MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

The Faculty Senate met in regular session on Wednesday, April 24, 1991, at 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 4, Davis Hall. Chairman I. Bernstein presided.

ATTENDANCE: Present: President Nedderman, Vice-President Baker, Dr. Dunn; Senators Balsam, Bernstein, Dillon, Duwaji, Eisenfeld, Gates, Gaupp, Girardot, Harrison, Harwood, Herrmann, Hissong, Holder, Jones, Ladde, Merrill, Mykytyn, Fanton, Pape, Petry, Porter, Rings, Rodnitzky, Simmons, Tees, Thompson, Tolbert, Tong, Trask, Weed, Wiley, Wood. Absent: Dr. Lovry, Senators Antoniades, Bagby, Bett, Chuong, Green, Knerr, Mindel, Paulus, Smits, Walker.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Senator Merrill noted a correction on page 2 paragraph 2. Correction was read and noted and the minutes of March 15, 1991, were amended and approved by voice vote.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN:
Chairman Bernstein remarked on the following issues:
1. A healthy discussion regarding the summer budget was held at the Faculty Advisory Committee. The Department of Psychology, has disconnected the phones for the summer and they will be reconnected in September. The Fort Worth Business Press called regarding this issue and sent over a reporter. Chairman Bernstein stated that the Faculty Senate budget could pay for his phone but he would make the same sacrifice as his colleagues. Some minority of the faculty are concerned about what sacrifices are being made in administration, without in any sense saying that it is a reflection of the majority of faculty. Two resolutions that deal with this issue have been received and will become part of new business.

2. The Chairman congratulated Senator Mark Dunn who was recently selected a COFGO fellow for next year and recognized his tremendous effort.

3. Chairman Bernstein thanked Marcia Sanders, Diane Walter, and Toshika Valdium for their services. Recognition was made of the services not only of the Executive Committee (Senators: Pape, Petry, Ladde), but also some of the Senators who have chaired committees that have spent a considerable amount of time on issues all of which were important, Senators: Tong, Girardot, Tolbert, and Herrmann. Thanks went to President Nedderman, Vice-President Baker and without mentioning all of the administration, Dean Rosen and Dean Perkins. The Chairman stated that the administrators that he had spoken to, even though there had been disagreements on many issues, conveyed a sense of confidence and respect they have for academic freedom.

4. Elections will be held during this meeting and the Chairman asked that the Senate please keep in mind that faculty fought long and hard to have representation and input. A Faculty Senate should be used as an outlet for faculty opinion.

5. The Chairman asked the senate for some sense of the setting for the Faculty Senate Banquet which is coming up soon.

6. The Chairman thanked Donna Darovich’s office for providing a list of newspaper quotations. In two newspapers, the sad thing was that UTA won by a small margin count of 4-3 in the Dallas Morning News on positive comments.
Remarks by President Nedderman:

President Nedderman updated the Senate on the following issues:

1. President Nedderman thanked the Chairman and said it is a pleasure to attend the Senate meetings and he and Dr. Baker are appreciative for the opportunity to attend. Some Senates do not permit the President or Vice-President or any other administrator to attend meetings.

Fiscal Scene in Austin:

