1.0 Call to Order

2.0 Approval of November 12, 2004, January 28, 2005, and February 2, 2005 minutes

Moved, seconded and approved with no changes.

3.0 Approval of Agenda

Moved, seconded and approved with no changes.

4.0 Officers' Reports

4.1 President: Dave Beckett (Dave B) – Dave B. introduced and welcomed Bobby Middlebrooks, a senate appointee taking the place of Gerry Mattson.

4.1.1 College Courses at area high schools

Dave B. described the recent events concerning college courses being offered at Oak Grove High School as part of a new ‘Dual Enrollment’ option. This option would require college professors to teach the courses on the Oak Grove High School (HS) campus. Apparently, a flyer was circulated at Oak Grove HS signing students up for either a psychology or sociology course that would be taught at the HS after 3pm. Faculty in the sociology department were unaware that this was being done. Faculty in psychology were told a while back that such a course was being discussed but formal approval did not occur at the departmental level.

Dave B. brought the issue up at the last President’s cabinet meeting. He listed three problems with these courses: 1) If the courses were taught on the HS campus it would be like taking a HS class with a substitute teacher instead of in a college atmosphere, 2) two USM departments were involved but at least one of the departments wasn’t even told about it. Departments should be involved from the ground up in these types of discussions and decisions, 3) Academic Council should also have been involved in this discussion from the beginning.
Bill Powell (Bill P.) told senators that Mathew Cox, Director of Recruitment, came to speak to Academic Council regarding this issue. Mr. Cox told the council that the original idea was to pilot a program at Oak Grove and that there were preliminary discussions with Oak Grove and courses such as sociology and psychology were suggested as possibilities. Oak Grove school took off with the idea and developed a flyer which they passed out to students. Academic Council discussed with Matt Cox all the issues and concerns they had regarding this proposal. Matt Cox apologized for the mix up and said that he should have approached it differently. Bill P. felt that recruitment services was trying to help Oak Grove out since Lamar County schools no longer allowed ‘early release’ of seniors (students leaving at noon.). These classes would be a way to help fill their day. This reasoning was questioned by Academic Council – seniors got out at noon but these proposed classes weren’t going to be scheduled until 3:30pm, which was after school had let out.

Another issue that came up at this Academic Council meeting was the ACT criterion for students dually enrolled. It used to be that students had to have an ACT score of 25 or better to be dually enrolled. Apparently, Provost Hudson changed that at some point and dropped the score to 21. Taking in a standard error measurement of 2 points, students could actually have a score of 19 and still be dually enrolled. Academic Council asked the Provost’s Office for the document officially lowering the entrance score to 21.

There was discussion by the senate regarding the following points: the benefits and pitfalls of having the classes taught here versus having them on the Oak Grove campus; the issue of dual credit versus dual enrollment; issues related to changing the entrance ACT score of 25 versus 21; and a question whether or not this would be considered a distant learning course. Dave B. and Bill P. both said that they had raised that question with Dr. Exline who assured them that this would not be considered a distant education course.

There was consensus among senators that this was again an instance where appropriate channels and constituencies were not consulted. There are pros and cons about the idea of an Oak Grove Dual Enrollment program but it needs to be considered carefully by all the appropriate parties involved and the appropriate processes need to be followed.

4.1.2 Online Evaluations

Last month, March 2005, the administration suddenly announced that faculty evaluations would be done online for this spring semester. Dave B. discussed this issue at the President’s Cabinet meeting and brought forth faculty concerns about online evaluations: 1) documented low response rate, and 2) concern that the only students who would do the evaluations would be students who had an ax to grind with a teacher, 3) two sets of matching trick questions to catch inconsistencies – but if students are consistent, single rephrased questions are going to be counted twice.

