

Meeting No. 66
March 10, 1976
Stephen F. Austin State University
Faculty Senate

Absent:
None

Ex officio Members Present:
Dr. John T. Lewis

Guests Present:
Dr. Ronnie Barra
Dr. Wayne Boring
Dr. Bennie Walker

1. Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.
2. Minutes of Meeting No. 65 were approved as corrected.
3. The treasurer, Mr. Jesse Richardson, reported that \$857.86 remains in the allocated budget.
4. Dr. Bennat Mullen reporting for the Faculty Government and Involvement Committee presented the following recommendation to the Senate for its consideration:
It is recommended that the matter concerning administrative structure, as well as the length of terms of service for department heads, and deans be deferred to the October meeting.
Motion carried.
5. Dr. Gloria Durr, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, read a letter from Mr. Jerry Johnson expressing his appreciation for the interest shown by the Senate in improving and enlarging bookstore facilities. Dr. Durr presented the following recommendations:
In regard to the bookstore -
 1. Consideration be given to increasing space provided for the bookstore in order to allow for more efficient management.
 2. Requests for supporting supplies and/or teaching materials accompany textbook request orders.Motion carried.
6. Dr. Jerry Vincent and Dr. Wayne Johnson submitted a revision of Minutes of Meeting No. 61 of the Faculty Senate, October 15, 1975. (See attachment) The Senate approved the revised minutes and recommended that the revisions be sent to Dr. Steen for consideration.
7. Dr. Jerry Vincent, Chairman of the ad hoc committee studying the Fiscal Affairs Division of the University, submitted the committee's report, recommending that this report be sent to the Administration and Financial Affairs for further study and recommendations. Motion carried.

- 8. Mr. Jesse Richardson suggested the Senate investigate the proposed payment of accumulated sick leave upon retirement or leaving the University, a matter of concern to faculty having been employed for several years. This was referred to the Professional Welfare Committee with Mr. Richardson assisting.
- 9. Dr. Deanna Malpass proposed that a set of all Faculty Senate Minutes be placed in the Library Reserve Room. Resolution passed.
- 10. Dr. Jerry Vincent requested that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee compile a list or summary of all policy changes at the end of the academic year and the list or summary be sent to all faculty members. Motion carried.
- 11. Mr. Jesse Richardson made the following report for the Insurance Committee:
 The law pertaining to the payment of insurance premiums for retired personnel has been referred to the Attorney General's office for interpretation so that all state agencies will handle this matter unilaterally.
- 12. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, April 14, 1976 in the Aztec Room at 3:15 p.m.
- 13. The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Chandler

Ann Chandler, Faculty Senate Secretary

(Attachments: 1)

Reviewed: *John T. Lewis, III*
 Dr. John T. Lewis, Academic Vice President

4-20-76
 Date

Approved: *Ralph Steen*
 Dr. Ralph Steen, President

5-4-76
 Date

MEMO

To: Faculty Senate

From: Ad Hoc Committee for Fiscal Affairs - Drs. Burr, Lackey, Malpass,
Richardson and Vincent, Chairman

Subject: Report of Ad Hoc Committee for the study of the Fiscal Affairs
Division

Date: 10 March, 1976

The following report is the result of a study conducted by the Senate ad hoc committee for Fiscal Affairs. The report is based upon information obtained from a survey of the faculty, as well as letters from, and interviews with, people in the Fiscal Affairs Division.

The report is divided into five portions: The four branches of Fiscal Affairs, plus a section on DOE, included because of numerous questions and comments from the faculty dealing with that area. Each of the four basic portions of the report is subdivided into the following categories: Faculty response, Problems encountered by the branch of Fiscal Affairs, and Observations and/or conclusions of the ad hoc committee.

Information in the Faculty response sections was obtained from replies to a questionnaire sent to the faculty in February. Of 430 questionnaires sent out, 98 were returned. A copy of the questionnaire and letter sent to each of the people in charge of a branch of Fiscal Affairs is attached. Responses to the survey, to letters and subsequent interviews provided the following information. After presenting a synopsis of material from both faculty and Fiscal Affairs, the committee has expressed its observations.