President Nedderman commented that he and Dr. Baker had spent the last two weeks in Austin, either with the Coordinating Board or the Senate Finance Committee. A major crisis exists in Austin due to the $4.5 billion shortfall that they see between estimated receipts for the next fiscal year and expenditures. At present it cost $30.5 billion to run the government of the State of Texas, which is almost equally divided between current state tax structure and local tax structure, a little over $15 billion in each. In the current state tax structure the sales tax brings in $8.19 billion, gasoline tax $1.53 billion, and motor vehicle tax $1.14 billion. Two very significant points are oil severance brings in $.69 billion, and natural gas severance $.68 billion. These are relatively small contributions anymore and in the past they were major avenues of revenue in the state of Texas. Oil production has been going down since 1972. Cigarette and tobacco brings in $.57 billion, corporate franchise $.53 billion and all other taxes and fees $.19 billion. These taxes bring in a little over $15 billion income from the current state tax structure. Texas ranks 46th out of 50 states in per capita state taxes. Local tax structure for the other 15 billion plus is a different story, school property tax is $6.4 billion, city property tax $2.4 billion, county property tax $1.8 billion, special district property tax $1.4 billion, other taxes $3 billion. Texas ranks 4th out of the 50 states in per capita local tax structure. Many of the proponents of tax reform are pointing to this, 46th in terms of state tax structure, 4th out of 50 states in the local tax structure. There is $30.5 billion income and $35.0 billion outgo. The state Comptroller certifies estimated income for the coming biennium and the legislature cannot exceed that amount in appropriations. Court mandated increases such as public education increases of $1.25 billion, criminal justice appeal system $.60 billion, mental health and mental retardation $.24 billion, department of human services (in order to receive the federal matching) $1.9 billion, and population increases $.50 billion, totalling $35 billion outgo compared to income of $30.5 billion ending up with the $4.5 billion shortfall. There will not be an appropriation bill by the Legislature until they solve the problem of where they are going to get the money. There are two opinions being considered, one is simply a bandaid to the existing tax structure, increase sales tax up to 7%, increase franchise tax, motor vehicle tax, and broaden the sales tax base to include services, to create $5 billion. Option two is a personal state income tax, and at the same time abolish the corporate franchise tax and reduce property tax by 30% and sales tax by 1.25. The state income tax has no chance at all unless there is a reduction in the current tax structure. There will be a special session in July of the Legislature after the regular session is over, at which time they will hopefully have come up with a revenue source. The big question is increasing existing current taxes or revamping the current tax structure. After this is done there will be an appropriation bill and it may be well into August or later before the appropriation bill for the next biennium beginning September 1 is known. President Nedderman stated he could not remember a time when the state took back money from the current year and the 1.5% reduction hurt when the Fall semester is over and Spring is nearly over and therefore it was necessary to retrieve the money from what is left of the year.
I welcome the privilege of representing U.T. Arlington at the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and I look forward to working with the Coordinating Board staff. I believe I was selected because of my credentials and experience in the certain areas of business and in performance evaluation in the not-for-profit area. Having spent six years in the Texas Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve plus and almost sixteen years now in higher education in Texas including the University of Houston and Texas A&M, I feel I can bring certain insights to their activities. And I am committed to making the most of this opportunity. I hope to critically examine the efficiency and effectiveness with which we deliver an educational product, and I am convinced that we can identify ways in which we can improve the quality of the product while concomitantly reducing the cost of delivery somewhere between 15% an 30%. I realize such a proposition may, at first, sound not only heretical but also preposterous. Nonetheless, I am determined to forge ahead. Dr. Harvey Deinzer, my mentor at the University of Florida, wrote in his classic work on the Development of Accounting

"There are no answers without questions, the search for knowns will be devious at best." Clearly, if there are no questions, self-evidently the right ones cannot be asked. The truth is, I believe that instead of asking questions, we have contented ourselves with asking simply for more money. But more money has not proved a panacea--indeed, and this applies to all areas of government, it seems that while spending more, we have received less and less. But first, what specific recommendations do I have for the Coordinating Board? I'm glad you asked. They are: (1) A sound system of internal control for institutions of higher education--not just financial, but educational and research activities as well; (2) Operational auditing of educational activities, both quantitative and qualitative; (3) A complete tracking system for our educational product, so we can determine whether its getting better or worse--absent this feedback, we're blindly shooting at a target, unknowing whether we hit or miss; (4) The moral fiber, aye, the conviction to see such systems implemented, honestly monitored and to respond to their results, painful though it may be. The first three items involve the application of technology, and they are secondary, by far, to the fourth, without which, the first three will be, just another waste of the taxpayer's money! One need only consider our continuing struggle with crime and prisons, public education, and drugs, as well as the current crisis in higher education in over twenty states in this nation, to recognize that something must be fundamentally wrong with our basic approach, which just has not worked: More money, more hardware and software, buildings and laboratories. No, my friends, this effort has been fruitless! I would be so bold as to suggest that our efforts have been misplaced, for while we have experienced, since Sputnik, a technological revolution comparable in impact to the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution, we have simultaneously witnessed a "moral implosion" that threatens the very fabric of our society and of our world! Just consider the scourge of crime and drugs! What we need, in William James's words, is to declare the moral equivalent of war! We must totally and completely re dedicate ourselves to those fundamental values and principles and fairness, and the moral backbone to stay the course. We can make a difference, and we must, if society is to prevail. We must reaffirm, with Jefferson, "eternal vigilance against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Academic Liaison Committee:

-Senator Girardot stated the Academic Liaison Committee met as requested and considered the motion of Senator Herrmann of February 6, 1991 on Part 4.2. Part 4.1 related to raising the SAT scores for entering Freshman and was passed at the last meeting.
Vice President Baker said expenditures have gone up but state funding went down in 1986. The problem is three fold, number one is recovery from the drop that occurred in 1986, secondly the population has grown therefore every aspect of every state agency has required more money just to provide the same level of service and third is the court ordered expenditures. The economy has been such that state revenue has not increased as fast as population.

Dr. Dunn asked what the principal source of revenue was for the federal government, was it not individual and corporate income tax and what kind of deficit does federal government have.

President Nedderman stated that one difference between the federal government and the state government is that the state of Texas constitution prohibits spending more than what the state comptroller says income is.

Senator Panton asked why President Nedderman favored a state income tax and had not mentioned a state lottery, was it the negative political environment.

President Nedderman replied that the state lotteries were not a particular gold mine, by the time administrative costs are taken care of. The estimates shown of what a state lottery would bring in would not be near the shortfall that has occurred at present.

Senator Weed said if UTA ends up with a sizeable cut, will the University have a "town meeting" for advice of how and where to cut.

President Nedderman replied this was a good idea.

Dr. Dunn stated a recent article in the Wall Street Journal said that lotteries returned on the average .35 of every $1.00 to the state, which is a fairly good contribution margin.

Senator Duwaji stated that an article in the Dallas Morning News said that only 15% of the entering Freshman class of 1985 at UTA graduated in 1989. UT Austin had 60% and the only university in the state of Texas that was lower than UTA was UT San Antonio.

President Nedderman said he would like to see comparisons with urban universities and particularly those that have a large amount of students who are supporting themselves and they may be comparable. Many students at UTA take longer than 4 years to graduate depending on what program they have entered into.

Senator Eisenfeld stated that President's Nedderman comment truly has some merit but the entrance requirements have something to do with this.

ELECTIONS:

Senator Holder stated she was supposed to be the second name (vice secretary) under secretary and the ballot shows her name first. Senator Tong replied that Senator Holder was supposed to be listed as vice secretary but a secretary was not found at the time and her name moved up to the first position.

Senator Tong, Chair of the Nominations Committee began the election process by reading all names and asking for any nominations from the floor. Senator Rings was nominated for Secretary from the floor and no other nominations were noted. Votes were cast by secret ballot and counted and the following were voted in for the Academic Year 1991-92: Chairman, Ira Bernstein; Vice Chair, Elinor Pape; Secretary, Lana Rings; Vice Secretary, Peter Mykytyn; Parliamentarian, Thomas Petry; and COFGO Representative, Mark Dunn.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

COFGO:

Dr. Dunn submitted a report to Chairman Bernstein and read the report to the Senate. The report is as follows:

Thank you Ira, and also for your kind nomination letter.
The Academic Liaison Committee recommends that Professor Herrmann's motion, Part 4.2, not be approved by the Faculty Senate in its present form. (4.2 refers to raising Science and Math requirements for incoming UTA freshmen.) The reasons are (1) Students could avoid meeting the raised requirements by going to a junior college, then transferring to UTA. (2) There are no data to indicate that it would have the desired result of raising quality of incoming freshmen for some colleges. (3) There are no data to indicate the extent to which students, who would be successful if admitted, might be restricted from entering. The Academic Liaison Committee suggests that the Faculty Senate consider examining the likely results of (1) Raising freshmen entrance requirements as to possible impact on potentially successful and on demographically diverse students. (2) Raising entrance requirements for transfer students as to the same impact as in B1. The Committee suggests that the Faculty Senate, as part of its pursuit of increased student quality, give concomitant consideration to addressing enhancement of faculty effectiveness in teaching and evaluating students.

