

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT MONROE

REVIEW

DECEMBER 2001 - MARCH 2002

James L. Fisher, Ltd

Gene Budig, former Chancellor, University of Kansas
Joseph E. Johnson, President Emeritus, University of Tennessee
James V. Koch, President Emeritus, Old Dominion University
Paul Wisdom, Consultant
Farris Womack, former Vice President of Finance, University of Michigan &
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
James L. Fisher, Chair, Review Team
James L. Fisher, Ltd
March 20, 2002

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	Chapter I, p.1
Overview	Chapter II, p.3
Academic Programs	Chapter III, p.9
Faculty	Chapter IV, p.18
Students	Chapter V, p.23
Budget & Finance	Chapter VI, p.30
Technology	Chapter VII, p.36
Administration	Chapter VIII, p.38
Intercollegiate Athletics	Chapter IX, p.40
Institutional Advancement & External Affairs	Chapter X, p.45
Campus Governance	Chapter XI, p.69
Recommendations	Chapter XII, p.72
Members of the Review Team	Appendix A, p.79
Interviewees	Appendix B, p.88
Interview Form	Appendix C, p.93
Index of Materials Used in the Review	Appendix D, p.96
Governance	Appendix E, p.97

Executive Summary

The University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) is an institution with a distinguished past and promising future but whose recent few years have been tormented by a raft of troubling issues.

Begun in 1931, as a regional training school for teachers, the institution prospered along with the surrounding community, and by the early 90s it was a university with an enrollment of almost 12,000 students. In retrospect, it appears that in an effort to become a true university ULM behaved frenetically. Many believe that most of the changes during the last decade were mainly cosmetic when systematic attention was needed.

Unquestionably, the beginning of the 90s did mark a time of expectation and promise. Although the State had suffered through a long period of economic turmoil that was largely the result of the heavy dependence on the oil industry, the enrollment had grown until its standing as a reasonably strong regional university seemed secure and there appeared to be many reasons to expect that better things were still to come. But several factors produced a series of setbacks from which ULM must now exert significant energy and determination to recover. Recovery from the economic and political problems will require strong leadership and extraordinary internal and external support.

During this period it appears that the following were the most damaging to the University:

Unanticipated enrollment declines resulting in loss of revenues (operating budget)

Overestimation of projected revenues after moving to Division I-A football
(athletic budget)

Adding new and continuing doctoral programs without sufficient additional
resources

Failure to identify and eliminate low completer programs

Failure to develop cost effective relationships with Delta Community College

Not reducing faculty and administrative positions as enrollment declined
Insufficient attention to racial issues
Coping with funding cuts and declining enrollment through attrition and
reallocating resources away from critical campus support ranging from plant
maintenance to student services
Reluctance to staff the development office consistent with fund raising potential
An eight percent decline in high school graduates from ULM's thirteen feeder
parishes while there was a four percent increase across the state
TOPS graduates selecting LSU and Tech over ULM
Inadequate state appropriations

Not one of the above, by itself, was necessarily irrational or responsible for the University's enrollment and financial problems. Nonetheless, when taken together and combined with other external developments (some of which were beyond ULM's control), these actions ensured a state of confusion and challenge. All of these issues must be addressed with intelligence and dispatch by the new President.

The tone of this review is serious because it is based upon the need for significant and sustained corrective action immediately. Focused and systemic changes are required and many of them will not be pleasant. It is a daunting task, not to be taken lightly and sure to cause some discomfort.

The findings and recommendations in this Review may cause the casual observer to conclude that there is little hope for redeeming ULM. This is not the case. The biggest challenge the new President faces is that of making the hard choices that must be made to ensure survival and at the same time demonstrating that the future will be even better than the brightest moment in the past. There are many ways to accomplish the juggling act that is required and one of them is to make certain that the element of surprise is removed. The faculty, students, staff, alumni and the community of Monroe need to be aware that corrective actions must be taken. But they also

need to be a part of the dream for a new ULM that is reality based and focused on doing well those things that will strengthen the institution. They want and need a president who will listen, who is completely visible, and who has the insight and courage to make tough and unpopular decisions.

The Board of Supervisors and President Clausen chose President Cofer with the full knowledge of the seriousness of the challenges at ULM. He is a decisive leader with Monroe roots and has a distinguished record as a “fixer.” There will be those who will question the changes that he must make and their opposition will soon reach the Board. The Board's response to these objections will be more determinative of ULM's likelihood to redeem itself than any other factor. The unqualified support of the Board for the plan of correction is an absolute essential. Over the next several months, strong sensitive leadership by the President with the support of the System President and the Board will determine whether or not ULM returns to financial health and academic growth or whether it continues to slide. Assuming this support, the future of ULM is both exciting and promising.

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 28-30, 2002, a team of six persons, each widely experienced in higher education and none having any present or past association with the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM), reviewed the general condition of the University (Appendix A). The Review included assessing materials and conducting interviews from December 20, 2001 through March 21, 2002.

The purpose of the Review was to assess the general condition of the University from an objective and uninvested but informed perspective. The team was charged to candidly identify and address issues affecting ULM and help establish a tentative agenda for the immediate future.

In addition, the Review might offer these benefits:

All concerned parties would have a more accurate impression of ULM and consider more specific and achievable plans and expectations.

Faculty, administrators, students, alumni, elected and appointed officials, the media, and the general public would consider the report to be a legitimate opinion of ULM that might differ from their own.

The region, the state and beyond would have a heightened awareness of, and interest in, ULM because of the involvement in the Review and a public report on the results.

The Review considered the following in terms of strengths, limitations, and/or aspirations:

General condition of ULM

Academic programs

Faculty

Students

Administration

Technology

Budget and finance

Intercollegiate athletics

Fund-raising

Public relations (including alumni and legislative relations)

Governance

Other issues and conditions presented during the course of this Review.

Before beginning interviews, team members read and evaluated materials assembled by ULM staff and a confidential position paper prepared by the former President. All counted, interview and focus groups included 294 persons including faculty, students, staff, alumni, elected/appointed officials, area residents, local business persons, members of the Board, media representatives, benefactors, and potential benefactors, persons selected because of special knowledge and randomly selected persons from the community (Appendix B). Interviewees were based on position, stratified random sample, and random sample. All interviews followed a general format that included 16 separate areas (Appendix C).

Interviewers were to ask about, but not press, each of the areas and all interviewed were advised that their opinions might be used in the final report but *without* attribution.

Readers should bear in mind that although much of the Review can be documented, much of it is based on the opinions of those persons interviewed. Wherever the opinions of the Review team are expressed, it shall be obvious.

This Review is the exclusive work of James L. Fisher, Ltd and should not be attributed to individual members of the Review team.

II. OVERVIEW

This Review intends to provide a balanced view of the University of Louisiana at Monroe. The University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) is not unlike most colleges and universities today. It has both strengths and weaknesses. Thus, it would be inaccurate and a distortion of reality for us to focus on only ULM's often impressive achievements, while at the same time ignoring its problems. Similarly, however, those who dwell on the highly visible instances in which the University has stubbed its institutional toe fail to recognize ULM's many strengths and, given appropriate remedial actions, its bright prospects for the future.

The authors of this Review have no axe to grind, but are vitally interested in the welfare and improvement of ULM and its many constituents and friends. None is a Louisianian, yet all have high regard for the state and for the potential of higher education and ULM to improve the lot of Louisiana's citizens. However, for improvement to occur, and for ULM to do an even better job serving its students and the citizens, it is necessary to draw an accurate picture of where the institution is today, describe its challenges, and delineate how it might best move into a potentially exciting future. The picture we draw is not always flattering, though there is a great deal about ULM that is worthy of the highest praise. Nonetheless, the information and recommendations contained in this Review should provide the System President, Dr. Sally Clausen, and ULM President James E. Cofer, the Board of Supervisors, and the Board of Regents with a highly plausible and well reasoned road map for the next few years.

ULM was founded in 1931 in Ouachita Parish as a two-year public institution and for more than a decade was a branch of Louisiana State University. The University of Louisiana-Monroe was created by the State as one of several regional training schools for teachers. The growth in the population of northeast Louisiana in the years following came about from intensive farming efforts and the commercialization of the timber industry. Monroe became a thriving community with a trade area that extended far beyond the boundaries of Ouachita Parish.

ULM became a four-year institution in 1950. Throughout the most important parts of its history, it has had “Northeast” in its name and most recently was known as Northeast Louisiana University, or NLU. When the University changed its name to the University of Louisiana at Monroe in 1999, many of its most rabid constituents had mixed feelings about this development and not a few alumni and residents of the region would have preferred to have kept the old name. Even in 2002, a few individuals suggested to us that *“The first thing the new President should do is to change the name back to Northeast.”* We do not agree, and believe the University of Louisiana at Monroe name will serve the institution well over time; however, President Cofer must be sensitive to such feelings as he and the University develop marketing plans and regional strategies in the future.

The Plus Side

ULM offers more than 90 separate degree programs and in the old Carnegie doctoral classification scheme was classified as a Doctoral II institution (Master’s I in the new Carnegie classification) in recognition of its five doctoral programs. As we will outline in a succeeding section, the need for some of these doctoral programs and the University’s ability to support them appropriately are matters of debate. Indeed, as the University’s headcount enrollment has declined in recent years, well more than a handful of academic programs have experienced considerable reductions in enrollment and therefore have become quite expensive on a per student basis.

The academic jewels in ULM’s crown are its allied health programs (pharmacy, nursing, dental hygiene, and a variety of other health sciences programs) and its undergraduate teacher education programs. One cannot help but be impressed with the magnificent pass rates of ULM students on licensure examinations. In most programs, more than 90 percent of all students who attempt a licensure examination pass, and the percent often approaches 100.

The Pharm. D. program is the only such program at a public university in Louisiana and is highly regarded. It is the most selective program in the University in terms of admission (the mean high school grade point average of recent entering freshmen exceeded 3.6). Its graduates perform admirably on national examinations, and they are highly sought after by employers. As another pharmacy dean put it, *“That’s a strong program they have and they really get results.”* The requirements of the pharmacy accreditation agency are stringent and not surprisingly ULM’s pharmacy offerings are among the most expensive in the University. Indeed, they no doubt would be even better supported if the state were to fund these programs at levels similar to the funding of other state universities with Pharm. D. programs in the South. ULM has doggedly requested such enhanced funding, but has only realized partial success in that regard. This exemplifies a general circumstance at the University of Louisiana at Monroe—it offers many high quality programs, but its state funding levels are surprisingly low. We will have more to say about this in a section below.

The University’s teacher education programs are strong. Recently, two of the institution’s redesigned teacher preparation programs (Alternate Certification and Practitioner Teacher) were highly rated by the BOR/BESE Select Panel of External Evaluators and designated as *“models”* with respect to their format and quality of content. Student performances on the teacher licensure exam (Praxis) consistently ranks at the top of the state’s institutions. For example, ULM’s teacher education students recently recorded a 100 percent pass rate on the Educational Testing Service’s teacher preparation examination for 1999-2000, thus ranking them in the top quartile statewide. The College of Education deserves credit for developing a set of academic requirements that students must satisfy in order to emerge from ULM’s programs. Ordinarily, then, an undergraduate product of ULM will not be seeking state licensure unless he/she already has surmounted a series of hurdles that appears almost to preordain their success.

At the same time, the University’s strengths are not confined to these areas. More than 98 percent of the University’s programs that are eligible for disciplinary accreditation have achieved that status, including numerous other programs such as business and chemistry. Only one other institution in Louisiana can match that boast. Thus, ULM can look prospective students in the

eye, especially those at the undergraduate level, and tell them with confidence that if they choose to attend ULM, the academic programs in which they study have met demanding standards and ULM graduates almost always pass the licensure examinations that certify one's competence. A national higher education official told us, "*Louisiana Monroe is an undiscovered treasure for students. Its ability to turn out hundreds of extremely well qualified students may not be widely recognized nationally, but it is very impressive.*"

The Minus Side

An unknowledgeable individual might find it difficult to associate ULM's enrollment, financial, and management deficiencies with the aforementioned academic successes. The two conditions seem incongruent and antithetical. Yet, this same institution has suffered an approximate 25 percent decline in headcount enrollment in the last six years and the number of new freshmen fell even more precipitously (until this past fall, when a 1.6 percent increase was recorded). The decline was particularly sharp among full-time students and white male students.