Although problems do exist (as indicated in the observations), they appear in large measure to be minimal, considering the size of operations entrusted to Fiscal Affairs. Certainly, an awareness of the academic functions of Fiscal Affairs needs to be encouraged. At present Fiscal Affairs indicates concern and interest in improvement in all areas.

Comptroller
(Includes Business Manager, Personnel Office and Fiscal Office)

Faculty response

1. Results of questionnaire: Yes 60 No 15 No opinion 23

2. Summary of comments from questionnaire:

The principal problem identified by those faculty responding with a "no" involved the attitude of a number of people in the fiscal office. This attitude was described as indifferent, inconsiderate, condescending, rude, and hostile.

Other problems mentioned by faculty included: confusion involving travel expense, long delays for reimbursement of travel expenses, accounting errors on computer printouts, mistakes on insurance coverage and premiums, and difficulty in getting competent applicants for jobs.

Problems encountered by Comptroller

According to the Comptroller, there are no significant problems that hamper the function of this office other than those normally encountered while operating within extensive rules and regulations of the state government.

Observations of the committee

1. The attitude of some of the people in the Fiscal Office is not what it should be.
2. There appears to be confusion and misunderstanding among the faculty of different schools regarding travel regulations.
3. Comparatively few clerical errors have been made. Nevertheless, the Comptroller is doing everything possible to reduce the number of mistakes and hopefully eliminate them.

Purchasing and Inventory

Faculty response

1. Results of questionnaire: Yes 36 No 48 No opinion 14

2. Summary of comments from questionnaire:

The most frequently mentioned item on the questionnaires pertained to the slowness in obtaining ordered material. The time span involved in specific illustrations ranged from an average of one faculty member's requisitions of 30 days to isolated cases of over a year.

Poor attitude and substitution of items ordered was also mentioned frequently with several examples of substituting goods which were said to be unwise.

Faculty also commented on the high degree of red tape in turning in orders and suggested that there was a significant communication problem.

Problems encountered by Purchasing and Inventory

The problems encountered by the purchasing department as set out by Mr. Hearne in his letter to the committee fall in four areas enumerated below:

"I. Rules, Regulations and Restrictions

1. Senate Bill 189, Article 664-3 Vernon's Civil Statutes passed by the 55th Legislature is the purchasing law under which the University must operate. This law basically states "The basic principle and/or foundation of State Purchasing is competitive bidding." The law established that the State Board of Control implement rules and regulations to implement the law.

The guideline established by the State Board of Control permits the University to purchase in the following manner:

- a. Any item not on a State Contract⁽¹⁾ or a Scheduled Purchasing System⁽²⁾ with a value of less than \$200.00 to be purchased by the University after obtaining three (3) competitive bids⁽³⁾ or showing an attempt to do so. The bids may be written or telephoned, but must indicate the name of the firm and the name of the bidder on the tabulation sheet.
- b. Any item costing \$200.00 or more not on State Contract must be purchased through the State Board of Control on Open Market⁽⁴⁾, unless the department requesting can justify as an emergency.⁽⁵⁾ Any item purchased as an emergency costing \$200.00 or more must have written bids submitted with the bid tabulation sheet.
- c. Any emergency purchase of \$500.00 or more must have prior approval of the State Board of Control before an order can be placed.

II. Departmental Request

1. In order to meet the requirements of the State Purchasing law and the Department's needs, the Purchasing Office must have cooperation from the Department and the successful Vendor.
2. The Department's needs are not known until the Purchasing Office receives from the Department a requisition establishing the needs and the date needed.
3. Until bids are received, the Purchasing Office cannot tell whether the needs can be met by the required date.

III. Vendor Performance

1. The reliability of a Vendor to meet his promised delivery date is a factor which we must accept.
2. During these economical times stock in warehouses is very low, and Vendor performance is poor.
3. Before the promised delivery date, the Purchasing Office makes written follow-up to expedite the order.
4. The Purchasing Office sends a copy of all correspondence received from the Vendor to the requesting department.