Senator Herrmann stated that lack of data was not a valid argument and this recommendation sounded very un-American. Senator Herrmann said anyone knows that two units of math and science requirements are not enough preparation. The students are entitled to more than this and faculty have a right to have students that have an adequate background. Unless some incentive is given to the high schools there will never be any change.

Chairman Bernstein asked for some form of motion.

Senator Girardot made point of order motion was tabled at last meeting.

Chairman Bernstein said the motion was tabled for a report but was not tabled indefinitely.

Senator Petry said the previous minutes stated there was not a motion to table, there was a motion for the Academic Liaison Committee to consider the motion. Senator Girardot stated this was not a motion, it was a report. Senator Girardot made a motion to reconsider the motion on 4.2. This was seconded and opened to the floor for discussion. Senator Girardot stated that a large part of the university does not feel this motion would represent the entire college. Senator Girardot said motion 4.2 which is Senator Herrmann's motion to raise the math and science requirements is on the floor and a motion has been made to reconsider.

Senator Herrmann restated the motion: at present, requirements for high school graduation are 4 units of English, 2 units of algebra and 2 units of science, and the motion is to require high school units be changed to 4 units of mathematics with at least 2 units of algebra and 1 unit of geometry and the science requirement be raised to 3 units.

Senator Holder asked if UTA could dictate or suggest how much is required for graduation since UTA accepts all graduates. Senator Holder asked that if someone graduates from high school aren't they automatically admitted to UTA.

Senator Herrmann stated this was wrong, it states that in order to be admitted a student must meet the requirements printed in the Undergraduate Catalog.

Senator Holder said that it would then be possible for a student to get a high school diploma and not be able to enter college, and would UTA be asking that the high schools change their requirements for those on college preparatory.

Senator Herrmann replied that the high schools do offer courses for college preparatory, but the students do not take them.

Senator Herrmann said this is a message to the students telling them that if they want to enter college they better take more classes and be better prepared.

Senator Gaupp stated that testimony had been heard that there are differential needs within the university and that raising standards at the entry level would both hurt and harm at the same time.
Senator Gaupp said to change the state educational system by passing one motion for admission at UTA is expecting an awful lot of the political system. There is a much easier way to approach this, if there are needs within some divisions of the university, increasing mathematics for instance, then the rules could be changed internally providing for increased demands on students in the curriculum. Senator Rodnitzky stated this has nothing to do with the state just this university. Whatever this body decides on this issue has no bearing on admission standards, it is only advisory. Admission standards can only be recommended and changed by the Undergraduate Assembly.

Senator Duwaji asked how UTA’s requirements compared with UT Austin and other universities in the state.

Senator Herrmann stated that he was unaware of what UT Austin set for SAT scores but it was inconceivable that anyone anywhere could be lower than UTA, some could be at the same level such as at UT El Paso or UT Pan American.

Senator Trask said that two basically different philosophies were being discussed and questioned what the resolution said about the mission of UTA. Senator Trask inquired if UTA was trying to compete with the Harvards and Yales. Senator Trask stated she thought UTA was attempting to have more of an open door policy and maybe students who just goofed and didn’t take extra courses in high school could have another option and attend UTA. The difference in philosophy seems to ask the question what do we want the university to be in the long run.

Senator Duwaji stated the message should be given to the students that if they want to enroll in certain math courses they will need to take certain math courses in preparation.

Senator Petry stated that the College of Engineering has taken steps and in an unusual area that one might not suspect and that is to require 2 years of high school foreign language before the students can enter into their program or take 2 semesters at UTA. Senator Petry questioned if this problem could be handled on a unit to unit basis here at UTA.

Question was called and seconded to end debate. The question was voted on by voice vote and passed.

Chairman Bernstein called for a vote on the main motion. Senator Duwaji asked that the motion be read. The Chairman asked the Secretary to read the motion.

