

**Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate  
Franklin College of Arts & Sciences  
February 5, 2004  
Pending Approval**

**1. Call to Order:**

Presiding officer Nancy Felson [Classics] called the meeting to order at 3:39 PM in Room 150 of the Student Learning Center.

**2. Identification of Proxies and Visitors:**

Proxies: Robert Moser for Luis Correa-Diaz [Romance Languages]

Absences: Rebecca Engauser [Dance], Michael Marshall [Art], K.K. Mon [Physics], Jim Coverdill

Visitors: Tom Jackson [Public Affairs], Angela Turner [Newsource 15], Ronell Smith [Banner-Herald], representatives from Fox News and the Red & Black.

Total: 39 Present, 4 Absent.

3. Presentation by Aaron Johnson [Institute for Behavioral Research] summarizing the results of the recent faculty survey regarding the leadership of President Michael Adams. This power-point presentation is available on the Senate web-site.

4. Report by Robert Rumley [Math] regarding two meetings requested by the administration:

MEETING WITH PROVOST ARNETT MACE ON 1/27/04 AT 2:00 PM IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE.

Present: Nancy Felson, Robert Rumely, Dean Anderson and Provost Mace.

Provost Mace stated three concerns if the Senate went forward with a confidence vote:

- 1) It might undermine President Adams' ability to represent the University to the Legislature during the current budget negotiations.
- 2) It might harm the search for a new Dean if candidates learned of an open conflict between the faculty and the President at our institution.
- 3) It might weaken President Adams' position with the Board of Regents. If the President should resign or the Regents should decide that it is time to remove him, we might not be able to recruit high-quality candidates at this time, in light of the recent controversies with the Foundation, the Athletic Association, and the faculty.

Dr. Mace invited us to express our concerns. We said the faculty's main concern was the administration's style form of top-down management, making decisions without faculty input about issues having great impact on faculty and the University. Two prime examples are the Parking situation from two years ago, and the imposition of the ½ course extra teaching load last year. We expressed long-term faculty concern about the philosophy of the leaders of the University, with their focus on rewarding units that bring in money and their management of the University as a corporation rather than an institute of higher learning focused on the production of knowledge (research) and excellence in teaching. In many areas, we said, the quality of the academic environment is being degraded—through increased teaching loads, loss of permanent faculty and increase in contract faculty, increased class sizes, and performance-based budgeting which rewards

efficiency rather than excellence. We need the administration to be our advocate to the Board of Regents on these issues.

Provost Mace said these matters concerned him as well. He acknowledged the increase in the use of contract faculty in lower-division courses (19.8% in 2003, 23.9% in 2003-2004), as well as increased class sizes (22→ 34 in upper division courses, 32→39 in lower division courses. He said the budget cuts had mandated these changes, along with as the additional½ course teaching load. He added that he is serving on a Board of Regents committee that wants to normalize teaching loads across the University System and that he expects the average load at Research Universities to be set at 4 courses per year. We expressed shock and said that this would be a step backward in those divisions of the College where the teaching load is currently under 4 courses. Dean Anderson cited a number of examples of lower course but not workloads, and said he hoped the Dean would have the freedom to deem various activities, such as lab supervision, as work-equivalents of courses.

Provost Mace said that, although President Adams was precluded from making public statements about the Audit, he would be glad to meet with a small group of Faculty representatives and discuss candidly any concerns we might have. In light of this request, Nancy Felson set up a meeting the following Wednesday, inviting officers and committee chairs of the Senate to attend.

#### MEETING WITH PRESIDENT ADAMS AND PROVOST MACE ON 2/4/04, 4 P.M., IN THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

Present: Elois Ann Berlin, Randy Clarke, Doug Crowe, Nancy Felson, Marjanne Gooze, Barbara McCaskill, Jaxk Reeves, and Robert Rumely, and Dean Anderson. The agenda, set by senate officers and committee chairs and sent to President Adams ahead of time, focused on issues of governance and communication rather than the Audit.

The meeting was frank and free-ranging. We begin by reporting on the Faculty Senate Poll and said we would share both the numbers and the rationale statements after we presented them to the full Senate. We then turned to problems with faculty governance and asked President Adams to express his philosophy on faculty input into major decisions affecting them. We asked about the Studies Abroad 10% tuition return (Were faculty involved in Studies Abroad consulted on this decision?) and Teaching Loads (What faculty committee is being consulted? How far have decisions gone? What impact can faculty have and how?)