IV. Workload

With the growth of the University the Purchasing Office has maintained an increased volume of work with no increase in staff. The Purchasing Office has six (6) people and handles in excess of 250 individual orders each day under the Rules and Regulations outlined above. As you can easily see many orders must be handled many times before the department receives the required material.

List of Terms

1. State Contract - Awarded on the basis of firm price or manufacturer's list price sheet. Term Contracts are based upon estimated quantities or dollar volume of selected items used generally and respectively by various State Agencies during a predetermined period.
2. Scheduled Purchasing - Like item requisitions from all agencies are combined and advertised for bid on regular schedule - monthly quarterly, or at intervals established by the Board of Control.
3. Competitive Bids - Basic principle of State Purchasing
4. Open Market - Any item not on State Contract and costing \$200.00 or more is advertised by the State Board of Control.
5. Emergency - As defined by the State Board of Control "Items which are so badly needed that the agency will suffer financial or operational damage if supplies are not secured immediately." "

Observations of the committee

1. It appears that due to the number of requisitions handled by the Purchasing Office (average 250 a day) with one or more items on each by a staff of six people and three unborn infants that the multiple handling of each requisition lends itself to errors-- both internally and externally.

The foregoing can best be illustrated by following the flow of requests through the Purchasing Office as per the following schedule:

- A. Department initiates orders
- B. Purchasing receives orders and numbers them
- C. Type of order
 - 1) Board of control bid
 - 2) Board of control open market order
 - 3) Local bid orders
- D. Determination of the funds available as per department operating and maintenance budget and whether or not item is listed in the five-year plan if it is a capital purchase.
- E. Forward to board of control for either bids or on the state contract, or if one which may be submitted to bids locally - the issuance of bid forms to vendors (either recommended or where they can find them)
- F. Return of bids from vendors to SFA directly or through board of control. If the cheapest bid is by the recommended vendor then proceed with ordering. If another vendor has low bid then requisition is returned to department for approval of low bid or for a reason why low bid should be accepted.
- G. Ordering merchandise
- H. Receiving of merchandise in by the department along with the invoice and the checking of received material by department to see if vendor has shipped the correct merchandise.

At any one of the eight levels enumerated above a typing error can occur, a wrong number can be entered or numbers read wrong in shipping. For instance, an order for salt must be specified by the ordering department or the purchasing department for the board of control open market order. Salt is identified as 775 but under 775 there nine different kinds.

2. The staff's lack of familiarity with purchasing procedures, checking ordered material with that requested, and receiving items different than those actually ordered creates a hinderance in speedy delivery.
3. Purchasing and Inventory appears understaffed and further, since most of the personnel are relatively young, the turnover rate of employment creates a great deal of difficulty.
4. According to Purchasing and Inventory, few faculty members have complained directly about purchasing problems.

Plant Maintenance

Faculty response

1. Results of questionnaire: Yes 34 No 54 No opinion 10

2. Summary of comments from questionnaire:

Comments regarding maintenance were grouped into three categories: Services in general, Building maintenance, and Problems concerning vehicles.

Services in general - The most frequently noted comments involved the slowness and poor quality of services, as well as exorbitant IDT charges for same. Other comments were concerned with poor organization and understaffed and insufficiently skilled work crews.

Building maintenance - An overall lack of building cleanliness exemplified by dirty restrooms and generally poor janitorial service was greatest concern to the faculty. Other comments involved the arbitrary cutting off of airconditioning and/or heat, extreme fluctuations of temperature, unreliable bells and clocks, and poor maintenance of specialized facilities such as the greenhouse.

Problems concerning vehicles - Comments in this category dealt mainly with confusion and mixups of vehicle reservations and the poor maintenance of vehicles. Inability to get bus drivers and lack of priorities on who can use vehicles were other comments expressed.