During this period, the University exhausted what had been thought to be adequate, if not generous, financial reserves and now faces several substantial funding deficits, for example, an apparent \$2.5 million in auxiliary enterprise and intercollegiate athletics alone. Meanwhile, the quality and maintenance of the University's physical plant deteriorated significantly. ULM's residence halls are in parlous shape and two have been closed. "Atmospherics" needs attention. Classroom buildings frequently are unkempt, roofs leak, rooms go unpainted and broken equipment is not repaired. This needs immediate attention as it is considered a very important reason why parents and students choose or do not choose a university.

Numerous students and faculty shared stories of poor service in University offices, bureaucratic confusion, failures to respond in any fashion to legitimate requests, and overwhelmed personnel whose office staffs had been cut to the point that services were adversely affected. We must underline that these observations do not describe isolated instances and they were not derived from small samples.

One cannot avoid the conclusion that the deterioration in the physical plant and the compromising of campus services are among the reasons why the University's enrollment has dropped.

There are other reasons why the University's enrollment has plummeted and we will examine these further in a later section.

One of the most damaging blows to the University's public profile occurred in 2000 when the Legislative Auditor reported that he could not certify ULM's audit because of the disorganized nature of the institution's financial records. This audit produced 18 "findings" (substantive problems) that related to ULM's financial management. We do not find this a surprising outcome, given that ULM has had six different individuals serving in the position of Controller in the last eight years and unwisely reduced personnel and operating support for financial management throughout the campus. Nonetheless, as a consequence, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), which accredits the University as a whole, formally warned ULM that it could lose its accreditation if it did not deal with these problems.

The Brighter Side

Needless to say, the University took this admonition seriously and its most recent audit (revealed in November 2001) reduced the number of findings to six and received a "qualified" opinion. The Legislative Auditor complimented ULM and President Swearingen for making "*phenomenal progress*" in dealing with the auditing problems identified and suggested that continued progress could produce an "unqualified" audit opinion in the next year or two. However, the six findings (most of which were repeated from the previous year) still indicate ULM has substantial work to do. For example, for the third consecutive year, the institution's financial statements were not properly prepared and contained errors.

Thus, ULM finds itself in a highly unusual situation. Nearly all of its academic programs that are eligible for disciplinary accreditation have achieved accredited status and its graduates perform exceptionally well on licensure examinations. At the same time, the institution's overall regional accreditation is threatened by failure to comply with SACCS criteria on the basis of *financial management*.

Without question, the University of Louisiana at Monroe faces challenges of daunting proportions and it is awaiting the arrival of its new leader with eager anticipation. The University craves the strength of enlightened leadership and we have confidence that an exciting future can be accomplished. The following pages will document this optimistic forecast.

III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The University of Louisiana at Monroe is considered to be a “comprehensive university” by the Carnegie Commission, but might well qualify for “Doctoral Intensive” status if its future production of doctoral degrees is sufficiently large and diverse. The University offers a half dozen associate degree programs, about 60 at the baccalaureate level, about two dozen at the master’s level, three specialist degree programs, and five doctoral programs (Pharm.D., Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, Ph.D. in Marriage and Family Therapy, and Ph.D. in Pharmacy).

As noted, the undergraduate programs in the allied health sciences and teacher education deserve kudos for the high proportion of students who pass and excel on state and national licensure examinations. In addition to pharmacy and teacher education, students in areas such as dental hygiene and nursing are among those who have recorded impressive examination results.

Funding

Despite an apparent resource allocation in favor of Academic Affairs throughout the previous decade, ULM’s academic programs are not well funded and the University must struggle constantly to meet the demands for faculty, students, and accrediting agencies. In Fiscal Year 2001-2002, the University’s state funding (not including tuition) per full-time equivalent student was \$4,327, compared to an SREB peer average of \$5,570. In a national context, comprehensive, public universities typically receive \$6,000-\$8,000 per FTE student and some receive much more than this. It is an especially small funding level for an institution that offers some doctoral programs and which has a heavy loading in the health sciences. Suffice it to say the institutions ULM wishes to emulate, and the institutions whose performance it matches or exceeds, typically receive much more generous funding.

While ULM did enjoy a 6.7 percent increase in its state general funds for the 2001-2002 fiscal year, the University currently receives 22%, or \$11.2 million per year, less state funding support than its competitors in the Southern region.

It would be wonderful if we could forecast significant or even adequate increased state support for ULM, but that does not seem to be in the offing. **We believe that ULM should increase its efforts to seek additional funding to stabilize the University. In addition, ULM may help itself by considering generating more revenue through increases in tuition and fees for high cost programs such as Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences. This team gives strong support to the efforts of President Clausen, President-elect Cofer and the Board to seek additional resources to stabilize ULM while expecting the University to make significant reductions of its own to balance its finances and move to the next level.**

Teaching Loads, Program Costs, and Credit Hour Generation

_____ Many faculty are almost congenitally inclined to reject notions that their teaching or the academic programs with which they are associated should be evaluated on the basis of their “productivity.” To these faculty members, “real” productivity focuses on student learning and student successes, and faculty performances, on refereed journal articles, books published by prestigious presses, foundation research grants, and applied research. While this certainly holds merit, any dollar spent on one program is a dollar that cannot be spent on another program and the 1998 Self Study Survey done of faculty at ULM revealed that a smashingly large majority of faculty believe the University does not have sufficient resources to support the programs it offers. Hence, it is inevitable (and appropriate) that academic programs be evaluated in terms of quantifiable magnitudes such as student/faculty ratios, the cost of generating a student credit hour, and credit hours generated per faculty member. The reality is that resources are scarce and difficult choices must be made.

_____According to ULM data, the University generated 221 credit hours per FTE faculty member in Fall 2001. This is a relatively low number for a comprehensive university. Similar institutions in other states would, on average, generate 250 to 275 credit hours per FTE faculty member (UL System average is 292). The problem, of course, has been falling enrollments and the concomitant reductions in the number of students in the typical class. It also suggests the possibility that the University currently is supporting more faculty positions than necessary.

_____It should come as no surprise that credit hour generation per FTE faculty member varies substantially among academic departments. In Fall 2000, the Department of Geography generated an amazing 688 credit hours per FTE faculty member, Government generated 628, and History 477, while Criminal Justice was responsible for 454, Sociology 446, and Biology 414. At the other end of the spectrum, Dental Hygiene faculty generated only 53 credit hours per FTE faculty member, while Toxicology recorded only 81. **These latter credit hour generation numbers are low even by comparison with most allied health programs at other institutions of higher education. Of course, accrediting agencies have something to do with these low numbers, though there are numerous accredited programs nationally in these areas where faculty members generate more credit hours and ULM should examine closely the activities in each of these areas.**

The most expensive disciplines at ULM in terms of their direct instructional expense per credit hour generated are Toxicology (\$940 per credit hour) and Marriage and Family Therapy (\$541 per credit hour). These numbers are so far removed from the remainder of the University that ULM should examine closely what is occurring in these disciplines and, in particular, assess both the number of faculty assigned to these departments and the overall viability of these courses of study. Consideration should be given to terminating the doctoral program in Marriage and Family Therapy; these data provide support for such action. We recommend that ULM review its master's and doctoral programs that are unproductive based on student enrollments, cost, and program quality.

Neither credit hour generation per FTE nor instructional costs per credit hour generated are by themselves indicators of whether academic programs should be continued or discontinued. Such data are, however, opportunity cost thermometers that should be heeded. That is, they are measures of opportunities forgone. When one spends large numbers of dollars in one discipline, the same funds cannot be spent in another discipline. Further, such data provide some indication of the nature and extent of cross-subsidies throughout the University. ULM may be content with the fact that the direct instructional cost of producing a credit hour is only \$39 in Government, and only \$59 in History, but \$940 in Toxicology and \$541 in Marriage and Family Therapy. On the other hand, given ULM's precarious financial straits, the latter two activities may be too expensive. **We cannot make such decisions for ULM, but we can underline the need of the University to give additional attention to magnitudes such as credit hours generated per FTE faculty member and the direct instructional cost of generating a credit hour.** The non-planned, attrition-based reduction of faculty positions over the past few years has resulted in several conspicuous imbalances that deserve attention. Further reductions should be strategic and consistent with the Board of Regents Master Plan for Higher Education and for ULM.

We recommend that ULM review closely inconsistencies in University generated credit hours with an eye towards reasonable parity and reduced costs. We also recommend that the size of the faculty be aligned with student enrollment.

The Implication of Funding for Academic Programs

ULM must reconcile its budget and stabilize its operations. Without an infusion of dollars to stabilize the University, programs and services must be curtailed even further. In the view of this team, we do not believe ULM can justify offering many low enrollment programs. At the undergraduate level, degree programs in Communicative Disorders, Economics, Insurance and Real Estate, Special Education, French, Spanish, Journalism, Agricultural Aviation, Day Care Nursery Management, Paper Science and Technology, and Health and Physical Education may have to be candidates for termination. **It is our understanding the University already has**

begun to address this difficult task. We recommend President Cofer move rationally, but rapidly, to review this issue. He should do so in the context of an evaluation of the overall viability of all of the University's academic programs consistent with an institutional academic strategic plan and in context of the Board of Regents Master Plan and available financial resources.

No doubt some faculty will argue that a legitimate university must offer majors such as Economics, Geography, Geology, French, Journalism, Physics, and Spanish. In the best of all worlds, that may be true, but ULM is not operating in that situation. Further, an intelligent compromise might well involve reducing these curricula to the status of an academic minor so that the disciplines continue to be represented. ULM, for example, must continue to offer foreign language study, but it does not follow that it must offer a fully developed major. Reduction of some or all of these programs to academic minor status will immediately diminish the number of upper level courses offered in these disciplines and thereby free up faculty resources for more urgent purposes. It also is possible some economies might be realized in library expenditures. **In any case, we recommend that a process be initiated whereby all academic programs on the campus are evaluated in terms of their cost, relevance, and viability. Special attention should be given to the undergraduate programs named above as well as selected graduate programs.**

At the master's level, there are several academic degree programs that no doubt are attractive to ULM faculty, but nonetheless do not attract sufficient numbers of students and are expensive in terms of faculty time and library resources. **Rather than name specific programs, we recommend that all graduate programs be examined. Again, without new state resources, the necessary aim should be to reduce the University's inventory from the current 22 academic degree programs to about 15 or 16.** This reduction in the number of graduate programs will allow the University to focus resources such as graduate assistantships on a smaller number of programs and thus increase their chances of survival and increased quality and productivity.

Doctoral education at ULM is an emotional topic. President Swearingen and many faculty believed strongly that ULM could and should break out of the programmatic mold it was in and offer selected doctoral programs. Like most faculty nationally, ULM faculty generally were strongly supportive of this initiative because they enjoy working with advanced graduate students and it stimulates their research. Alas, the University's rationale for offering doctoral programs other than in Pharmacy is not persuasive. According to ULM data, in 2001, the doctoral programs in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership and Counseling had fewer than 15 students. These programs must grow and strengthen academically if they are to survive. However, time may not permit this to happen. The program in Marriage and Family Therapy had only 22 students. Most of these students are part-time and so the student FTE figures are even lower. These numbers cannot be surprising in light of the 16 percent decline in overall enrollment in the ULM's graduate school from 1997 to 2001.

Hence, ULM should reduce the number of its doctoral programs in order to streamline resources and strengthen those retained. The University simply cannot afford the resources it now devotes to these programs. Although the initial savings of resources from programs will be small by their elimination, ultimately this savings can be utilized to deal with absolutely essential needs elsewhere in the institution.