Dave B. proposed at that cabinet meeting that the original committee that had previously looked at online evaluations reconvene to look at all the issues involved in implementing online
Cabinet members thought that was a good idea. However, today Dave B. learned that the online evaluations were going on as planned without the committee meeting he had suggested. Bill Powell then told the senate that after a meeting this morning (April 8), Joan Exline stopped him and told him that the online evaluations would be implemented April 18th. She asked Bill P. for any recommendations he might have about the implementation. Bill P. told Joan that the online evaluations should not be done until the committee had a chance to reconvene. Dr. Exline stated that the online evaluations were going on as scheduled because it met a SACS need – specifically, that they needed aggregate data to compare the coast and Hattiesburg classes. A secondary need was that other programs needed it for accreditation processes. With no alternative, Bill recommended and Joan agreed that: 1) written comments be taken off (since there was no assurance to faculty that the comments would be kept private), 2) Only the person being evaluated would receive the results (not chairs or deans), except in the case of adjuncts, 3) Dr. Exline agreed to eventually reconvene the committee that initially looked at the online evaluation issue to examine it further – this committee would reevaluate the use of online evals possibly even returning it to paper if that is what they felt was best, or possibly creating a new instrument, 4) There would be a 2nd pilot in the summer (Dr. Exline did acknowledge that the official evaluation was the fall evaluation), 5) Dr. Exline agreed that deans would not be allowed to change the evaluation in any way (apparently one had tried). Also, Dr. Exline stated that the online evaluation was not an initiative coming from Dr. Thames.

Q: What is the issue concerning SACS – why is this suddenly necessary?
A: Dr. Exline said that SACS needs the aggregate data to compare campuses.

Q: Why couldn’t the paper method do that?
A: Bill P.’s opinion was that it could be done the old way but that Dr. Exline was choosing not to do it that way.

Q: A senator pointed out that the original committee that had looked at online evaluations had recommended against doing them online.

There was a discussion and concern about the low return rate and consequently the limited information that would be available for faculty and SACS.

Myron Henry stated that he serves as a SACS evaluator and that he is unaware of any SACS need that would require these evaluations to be done online. SACS only cares that evaluations are done. He requested that we find out specifically what was driving this need for an online evaluation and its rapid implementation.
Another senator suggested that the aggregate data that is needed is available for the last couple of years through J.T. Johnson. The senator wondered if Dr. Johnson had been approached by Joan Exline about getting this data instead of trying to do this online.

Another senator suggested that the Faculty Senate’s Administration and Faculty Evaluations Committee look into this.

4.1.3 Discussion with President concerning Continuing Ed

The executive committee discussed with Dr. Thames the issue of Sue Pace not being allowed to speak to the Faculty Senate. The president said that only Joan Exline was authorized by him to speak to the public concerning Continuing Education because he felt that she was the most knowledgeable person within the administration in this area.

4.1.4 Discussion with President concerning IHL Tenure Policy

[This issue was discussed at last month’s faculty senate meeting and is followed up here.] The executive committee asked the president about the IHL’s policy concerning tenure being granted after a recommendation from the president (the new policy leaves out the wording “recommended by the department, chair, dean and provost). President Thames said that he believed that the recommendation should come up from the department, chair, dean and provost and that the Faculty Handbook states that. Dr. Thames said that he would abide by the Faculty Handbook regarding this matter. Senators asked that the executive committee check the Faculty Handbook to make sure that it indeed covers this.

At present, the Faculty Handbook does indeed cover this:

9.3.1 Mandated University Advice. The Board of Trustees mandates that the state's institutions of higher learning must maintain committees for recommending tenure and that the chief executive officers of the institutions adopt policies for promotion and the award of tenure

9.6.7 Credit for Prior Accomplishment. At the time of initial employment by the Board, an administrative employee whose prior employment included faculty rank and tenure may be granted tenure only if so recommended by the department, the Dean, the Provost, and the President and approved by the Board.1
1 Board Policies and Bylaws, Section 403.0101.

4.1.5 Response to “Business Leaders”
Last FS meeting, the executive committee was charged with writing a response to the Hattiesburg “Business Leaders.” Dave B., with input from the executive officers and two other senators, wrote a response which was published in its entirety in the Hattiesburg American on March 27, 2005. The letter follows:

Faculty Senate Statement on the Hattiesburg Business Meeting

March 18, 2005

Members of the USM Faculty Senate wish to respond to topics and comments made prior to and at the meeting of “business leaders” held at Warren Paving on March 10, 2005. In an article appearing in the March 3, 2005 issue of the Independent, Mrs. Bonnie Drews, one of the meeting’s hosts, is quoted as stating that “the issue is whether USM will continue primarily as a liberal arts university or whether is will focus on technology.” She is further quoted as stating that the liberal arts and liberal arts faculty have “set the direction of USM for the past 25 years,” and that Dr. Thames is attempting to change the university’s direction “despite opposition from the liberal arts faculty.”