Senator Ladde read the motion. Motion 4.2 would require high school units in the following way: Mathematics from 2 or 3 to 4 units, with at least 2 units algebra and at least 1 unit geometry; Science from 2 to at least 3 units. The motion failed with 16 opposed and 7 for.

Senator Girardot stated that points B and C of the committee’s report could be done at another time.

OLD BUSINESS:

Senator Rings stated the people in Foreign Languages asked that she inquire as a point of inquiry (1) why isn’t there a system-wide standard within the UT System.

President Nedderman replied that most of the universities in the UT System would object to that on the basis of violating institutional prerogatives, they would be giving up institutional prerogatives.

Senator Rings stated she would like to commend the following senators: (1) Senator Herrmann for his concern about quality; (2) Senator Holder for her suggestions of outreach to pupils of poor backgrounds; (3) Senator Ladde for his distribution of the articles on humane programs which work; (4) Senator Porter for her suggestion that we all make an effort to include or continue to include pertinent contributions of all human beings in our courses; (4) Senator Rodnitzky for his humanity and concern for those less fortunate than we; (5) Senator Wood for his concern about the effectiveness of our teaching.
NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Rodnitzky distributed a proposal drafted by himself and Professor George Green and asked that it be made into a resolution. In absence of a resolution it appears that faculty approved of the cuts even though they were not consulted. Faculty are the only people making cuts and most of them are in the Liberal Arts Department, who already are the lowest paid faculty at UTA. Two years ago the Senate unanimously voted on a resolution that condemned contract salaries for the summer and this seems to be a step in that direction. The faculty is taking the full cut this summer and administration is not being cut at all. At SMU they have a different outlook, they are cutting back on administration. Chairman Bernstein stated to make this in resolution form it should be prefaced by, be it resolved, whereas should be added and the top two lines moved to the bottom. This motion was seconded and approved and the following is the corrected resolution: Be it resolved, whereas the reductions were imposed in Liberal Arts without consultation with the faculty, and the reduced salaries force faculty to bear the complete burden of funding deficiencies. And whereas university administrators are paid full salary for summer work even though their summer work loads are generally lighter. And whereas faculty, on the other hand, are already making a sacrifice when teaching during the summer, since summer teaching loads are about 75% heavier than those in the fall and spring session. Finally, whereas it is clearly unfair (and possibly illegal) for the University to pay reduced salaries to some faculty while other faculty and all administrators are paid full salary. The reductions set an ominous precedent that could easily be applied to all UTA faculty. The Faculty Senate urges the UTA administration not to approve summer session scheduling that includes: percentage-reduced salaries for tenure-track faculty.

Chairman Bernstein opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Mykytyn stated he also had a resolution prepared by himself and members of his department that is very similar to Senator Rodnitzky's. He stated it goes along the same lines and asked if it was appropriate for this motion to be carried as a resolution. One individual in the department had requested that be it resolved that summer salaries for all salaried employees who are currently budgeted for the summer of 1991 at 100% be reduced by 10%. This resolution is from one individual in the department that has the support of a couple of other individuals but it is not a departmental resolution nor does it have the vote of the majority of the department.

Chairman Bernstein stated that Senator Mykytyn had discussed this with the Chair prior to the meeting and asked Senator Mykytyn if he would object if his resolution be rolled into Senator Rodnitzky's resolution. Senator Mykytyn's resolution is a representation of three individuals in his department without saying it is a majority of the department.

Senator Petry asked if the original resolution of Senator Rodnitzky's will include that the Faculty Senate recommend a 10% cut.

Chairman Bernstein replied no, the motion should reflect that it had reflected Senator Mykytyn's intent.

Senator Petry said the intent of what Senator Mykytyn is saying is that all administrative salaries would be cut 10%.

Senator Mykytyn said this is a 10% cut for all salaried employees at 100% for the summer.

Chairman Bernstein stated Senator Mykytyn is representing some people in his department and if he doesn't bring up a separate motion or resolution that it will not be neglect to the colleagues that asked him to address it. This is not included in the motion, Senator Mykytyn is just representing his colleagues who asked him to do this.
Senator Pape said she thought a lot of people would not be able to go back and look at their secretaries and ask them to do anything if something like this was proposed.