In summary, without new resources, ULM should pare its offerings of its 90+ academic programs back to about 75, and should back away from doctoral degree programs with the exception of the joint Ed.D. and those in Pharmacy.

Liberal and General Education

ULM does not require all of its undergraduate degree candidates to complete a strong core of liberal and general education courses. True, the Louisiana Board of Regents does require that all students at public universities complete a modest core of courses; however, this is an admittedly minimalist approach to the need to broadly and liberally educate all baccalaureate

degree candidates. ULM, rather than take the Board of Regents core as a minimum (as it was intended), frequently regards it as a maximum. Thus, some of ULM's academic colleges require only minimal amounts of liberal and general education. Consequently, it is possible for a student to graduate from ULM without having any knowledge of a non-Western society; without having any course work relating to women and minorities; and, without having any work in a foreign language. **This is a major weakness and steps should be taken to remedy this situation. We recommend that ULM review its liberal and general core curriculum with an eye toward strengthening minimum requirements in the future.** ULM students are going to graduate into an increasingly multiet hnic, international, computer-driven world and it is simply necessary that the University ensure that its students have sufficient grounding in these areas. Surely recent world events have underlined the saliency of this need. It is one thing for a student to pass a licensure examination; it is quite another thing for that student to be liberally and broadly educated and to be able to function as an informed citizen in an increasingly complex and rapidly changing world.

Academic Organization

The University of Louisiana at Monroe's academic programs are organized into seven distinct colleges: Allied Health and Rehabilitation Professions, Business Administration, Education and Human Development, Liberal Arts, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Pure and Applied Sciences. This may be too many academic units given the nature of the University's enrollment and budget.

Further, 2002 is not a time when ULM can afford to devote unnecessary resources to administrative tasks. **Therefore, we make two recommendations with respect to the consolidation of colleges at the University:**

Allied Health and Rehabilitation Professions, Nursing, and Pharmacy should be recombined into a single college with separate schools. A variety of new names can be considered.

Liberal Arts and Pure and Applied Sciences should be combined into a single College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Further, we recommend that President Cofer immediately begin the development of an academic plan for ULM. This strategic plan should address the preceding recommendations concerning faculty productivity, program elimination, and department/college consolidations, and be consistent with the mission of the institution and the Board of Regents Master Plan. Decisions concerning academic programs must be based on sound academic theory and consultation with appropriate faculty. Most recent academic decisions appear to be based upon expediency and the necessity to alleviate short-term fiscal problems without consideration of long-term academic consequences. Once again, this is an action that will send highly desirable messages to faculty, staff, students, media, and decision-makers in the state even while it is generating resources.

Delta Community College

Delta Community College is a very new feature on ULM's horizon and still enrolls fewer than 300 students. Since ULM heretofore has operated as an open enrollment institution, some ULM partisans have worried that the advent of the Community College will reduce ULM's enrollment. Perhaps, but this need not be the case in the long run. **We strongly recommend that ULM welcome the Community College with open arms and consider affiliation agreements for the provision of services and sharing of resources as well as articulation agreements for course transfers.** Together, they can serve the citizens of the region more effectively. Further, the existence of the Community College reduces the pressure on ULM to admit under-prepared students and to support extensive remedial education. Such a partnership could be a long-term financial and educational benefit to ULM, the Community College, and the surrounding community.

The University has available space (classroom, offices, residence halls) it should offer to rent or lease to the Community College at favorable rates. Such an arrangement would be jointly beneficial. From the standpoint of the Community College, it would provide immediate access to space that otherwise might take years to build. It also would be able to access numerous academic support functions, including ULM's library and computer services. Of course, the University should be compensated in some fashion for these services. The cost of generating a new library, etc., can be staggering. Hence, Delta would be well advised to prepare to lease space and share services from ULM. The Community College also might utilize some ULM faculty to teach its classes, depending upon the circumstances at both institutions. It also seems probable that Community College students would be attracted to a situation where they could attend classes on a University campus. However, ULM should be given assurance by respective Boards that their status will not be altered (except for the better) due to a stronger partnership with Delta Community College.

From ULM's standpoint, a close arrangement provides an opportunity to generate revenue from facilities that are underused or not used at all. A close relationship should also stimulate revenues in the University's auxiliary enterprises, including its food services and bookstore. Further, Community College students who attend classes on the ULM campus are much more likely than others to consider transferring to ULM when they have completed their Community College education. Finally, this arrangement would allow ULM to focus its attention on raising its own admissions standards. Hence, in the long run we believe this could be a win/win for both institutions and for the external community.

We recommend that President Cofer open immediate discussions with Delta Community College in order to ascertain areas of mutual interest. Again, care must be taken to ensure that there is no perception that the mission of ULM, a Four-Year III (SREB) and a Master's I (Carnegie) level institution, is being compromised.

IV. FACULTY

ULM faculty typically are well-trained, energetic, devoted to their students, and loyal to their University almost to a fault. A senior Nursing student spoke for many ULM students when she pointed out that *“My faculty are tremendous; they’re always ready to help me and they really seem to be concerned that I learn the material.”* Faculty are in general highly complimentary of each other. *“We’re here because we’re devoted to ULM and our students, not because we’re paid a lot,”* commented one faculty member, who was then patted on the back by another faculty member who said, *“Professor XX is a master teacher; I’d like to take a course from her myself.”* There are many such individuals on the ULM faculty.

ULM faculty members are well-qualified, but they predominantly hold terminal degrees from research universities primarily in the South. **As resources and time permit, we recommend the University attempt to diversify its faculty. The first step in this process is to spread its hiring nets more broadly throughout the country and beyond.** This will require specific effort and guidance, but will yield a variety of benefits, among them a more diverse faculty with a broader, more visible reputation. **Additionally, one aspect of diversity where significant improvement is warranted is in the area of minority faculty hiring, especially African-American faculty. Currently, nearly 27 percent of the ULM student body is composed of African-Americans, reflecting its general population. However, the percent of full-time, tenure-line faculty who are African-Americans is only a fraction of this and there are no African-Americans in the upper administration. Much effort needs to be expended in this arena and President Cofer should clearly enunciate his values in this regard.**

Faculty morale is a circumstance that can be improved dramatically---most immediately by the President-elect talking candidly with faculty, staff, and students; by his walking the campus and visiting offices and laboratories; and, by his communicating frequently and accurately. He should also make efforts to be visible off campus meeting with members of the community, public officials, and business leaders. We strongly

recommend he do so.

However, we believe that faculty are not permanently antagonized, nor are they obstructionist. Instead, they await candid, open, and visionary leadership capable of reigniting their enthusiasm for their University. Faculty young and old want ULM to succeed and they will unite behind, and support, a President who talks and consults with them, is interested enough to tour their offices and laboratories and see first hand what is going on, and who articulates a strong and attractive vision describing how the University will deal with its problems, regain its momentum, and move ahead. **We recommend that the President avoid the perception that he and other senior administrators are isolated on the seventh floor of the Library and Conference Center. Visibility must be an important key especially during the initial weeks of his presidency.**

Faculty Salaries

Attracting and retaining faculty at ULM often has been a challenge because of the relatively deficient faculty salaries the University is able to offer. ULM's average salaries trail regional and national averages at every rank and by significant amounts. However, state averages reveal that ULM is competitive with like institutions such as McNeese State, Nicholls State, Northwestern State, and Southeastern Louisiana which are also low in state appropriations when compared to their peer institutions in the South. This implies that faculty salaries have been a priority at ULM, even at the expense of other units.

We should not overlook the reality that faculty labor markets are national in scope and Louisiana institutions must compete for faculty talent against numerous other universities in other states. Alas, ULM's average salary at the Assistant Professor rank trails those paid by comparable institutions in every other state in the South by a minimum of five percent and more often by about ten percent. At the Full Professor rank, ULM's salary trails the 14 other institutions in our sample by 9.6 percent.

To paraphrase Cardinal Newman, faculty are the heart of any university community. Attracting and retaining faculty, therefore, is one of the very most important tasks of any university president or governing board. We believe it is nothing short of remarkable that so many ULM faculty have remained with the institution (and have done so well) despite the noncompetitive nature of their salaries. It is also worth noting that the value of the ULM fringe benefit package is not especially competitive either and trails national averages by several percentage points. The bottom line is that although ULM has placed a high priority on faculty salaries, ULM's total compensation package for faculty is still disturbingly deficient. **We strongly recommend that the State of Louisiana increase faculty compensation at all of its institutions, but especially at ULM, which is particularly disadvantaged because of the many excellent but high cost health sciences programs it offers.**

Needless to say, ULM likely will have greater success in enhancing its faculty salaries if the Board of Supervisors, the Board of Regents, legislators and the Governor perceive the institution will use these dollars productively. Hence, we make two recommendations. First, **ULM should emphasize its devotion to merit and market factors in dispensing faculty salary increments.** That is, ULM's scarce faculty salary dollars should go to the best and most productive faculty and those whom it would be most costly for it to lose. While this principle will not be universally popular among faculty, it will constitute an important step in convincing decision makers that an investment in ULM actually will yield desired results.

Second, in a separate section, **we recommend that ULM develop and implement a meaningful post-tenure review policy.** If the ULM faculty demonstrates it is prepared to police its own ranks, then its claim for additional salary dollars will be much more attractive.

Staff Salaries

It appears some individuals who occupy full-time staff positions earn only slightly more than \$1,000 per month, which corresponds roughly to the minimum wage. Indeed, our

conversations with administrators revealed repeated instances of ULM acting as “*a training agency for neighboring businesses.*” For example, in areas such as public safety and computer services, ULM trains employees who then consistently leave for higher paying jobs in the Monroe community. **We recommend that the State of Louisiana increase staff salaries by an amount sufficient to allow its universities to attract and retain necessary staff personnel. This will do more to revive the region economically than bringing in a new business that guarantees 300 new employees.**

Post-Tenure Review for Faculty

Faculty tenure was never meant to be a guarantee of lifetime employment for faculty, nor was it meant to protect incompetent or even lackadaisical faculty from evaluation by their students and their peers. Further, the institution of tenure was never meant to be an absolute protection from dismissal for faculty. Instead, it was meant to be a device to ensure the academic freedom of faculty and to provide them with extensive due process when and if their performance or position was questioned.

We note that ULM does not have a meaningful post-tenure review policy for its faculty. **The President, through his chief academic officer, should provide the campus governance organization with a set of time-lines for such a policy and ask the Senate to generate a recommendation for him to consider. These guidelines should include a periodic, comprehensive evaluation of each tenured faculty member, at least every five years, by his/her peers, according to previously adopted criteria. Either that evaluation or the recommendation of a dean might initiate an improvement plan for the faculty member in question and the University should offer a Faculty Productivity Center for faculty members through which they can grow professionally.** The plan should outline what steps the faculty member needs to take to retain his/her tenure. A faculty member who fails to satisfy the improvement plan could be dismissed from the faculty, or a variety of lesser sanctions might be imposed. Every faculty member in this situation should have the opportunity for his/her case

to be reviewed by a duly constituted group of faculty peers outside his/her academic department. Ultimate dismissal should depend upon a recommendation by the President to the Board of Supervisors.

The adoption of a meaningful post-tenure review policy by ULM is yet another action that would send highly desirable messages to the state about the seriousness with which ULM faculty take their responsibilities. It would grant credibility to the University and its President because it would demonstrate that the faculty at ULM are professionals committed to policing their own ranks. We must underline that a post-tenure review policy should not be designed, and should not be used, as a means to eliminate numerous individuals from the faculty. Instead, it should be designed to maintain and improve faculty performance, and to eliminate the small number of unproductive faculty.