The faculty at USM have not and do not consider the university to be “primarily a liberal arts university.” Although the liberal arts and the fine arts certainly flourished under the leadership of Dr. Aubrey Lucas, strong programs also developed in science, business, nursing, education, and psychology (to name a few) within the “past 25 years.” Students and their parents have every right to expect USM to be a comprehensive university with faculty throughout who excel in teaching, research, and service.

Opposition to the present administration is not solely from the liberal arts faculty but is actually widespread among the faculty. In the faculty-wide no confidence vote of March 10, 2004, 462 faculty voted, with 93% of those voting choosing no confidence. The total liberal arts faculty at the time numbered less than 200 individuals. The inescapable mathematical conclusion is that the majority of faculty voting no confidence were from colleges OTHER THAN the College of Liberal Arts (now the College of Arts and Letters).

According to the Hattiesburg American, after the March 10th meeting business spokesperson Bob Mixon criticized some comments posted anonymously on the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) website calling for violence against meeting organizers. First, we are not aware of any call for violence posted on the AAUP website. Second, on a message board anyone can post anything under any name he/she chooses. Third, of course no meeting organizers or attendees were subjected to violence by faculty members.
Mr. Mixon is further quoted as stating that “opponents’ attempts to unseat him [Thames], in my opinion, is only one step in a much more ambitious agenda.” We have no idea what this ominous “much more ambitious agenda” includes and would very much like Mr. Mixon to be more specific regarding this allegation. Our agenda has been, and continues to be, an expectation that the administration conducts itself in a competent and upright manner, and consults with faculty leaders BEFORE important decisions are made affecting the faculty and their students, not AFTER. For the last two and a half years the faculty of the university have constantly been in the unfortunate position of having to react to hasty decisions made by the administration without input.

Mr. Mixon emphasized that everyone at the university build a “positive rapport” with the media. We agree, but suggest that excluding media from a meeting such as was practiced at this meeting of business leaders is not a good start. Mr. Mixon was also quoted as being receptive to the idea of holding future meetings between community leaders and faculty members, suggesting that such meetings would be “absolutely essential” to finding solutions to the current troubles on the USM campuses. We would happily attend such meetings and await an invitation. Interestingly, over the last two years the leaders of the USM Faculty Senate have NEVER been asked to address a meeting of alumni or business leaders to discuss the problems which have disrupted our university.

It should be clear to all observers that the events which have upset the campus have originated with the USM administration, not with the faculty. A few examples of such events include the attempted firings of two distinguished, tenured professors, the inflated enrollment numbers, the ill-conceived and inadequate drug and alcohol policy, the fall of the university to the lowest possible tier in the U.S. News and World Report, the premature post-tenure review report, the SACS probation, and the recent dispute between the Dean of the Business College and the administration over research goals and programs. All of these issues had their origin in the university’s administration. For faculty to ignore such missteps through lack of comment would have been an evasion of their responsibilities as members of the university community. We remain committed to a University of Southern Mississippi where the input and ideas of all of its members are valued and where such input and ideas would be elicited and considered by the administration before significant decisions are made.

Signed,

Faculty Senate Executive Committee,

per motion of the Faculty Senate at Large

4.1.6 Other

Dave Beckett stated that the Faculty Senate’s executive committee met with the IHL’s Dr. Croft yesterday regarding Dr. Thames. Because this was a personnel issue, Dave B. asked for a closed door session for this portion of the senate meeting. A motion was made, seconded and passed to
go into closed session. All non-senators were asked to leave. One senator asked that non-senate faculty be allowed to stay. But the senate president determined that this was not appropriate for this session. The session was closed and opened with no remarks to the public.

4.2 President-Elect - Provost Council meeting was again canceled.

4.3 Secretary - No report

4.4 Secretary-Elect - No report

5.0 New Business

5.1 Report from Dr. Gunther regarding budget

Senator Bill Gunther (Bill G.) gave a handout and an overview of his initial review of the actual “savings” to the university from the reorganization of the colleges. Looking at the budget from fiscal year 2003 (the year before reorganization) and 2005 (a year after reorganization), Bill G. found the savings to be about $121,370, a tad short of the often reported $1.8 million. He noted that most of the new deans’ salaries have been allocated in ‘instructional’ lines not ‘administrative” lines in the new budget, even though the majority of their work is ‘administrative.’ The administration claims “Our reorganization from nine colleges to five put $2 million directly back into classrooms for students” – Bill G.’s report demonstrates that this is untrue. Faculty Senate has repeatedly asked the administration for disclosure of this ‘savings’ and this information has never been provided. Bill G. suggested that now, with the additional budget information and this report, the senate again ask Dr. Thames to provide it with information of the cost savings or show us where this report is incorrect.