Problems encountered by Plant Maintenance

The following appeared to be the most significant problems which reduce the efficiency of Plant Maintenance:

1. Budget - As with all other divisions, the budget is considered to be inadequate for both salaries and for supplies and other items which must be purchased. In spite of the increased demand for various services, the budget for the year ending August 31, 1977 is the same as that for the present year ending August 31, 1976.
2. Understaffing - To a large extent, slow service results from understaffing in quantity and quality which is to a great extent a budgetary problem.
3. Inability to get needed supplies on time - This problem arises primarily through bottlenecks encountered in the State Board of Control.
4. Central Stores Inventory too limited - Reserve supplies of spare parts, repair materials, etc., are inadequate for giving rapid service at all times.
5. Inadequate Transportation for maintenance crews - Insufficient numbers of vehicles make it difficult to get crews along with their tools and supplies to diverse areas where their services are required at a given time. The Division of Maintenance finds that its justifications for purchase of more vehicles are consistently rejected.

6. Inadequate janitorial services - It was pointed out to the committee that one of the problems which prevents consistently good janitorial service is the very high annual turnover in janitorial personnel, approximately 105%. Again the low budget and resulting low levels of pay prevent the retention of trained, experienced persons.
7. Faculty misconceptions about maintenance charges for services - The Director of Maintenance feels that too many of the faculty do not understand how charges are made for services. In general, departments are not charged for repairs and upkeep of existing facilities. Charges are made for both materials and labor when the services involve remodeling, construction of new facilities, or supplying special services which fall outside of prescribed "housekeeping" services.
8. Misdirection of complaints and requests for services - Requests for services should be made to the Maintenance Division, not to the Fiscal Office, the President's office, etc. Similarly, complaints about inadequate or lacking services will be met faster if the complaints are directed to Maintenance rather than a variety of other offices, including that of the President.

Observations of the committee

The basic criterion for findings of this committee is the information obtained from the questionnaire supplied to the faculty. A large number of the faculty did not respond and the compilation of responses received does not indicate that a majority of the faculty (or even a large minority) is dissatisfied with the services rendered by Plant Maintenance. This is not to say that no problem areas exist. Problem areas recognized by this committee are:

1. Slow service - in many instances services were slower than they should have been. According to the Director of Maintenance a new Work Control Center under the direction of a single person should expedite matters.
2. Exorbitant charges - The maintenance division did discover errors in records which resulted in overcharges. These errors have been corrected. Hopefully this type of overcharge will not occur in the future.
3. Building cleanliness - Dissatisfaction with this and janitorial services in general appears to originate primarily in the Ferguson, Music, and Rusk Buildings, rather than being campus-wide.
4. Problems related to vehicles - Even though only a relatively small number of respondents indicated dissatisfaction with vehicle reservation and vehicle maintenance, the dissatisfaction is probably significant, because a very large portion of the faculty is not involved with the use of college vehicles and would not be expected to express an opinion about this.

Architects and Contractors

Faculty response

The faculty responses focused upon poor design and construction, shoddy workmanship, cramped space and lack of windows. Lack of faculty consultation on both new buildings and remodelling was stressed. The most critical responses came from three buildings: Ferguson, Music and Rusk. In Ferguson, poor construction was illustrated by separation of walls from fifth floor ceiling and cracked windows. Poor design cited offices inadequate in size for "primates in a zoo," insufficient storage, shelving and windows. In Music, poor acoustical qualities and distracting outside noises were noted. Comments regarding the Rusk remodelling emphasized plumbing and electrical problems continuing months after the completion of work.

Problems encountered by Architects and Contractors

In the past few years, over \$60 million has been spent on campus structures. Hundreds of hours are spent in selecting architects, planning work and carrying it to completion. From conception to completion, some projects have taken as long as five years. Initially, the President appoints a committee from the school involved to work with architects and contractors as well as to study similar facilities on other campuses. Problems develop at various levels: selection of architects, amount of funding at given times, and decisions made at the school level. As an example of the latter, deans and department heads may opt, on occasion, during an era of rapidly expanding faculty and enrollment, for quantity of offices rather than size. Nevertheless, interiors of new buildings are done in consultation with deans and department heads. They, in turn, may or may not consult intensively with their faculty. The University does try to ensure good workmanship and supervision of construction. Monies are held back on occasion in order to ensure correction of errors or flaws. The administration attempts to correct or repair major problems as quickly as possible.

