Appalachian State University
Faculty Senate Agenda
September 9, 2013

AGENDA SUMMARY:
(Full Agenda follows on next page)

(3:15 pm) I. Welcome and Announcements INFORMATION

(3:20 pm) II. Approval of the April 29, 2013 (First and Second Session) Faculty Senate Minutes. ACTION

(3:25 pm) III. Visitor’s Reports
A. Chancellor Peacock INFORMATION
B. Dr. Jeff Bortz, AAUP Report (Appendix A)

(3:55 pm) IV. Provost’s Report
A. Report from Provost Gonzalez INFORMATION
C. Report from Dr. Mary Reichel INFORMATION
   1. New Role
   2. Faculty Handbook Suggestions (Appendix B)

(4:15 pm) V. Chair’s Report
A. Report on the Faculty Handbook and Policy Manual Taskforce INFORMATION
B. Discussion on Faculty Handbook and Policy Manual Suggestions INFORMATION

(4:45 pm) VI. Committee Reports
A. Committee on Committees Recommendations for Vacant Committee positions ACTION

(4:50 pm) VII. Unfinished Business

(5:00 pm) VIII. New Business

(5:15 pm) IX. Adjourn (time approximated)
I. Announcements
   A. Welcome and Introduction of Visitors.

II. Minutes
   A. Approval of April 29, 2013 First Session and April 29, 2013 Second Session Faculty Senate minutes. Available online at: 
      http://facsen.appstate.edu/sites/facsen.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes%20April%2029%202013%20First%20Session%20Unapproved.pdf

   http://facsen.appstate.edu/sites/facsen.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes%20for%20April%2029%202013%20Second%20Session%20Unapproved.pdf

III. Visitors’ Reports
   A. Chancellor Peacock
   B. Dr. Jeff Bortz, AAUP Report (Appendix A)

IV. Provost’s Report
   A. Report from Provost Gonzalez
   B. Report from Dr. Mary Reichel
      1. New Role
      2. Faculty Handbook Suggestions (Appendix B).

V. Chair’s Report
   B. Discussion on Faculty Handbook and Policy Manual Suggestions.
(4:45 pm) VI. Committee Reports (Committee Chair’s name is in bold print)

A. Academic Policies (Campbell, Crepeau, Nash, Reed, Stanovsky)
   No Report.

B. Agenda Committee (Koch, Aycock, Ehnenn, Gates, Martin, Provost Gonzalez)
   No Report.

C. Budget Committee (Geary, Hageman, McGrady, Murrell, Reck, Rice, Stallworth, Strazicich, Szeto)
   No Report.

D. Campus Planning Committee (Crawford, Daigle, Everhart, Fenwick, Frye, Stokes)
   No Report.

E. Committee on Committees (Gates, Hester, Morehouse, Oliver, Puckett)
   1. Recommendations for Vacant University Committee Positions.

F. Faculty Handbook Committee (Koch, Aycock, Vannoy, Provost Gonzalez)
   No Report.

G. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Alexander-Eitzman, Cremaldi, Ehnenn, Erickson, Howard, Toub, Stoddard)
   No Report.

H. Welfare of Students Committee (Gosky, Lane, Ortiz, Peterson-Sparks, Smith, Zrull)
   No Report.

(4:50 pm) VII. Unfinished Business


(5:00 pm) VIII. New Business

(5:15 pm) IX. Adjournment
Appendix A: Administrative Bloat:
The Excessive Growth of Administration at ASU, 1990-2012
Report by the AAUP Special Committee on Communications

The Problem:

The purpose of this report is to examine data concerning the expansion of executive administrative positions at Appalachian State University over the past two decades. One of the action steps of the University of North Carolina Strategic Directions 2013-2018 ("Our Time, Our Future: the UNC Compact with North Carolina") report is “to reduce excess layers of management,” to “reduce overlap in administrative functions” and to “simplify unnecessary bureaucracy, thereby refocusing resources on the academic mission of the university.” Given this system-wide compact with the state, the examination of changes in executive administrative positions since 1990 is crucial information to gauge whether ASU is in compliance with the goals and specific action steps of the UNC system.

For the last few years, state appropriations for ASU have fallen while administrative positions and pay have grown. Given that Academic Affairs receives a single pot of money that it can use to support teaching and research by hiring and paying faculty, or to support management and administration by hiring and paying administrators, we are concerned that the growth of one—administration--has come at the expense of the other—faculty--those who directly carry out the university’s primary missions: teaching and research.