A full report can be found attached at the end of these minutes.

5.2 Other

Senator asked if Dave B. had heard anything new about the budget cuts. Dave B. said he didn’t know anything about this and at the executive officers’ meeting with President Thames, Dr. Thames stated that he hadn’t heard anything either.

A guest in the audience asked about an article in the Hattiesburg American on minority recruitment. In the article was an embedded table that indicated that USM’s faculty lines stayed about flat for a time period of 3 years whereas Ole Miss increased their numbers by about 100 persons give or take (they started out with fewer and ended up with more than us), and MSU by about 300 (to the best of this audience member’s memory). He wanted to know what this all meant, if anyone else had seen the article and if the IHL was favoring UM and MSU. Dave B.
answered that it was difficult to get solid answers on faculty numbers from our Human Resources but that he (Dave B) planned on sitting down with Russ Willis to get some reliable numbers. Someone mentioned that there were about 50 job ads posted for faculty positions right now.

6.0 Committee Reports
6.1 Academic and Governance
6.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations

Dr. Folse gave a handout of the total number of evaluations that were done for the president, provost, deans and chairs. The evaluations on Dr. Ken Malone, Chief Operating Officer on the coast will be done and given to him next week.

A discussion arose regarding the discarding of evaluations that were completed by individual faculty and sent separate from the evaluations forwarded by the departments.

6.3 Awards

The selections of award winners are underway.

6.4 Budget
6.5 Constitution and Bylaws
6.6 Faculty Welfare
6.7 Government Relations
6.8 Technology

Taralynn Hartsell, chair, reported that after talking with Homer Coffman, it was determined that the computer use policy will change. There is a new security policy in place but it does not address email monitoring. Faculty senate will have a representative on the ITech Advisory Committee. Dave B. said that he will attempt to get an email monitoring policy in place soon.

6.9 Elections

Paula Smithka, chair, said that she is still waiting for a list of faculty in CoST.

6.10 Ad hoc committee reports and liaison reports (AAUP and others)

6.10.1 PUC

6.10.2 AAUP

Amy Young stated that the local chapter of AAUP passed a strong resolution of no confidence in Shelby Thames on March 10th and sent it and a request to hire a new president to the IHL Board. She also announced that on April 15th, Dr. Robert Campbell will be at USM to speak to students and then again to the AAUP.
7.0  Old Business

Strategic Plan is complete and up on the web at http://edudev.usm.edu/ie/Strategic%20Planfinal.doc

Tim Rehner talked about the new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). He said that he was on the initial committee back when its goal was to do a plan that looked at technology. He said that the SACS consultant suggested that the committee focus on something different than technology. The committee has decided to look at written and oral communications. The committee was going to select two faculty members from speech and English (2 classes each) as samplings. Tim R. suggested that this sampling was too small. He thought that the plan should target all the core classes. The committee thought that that sampling was too big. Dr. Exline met with Academic Council (AC) and presented a larger plan of targeting two to four classes per college. AC suggested fading in the QEP plan to eventually encompass all core courses.

Tim R. also stated that the university would be advertising for a faculty member to be QEP coordinator. The selected person would get release time and would report to the provost.