Senator Petry said point of order; either this statement is in the motion or it is not.

Chairman Bernstein replied it is not in the motion.

Senator Mykytyn apologized for not having his resolution xeroxed and the intent of the individual was to bring this idea before the Faculty Senate for discussion.

Senator Gaupp asked what would happen if this passed.

Vice-President Baker said if this was approved by the administration there would be fewer faculty teaching in the summer because the money used to raise those who do teach up to 100% would come from salaries of people who would otherwise be teaching.

Senator Harwood stated he was in agreement with Senator Rodnitzky’s resolution and several faculty in his department felt the same way. The comments in his department by the dean were that he was sorry he would have to offer K Mart salaries for the summer but there was nothing else he could do. In Architecture, the dean perceives it as supply and demand.

Senator Petry asked if a percentage of reduced salaries meant that one was teaching at 100% and getting paid for less than 100% time.

Senator Rodnitzky stated he was teaching 4 courses at an already reduced rate (summer salary is 1/6 of regular salary) and this summer he will receive 15% less than summer salary.

Senator Petry said that this translates to teaching 100% time and getting paid 85% time.

Senator Duwaji stated the number of contact hours per course for the 5 week session are almost the same as the contact hours per course during the long semester. This resolution doesn’t reflect that there is any discrepancy in the load between long term and short term.

Chairman Bernstein gave an example that if a faculty member normally received a salary of $3,000. per month from September to the following June to teach a certain amount of courses they would now be teaching 2 courses at 85% of $3,000. yet they are teaching two courses each term.

Senator Weed stated the paperwork in his department was being sent in as reduced fractional time and faculty are being put in as 85% time. Senator Weed stated he is not getting paid for 100% time even though he is putting in 100% time but the paperwork indicates 85% time.

Chairman Bernstein asked the administration if there was not an issue of accuracy of record keeping and on what standard would teaching two courses be considered full time and if it is being stated that one is teaching two courses at 85% does this not create inaccuracy of records.

Vice-President Baker stated there is not a standard definition of what constitutes 100% time.

Senator Petry stated that he and many of his colleagues in the College of Engineering would like to have it as well as that and many of the faculty have been told they would not receive any summer support and would like the opportunity to teach.

Senator Porter stated that since this money has to be returned to the state and there is only so much money to spread around then the options are either all faculty that want to teach should be allowed to teach and reduce the salary to 85% or reduce the amount of classes which would mean some faculty could not teach at all. This would jeopardize the program and students who are wanting to take courses and can’t get them and will damage the program down the line.
Senator Porter said if students can't get courses here they may go to a junior college and in the long run we may be shooting ourselves in the foot.

Senator Wood said it comes down to supply and demand, people in Chemical Engineering would be glad to work at 85% and if they didn't they could yield their money to someone who is willing to work for 85%. This is a hard nosed way of looking at it but there doesn't seem to be a better method for not hurting some faculty that don't want to be hurt either eliminating them entirely or paying them less.

Senator Rodnitzky said the point here was that the faculty were not consulted and in his department 13 to 1 and 8 to 0 of the people that are teaching state this is bad. If the faculty accepts 85% this time, would they be expected to take 55% next time and the faculty feels they are being unfairly treated. Having faculty in the classrooms that are feeling unfairly treated doesn't make for a good teaching atmosphere.

Senator Herrmann stated these cuts send a message to the higher-ups that here are all these hungry professors who will teach for 85% pay and may be willing to teach at 50% next summer.

Senator Wood said if one teaches in the summer when they figure out what the amount per course is at full funding, summer salary is at 50% to 75% of that amount so faculty are already getting the ax in the sense by teaching in the summer and people are willing to do it. Senator Wood said he thought that the Coordinating Board and the Administration did not like to have to do this, if they had their choice, but the choices were difficult to make, either pay 85% or reduce the program to the amount of people that are getting paid at all. Senator Wood said these are choices for this particular situation and he didn't feel that this would put faculty in bondage and salaries would be reduced from now on, that would be unrealistic and is an exaggerated response. Senator Wood stated he would hope that any person teaching a course would do it in a professional manner.