To investigate this, we looked at the total number of administrative positions that have “Chancellor” or “Provost” in their titles (i.e., Associate Vice Chancellor) and their salaries from 1990, our baseline, to the most current data year, 2011/2012.\(^1\) None of this is a comment on individuals since we assume that each administrator is doing the job assigned to them as best they can. What we do question is dedicating more resources to management, while reserving fewer resources for the targets of management: teaching and research. We bear no ill will towards anyone at the university but do believe that the institution would be better served by marshaling a greater percentage of its resources towards the tasks that society has entrusted to us, educating students (teaching) and educating society (research).

The Data:

In 1990, ASU possessed seven positions with “Provost” or “Chancellor” in the title (excluding the Chancellor). These included the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, three Vice Chancellors, two Associate Vice Chancellors, and one Assistant Vice Chancellor. These seven positions commanded an aggregate salary of $533,920.

There were 554 full-time faculty members and the head-count enrollment was 11,483, a ratio of 1 faculty member per 20 students. The average salary for full-time faculty at all ranks was $41,915. Student credit hours generated totaled 295,107. Annual tuition and required fees were $1118.50. State appropriations to ASU were $51,362,716, which constituted 65.3% of the

---

\(^1\) See the methodological note at the end.
university’s operating revenue. Tuition and fees income constituted 15% of operating revenue. Instruction took up 48.7% of university expenditures.

In 2011, there were seventeen positions with “Provost” or “Chancellor” in the title (excluding the Chancellor). These included the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, three Vice Provosts, three Vice Chancellors, seven Associate Vice Chancellors, and two Assistant Vice Chancellors. Total salaries for these positions jumped more than 350% to $2,420,382 in non-inflation adjusted dollars. Adjusted for inflation, the increase was 166%.

Full-time faculty increased to 705, a 27% increase since 1990. The average salary for full-time faculty at all ranks was $72,956, an increase of 74% since 1990. When adjusted for inflation, average faculty salaries increased by less than two percent. Total faculty salary outlay increased 155%. Student enrollment increased to 17,334, an increase of 50% over 1990. The student-faculty ratio was 1/25 in 2011. Student credit hours generated increased to 467,482, a 58% increase over 1990. Tuition and fees experienced an increase to $5538, more than a 400% increase over 1990, rising to 22.7% of operating expenditures. While increasing to $125,742,612, total state appropriations dropped to 33.5% of university revenues. Expenditures for instructional purposes dropped to 32.5% of total university expenditures.

For 2012, the official data was not fully available to us. In the fall 2012 Faculty EPA Salary Report (BD 119), there are eighteen positions at this level, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, three Vice Provosts, three Vice Chancellors, eight Associate Vice Chancellors, and three Assistant Vice Chancellors. Aggregate salaries are $2,643,075, an increase of 12.5% over the preceding year. In addition, three new executive positions were created to be filled for the 2013-14 year: the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Compliance, and the Special Assistant to the Provost. It is likely that these three positions will raise the salary base of executive administrative positions by another $500,000. The number of positions will increase to 21.

In short, the data suggest that from 1990 to 2013, executive administrative positions will have increased from 7 to 21, and total salaries for them from about half a million dollars to close to three million dollars, a 500% jump. Upper administrative pay growth has outstripped teaching load growth, the number of full-time faculty, faculty pay, state support for the university, inflation, and almost any other growth indicator except tuition, which suggests an accelerating burden on parents and students to support an increasingly costly and cumbersome upper administrative caste.

Meanwhile, state appropriations to support the university have been on the decline for the past four years. Since 2008, the percent of the system’s budget that comes from state appropriations has declined from 35.7% to 28.7%. To make up for some of this decline in state funding, tuition and fees in the system have increased as a percentage of the total budget from 13.4% in 2008 to 15% in 2012. The proportional split between state appropriations and tuition/fees has changed from 72.6% state and 27.4% tuition/fees in 2008 to 65.7%/34.3% in 2012. This data points to the reality that the state system has relied on increases in tuition and fees to counterbalance a significant portion of loss in state funds. The current direction in funding is counter to the objectives of the “Future Directions” document of the UNC system,
which states that “in keeping with the state’s history and the university’s constitutional mandate, (the university will) maintain low tuition."