Improper Use of University Classrooms By Faculty

We regret we must record the fact that multiple students informed us that some of their faculty were accustomed to using their classroom sessions to criticize the University, the Board, the administration, and the former President. We must point out that this behavior is unethical and is a direct violation of the *1940 Statement of the American Association of University Professors*, which is known to most professors because it defines the nature of faculty academic freedom. The *1940 Statement* makes it absolutely clear that it is inappropriate for faculty to introduce extraneous material into their classrooms. Thus, a faculty member teaching a physics class (a fictitious example) has no business using his/her classrooms or laboratories to discuss the University's admissions policies, intercollegiate athletics, or the competence of the President. Yet, such instances appear to occur at ULM and some faculty seem unaware that such extraneous material has no place in their classrooms. **Once again, we urge faculty members to police their own ranks and to recommend, as necessary, a policy that clearly enunciates the AAUP standard in this regard.**

V. STUDENTS

In Fall 2001, ULM enrolled 8,760 headcount students, of whom 6,814 were full-time. Eighty-nine percent of ULM students are undergraduates. Since 1998, headcount enrollment has declined almost 25 percent and the FTE student body even more so, by 19.4 percent. ULM's Fall 2001 enrollment was the institution's lowest since 1971.

ULM is not a high tuition institution, at least in a national context. Whereas the national average level of annual tuition and fees for a public institution is a bit more than \$3,500, and the SREB average is \$2,920, ULM's annual tuition and fees were only \$2,385 in Fall 2001. Thus, the University is a bargain for students.

ULM's students come predominantly from the 13-parish Northeast Louisiana region, though it always has attracted some students from outside of Louisiana. Because this region of Louisiana is characterized by low levels of personal income and exhibits higher than average levels of poverty, ULM's students are generally moderate income, and federal, state, and institutional financial aid are critical to their ability to attend. While no data are available, ULM faculty and administrators report that a large majority of students are "first generation." Reflective of this were the comments of a fourth year Pharmacy student who noted that "*Except for ULM, I would probably be a farm day worker. I'll always be grateful for the chance this place [ULM] has given me.*"

Almost 64 percent of ULM students are women and this proportion has been growing over time. ULM has experienced recent difficulties in attracting and retaining male students, particularly white male students. This is a common demographic occurrence across the country. Approximately 27 percent of ULM students are African-American and this percent has been growing during the 1990s.

Admissions Policy

ULM always has maintained a selective admissions policy in academic programs such as Pharmacy, where it has not been unusual for entering freshmen to present an average 3.6 high school grade point average. Other programs which have admissions criteria include business, education, nursing, and those in allied health. Throughout most of its history, however, ULM has had an open admissions policy for most other students and typically accepted virtually every freshman applicant who had earned a high school diploma. Many ULM administrators and faculty believe this did not redound to the University's advantage. They argue that highly qualified high school graduates found other selective admissions institutions (notably Louisiana State University and Louisiana Tech) more attractive. (The average fall 2000 ACT score of enrolled freshmen at ULM was 19.3 and the System average was 19.5 while the state average was 20.6 and the national average was 22.1). The advent of the TOPS state scholarship program probably accentuated this tendency, as many individuals in the University's traditional 13-parish recruiting grounds who previously might have attended ULM for cost reasons now had the ability to go to another institution farther away from home. This was happening while high school graduates were declining in ULM's feeder parishes. At the same time, numbers of high school graduates increased by about four percent statewide. Other universities should heed that the SREB anticipates a 12% decline in high school graduates over the next decade.

Student Attitudes Concerning Support Services

The many students with whom we talked about ULM are generally complimentary of its academic programs and of the faculty. *"This is like one big family,"* said an undergraduate student who said she "loved" ULM. *"I think I am getting a good education here and I wouldn't trade it for any other university,"* exclaimed another enthusiastic undergraduate student. Said another, *"Sure, sometimes equipment breaks down and is not repaired and there is a shortage of stuff, but the faculty still care and they are really good."* While noting that *"Some of the faculty should retire because they've lost their enthusiasm,"* and *"A couple of my*

faculty have been very hard to find and they don't even keep their office hours," most students give high marks to their faculty and are generally happy with the academic programs they are receiving at ULM.

Even so, many students are critical of the quality of the administrative and support services they find at the University and some are extremely bitter about *"the absence of a service mentality"* at ULM and *"the lack of any focus on students."* The Spring 2000 Noel-Levitz National Student Satisfaction Survey results for ULM confirm these problems. While some services such as academic advising and faculty instructional effectiveness are highly rated, others are assailed by students. For example, students downgrade ULM on perceived safety and security in particular and give low marks to the campus climate in general, campus life, and the lack of *"student centeredness"* and *"atmospherics."*

Numerous students criticized ULM for *"allowing the residence halls to go to pot."* Members of the Review Team walked the campus and visited buildings and we are forced to conclude that these students are not too far off base. One reason among many for this situation is the absence of professional residence hall personnel in many residence hall areas. **This must be remedied by allocating additional resources devoted to nourishing residence hall life, though we might add much the same thing needs to occur in other student support areas such as campus security, counseling, and student health.**

One of President Cofer's most important initial actions, and one that will meet with universal acclaim, could be very simple: ensure that the campus and its buildings are cleaned, trash collected, urgent repairs made, and paint applied. In words of a national higher education authority, what is needed is *"the launching of a sustained effort to restore the beauty and infrastructure of the campus, making the classrooms, residence halls, and faculty and staff offices sources of legitimate pride."* This will immediately raise spirits and signal that a new wind is blowing at ULM. It also will tell prospective students and parents that the excellence that characterizes most ULM academic programs can and will be carried over to

the buildings and grounds of the campus itself. However, it will require new resource commitments and much imagination.

Safety and Security

The perceived safety and security issue is especially problematic. While ULM's FBI crime data do not suggest it has a severe crime problem, there is no doubt that many students perceive that there is a crime problem at the institution. *"It doesn't feel safe here at night,"* complained a woman student, while a student residing in a residence hall asserted that *"There are break-ins into cars all the time."* A variety of individuals contended that *"The parking lots are too dark"* and *"There is just not enough lighting around campus."* Complaints of thefts and burglaries and intimidation by local residents surfaced frequently. With regard to the latter complaint, several students reported that *"The local teenagers force us off the sidewalks"* and several administrators confessed that there were some behavioral problems among those termed *"non-active"* students who *"receive their financial aid at the beginning of the semester, and then stop attending their classes, but stay on campus and create problems."*

A city law enforcement official said, *"The campus is bisected by numerous city streets that allow off-campus individuals to gain easy access to the campus."* *"It's hard for them [ULM officials] to keep a handle on things as a result,"* the official continued. **In a section below, we propose that President Cofer should give extensive consideration to working with the city in closing off some streets, changing their traffic flow, installing speed bumps, utilizing traffic circles and gates, and restricting movement on to the campus late in the evening, et al.** Whether or not the perceptions of unsafe conditions at ULM are matched by reality, such attitudes are causing significant problems for the University and must be addressed in a straightforward fashion.

ULM is hardly the first institution nationally to deal with possible safety problems and we recommend President Cofer examine the experience of other institutions and develop a program (with the city and nearby residential communities) that involves

increased resources for lighting and law enforcement, new traffic control and street changes, and outreach by the University into potential problem communities. We also believe the University should investigate the charges that more than a handful of students register for courses, receive financial aid, and then essentially stop going to classes. It is inappropriate for ULM to have individuals residing in its residence halls who, when all is said and done, are no longer students. Of course, higher admissions standards would by themselves alleviate some of this problem, if it is widespread.

Finally, it appears that ULM does not employ a large enough number of security personnel to fulfill its duties. **Plain and simple, ULM needs more security officers and personnel who are visible and can patrol the campus, especially during critical periods of time.**

Dropout and Graduation Rates

Reflecting its virtually open admissions standard over the years, ULM does not boast very high retention rates for entering freshmen. The University reports its most recent “fall to fall” retention rate for freshmen to be 71 percent (Board of Regents Data). **ULM must give strong consideration to how it will make improvements in its retention rate.** It is a waste of the state’s resources to admit students who do not succeed and high drop out rates almost inevitably involve many avoidable personal tragedies. Higher admissions standards will make a difference; however, **unless the quality of campus support services and campus infrastructure improves, the University is likely to continue to lose students and, hence, we once again recommend President Cofer take immediate action in this realm.** ULM’s Strategic Plan indicates the institution hopes to increase this rate by 3.5 percent by 2005-2006 and we believe this is an important achievable goal. **We recommend that ULM should strive to reach a Freshmen retention rate in the 80s.**

The University of Louisiana at Monroe’s six-year graduation rate for entering freshmen is low by any standard—32 percent. Thus, only one in three new freshmen has graduated within

six years of his/her entrance. This deficient rate represents bad use of public resources and is personally destructive to many of the individuals involved. The University's Strategic Plan proclaims a goal of 36.9 percent by 2005-2006. This is laudable, but may not be realistically achievable, given that the students will measured by this rate already are taking courses at ULM, or already have dropped out and disappeared. Plausibly, ULM may not experience a significant "bump up" in its six-year graduation rate until 2007-2008, when the full impact of more selective admissions will be felt. **Once again, however, we caution that a more selective admissions policy will not by itself offer a magic solution to the University's low graduation rates. Selective admissions must be accompanied by numerous improvements in campus life, service, and infrastructure.**

We recommend that the institution aspire to reach a six-year graduation rate of 65%.

Recruitment Efforts

It goes almost without saying that ULM needs to augment its recruitment efforts. Recently, it has begun to do so, but much more effort is needed if it wishes to reverse its enrollment decline and recruit more high quality students. The blunt truth is that if the University's admissions efforts fail, then nearly everything else will come to naught. This is another area that President Cofer must take to his heart, evaluate, endow with energy and purpose, cultivate, and support. Faculty should volunteer to give lectures in surrounding high schools. President Cofer should visit principals, counselors, and teachers at key "feeder" high schools in the region. It is especially important that University students and athletes as well as alumni are enlisted in the renewal of ULM. ULM must increase its partnerships with local schools and accentuate the many legitimate positives associated with its academic programs. This is not rocket science. Numerous institutions have found themselves in the same parlous admissions environment and have turned their situation around in a year. The University of Louisiana at Monroe is capable of doing so as well, but it will take a conscientious effort and focus by the entire campus for this to occur. No

one on campus should be permitted to say, “That’s someone else’s job,” for admissions and recruitment must now become everyone’s job. The alternative is retrenchment, bitterness, and institutional failure.

It is important to note that while growth is often noted in business terms as profitable, in higher education, quality, not quantity is critical. There are some notable “small” universities with extraordinary reputations. Louisiana’s emphasis on performance and quality rather than just headcount should be encouraged.

VI. BUDGET AND FINANCE

The story of the financial, audit, and management woes of the University of Louisiana at Monroe has been told with sufficient frequency that its general outlines are no longer a mystery. However, it is worthy of repetition and summary:

Since 1982, ULM has experienced 16 cuts in its state appropriated budget.

During the 1990s, ULM exhausted most of its reserve funds, both inside and outside of its auxiliary enterprise.

Several of ULM's auxiliary enterprises, but especially intercollegiate athletics, have experienced persistent deficits in recent years.

The annual structural deficit in intercollegiate athletics (the amount by which revenues typically fall short of expenditures) is in excess of \$700,000.

In order to deal with its intercollegiate athletics funding deficit, ULM has been forced to transfer funds from other areas of the institution.

ULM has experienced an almost disastrous turnover in its senior financial and financial control leadership, including six different controllers in the past eight years.

The University's headcount enrollment is its lowest since 1971 and its tuition collections have decreased significantly as a proportion of its Educational and General Budget despite some relatively small tuition increases.

The University was forced to close two residence halls.

In 2000, the Legislative Auditor reported he could not issue an opinion on the University's financial position because ULM's financial records were so disorganized.

The same audit generated 18 specific substantive comments and deficiencies with respect to ULM's financial and budgetary activities.

SACS formally warned ULM that its regional accreditation could be in jeopardy if it could not remove some or all of the previous problems and demonstrate that the institution has sufficient resources to carry out its mission.

The 2001 Legislative Audit reduced the number of substantive comments to six, and praised the University and President Swearingen for phenomenal progress in dealing with its problems.