President Adams began by affirming his belief in shared governance, and said that he thinks that in the last two years the administration has made changes in the way they do things. He spends most of his time dealing with the macro-level, and on that level, faculty had given input on such issues as strategic planning and the budget, mainly through the University Council. He noted how he had spent the last two days in Washington negotiating grants, and this noon had met with a donor; he delegates many day-to-day decisions to the Provost, Deans, and Vice-Presidents. He acknowledged it as a legitimate complaint if faculty think they have not been adequately represented in budget issues. Right now, however, we are facing a cut of \$50-60 million out of our original \$400+ million appropriation from the State, and it could go as high as \$80 million. There will be open forums this spring on how to implement these cuts, if they occur. He invited faculty members to come with him to the legislative session on Thursday, February 12 to discuss the budget. He said it was very helpful to bring real live faculty for legislators to see, and it would also be good for faculty to see the range of attitudes legislators have.

We repeatedly expressed our distress at the lack of consultation on issues that affect faculty and mentioned the desire for formal representation on the University Council Executive Committee, as a step to getting input into decisions before they are made. On the 10% tuition return on study abroad programs, for example, program directors were given no advance notice, even though plans had been made. Provost Mace said that the issue was being dealt with, and that any program administrators who could document hardships would have the tuition tax postponed; the tax, he said, was needed to fund University overhead expenses

incurred by the programs. As another example, Marjanne Gooze said that cuts in travel money and the extra 1/2 course teaching loads (imposed without consultation) were having a severe impact on research in the Humanities, making its faculty feel they were at the bottom of the heap, and their contributions were not valued. The cuts did not impact science faculty as much because they had big outside grants, but such grants are not as plentiful in the Humanities, especially for older faculty. There is a serious morale problem in the humanities, and a great fear that gains in the research environment over the past decade will be reversed.

Barbara McCaskill brought up the hardships caused, especially in the Humanities, by the admission of an extra 800 freshmen last fall. President Adams said that had been a big mistake, and that they had changed the admissions procedure (including implementing a waiting list) to make sure it did not happen again. Robert Rumely raised the issue of the 4-course teaching load that Provost Mace had indicated might be mandated by the Regents and the Legislature. He asked if the Provost understood that it would destroy UGA as a research University: that top faculty would leave, it would be difficult to recruit the best young faculty, and the rest of the faculty would be resentful. He added that there is a need for early faculty input on key issues affecting them. Provost Mace said it would only be an average 4-course load, not necessarily realized at the department level. However, he did not make clear how the average would be computed.

President Adams and Provost Mace both said they were unhappy about these issues but that they were consequences of the severe budget cuts we have suffered. President Adams said that the Legislature made a decision to cut the operating budget (which funds personnel) but to add \$200 million to the capital budget (which funds construction) through the issuance of bonds. The new construction projects would be distributed throughout the State, as a means of bringing the State out of its recession. He said UGA was getting about \$60 million of this, a greater share than any other institution; given a choice between having \$60 million added to the operating budget, or \$60 million to the capital budget, he would instantly take it in the operating budget; but since that was not possible, would we want to turn it down in the capital budget? Several of us said this perspective on new construction should be more widely known

. Again, we emphasized the need for better communication. President Adams affirmed his commitment to this and said that in early March he would make a presentation to the Faculty about the budget, soon enough for faculty input to make a difference. By then, we would know how the Governor's proposed budget had fared in the Legislature.

#### **4. Senate response to the faculty survey.**

We voted unanimously not to defer the vote on questions 1 and 2 of the poll until our February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. Senators expressed diverse views as to whether poll results serve as a mandate for the Senate. Most agreed that, since 2/3 of the faculty already feel that the upper administration is not responsive to their input, the Senate should take care not to seem similarly unresponsive; some expressed the view that we still have to act in the best interests of the faculty—e.g., if we have information that the faculty at large does not have that would contradict an action specified by the larger faculty.

We voted (38 to 1) to change an ad hoc committee, constituted by the Committee on Committees, to draft a statement in response to question one of the poll and present it at the regularly scheduled Senate meeting of February 19, 2004. The statement should reflect the comments of the College faculty at large. Interested senators were encouraged to volunteer for this committee.

We defeated a motion (17 to 18) to vote at today's meeting on question 2 of the poll: should the faculty senate conduct a vote of confidence. Some felt that faculty needed time to digest the results of the survey, to consider President Adam's responses, and to complete the draft in response to question 1 of the poll; others

argued that delay made the Senate appear unresponsive and ineffectual. The defeat of the motion left it open that the Senate would take up this issue on February 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM

Submitted by B. Randy Hammond, Psychology.