

FACULTY SENATE REPORT
FEBRUARY 12, 2018

1. The diversity survey's release occasioned some frustration because the numbers weren't disaggregated in ways that would tell anyone how different populations were experiencing the university or how any unit in particular was doing. The president pledged to get the data disaggregated.
2. The budget survey received a large number of responses. A lot of the responses involved written suggestions (from boxes marked "other"), and those are being read and tabulated now. However, some frustration was expressed because the format of the survey required all options to be ranked in order to give any opinion at all, and this in many cases involved doing things like deciding whom to cut. So survey respondents were forced to enter rankings even if they thought one or more of the options should not be considered at all, and better possibilities were not listed and could only be written in as "other". This frustration was noted but since the survey has not been fully processed no action was promised on it. Budget forums were announced for 2/22 in Floyd Theater and 2/26 in Kornhauser.
3. The provost's report had to do considerably with the challenge of 'right-sizing' the University, possibly getting as high as 30,000 students within 5 years or so, and needing ideas for doing so. A number of ideas were offered involving using Shelby campus more, offering evening/weekend classes, more online, teaching in different languages such as Spanish, a completer's degree, etc. Suggestions to Provost.
4. The president was asked about the new pay-for-performance 'budget model' that is being implemented without going through faculty senate executive committee, planning & budget committee, or the senate as a whole. (And perhaps has also bypassed staff and student senates?) The president was a bit evasive about this, at first referring to it as funding based on revenue – if you make your revenue targets you get funded, if you miss your targets, some funding gets withheld – but then when questioned saying that it was just an implementation of the state's performance funding scheme. But this is quite different from a revenue-only performance model. This issue was not resolved, and potentially reflects a major change in the budget model being done without consultation.
5. There was some discussion of the rather vague/broad-brush-stroke document on "pillars of excellence" in implementing the 21st century initiatives.

Thanks, and sorry to have to file this electronically,
Avery Kolers