Suffice it to say that these conditions did not arise in a single year; they represent the accumulation of many years and many events. Also, we must underline that not all of the financial issues the University has encountered have been the result of its own actions. Among the exogenous decisions that have affected ULM are: frequent budget cuts in the early '90's (from which the University has never recovered), the loss of \$20 million in tuition from the mid '90's to the present, declining graduation rates in ULM's feeder parishes while the remainder of the state enjoyed a slight increase in high school graduates, new mandates resulting from Title IX, and new student opportunities to attend LSU and Louisiana Tech as a result of TOPS.

Whatever the causes, the result has been a serious loss of institutional credibility, problems with SACS, sagging enrollments, fund deficits, a deteriorating physical plant, bad press, and huge morale problems.

The University of Louisiana at Monroe is not the first institution ever to have encountered financial problems and, as we have noted in section above, is capable of turning this situation around within only a few years. **What is needed first and foremost is the commitment from President Cofer to do so, improved and stable leadership in those areas relating to financial affairs, additional personnel and operating support for those functions, and understanding and support across the campus, especially among faculty. In addition, ULM must now initiate a regime of realistic budgeting.** ULM has acquired a reputation for consistently overestimating its revenues, underestimating its problems, and *"predicting that the worst is over"* when even worse days were yet to come. The order of the day must be realism backed by analytical and strategic thinking and no budget secrets from anyone.

No single event so focused the attention of the University community as did the receipt of a "no opinion" audit on FY 2000. While there may have been a host of extenuating circumstances and the audit in the subsequent year hinted at some of those, there was no mistaking the seriousness of the financial situation and the need to remedy it. Enormous effort was spent to remove the deficiencies that produced the "no opinion" audit and FY 2001 was an interesting turnaround. But that effort merely and only partially recovered lost ground. While the records were now sufficiently extant to produce a balance sheet, **the contents of the sheet must improve.**

Since 1996, ULM has experienced a steady decline in its total headcount enrollment. In the early years of the enrollment decline (1996-1998), full-time faculty ranks did not decline, but instead increased. Only since 1999 have faculty ranks begun to be trimmed. The most recent data available from the University show that from 1999-2001, total headcount enrollment dropped from 9,950 to 8,765, a 12% decrease. During this same time period, full-time faculty positions were reduced from 438 to 384, a 12.3% decrease.

These and related data concerning class sizes and credit hour generation per faculty member point to the need to analyze the ratio of the faculty to students. The University must continue to make adjustments and possible faculty reductions, perhaps by as much as ten percent, in order to redirect dollars that will be necessary for ULM to turn itself around. Such reductions will be painful and must be connected both to the termination of academic programs and to a sound academic vision for the future of ULM. What must also cease is the generally unplanned use of vacant positions (attrition) to deal with financial problems. Perhaps, the size of the faculty must be further reduced, but this must be done in response to an academic vision and strategic plan for the future of the University. The University no longer can afford to *"grab whatever positions become vacant in any area"* in order to meet its needs.

The Need for New Campus Physical Master Plan

ULM would benefit from a soundly developed, comprehensive campus master plan that thoughtfully reflects the institution's academic needs and faculty and student requirements. This plan should assess the adequacy of existing land and facility spaces for ULM's current and anticipated future enrollment; identify and justify needs for additional buildings and renovated space; develop a plan for the use and renovation of residence hall space; identify land needs for future expansion; specify how the University will enhance and utilize its water front; evaluate parking needs; consider outdoor recreation needs; take into account the legitimate needs of intercollegiate athletics; specify a campus beautification plan and schedule; consider traffic and automobile circulation around and through the campus; and, set forth possible sources of funding for these tasks. *"ULM needs to develop 'a look' that is both attractive and identifiable,"* recommended a state higher education official. **We recommend that President Cofer engage reputable outside consultants to move the campus in this direction.**

One aspect of the physical development of the campus which deserves immediate attention is the status of the several boarded up and vacant buildings and residence halls. Olin Hall, by way of illustration, stands out. It is stolid, unattractive, and empty. **ULM should give immediate consideration to demolishing Olin Hall. It will take new found resources.** The cost, according to a state higher education official, might range up to \$1 million. On the plus side, however, the University would remove an eyesore and free up some highly attractive space for other uses.

Related to this is ULM's general need for maintenance of its buildings. According to state officials, a lower bound estimate of ULM's deferred maintenance needs is \$8 million. There are many projects that need to be done. **However, these officials also pointed out that ULM has a \$600,000 balance available to address non-auxiliary maintenance and rehabilitation projects. Further, the institution has had these funds available for approximately one year, but has not used them because of apparent internal disagreements. We recommend that ULM immediately use its resources earmarked for deferred maintenance.**

Another aspect of the physical development that requires immediate attention is the flow of traffic around and through the campus. **ULM should work with the City and engage traffic engineers who can suggest alternatives to the current grid of roads that “cut up the campus” and “give free and open entre to ne’er do wells.”** Plausibly, the University can reduce the perception that it is not always a safe place to be by changing the routing and flow of traffic around and through the campus. Speed bumps, stop signs and stop lights, small traffic circles, gates, nonlinear streets—all of these are among the possibilities that can reduce speeds, change traffic patterns and perceptions. Such innovations, along with a visible increase in the University’s security forces, would do much to change both perception and reality concerning the safety of the campus.

Finally, we must note that state higher education authorities believe the absence of experienced leadership at ULM in the physical planning of the campus, facilities management, and building maintenance is a severe shortcoming. *“ULM needs major help here,”* according to a highly knowledgeable state higher education official, and *“its organization and planning are inadequate to its needs.”* **We recommend that President Cofer talk with experienced state officials about ULM’s facilities management and planning needs and then move rapidly to improve this situation. Further, we believe that the dual reportage of the Director of Physical Plant and Capital Planning should end. This individual should report solely to the Vice President for Business Affairs.**

Privatization and Outsourcing

It is apparent ULM has had difficulties in providing a variety of services at the level of quality most individuals have come to expect. Privatization and/or outsourcing of some of these services may present an optimal solution to the University’s problems. Services ranging from the operation of residence halls and campus security to information technology training and food services can and have been successfully privatized or outsourced on other campuses. Indeed, three of eight University of Louisiana System institutions have privatized the operation of some of their residence halls. **We believe President Cofer should give early consideration to**

privatization and outsourcing options in both the auxiliary and non-auxiliary areas of the institution. The University might well experience a noticeable improvement in the provision of services even while it removes several financial mill stones from its back. Several of these areas, for example, the book store, can be important profit centers. The Review Team can recommend experienced consultants who would expedite these considerations.

Strategic Plan

Some constituents on the campus believe the University's Strategic Plan provides a road map for the University's future and implicitly supplies a strategy for reductions as well. We must demur from this suggestion. ULM's Strategic Plan, like most at universities, tends to be a wish list of what departments and units would do if they had more resources, not less. ULM's world in 2002 is very different. **We believe President Cofer should direct a process whereby ULM produces an academic and institutional strategic plan consistent with the new realities. In the short-run, however, he and the University will be better served by an enunciation of principles and goals that describe what the institution values and, broadly speaking, what it is attempting to accomplish.** Such a document might consist of no more than a few pages, but it will establish the vision, values, and ground rules for necessary contractions, while noting where within the University expansion and additional investment are needed. Then, over time, ULM can develop a more comprehensive Strategic Plan.

VII. TECHNOLOGY

The salient fact of life at the University of Louisiana at Monroe in the technology arena is the scarcity of resources. While there have not been cuts since the early 1990's when all institutions and state government received them, there has been a continuing decline in student enrollment and a subsequent loss of tuition dollars of up to \$20 million in the last six years. A student technology fee generates approximately \$600,000 per year and it has resulted in several attractive computer laboratories that are much appreciated by students and faculty alike. However, these funds may not be used to support faculty office and research needs, or to purchase administrative hardware and software. This has meant the campus "*has become somewhat of a checkerboard*" in terms of the availability of technology. Units possessing outside sources of income, or which have obtained grant funding, usually have more up to date technology. Illustrations are the College of Education and Human Development and the College of Business. Both possess more up to date PCs and software than does, say, the College of Liberal Arts. "*It's feast or famine,*" according to a dean.

In general, students do not complain either about the availability of PCs or their access to the Internet, though members of the Review team found Internet access to be surprisingly slow in many campus buildings, including the Library and Conference Center, in light of the supposed broadband connections the University has. However, according to ULM personnel, all residence hall rooms are connected to the Internet.

"Where ULM really falls down," according to a faculty member, *"is in technology support."* *"If it breaks, you're probably out of luck,"* bemoaned an administrator. Additionally, if one wants support for technology or Internet-related course work, it is unlikely one is going to obtain this support from the Computer Center. *"Their spirit is willing,"* said a relatively new faculty member, *"but they simply don't have the personnel."* For example, a faculty member who wants to develop a moderately sophisticated web page for his/her courses could in theory receive some support from the Computer Center, but is unlikely to receive that assistance because of the small number of personnel there. By one estimate, the Computer Center has 17

employees, but should have 45. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of this surmise, but we can observe that the Computer Center was hardly immune from the budget cuts of the past few years. Administratively, the application of information technology appears to be uneven. In a few instances, it is well integrated, but in others, it is sparsely used. The potential for productivity gains from a broader use of technology is substantial. The proclivity of Louisiana agencies to require excessive numbers of reports and for differing state agencies to require duplicative reports cries out for the application of information technology by ULM.

Early on, President Cofer needs to ascertain if appropriate senior personnel are present on the campus who are capable of moving the University where it needs to go in the area of technology in general. If not, then he must move ahead to bring appropriately skilled and experienced people to the campus.

VIII. ADMINISTRATION

In theory, the ULM administration operates via a conventional four vice president model involving academic affairs, financial affairs, student affairs, and institutional advancement. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with the four vice presidential arrangement and much in it to commend. Currently the student vice presidential slot is occupied by an individual who holds the title of Dean.

The major problems in the current ULM administrative arrangement relate to reporting relationships and over centralization of authority. **Nine individuals apparently report to the President; that number should be reduced.** For example, the facilities planning head should not report to the President and it is questionable whether the Director of Athletics should. **We recommend that President Cofer streamline the administrative management at ULM and reduce the number of individuals reporting to the President. It is also recommended that intercollegiate athletics, should be viewed as one of many student activities supported by the University, should report to the new student affairs vice president or the chief finance officer.** In addition, **deans and middle level administrators must be given additional authority to deal with the daily work of their areas.** *“Deans just don’t have any power or authority to do things,”* commented numerous faculty (and a few deans). *“Sometimes even equipment purchases seem to have to be OK’d by the President’s Office,”* complained a faculty member who has been quite productive in attracting outside research money. The Review Team well understands that fiscal emergencies can lead to extraordinary controls and administrative supervision in order to avoid calamity; however, **ULM cannot perpetually operate on an emergency basis and it should task its deans and middle level administrators to do their jobs and exercise discretion within reasonable guidelines.**

Setting administrative structure aside, it is evident that many routine administrative tasks are not being performed either as well or as promptly as one might reasonably expect. One reason for this, a senior administrator suggested, is that *“many administrative areas have been gutted and they don’t have the people or the money they need to get the job done.”* We

encountered numerous examples that appear to provide support for this hypothesis.

In any case, as we have pointed out in several other areas of this Review, ULM must now begin to do the simple things of life much more effectively. It must clean rooms, collect trash, paint offices, repair sidewalks, pay bills, collect debts, track student financial aid, register students, and keep its accounts better than it has in the past. Only when the performance of these tasks has improved will the outlook of the University truly have improved. What needs to be accomplished in these areas often is visible to the naked eye. What is called for now is the reallocation of resources to these tasks, inspiring leadership, and (above all) pride. **To the extent that new leadership is required in some or all of these areas, President Cofer should move expeditiously to make the necessary personnel changes with experienced higher education professionals. Efforts should be made to increase the presence of minority individuals (particularly African-Americans) in administrative positions.**

IX. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Anyone responsible for the finances of athletics at a state university needs to know the following:

1. Athletic programs are losing a billion dollars a year;
2. Last year college athletics generated \$3.1 billion while spending \$4.1 billion;
3. As many as 85% of college athletic programs are losing money;
4. Powerhouse programs are experiencing only small profits;
5. More than three dozen football and basketball head coaches are signed to contracts valued at over \$1 million a year; and
6. It is common for large football programs to expend more than \$1 million a year on assistant coaching staffs.