8.0  Other

9.0  Adjournment (4:55)
Members present and those absent [in brackets] but represented by proxy (in parentheses):

**College of the Arts & Letters**

Joe Brumbeloe

[Amy Chasteen-Miller] (Alan Thompson)

[Phillip Gentile] (John Meyer)

Kate Greene

Stephen Judd

John Meyer

Bill Powell, President-Elect

Bill Scarborough

Paula Smithka

[Jennifer Torres] (Stephen Judd)

Anne Wallace

**College of Business**

James Crockett

David Duhon

Bill Gunther

Laurie Babin

**College of Education & Psychology**

Taralynn Hartsell

Melanie Norton
[Joe Olmi] (Tammy Greer)
Janice Thompson
[Daniel Tingstrom] (Tammy Greer)

**College of Health**
Bonnie Harbaugh, Secretary-Elect

[Susan Hubble] (Mary Lux)
Margot Hall
Mary Lux

[Mary Frances Nettles] (Tim Rehner)
Tim Rehner

**College of Coastal Science**
Chet Rakocinski

[Don Redalje] (Chet Rakocinski)

**College of Science & Technology**
David Beckett, President
Randy Buchanan
Peter Butko
Raymond Folse

[Mary Dayne Gregg] (Mary Lux)
Myron Henry

Bobby Middlebrooks
Gail Russell

Alan Thompson

University Libraries
Mary Beth Applin, Secretary

[Jay Barton Spencer] (Mary Beth Applin)

USM-Gulf Coast
[Allisa Beck] (Mary Beth Applin)

[J. Pat Smith] (Will Watson)
Wil Watson
Kay Harris

Members Absent:

College of the Arts & Letters: 0

College of Business: 0

College of Education & Psychology:
Melanie Norton

College of Health: 0

College of Coastal Science: 0
College of Science & Technology: 0

University Libraries: 0

USM-Gulf Coast: 0
A Comment on the

$1.8 Million in “Savings” from

Reorganization At USM

I

Reorganization and Administrative Costs

We have repeatedly heard reference to the $1.8 million in savings achieved at USM through the reorganization of the Colleges effective Fall 2003. The term “savings” has been used quite freely in describing an objective of this reorganization although it is not clear if this means an actual reduction in administrative costs or a reallocation of administrative costs to instructional costs as deans/associate deans return to teaching. Let us accept at first that most people would associate a claim of $1.8 million in “savings” to represent cost reductions and examine the facts that appear in the annual “Budget Books” of USM.

In Table 1 below, the actual “Dean’s Office” budgets are show as reported in the “Budget Books” for the each of the organizations impacted by the reorganization. According to this the data in Table 1, the total administrative cost savings represented by the Dean’s Office budgets amounted to only $121,370. That leaves some $1.7 million in savings unaccounted for in the Dean’s Office budgets.

However, even this amount ($121,370) of savings is misleading for several reasons. First the proportion of the deans time (FTE) assigned to administrative responsibility of the colleges has been significantly reduced from 2002-03 to 2004-05. In FY 2003, the deans of colleges were almost all assigned full-time responsibility for being dean (FTE = 1). In 2005, deans were assigned significantly less time to the Dean’s Office as shown in Table 2. For example, the College of Business dean was assigned 1 FTE in 2002-03 to the dean’s office, but only .21 (about one-fifth) to this same administrative responsibility in FY 2005. The other deans ranged from .32 to .38 FTE in the dean’s office. The remaining portion of time was assigned to the departments in which the deans held tenure. The effect of this reassignment is to significantly reduce reported administrative cost and to raise the reported instructional cost. Unless these new FTE loadings actually represent a shifting of their time to new duties in their respective departments, it would be more appropriate to use an FTE of one to represent the true cost of administration in the Colleges. This cost estimate is provided in Table 2.

A second misleading part of this information is the shifting of fund raiser positions out of the deans office to Development. In the College of the Arts and in the College of Business, development officers were listed as part of the budget in FY 2003. In FY 2005, these positions were listed in the
development office budgets, an apparent “savings” when examining college budget changes. Table 3 shows that the salary costs of these two individuals amounted to $102,800. To that is added an estimated fringe cost of 25%, bringing a total of $128,500 that should be added back to the current cost for a fairer estimate of savings.

After adjusting for the underreporting of dean’s FTE and for the shifting of development officers out of the dean’s office, the apparent “savings” in Dean’s Office budgets is actually an increase of $470,722 as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Savings from Table 1</th>
<th>+$121,370</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean FTE Adjustment (Table 2)</td>
<td>-$463,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer (Table 3)</td>
<td>-$128,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalculated “Savings”</td>
<td>-$470,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These facts as reported is the USM “budget books” raise serious questions about the claim of $1.8 million from reorganization.