Observations of the committee

The lack of faculty input regarding building and remodelling in various schools appears to rest almost entirely at the door of deans and department heads. Such consultation gives evidence of greater convenience and happier faculty and should be emphasized in future building and remodelling.

Allocation of DOE Funds*

I. Processes for allocating DOE monies:

1. The Vice President, in consultation with the President, determines the allocation of DOE money.
2. Departmental priorities for DOE allocations are established in the five year plans submitted by department heads.
 - 2.1 The 5 year plan is used to establish departmental needs.
 - 2.2 The department initiates requests through deans of the respective schools.
3. DOE allocations must match needs established in the 5 year plan.
 - 3.1 Priorities established in the 5 year plan are not static. Requests can be altered within the 5 year plan in terms of priorities.
4. The Vice President and deans of the respective schools determine whether there will be any increases in departmental DOE allocations. Currently these increases are based on income generated by the department and needs specified in the 5 year plan.
 - 4.1 Prior to the initiation of current cost accounting procedures, "noise" generated by various departments was the basis for departmental allocations.
 - 4.2 At the present time, cost accounting and need determine departmental allocations. The administration is balancing DOE expenditures on the basis of income generated by the various departments.
5. DOE money is allocated to respective school deans who, in turn, make departmental allocations. The deans must follow guidelines established through the 5 year plan and cost accounting procedures.
 - 5.1 DOE money can be transferred among various accounts at the departmental level.
6. At the present time high earning departments are sometimes short changed because other departments within the school are operating in the red. Those departments or schools which have been operating with a deficit are being required to reduce those deficits gradually.
7. A current concern of the Vice President's office is to establish a university-wide economic balance.
 - 7.1 It is likely that, where necessary, some departments operating at a deficit will continue to be supported in order to maintain university status.

* Information in this section was obtained from an interview with Dr. Lewis.

8. Sixty thousand to one hundred thousand dollars in DOE funds are withheld at the beginning of each budget year. This money is reserved for emergencies, unforeseen contingencies, grant matching funds, and one-time large special purchase requests, such as new stage lighting for the Fine Arts Auditorium, the electron microscope for the School of Science and Mathematics, etc. If this money is not expended, it is carried over to the next year.
9. A portion of DOE funds, as well as funds from other university accounts, is used to support Computer Center operations. This is necessary because there is no line item legislative support for computer operations.
10. DOE funds are also used to support general university functions in academic areas such as the University Statistics Laboratory, the university furniture account, student teaching expenses, etc.

II. Summer teaching allocations:

1. Monies for summer teaching budgets are requested by the department head through his dean. These requests are forwarded to the Vice President's office. They are evaluated in terms of the number of sections required and student-teacher ratios. Departmental teaching allocations are then determined by the school deans who must operate within the economic guidelines determined by the Vice President.

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
NACOGDOCHES, TEXAS 75961

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

February 10, 1976

Attached is a copy of a questionnaire that has been sent to the faculty which, as indicated, is part of a study that was initiated in response to a petition that was submitted to the Faculty Senate. The primary function of the ad hoc committee appointed to conduct the study is to gather information and draw conclusions. This questionnaire will provide us with a certain amount and type of input from the faculty, but we feel that, in order to draw any meaningful conclusions, we must also have input from people in the Fiscal Affairs Division.

We would appreciate it very much if you would describe for us the nature of any problems encountered by you that, from your point of view, impair the effectiveness of your branch in its role of supporting the academic function of the university. We feel that your response to this request would be extremely helpful because many problems, as viewed by the faculty, are due to circumstances of which they are unaware. Subsequently, after we have gathered input from the faculty and Fiscal Affairs, we would like to discuss any problem areas with you before we draw conclusions and submit a report to the Senate.

It is our sincere hope that from this study will emerge a better mutual understanding of problems faced by both faculty and Fiscal Affairs.

Sincerely,

Jerry W. Vincent, Chairman
Senate ad hoc Committee
for Fiscal Affairs

JWV/sls