Since 1980, the number of Division 1 men's basketball programs has jumped by an incredible 24 percent. It is common for athletic teams in football and basketball, like the ones at ULM, to agree to play big-name schools for a significant amount of guaranteed money, and these games rarely result in close scores or wins by the smaller programs.

What we have in college sports today is an arms race among competitors or a growing system of haves and have-nots. Most directors of athletics are certain that their programs are about to make it big, and all that is needed is more patience and more resources.

One graduate from the Monroe area told us, in no uncertain terms, *"Winning athletic programs are a significant part of the Louisiana culture, and universities down here are judged by their winning percentages in athletic competition."*

A student said, *"We are told that a big-time athletic program will give us needed exposure and it will help us in recruiting students. I am not sure of that. People from this part of the state like athletics, but they have been staying away from our football games in droves."* *"Intercollegiate athletics have become the tail that wags the dog at Monroe,"* in the

view of a higher education board member. One of the justifications for intercollegiate athletics is that it builds spirit and support on and off campus and that these benefits outweigh the costs. At ULM that argument, “specious on its face,” grows less relevant each year. Only a cursory inspection of ULM’s situation in intercollegiate athletics is necessary for one to conclude that the University has overextended itself in intercollegiate athletics. Depending upon whose numbers one adopts, the University’s accumulated deficit in intercollegiate athletics ranges from \$1.6 million to \$2.5 million. A June 30, 2001 Louisiana Legislative Audit concluded the deficit was \$1.8 million. Two factors appear to be causal: (1) ULM chose early in the 1990s to move from Division I-AA to Division I-A in football and in recent years its football teams have lost far more games than they have won against non-traditional opponents, with the end result that attendance and interest have plummeted; (2) ULM was out of compliance with Title IX gender equity requirements and hence was forced to make large additional investments in women’s intercollegiate athletics.

ULM pays for its intercollegiate athletic programs with an allocation of Educational and General (E&G) funds controlled in amount by Board of Regents policy and then adds to this revenue from ticket sales, gifts, game guarantees, and internal shifts of resources from other auxiliary enterprises. Revenue from football ticket sales has slumped dramatically since the University’s salad days in the 1980s when the former Northeast Louisiana University won a Division I-AA national championship. This past season, home attendance declined once again and now is only about 5,000 per game if actual bodies are counted. “*Nobody goes to the games,*” lamented a student leader.

ULM competes within the Southland Conference in all sports except football, where it is a member of the newly formed football wing of the Sun Belt Conference. Traditionally, ULM has achieved considerable success in men’s basketball (where it has won approximately 80 percent of its games on its home court, Fant-Ewing Coliseum) and in baseball (where it is a regional baseball power and sometimes a national power as well). Historically, the University achieved considerable success in football, first in the NCAA’s Division II and then in Division I-AA, where it won a national championship. While the football team has never sold out Malone Stadium, in

1998 it did record an attendance of 28,725 in a game against traditional rival Louisiana Tech.

Unfortunately, Tech no longer is on ULM’s football schedule and has been replaced by the likes of Idaho, Sam Houston, Middle Tennessee, New Mexico State, North Texas, and Troy State. Even if ULM’s football team were a powerhouse, these universities do not represent traditional rivalries and fan interest has waned. *“How am I supposed to get excited about a game against New Mexico State?”* complained an alumnus who also is a donor.

According to the University’s 1 June 2001 “Response” to SACS, the following were the institution’s revenues and expenditures in intercollegiate athletics, FY1996 through FY 2000.

	<u>FY1996</u>	<u>FY1997</u>	<u>FY1998</u>	<u>FY1999</u>	<u>FY2000</u>
Revenues	\$2.17 m.	\$2.57 m.	\$2.38 m.	\$2.56 m.	\$2.08 m.
Expenditures	\$4.37 m.	\$4.38 m.	\$4.37 m.	\$4.66 m.	\$4.30 m.
Deficit	\$2.20 m.	\$1.81 m.	\$1.99 m.	\$2.10 m.	\$2.22 m.

ULM was forced to transfer funds into intercollegiate athletics in order to handle these deficits. These funds came predominantly from other auxiliary enterprises; therefore, areas such as the bookstore, food services, residence halls, and the like actively subsidize intercollegiate athletics. It also appears non-auxiliary areas of the University subsidize athletics, both directly and indirectly, via services provided, charges assessed (or not assessed) and the like.

On the revenue side, even if paid football attendance were to increase by 10,000 per game (50,000 additional fans in a typical season), and each of these fans spent an average of \$15 for their tickets, parking, programs, food, etc., this would net only an additional \$750,000 per year. And, that is only about one-third of ULM’s long-term, structural annual deficit in intercollegiate athletics. Hence, ULM must generate new, on-going private support for its athletic program.

We believe ULM must downsize its intercollegiate athletic commitments, and abandoning Division I-A football may be a necessary (though painful) part of that solution.

What ULM wants to do in this arena may, in any case, turn out to be irrelevant. Frequently discussed changes in the NCAA's requirements for membership in its Division I-A football division would force ULM out of Division I-A.

Regardless, the remainder of the University should not be forced to subsidize intercollegiate athletics, year after year. **We recommend President Cofer commission a study group to examine the ways and means by which fiscal integrity can be restored to intercollegiate athletics at ULM.** Solutions will not come easily. Even a move to I-AA football will not result in huge financial savings, as one of the costs of such a move will be the loss of "revenue guarantee" games against truly big-time I-A football opponents that generate from \$250,000 to \$500,000 revenue per game.

If significant on-going private revenue cannot be generated quickly then ULM has three options: 1) move to Division I-AA to try to generate more game attendance and revenues and reduce travel cost by playing more teams within the state. Additionally, try again to negotiate a game with Louisiana Tech which has proven to generate considerable revenue for both; 2) play Division III level (non-scholarship) football. Many fine institutions of higher education play non-scholarship football at the Division III level. Such a solution would cushion any enrollment drop that might result from terminating football completely; or 3) drop football altogether.

Based upon our interviews with numerous individuals, however, we believe there is a case to support the notion that school spirit and attendance would be increased by a I-AA football schedule that included traditional opponents such as Northwestern, McNeese, Nicholls, and similar institutions. Students who might not remain on campus for a game against Idaho might do so for games against Northwestern or Southeastern, not the least because these are games that involve "bragging rights" and are ones ULM conceivably would win. Witness the excitement attached to ULM's men's basketball team. The lesson is this: Winning teams playing contests against traditional opponents attract fans, ignite spirit, stimulate gifts, and

bring people to the campus. Those are precisely the qualities that are absent now with ULM's I-A football program. As an alumnus put it, "*Winning athletic programs are a significant part of the Louisiana culture, and universities down here are judged by their winning percentages in athletic competition.*" ULM must now find the niche where it can win.

Fiscal stability must be restored to intercollegiate athletics at ULM. Three options that must be considered are: a) moving to Division 1-AA to try to generate more game attendance and revenues and reduce travel costs by playing more teams within the state (including Louisiana Tech), b) playing Division III level (non-scholarship football), or c) dropping football altogether.

Ultimately, ULM must: (1) increase the revenue generated by its intercollegiate athletics programs; (2) reduce costs; or, (3) pursue a combination of the two. There are many possible scenarios. For example, the commission should examine the number of sports ULM supports and consider the savings that might be earned by eliminating several. President Cofer's commission must examine the alternatives closely and then provide him with a timely and incisive discussion of possible courses of action, and do so by midsummer. Finally, when the President has determined the best course for the institution in intercollegiate athletics, his Board must support him completely and help the institution move on to other issues of pressing importance.

X. UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

The Division is fairly new, starting in 1994 with the first appointment of a vice president. Previously all advancement activities had been handled out of the President's office.

The division has the typical Advancement departments, Development, Alumni, and Public Affairs, but at ULM, just as in some other areas, this organization is very horizontal. There are separate departments of Special Facilities, Resource Development, and the Performing Arts Series, all reporting to the Vice President. Additionally, he is Executive Director of the Foundation, and an Assistant Director of Foundation and Alumni Accounts reports to him. He also has responsibility for legislative relations. **There are too many people reporting directly to the Vice President of Advancement. We recommend that the new President consider addressing the situation and either transfer unrelated offices elsewhere or add staff to the division.**

Special Facilities involves the oversight of some buildings, primarily the Conference Center and University House. There is one staff person. Resource Development also is staffed by one person. He handles the alumni/development data base and computer software. The Performing Arts Series is a self-supporting activity formerly managed in academic affairs. It was re-assigned here because it was ineffectively managed. A part-time faculty (one course released time) is responsible. Its funding is approximately \$140,000. Each of these functions was transferred here over the last three years "*because they were not doing well elsewhere.*" They are an unfortunate burden on the Vice President and also on the rest of a severely limited staff. Most special events on campus (95%) are also "*given*" to this division, so whenever one occurs, development and alumni staff are called upon to leave their other duties to handle these responsibilities. Many of them require huge amounts of time. We recommend their reporting lines be changed in order to free-up the Vice President's time. He should become more involved in development activities. The Resource Development person should probably report to the Director of Development.

The budget for the Division is quite small, \$829,802, and has decreased by \$136,755 since 1997.

Development

A formal Development office is also quite young. It began with the centralization of alumni phoning and the establishment of a phone-a-friend center in 1995. A Coordinator of Development Services was hired and assigned to manage student callers and report results. In mid-1996 a Director of Development was hired with directions to “*grow the annual fund,*” which had been organized “*to combine fund raising efforts of the foundation and the alumni association.*” All private funds donated on behalf of the University with the exception of funds donated to support athletics come into the ULM Foundation. A separate Athletic Foundation exists to accept contributions for athletic programs.

Since 1996 with the exception of the Director of Development and the Vice President the staffing has been sporadic because of the difficulty of hiring staff with the limited resources available and keeping them once they have been trained. Today only a Coordinator of Annual Fund position is staffed. A Coordinator of Development Services position exists but has been vacant for over one and one half years.

The Annual Fund, formally established in 1994, is considered the “core development program” for ULM. It is organized in a non-traditional fashion. It conducts annual telephone campaigns utilizing University students who call not only alumni but non-alumni individuals. Such individuals are solicited several times a year. Graduates of the seven colleges are contacted first to ask for gifts to support programs within those colleges. They are then contacted a second time later in the year to request support for general University programs. According to staff, “*Historically ¾ of the annual gifts are designated to specific scholarships, college departments, and other academic programs.*” The balance of the gifts “*support student recruitment and retention efforts and the faculty/staff development grants program.*” The grants program is utilized to fund various faculty and departmental programs including enhancements for

operations, professional development, research, construction, and creative endeavors.

In addition to the phoning program a separate effort to generate annual gifts normally considered part of a major gifts organization in most colleges is utilized and recorded as part of the annual fund. This program is called University Associates and includes gifts from a minimum of \$1,000 to gifts of more than \$15,000 annually. The University Associates organization is an umbrella for several gift levels. The \$1,000 level is called the Ouachita Society, a \$2,500 annual giving level is called Founder's Circle, a \$5,000 level the President's Club, \$10,000 level the Diamond Level, and the \$15,000 level is called Platinum. These gifts are solicited by a volunteer organization consisting of nine members of the Foundation Board of Directors and assisted by staff. Members of the Associates group receive annually a hand-thrown collectors piece of pottery designed by a University faculty member who is a certified master potter. An annual Associates event is held, usually in the spring, which is a stand-up hors d'oeuvres and thank you kind of affair. Attendees receive a report on where contributed moneys have been allocated, and they hear directly from the President of the Foundation and President of the University.