II

Retirements, Resignations and Reassignments

Are we to believe that the “savings” are a combination of reductions in actual expenses from resignations, retirements and a reallocations from administrative to instructional costs of former administrators? First, let us exam the reallocations of administrative costs to instructional costs.
1. Reallocations. Of the 10 former administrators impacted by the reorganization, only four returned to the classroom. Their combined salaries in FY 2002 were $417,502. Most returned to the faculty at a reduced nine-month salary, thus the university recovered a total of $54,518 (includes fringe) in actual cost savings and is shown in Table 4. The remaining salaries were simply reallocated to the instructional budgets and total $373,888 plus estimated fringes or a total of $467,460.

2. Resignations and Retirements. There were additional cost savings derived from the resignations or retirements of four other former deans. These salaries and fringes total $703,419 as shown in Table 5 and represent actual cost savings. It is important to note however that to the extent some of the duties that these individuals would have performed (teaching, advising, etc.) required the hiring or shifting of responsibilities, the “savings” are overstated.

To summarize:

Expenditure Differences as reported in the
Budget Books (Table 1)  -$121,370

Less Adjustment for Dean FTE (Table 2)  +$463,592

Less Adjustment for Shifting Development Officers (Table 3)  +$128,500

Equals Increase in Administrative Cost from Reorganization  -$470,722

Less Resignations/Retirements of Deans (Tables 4 & 5)  +$757,937

Estimate “Cash” Savings from Reorganization  +$287,215

Less Gross Reallocations to Teaching (Table 4)  +$467,360

Equals Cash and Reallocation of Deans  +$754,575

Table 1

Dean’s Office Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Book Changes to Dean’s Office Accounts</th>
<th>2002-2003</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old/New Colleges</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts to Arts and Letters</td>
<td>$269,625</td>
<td>$633,895</td>
<td>$364,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Arts eliminated</td>
<td>$380,921</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-380,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$568,520</td>
<td>$558,894</td>
<td>$-9,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Psychology</td>
<td>$542,288</td>
<td>$648,981</td>
<td>$106,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services to Health</td>
<td>$311,313</td>
<td>$471,647</td>
<td>$160,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing eliminated</td>
<td>$282,461</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-282,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>$236,307</td>
<td>$207,681</td>
<td>$-28,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>$229,198</td>
<td>$206,778</td>
<td>$-22,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>$486,505</td>
<td>$453,904</td>
<td>$-32,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>$220,773</td>
<td>$126,040</td>
<td>$-94,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School/Graduate Services</td>
<td>$254,998</td>
<td>$353,719</td>
<td>$98,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,782,909</td>
<td>$3,661,539</td>
<td>$-121,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Adjustment for FTE of Deans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>As Reported in Budget Book</th>
<th>Assuming FTE=1</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business (FTE = .21)</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$152,381</td>
<td>$120,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters (FTE = .32)</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$134,375</td>
<td>$91,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Psychology (FTE = .34)</td>
<td>$42,743</td>
<td>$125,714</td>
<td>$82,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (FTE = .38)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$131,579</td>
<td>$81,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology (FTE = .35)</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$134,286</td>
<td>$87,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$214,743 $678,335 $463,592

### Table 3

**Reassignment of Development Officers**

*(Cost Shifted to Development from FY2002 to FY 2005)*

| College of the Arts       | $40,800                     |
| College of Business       | $62,000                     |
| Sub Total                 | $102,800                    |
| Fringe (assumed 25%)      | $25,700                     |
| **Total**                 | **$128,500**                |
### Table 4

**Former Deans Who Return to Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dean’s Salary</th>
<th>Faculty Salary</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$110,670</td>
<td>$96,501</td>
<td>$14,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$101,026</td>
<td>$101,026</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$127,590</td>
<td>$114,090</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Technology</td>
<td>$114,737</td>
<td>$98,792</td>
<td>$15,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$373,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,614</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fringe (25% Assumed)  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,518</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Dean of the College of Health and Human Services was assigned to a department in FY 2003 in the amount of $36,521. Thus the net increase to departments is $410,409 - $36,521 = $373,888 plus estimated fringe benefits equals $467,360.*
Table 5

**Estimated Savings from Resignations/Retirements of Former Deans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of the Arts</td>
<td>$104,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$119,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>$115,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education/Psychology</td>
<td>$121,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Dean</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$562,735</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (Assumed 25% )</td>
<td>$140,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$703,419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>