In order to meet the challenges of reduced state funding, the university system initiated a business transformation project—the President’s Advisory committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness (PACE)—followed by the implementation of the Finance Improvement and Transformation program (UNC FIT) in order to demonstrate the efficient stewardship of public money and student investment. A concern of these initiatives was the growth of administrative costs. Partly in response to these initiatives, UNC-Chapel Hill hired Bain and Company to analyze the university’s spending and suggest cost-saving strategies. Among key findings of the Bain Report were that administrative expenses per student have grown faster than academic expenses and that the administrative organizational structure is redundant, with multiple layers that exacerbate unnecessary complexity and inefficiency. UNC-Chapel Hill has initiated an administrative reduction plan that is expected to save them from $3-$12 million annually.

The rise in university administrative costs is a national phenomenon. Recent books like The University in Chains by Henry A. Giroux (2007) and Unmaking the Public University by Christopher Newfield (2011) have demonstrated the negative impact of this trend. According to the U.S. Department of Education, university faculty positions have increased by 50% over the past forty years (approximately the same rate that student enrollment has increased), while top-level administrative positions have increased by 85% and administrative staff by 240%. Spending on instruction from 1998-2008 increased by 22% while administrative costs increased by 37%.

The Conclusions:

Since 1990, the number of executive administrative positions has increased 200%. Non-inflation adjusted salaries for these positions have increased almost 350% and inflation adjusted spending increased 166%. During the period 1990-2011, average salaries for full-time faculty members have increased 74% in non-inflation adjusted dollars, but less than two percent adjusted for inflation. The total full-time faculty salary outlay has increased 155%. Student headcount has increased approximately 50%. The percentage of state appropriations that covers the university’s expenditures has dropped from over 65% in 1990 to less than 34% in 2011, while tuition and fees have grown more than 400%. Even more alarming, the percentage of ASU’s expenditures that supports instruction has dropped from 48.7% to 32.5%.

The data on executive administrative positions and costs are just the tip of the iceberg. As these new positions are created other support positions are often created with them. This report did not examine the growth of mid-level administrators, particularly in the areas of business affairs, student development, and university advancement. While it can be said that many of these positions were filled before being given the title of Associate or Assistant Vice Chancellor, in all cases where this transition occurred, there was substantial salary increase with the change, so it is not an inconsequential matter to create a new auxiliary Chancellor or Provost position. In addition, with each new executive position or elevation in title of a previously existing position, new second-tier administrative positions are created. A recent example is the creation of the position of CIO and Associate Vice Chancellor in Instructional Technology Services in 2012.
Currently there is a search for two new middle-level administrative positions in ITS (Chief Information Security Officer and Director of Information Analytics) with responsibility over functions previously successfully performed by IT staff. Thus the creation of a new Vice Chancellor position has resulted in the development of two new administrative positions, adding increased salary and administrative layers.

Given this data there should be real concern at ASU about the inordinate increase in executive administrative positions and costs at a time when state financial support is declining dramatically. In light of the UNC system’s concern about the growth of layers of administration, the UNC General Administration should share this concern. The UNC system and ASU share a core mission of teaching, research, and service. The growth of administrative costs at a time when state appropriations are dropping, when enrollments are increasing, when tuition and fees are expanding, and when the percentage of the university’s expenditures that support the core mission is declining, is a dire sign of the times.

The Methodology:

This is a special report of the Appalachian State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Research and writing were carried out by the Committee on Communications consisting of Professors Jeffrey Bortz (History), Sheila Phipps (History) and Gregory Reck (Anthropology). In order to complete a comparative and longitudinal analysis of relevant data, every effort was made to locate information for the years 1990, 2000, 2011 and the most recent year of 2012. The ASU Library houses the last three years of the Faculty EPA Salary Reports (BD 119) in Reserve Reading. Those documents are available to the ASU public. Data for the years 2011 and 2012 were acquired directly from an examination of those documents. We were informed that the Library is not required to retain or archive BD 119 reports for earlier years. With the assistance of the staff in Library Archives, some earlier salary reports were located; however, they were restricted because they contained social security numbers. Reports from 1990 and 1999 were included in these archives so we relied on archives staff to examine reports from those two years so that they could extract the comparable data. Additional data on enrollment, faculty, tuition and fees, state appropriations, and expenditures were collected from ASU Fact Books for the years 1990-91, 1999-2000, and 2011-12. Some additional information on state appropriations and tuition and fees were provided by Institutional Research and Assessment.