Because of the unusual handling and reporting of Annual Fund giving, it is impossible to measure the performance of the "normal" alumni/ friends portion of the fund-raising program. What is reported as Annual Fund giving is as follows, but note that much of it is normally not included in an Annual Fund:

ANNUAL FUND GIVING

<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
\$732,000	\$874,000	\$826,000	\$866,000	\$845,000

The University Associates part of Annual Giving is also impossible to monitor separately with accuracy, but it is part of the above figures. In FY 2000, there were 141 \$1,000 plus donors, 27 \$2,500 donors, 21 \$5,000 donors, and 18 donors at \$10,000 or more. If one assumes all gifts were at the minimum level of each category, these gifts totaled \$493,500 of the total \$866,000

reported as Annual Fund gifts in that year. We also know that the Associates program has grown substantially each year. So the above chart, which looks level, at best, would actually show substantial decreases if it reported only the non-Associates, usual kinds of Annual Fund giving.

This decrease in alumni/friend annual giving reflects the unfortunate inattention given the cultivation of alumni and friends because of resource deficiencies and staff vacancies over that period.

The Associates program, on the other hand, is very impressive for such a young organization. It takes most colleges a number of years to assemble as large a membership at these levels.

Alumni giving totals are also difficult to break down, because it is impossible to know how many are Associate members. Some alumni gifts also are made to the Athletic Foundation and recorded there. Alumni giving as reported to CAE is as follows:

ALUMNI GIVING

	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
Total Gifts	\$570,000	\$1,228,000	\$466,000	\$349,000	\$350,000
Less Athletic	<u>160,000</u>	<u>127,000</u>	<u>118,000</u>	<u>168,000</u>	<u>193,000</u>
Net to Fdn.	\$409,000	\$1,100,000	\$348,000	\$180,000	\$156,000

Note that gifts to the Athletic Foundation are not raised by Development (except for some in 2001) and are not monitored or recorded by the ULM Foundation. They are raised by the athletic staff. The most notable factor in looking at these gift totals is that gifts have been decreasing since 1997. Normally, significant increases should be seen. This result reflects the under-staffing and under-funding of the Development Office, but even more importantly, the lack of programs, communication, and cultivation of ULM alumni.

There is concern that this year will be no better and in fact may decline more since lack of staffing in the office and funding shortages prevented the normal fall campaign to take place. The plan now is to run a phone campaign in late winter and spring. However, this campaign will be run differently too. Previous campaigns have all been carried out with trained and paid student callers. A decision was made this year to outsource the phone-a-thon to a professional company.

The Associates (major gifts) portion of the Annual Fund Program is the most impressive as mentioned earlier. This is especially so given the small staff and the short period of time of its existence. Also impressive is the endowment giving which has resulted in a number of endowed chairs and professorships noted later. Less impressive is the unevenness in the giving levels over the five-year period. It appears that gifts in 2001 were the lowest in the last five years. It is very apparent that the Monroe community and the constituencies ULM enjoys are quite benevolent, and there is considerable affluence in the community which suggests the potential for much more substantial fund raising in the future. **We therefore recommend that the new President make serious efforts to find adequate resources, even in these difficult times, to improve the staffing and funding of the Development program.** There is virtually no operating budget (see chart below). That shortfall should also be addressed either by the University or the Foundation. The Foundation has the ability to do much more for the University but it will not be able to do this satisfactorily without funding the Development program.

DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>2001-02</u>
Total Budget	\$228,021	\$209,684
Personnel	215,521	201,265
Operating	12,500	8,419

The most urgent step is to fill quickly the long vacant position in the Annual Giving office. Secondly, a planned giving officer should be funded at a generous level and an individual with considerable experience and training and with a demonstrable track record should be hired. There have been attempts by the Vice President and the Director of Development to do some planned giving work and at one point some professionally designed brochures were distributed. But a planned giving program cannot be established in that way. The only planned gifts that exist for the University are one Uni-trust, one Charitable Remainder Trust, and one Farm-trust. The capacity and the potential for planned gifts is immense and the University is missing a great opportunity by not seeking them in an aggressive manner. It will not work to have individuals who are untrained in planned giving attempting to do this in their spare time.

The other prime staffing concern is to stop using the office of the Director of Development as a catch-all for University needs, such as managing special events on campus.

Another concern is the multiple solicitations of alumni, corporations, and friends. None of these constituencies respond well to multiple solicitations. Institutions who have had the best success have found ways to limit them in most cases to one per year. Here it appears there are three to four, at least. Alumni are solicited once by the Colleges, once by the University, once by direct mail, and many of them are also solicited by the Athletic Scholarship Foundation. **We recommend that athletic fund-raising and reporting responsibilities be transferred to the Development office along with necessary staff. Athletic and academic giving prospects should not be solicited multiple times each year.** The direct mail piece is appropriate and useful if it is utilized primarily as a pre-solicitation piece for those alumni who will be called, and

as a somewhat different direct mail solicitation letter for the balance of the alumni. The pre-solicitation direct mail piece should be simply a brief letter expressing the need the University has for support and then a notification that they should expect a call within a short period. An exact period should be identified if at all possible.

Mention has been made by staff that they are working towards a means of making a single solicitation which enables the donors to make one gift a year and partition it into support for the areas they are interested in helping. That is one of several good ways to handle this. Handling the separation of giving requests between the University Foundation and the Athletic Foundation is more difficult, since funds need to be designated to each entity at this time. **We recommend that consideration be given to merging the Athletic Foundation into the ULM Foundation.**

There is not a good rationale for having separate foundations in this day and age. Modern bookkeeping and computerization of records enables a single foundation to distribute the funds it receives into separate accounts for various organizations and that would not be a difficult thing to do in this case. This is made somewhat easier by the current situation where the records of alumni and other donor names and giving records are already centralized. The more difficult aspect will be a political one since there exists currently considerable concern about the efficacy of athletic funding and probably the Athletic Scholarship Foundation itself. It is likely unwise to consider making this merger too quickly because of the danger of prejudicing the current donors to the ULM Foundation who might fear, that with the merger, donations they make to scholarships and academic functions of the ULM Foundation will somehow be diverted to athletics. Some fear that this is already occurring. Nevertheless, the plan should be made and the University can determine the best timing for such a merger. There are currently two paid employees of the ULM

Foundation, a CPA and an accounting technician, who handle the financial management of some \$34 million in assets. We do not know what staffing there is in the Athletic Scholarship Foundation, but certainly there could be considerable savings accomplished in a merger.

We recommend that the University Associates program be separated from the Annual Fund. It should be treated as a typical Major Gifts program and its giving should be reported separately as such.

The Development budget is deplorably low. We are surprised that fund raising results are as good as they are. But we also notice that they are tending to decline rather than to grow.

The last part of the University's fund raising is handled primarily by the President of the University, with assistance from the Vice President, and the gifts are to capital and endowment, mostly to endowment. Thanks to the State of Louisiana's program to participate in endowed chairs and professorships, the University has been able to raise money to establish a good number of these. There are now a total of nine endowed Chairs and forty-three Professorships. The State of Louisiana contributes 40% of the endowment, which totals \$1,000,000 for the Chairs and \$100,000 for the Professorships. The endowments are invested and managed by the ULM Foundation.

ULM Foundation

The ULM Foundation is the official recipient of all non-athletic donations to the University of Louisiana at Monroe. The Foundation is directed by a Board of Directors of twenty-eight members who are elected to three-year terms. The Vice President for Advancement at the University is the Executive Director of the Foundation and is compensated for 1/3 of his salary by the Foundation. The sole purpose of the Foundation is “to solicit, accept, administer, invest, and disburse funds or properties for the benefit and advancement of Northeast Louisiana University” (amended to University of Louisiana at Monroe), its faculty, and its students.

The prime activities of the Foundation in its earlier years were primarily to accept gifts of real estate, and to buy and lease real estate for the benefit of the University. Since the formation of a division of University Advancement in the ‘90’s, it has become a more complex entity receiving gifts of cash and securities in addition to real estate, and its endowment has grown to the \$34 million range at this point.

The Foundation operates with an “affiliation agreement” with the University of Louisiana at Monroe which firmly establishes its independence from the University and details the manner in which it interacts with the University and handles and disburses funds it receives which are to be used for the benefit of the University. It specifies that its “*primary objective will be to provide support for the University.*” It also details that in fulfilling its mission it solicits and accepts various kinds of gifts, it receives, holds, and administers such donations, and it expends funds for its own operations and for incidental expenses necessary for the conduct of the affairs of the

Foundation. It also specifies that it shall reimburse the University “either directly or through in-kind services for the cost of housing, personnel, which personnel shall remain public servants for all purposes, and other support furnished to the organization by the University.”

The organization in its sole discretion may invest the donations it receives as it deems appropriate, and in fact it does so with considerable success, utilizing the services of well-established fund managers. The document appears to be a fine statement of the independence of the Foundation and a satisfactory agreement it has developed in cooperation with the University.

A secondary document entitled “Fund Management” establishes the terms under which the Foundation manages funds of the University which are transferred to the Foundation, such as the matching funds for the several endowed Chairs and Professorships.

In addition to the Executive Director, the Foundation has two paid employees, an Assistant Director for the Foundation and Alumni Accounts and an accountant. There is also a secretary. In addition to several administrative types of committees, there is a committee on real property, an annual fund committee, and a major gifts and planned giving committee.

Unlike many foundations at schools with young development operations, this Board seems to understand its mission. A couple of members explained their role in essentially the same way, “*It’s to support the University.*” One of the officers said, “*The Board participates in fund raising, but not as much as they should.*” When asked about how many participated and at what level, he said “*I really haven’t looked at the list and I don’t know if they have been solicited or*

not.” He added, “*Most of these solicitation efforts are by the staff.*” Actually, of the 32 members of the Board, 29 have contributed at the \$1,000 level or above. During the last year fifteen gave at least \$1,000, five more than \$4,000, five at least \$10,000, and four at the \$20,000 plus level. If the Foundation becomes even more serious and sets up an evaluation committee function and assigns teams of Board members to solicit other members, those numbers should increase exponentially.

Future Considerations

Given all the other financial problems the University has been experiencing and the very young age of the Development program, we were both surprised and impressed at the overall quality of the fund raising program through the ULM Foundation. Following is a chart showing some comparable statistics from universities a ULM official has identified as being somewhat comparable and ones with which ULM would like to compete academically.

	<u>TOTAL PRIVATE GIVING</u>				
	(In 000)				
	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
ULM	\$1,185	\$2,242	\$2,559	\$2,560	\$3,349
Arkansas St.	\$2,864	N/A	N/A	\$7,632	\$3,770
Ark. U., Little Rock	\$3,733	\$4,434	\$5,994	\$4,248	\$7,384
Middle Tenn.	\$4,563	N/A	\$4,113	\$5,362	\$7,368
S.W. Texas	\$4,243	\$4,792	\$8,474	\$10,874	\$9,708

You will note that most of these have been raising somewhat more money than ULM and their progress has shown an improvement over the five years that in most cases has been more extensive. These figures illustrate the sort of fund-raising which is possible at a university such as this, however. It is apparent that ULM's fund raising has been hampered seriously not only by its youth but by its very small staff, extensive turnover, and the freezing of vacant positions. Once there becomes some stability, things should look up quickly.

Because of these considerations and because the institution's recruitment and solicitation of donors of strong ability has been successful, it suggests that a capital campaign in the not too distant future would seem to be feasible. The University's financial condition is very difficult and the new President must be searching for ways to pull out of the decline and fund some of the deficient areas as quickly as possible. A capital campaign could address a number of these issues, and since the needs are so apparent, it could have an excellent chance of success. It should be able to generate considerable new resources for the institution. A capital campaign always, if successful, has the lasting impact of increasing the visibility of the University as a fund raising entity and of raising the annualized level of giving substantially.

