenue. Over the past 7 months since he has been at UofL, he has not seen the billing issue. But he has seen ebbs and flows and an imbalance over the years of income and out-go. In 2018, there will be a slight imbalance.
- Question: The KentuckyOne money pays for some faculty. What will happen when that money runs out? How will we backfill?
  - Reply: We won't. We will close programs.

Mr. Durbin reported that HSC closed 2017 with a positive cash balance. For 2018, all HSC deans and chairs are resetting their budgets, and they will be monitored. In strategizing with the deans, each were given a budget packet that includes all funds, goals & targets and a spending summary.

### **DISCUSSION: Tenure – Board of Trustees Tenure and Nepotism Subcommittee**

Ms. Sandra Frazier, Chair of the Board of Trustees subcommittee, welcomed all and thanked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for allowing this joint meeting. This committee wants to be up to date with peers regarding tenure. Thanks to the Staff Senate and Will Armstrong for addressing the nepotism piece on this issue. Tenure is a faculty issue, and thanks to Enid Trucios-Haynes and Bonita Black for their work. Senate Chair Trucios-Haynes reported that the Senate's Ad Hoc Tenure Committee goal to verify that UofL's tenure policy was up to date, it looked at peer institutions' and ACC schools' tenure policies. Ms. Frazier said that today's meeting was for discussion and, after digesting all the information, to come together in one month to collect ideas. She seeks to understand tenure and not to abolish it. Initially, the Board of Trustees believed the policy had never been reviewed, but that misconception has been corrected. She is interested in hearing thoughts on tenure.

- Question (Black): Does UofL's have a post-tenure review process and what is it?
  - Reply (Trucios-Haynes): Yes, there is a review process. And units have a review process, as well. There is a yearly work plan review and a 5 year review for tenured faculty. The review process holds faculty to their commitments.
- Question (Black): Are there any issues in granting tenure?
  - Reply (Trucios-Haynes): It is a very strenuous process that includes input from peers and student reviews.
  - Reply (Wallace-Boaz): Agrees that it is very strenuous and includes teaching, research and service components.
  - Reply (Barker): In the College of Business, we look at it as a very expensive commitment, not a casual decision. A unit must decide if the person is worth the investment and will be a service to the profession. It is gut wrenching for both the unit and the person. It takes months to gather documents. It is very comprehensive.
  - Comment (Eells): The tenured faculty in each department vote to add the new faculty member. Then, it must pass the dean and the provost.
- Question (Black): Are there any issues with the implementation process at UofL?
  - Reply (Barker): The post-tenure review process has a lack of meaningful incentives. For example, there is no raise pool. If you do good work, meet standards, etc., there is no outcome.
  - Comment (Black): The Board of Trustees is aware of that.
  - Comment (Billingsley): The incentive to continue excellent work is all internal. There are no outward rewards.
- Question (Black): Do you know of any universities with incentives?

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

- Reply (Billingsley): I know of none.
- Comment (Trucios-Haynes): Many excellent, hard-working and engaged faculty get satisfaction outside of money. We have experts to inspire students who are never financially rewarded. Community engagement is not counted in our work plan. We do it because of our own dedication to our passion.
- Comment (Trucios-Haynes): The process is common across universities. It turns out to be a 6 year review of a faculty member. The voting for or against is also very difficult.
- Comment (Barker): Tenure in context: This is not a job. It is our identity. There is no clock punching. A 5 year award is not what tenure is about. Post-tenure review is good for the institution, the faculty and the students. It keeps faculty engaged.
- Comment (Trucios-Haynes): Tenure ensures academic freedom and inquiry without fear of retribution. It gives us the opportunity to follow a new idea in research, unfettered by current political thought.
- Comment (Fuller): The public thinks tenure is job security. How can we help get the word out?
- Comment (Frazier): This discussion has helped immensely to understand that no dollar value can be place on the vocation and identity. Understanding the passion is very different than attaching a dollar amount to tenure. This has been a very informative conversation. To be reviewed every 5 years is a lot better than since 1995.
- Comment (Black): I appreciate the conversation. It is good to hear from the people living and breathing it. It would be good to have more people at the Board of Trustees meeting when we discuss this – to hear the real information and not just from a magazine article.
- Comment (Billingsley): We skipped over faculty who get tenure and then coast to retirement. In looking at this information, he was staggered to see the accomplishments of faculty over the past 10-14 years. There are very few instances of underperforming faculty post-tenure.
- Comment (Eells): Years ago, 97% of post-tenure reviews were 'satisfactory'. The REDBOOK's remediation plan resolved the 3%. It is not punitive, but to help the faculty meet expectations.
- Comment (Black): When we meet with the full Board, we will need more information on this issue.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gretchen Henry