Since we limited research to “executive administrative positions,” only data on salary and positions that include “chancellor” or “provost” in their titles were collected. Since there has always been one university Chancellor, that position is not included in the data. We of course made every effort to be accurate and apologize in advance for any errors in the data.
Increase 1990 – 2011

Operating Revenue from State Appropriations -49%
Expenditure on Instruction of Total Budget -33%
Students per Faculty 25%
Number of Full Time Faculty 27%
Student Enrollment 51%
Operating Revenue from Tuition & Fees 51%
Student Credit Hours 58%
Ave. Full Time Salary (all ranks) 74%
Positions at VC or VP 143%
Higher Admin Salary 353%
Tuition & Fees 395%

(continued on next page)
The Chart (a full spreadsheet is available upon request):

The goal of this report was to determine the growth in executive administrative positions, thus the chart should be viewed as simply an illustration of that growth. Positions, not persons, are listed. Why and when the new positions were added were not questions driving this research but can be asked of the administration during further investigation. Since titles were changed and responsibilities were divided over the course of the two decades covered by this report, the chart does not reflect changes in individual positions across time, only the growth in the number of positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990 POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>2011-12 POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost/ VC</td>
<td>$96,800</td>
<td>Provost, Exec. VC</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC, Dev. And Public Affairs</td>
<td>$73,100</td>
<td>VP, Resource Management</td>
<td>$166,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. VC, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>$74,550</td>
<td>VP, for Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. VC, Student Affairs</td>
<td>$61,270</td>
<td>VP, Undergraduate Ed.</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. VC, Business Affairs</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>Assoc VC, Int. Ed. and Dev.</td>
<td>$131,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC for Student Development</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>Assoc. VC, Enrollment Mgmt.</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC, Dev. And Public Affairs</td>
<td>$74,200</td>
<td>VC, Student Dev.</td>
<td>$159,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. VC, and Dean of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. VC, Student, Dev.</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC for Business Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>VC for Business Affairs</td>
<td>$169,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. VC for Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. VC for Admin.</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC for University Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>VC for University Advancement</td>
<td>$185,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc VC, Comm &amp; Cul Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc VC, Comm &amp; Cul Affairs</td>
<td>$119,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. VC, Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. VC, Finance</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc VC for Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc VC for Development</td>
<td>$180,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst VC Gift Pln &amp; RI Est Mgmt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst VC Gift Pln &amp; RI Est Mgmt</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. VC, Advancement Serv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. VC, Advancement Serv.</td>
<td>$111,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SALARIES</td>
<td>$533,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,420,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Faculty Handbook—Some Suggested Ideas for Revision

August 16, 2013; M. Reichel

These ideas came from the Faculty Handbook Revision Task Force, Faculty Senate chairs, Academic Affairs discussions, and long use of the Handbook.

Chapter II: Administrative Structure of the University—needs to be reviewed for consistency with the ASU Policy Manual—references to Policy Manual probably a good idea; FHRTF started a revision of Section 2.8 the Department Chair but it needs to be reexamined; Section 2.6 Dean section should also be revised.

Section 3.8 Tenure-Eligible Academic Ranks

Section 3.8.6 Associate Professor—it is probably time to clarify whether candidates can come up “early”, before the mandatory year or not. Also some “clean up issues” for instance we still refer to the possibility of separate decisions about promotion to Associate Professor and tenure (Section 3.8.5.4 and other sections) but in practice those decisions are handled at the same time.

Section 3.8.5.4.1 Credit toward Tenure and Promotion for Service Elsewhere—seems to be general agreement that this section should be revised to state that credit must be determined at the time of hire.

Section 3.8.7.2 Professor—Do we want to keep for “at least ten (10) years of appropriate experience”?

Section 3.10 Joint Appointments—study and see if this section needs to be revised.

Section 4.1.4.8 “A permanent file of all minutes of the DPC shall be maintained in each department office.” and Section 4.1.8.7 “a permanent file of all minutes of the PTC shall be maintained in each department office.” The University Archivist pointed out that these sentences may be in conflict with the state retention guidelines.

Section 6.2.2 Off-Campus Scholarly Assignments—refers to possibility of a two semester OCSA which is not the practice any longer when the leave is funded by ASU. Longer leaves happen when there is external funding.

Chapter VII Faculty Senate, Committees, and Councils—Andy has mentioned that he thinks Senate should review this chapter.

Chapter VIII Employee Benefits and Service—my opinion is that we should either eliminate or seriously reduce this chapter. It doesn’t really fit with the rest of the Faculty Handbook.