Senator Holder asked how much the administrations salaries would be reduced be it from the President down to the Dean, as most of them are faculty members as well and would fall under faculty rules.

Vice-President Baker stated that if one reduced anyone's salary that would be applied to the amount needed to be returned so presumably that could be spread out. Policies that were established by the various regimes are not necessarily the same, it is not necessarily true that everyone's salary is being cut, some chose to do that some chose not to. Vice-President Baker said he understood that the College of Science did not cut salaries.

Chairman Bernstein stated there was not a formal vote, Dean Rosen established the pay at 1/4 time for each course taught and that is the normal procedure. People at best will be teaching 25% time and to say that this is not taking a pay cut when they are going to be having 9 weeks furlough is to say migrant workers are getting a vacation when it is not harvest season.

Vice-President Baker said that not everyone gets to teach all summer even under the best of circumstances.

Chairman Bernstein stated it used to be that way that in the middle to late 60's this was the case. It became 75% around 1970 and then the erosion took place subsequently and if one was lucky they received 25%. Faculty are being told to hold back a third of their salary and give a free loan to the state of Texas which is a faculty concern of the first magnitude.

Senator Rodnitzky made a motion to call the question, it was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Chairman Bernstein called a vote on the resolution. The resolution passed 13 for, 7 opposed, and 5 abstentions.
ANNOUNCEMENTS:
- Chairman Bernstein said if he was asked to speak about this resolution as the Chair of this body he would say that he is not eager to see the administration make sacrifices, not to say that we should all suffer together but there are two things to be said: Number one, anybody who works for a living should recognize the meaning of a speed-up, that is what is being done in Liberal Arts, there are no two ways to describe it. When you pay someone for a certain amount of work at 100% and now you are paying them 85% that meets the definition. Chairman Bernstein stated if they wanted to bring it on themselves as long as it didn't effect him that doesn't bother him, but that apparently is not the case. Secondly, for those who don't work for a living the Chairman would suggest that he would like to pick his own charity.
- Senator Girardot commented there were two possible outcomes of this vote as a resolution which has no weight excepting as its given weight by somebody who receives it. If it is received under the proviso thank you very much we like to know your opinion that is it. If it is received under the proviso thank you we think it is important and we are going to do something about it, we have heard what Dr. Baker said the result would be, less teaching jobs this summer.

ADJOURNMENT:
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gangaram Ladde
Secretary

GL/dkw
4/24/91
This was specifically about higher education and Senator Mykytyn asked President Nedderman if he would enlighten the senate on this bill.

President Nedderman replied that this must be House Bill 110. House Bill 110 is a disaster, for example UT Austin would have a $30 million cut from the current level of support, UTA would have a $8 to $9 million cut from the current level of support. When the legislature decides what they are going to do about taxes and devises a tax system where the comptroller can estimate income at a higher level then the legislature can write an appropriation bill with a higher level. President Nedderman stated faculty salaries were number one on the list and when the LBB hearing was held, an equal emphasis was placed on staff salaries because they have not kept pace with faculty salaries since 1985. In 1985 when there was a significant increase in faculty salaries of 11.5%, staff got 1.5% and they have never caught up since.

Charles Lowry, Library asked President Nedderman about the audit that is in process as to who they are, where they are, who they are auditing and where they are finding all these facts in government and higher education.

President Nedderman replied that they aren't sure what the results will be. Early in the summer, Lieutenant Governor Bullock took the initiative with the concurrence of the Governor and the Speaker of the House in stating that all state agencies would go through an audit review to see if there were some state agencies that were performing functions that could be eliminated or combined. There are 90-100 auditors over the state, three of them were on campus April 24, 1991 for UTA’s audit review and they were scheduled for one hour. The report by the auditor’s task force is to be submitted to the Governor by July 1.

Charles Lowry inquired how quickly the comptroller could project the income to the state if there was a transformation to the tax structure.

President Nedderman replied that this could be done very quickly when a tax rate is established.

Senator Balsam stated that with the contingency plans for next year based on different scenarios could a best case and a worst case be determined.

President Nedderman said that originally the Investigative Budget Board had requested 4 levels of budget. Level 1 was 7% below the current level of support, level 2 was the current level, level 3 was a 10% increase and level 4 was what was needed. When the appropriation bill is set, the budget response could be made within a week.

Chairman Bernstein stated there were political aspects to closing down all new degree programs even if they don't cost the university money because it could be regarded as a way of getting across to taxpayers that business has to be paid for directly or indirectly.

Vice-President Baker stated that a lot of the Board’s motivation was to try and send a message to the Legislature by saying higher education can not continue to do new things and therefore meet the needs of a changing society with new programs.

Senator Herrmann inquired what happens to the PUF money and could it be used for something else.

Vice-President Baker replied that would be up to the Regents if in fact there is a savings of money because capital improvement plans do not materialize, then that could go into equipment or library purchases.

Senator Girardot stated the reason for the Chemistry and Physics expansion was not for more space, it was for safety reasons.

Dr. Dunn inquired what has happened to the state funding expenditures in the last five years, has it gone up or down. Continually being confronted with shortfalls would suggest that the growth and expenditures are not accompanied by growth of revenue.
Coordinating Board Meeting:
President Nedderman stated the Coordinating Board is also in a state of chaos, particularly since the state doesn't know what it is going to do for higher education. At the meeting attended by Dr. Baker and President Nedderman this past week as reported in the Council of University Presidents and Chancellors publication, the Coordinating Board decided at their meeting of April 18 that the state money situation was too unstable to support any type of expansion. They decreed that new degree programs and projects if recommended by the Coordinating Board staff would be given tentative approval and could not be implemented until the Legislature provided "adequate" funding for higher education. It was determined that if the programs or projects put on the shelf are still there in July 1992, the evaluation process would need to be repeated. The Phase 1 Expansion of the Physics and Chemistry building was on the agenda, however it was decided after consultation with Chancellor Mark on Wednesday afternoon that in the light of some very recent questions that had been raised by the Coordinating Board Staff there was not time to answer adequately and that the proposal would be withdrawn rather than running the risk of denial. The Coordinating Board has agreed to continue to work with UTA and the proposal will go back to the board. Another thing that seems to be gaining momentum is increasing tuition. It does disturb some legislators when they see a number of states where a student can come to the state of Texas and pay less for out-of-state tuition than they would pay for in-state tuition in their own state. Tuition may be raised to $32.00 a semester credit. Many states are setting the tuition rate where the student pays somewhere between 20% and 30% of the actual cost, if Texas goes to $32.00 that would put the state in that range somewhere in the 25% bracket. It has been pointed out that many states are going to an indexing system, that is where the tuition will be adjusted regularly as a certain percentage of the computed costs.

REMARKS BY VICE-PRESIDENT BAKER:
Vice-President Baker stated the last Coordinating Board meeting was the most negative and pessimistic he had ever attended. The Board feels frustration with the funding level for higher education and recognizes in the end it is powerless to do anything about it. The Coordinating Board does not appropriate money, it does recommend funding, and therefore tries to do things it believes will help higher education and this amounts to a moratorium on everything. Lacking the ability to provide funding, the Board is forced into a negative posture. It has a resolution that it will not approve any new construction if that construction costs the state any money to maintain, cool, heat, etc, and it will not approve any new degree programs until higher education has more money. Vice-President Baker said that new degree programs do not increase the cost of spending, they may increase costs to the University but they do not use money out of the State Treasury. The Board does not understand the distinction between what is the cost to the taxpayer through whatever system Texas uses to fund higher education and what is the cost to the institution.
Vice President Baker said two departmental chairs have been filled and a couple more are searching. There is an acceptance for a new chair in Chemistry, Keith McDowell who is currently at Los Alamos National Laboratories and the Foreign Language department has a new chair, Ruth Gross who comes from the Eastland School of Music which is part of Rochester University. Both of these chairs will join the University in September.

QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT:
-Senator Mykytyn stated there was an editorial in the Dallas Morning News where the Chancellor in Austin spoke about Senate Bill 10.