We recommend that serious attention be given to early planning for a capital campaign to be implemented in the not to distant future. Necessary staffing for the campaign should be commenced. A campaign consultant should be appointed relatively soon to help guide the University in campaign planning and necessary build-up of staff.

Alumni

The Board of the Alumni Association has 18 members plus four members of an Executive Board. The Board membership is set up by districts where there are chapters, and the number of members picked from various districts varies from one to three depending on the size and activity of the particular chapter. The current President, President-elect, and other officers seem to have deep feelings for the University and great interest in improving the level of activities of the Alumni Association, as do other members of the Board. One alumna felt that the Board has trouble “*seeing the big picture.*” That person said, “*We must learn to reach out and to broaden our perspective.*” A number of alumni agreed with one who said, “*We have so much potential here, but we haven’t aggressively pursued it yet. We must start doing it.*” It is apparent that the Board is looking for better direction from staff and are pleased to see a new Director on board. All Directors seem to agree that “*there has been no stability in personnel.*” And a staff member mentioned, “*there is too much to do and far too little time.*” Both observations seem to be on target.

The data base for all alumni and all donor records are held in the Alumni office. The system they use is an excellent one called Raisers Edge, which specializes in development/alumni data bases.

There are several alumni programs in place, the best of which appear to be the Group 31 (Ambassadors) program and the Faculty Honors program. Group 31 is composed of thirty-one upperclassmen who have been selected as the cream of the crop. We had the experience of having

one of them as our driver and were highly impressed. The Faculty Honors Program also appears to be a good one. It takes place in April for a full week. Seven faculty, one from each College, are chosen to be honored by the Alumni Association. Each one is personally honored and receives a professionally done video, plus a \$1,500 stipend provided by the Alumni Association. All this takes place at a dinner and presentation.

The Association also organizes tailgate parties at home football games, although the success of this the last year or two has been less than before. It also participates in the development of alumni chapters. There are presently 33 with charters; however, not all are very active. One alumnus said *“at one time our chapters were quite active, but they need revitalization now.”* In a meeting of alumni it was very obvious that there were very strong feelings for the University.

Alumni solicitation for the annual fund should be a major portion of it. There are 52,000 alumni on the books but only 22,000 good phone numbers. There are approximately 37,000 who can be identified with a good address. A total of 37,638 alumni were solicited in fiscal 2001 in the annual fund, but only 1,507 donated, which is 4% of those solicited. Their donations, however, totaled \$376,999, an average of about \$250 each, which is quite good. The faculty and staff in comparison donated \$36,000 but over 33% of them contributed. In fiscal year 2000, 5.5% of the alumni contributed \$428,000, substantially more and with better participation. Going back one year further, the alumni participation was 6.5%, and one year previous 6.8%. Obviously the degree of interest in the University and/or the effectiveness of alumni communication and cultivation have been decreasing.

A principal key in building alumni support and participation is the degree of their involvement in alumni activities and programs. Revenues to support alumni association programs have experienced a steady decline over the last four years. In 1998-99 revenue to the program was \$209,234, but it has decreased every year and in the current year is only \$117,400. We suggest there is a strong correlation between that factor and decrease in alumni participation.

We recommend alumni support and involvement be increased. The Alumni office budget is inadequate. President Cofer will have to become visibly involved to ensure new resources.

One of the best alumni involvement activities at any institution is through its clubs or chapters program. Consensus here is that the chapters program has weakened. There are many ways to develop a chapters program, but the key is having someone on a very proactive basis ensuring that chapters set up meetings. The meetings also must be attractive and exciting, and someone from the University must be there. Obviously with the decrease in budget just noted, the alumni office has trouble funding any travel to a meeting if it is out of the immediate area. And sometimes there are other meeting expenses that must be picked up.

Funding must be increased to build a program. That is obvious and we recommend that the new President take a look at that to see what can be done. There is also a beautiful opportunity approaching, since the new President will be here in April. Alumni love to meet new presidents and to hear what they have to say about the University. It is the best chance a president has to contact large numbers of alumni and to share his vision with them. Frequently it

is difficult to get attendance by simply holding a chapter meeting, but if it can be promoted with the new President speaking, the attendance should blossom. We recommend that President Cofer develop a very carefully prepared presentation on how he sees the University at this time, where he wants to take it, and how he intends to get it there. He should engage in a “blitz” of all alumni chapters in order to address alumni in these different geographic areas. Since not all areas will have chapters, this also makes for an opportunity for alumni in other areas to meet the new President. New chapters are frequently formed by getting an assemblage of alumni from an area and making sure they have a positive experience getting together.

The Alumni Association has a dues program which has been in place for a number of years. It charges \$25 a year for membership. Only dues paying participants are considered members of the Alumni Association. Membership numbers hit their peak in 1994-95 when slightly more than 4,000 alumni were members. Since then there has been a steady decline, and in the 2001 fiscal year only 2,831 alumni were dues paying members of the Association. Since only alumni who pay dues are members, one should recognize that last year only 7.7% of alumni with good addresses were members. Over 92% of the alumni were disenfranchised, excluded from what should be “*their alumni association.*” That 92% did not have the right to vote, the right to feel they belong, and they received none of the benefits that members received. Another disadvantage to a dues program is that even though dues payments are not a contribution, most alumni treat them as one. A deterrent to improvements in the annual fund is the multiple solicitations alumni receive annually. The request for participation in the dues program each fall will be perceived by most alumni as another solicitation from the University and another irritant. The annual fund would improve if this irritation were removed.

Alumni involvement in chapters and other functions has been decreasing annually. Alumni participation in the annual fund has been decreasing, and membership in the dues program has also. All this needs to be turned around. The best way to do this is through better communication. ULM needs to communicate better with its alumni; yet the principal communication piece it has is “*Impact*.” This magazine of the Alumni Association is not sent to the 92% non-members of the Association. Most alumni have never laid eyes on this magazine. Only the much less attractive “*Drum Beat*” is received by the entire alumni body. It mostly is comprised with ads for athletic programs. That does not make sense, and an active association can never be built on such a basis. We recommend that the dues program be eliminated. **We also recommend that the President plan and conduct an early blitz of alumni chapters and other groupings of alumni around the region and beyond.**

Another part of the dues program is equally disadvantageous, the Lifetime Membership club. In any giving program, the key ingredient for its success is getting its constituents in the habit of giving regularly to the institution. Once an individual has been contributing for several years, it no longer is a question of whether to give each year, it becomes rather a question of how much. What happens with a lifetime membership is that the individuals who are the most interested and the most capable of giving are the ones who will ante-up the \$500 for a lifetime membership because it will sound to them like a good deal. And it is, for them. But the inherent message that has been communicated is “*now you’ve done your duty, and you will never have to give again.*” And so despite the fact that in fund raising circles it is known that the best future prospect for a gift is a former donor, ULM with its lifetime membership has told its best former donors “*you don’t have to give again.*” This program should be disbanded also. This

“dissolution” of alumni dues and lifetime membership may seem difficult, but it is not as tough as it seems. Dozens if not hundreds of associations have eliminated these programs. There are a number of ways to do this, but we would suggest this: pick a good time, such as the beginning of the next year (next fall). And, instead of sending out the normal solicitation for dues brochure, prepare a carefully drafted package to include a new membership card with the name of each alumnus/a printed on the card. Send these cards together with a thoughtful letter to each alumnus/a. On the back of each card print a list of benefits that person will receive as a member. Use the same benefits current members receive, which usually don’t cost anything. Perhaps also the University would agree to allow cardholders to use the University library and get a discount at the bookstore. Then explain to each new member that the University and/or the Alumni Association are pleased to welcome them as a full-fledged member of the University’s alumni body. To those who were members previously, indicate in a special letter that the dues program is being abolished because it is necessary to include all alumni as members of the Association. Explain why. Explain further that the changing of the program will have an economic impact on the Association, which depends on some of those revenues. Then give them the opportunity (maybe even with a card) to contribute by means of a “voluntary service contribution” if they would like to continue supporting the Alumni Association. But also encourage them to participate in the Annual Fund when they are called by a representative of the University, because part of the annual fund revenues will help to support the Alumni Association also. The Alumni Board must agree to this program, and the Foundation Board also, because the change will improve alumni attitudes and revenues to the Annual Fund should increase. Other places where this was done have noticed substantial increases in the years following such a program. The Foundation Board would have to agree to subsidize the Alumni Association for revenues lost, but

they should be able to afford this because this change will help the Annual Fund and the Foundation in both the short and the long term.

Lifetime members should be handled in a personalized manner. An explanation should be relatively easy since they obviously have a great deal of interest in the University. Explain candidly what has been explained here, that this is what is best for the Association and the University. They are sophisticated people usually and will understand readily. Then encourage them to convert their lifetime membership interest into involvement in one of the several levels of Associates in the Annual Fund program.

Publications

University publications are the responsibility of a Coordinator of Publications in the Public Affairs Office. There is also a Coordinator of Graphic Design and a Coordinator of Photo Services who participate in producing University publications. There is also in the Director of Business Operations chain of command an Office of Graphic and Technical Services, including a print shop. Apparently some graphic art staff in that area also participate in producing the publications. This dual reporting arrangement suggests a certain degree of confusion, difficulty, and inefficiency. A single person should be responsible for University publications, and that person should be in the public affairs area. We recommend that President Cofer look at this situation as he is reviewing the organization of the Vice President of Business Affairs Office and consider moving Graphic and Technical Services to the public affairs department.

Theoretically all University publications are supposed to be approved by the public affairs office. We recommend also that President Cofer re-enforce this regulation since enforcement appears to have slipped recently.

The quality of publications is mediocre overall. For example, the CASS publications for the Center of Academic and Student Success are quite difficult to read. The headings are in a very elaborate and difficult italics font. Some of these headings are almost impossible to make out. For example, look at what is apparently a capital W in several of the headlines. Furthermore, there is too much prose, and it is in too small a typeface, and too close together if students are expected to read this. In the Fall 2001 CASS brochure the reader is detracted from the ability to read the prose easily because of the background paper with its different colors.

The “Let Your Mind Run Free” brochures, which are part of the student recruitment package, are also illustrative. Some of the photos, such as the one inside the front cover of the larger brochure, are not at all clear. The font size is too small for easy reading. Students are not readily going to struggle to read this. On page 21 in the larger brochure, there is a photo at the bottom with type copy over it which is virtually impossible to make out. The smaller “Let Your Mind Run Free” brochure called “general information” has a dark photo on the front cover which prevents the University’s name which is printed over this photo from being clearly seen. The same problem exists in the application packet admissions brochure.

The *Res Scholaris* magazine for the year 2000 is potentially a first class publication. However, the *Res* above the name *Scholaris* on the top of the cover is so well disguised by being

the same color as some of the background that one can barely read the word. The name of the University is impossible to read as its white typeface runs over the whitish forehead of the individual whose photograph is on the cover. On page 13 the graphic which flashes across the page in a purplish color makes the prose unreadable. The fonts throughout this magazine are too small and too close together to read easily.

The issue of *Impact* (the winter of 2000 issue), which is the University (Alumni) magazine, suffers from similar problems. Most photos in the magazine are of poor quality and unclear. The prose throughout is more like what is sometimes seen in esoteric publications than a magazine designed to impress alumni and friends of the University. There is far too much prose without breaks, the font is too small, and it desperately needs some white space. It is difficult to imagine recipients really reading it.

We recommend that the President should consider transferring the Graphic and Technical Services department from business operations to public affairs, where similar operations and responsibility for University publications are located. Further, someone qualified should take a close look at the operation of the publications office and provide regular critiques of publications. Perhaps a consultant would be advisable. We also recommend that all publications should be planned, designed, and finally approved for content and design by the public affairs office. This regulation must be enforced.

Graphic Identity

The University has a poor image currently and lacks a strong identity with constituents who aren't already close to the institution. Its enrollment is in a declining trend. The University name was changed recently, so many might have trouble even knowing who or what ULM is. Many alumni interviewed still refer to it as Northeast, as do people in the community. And yet the institution has no consistent graphic identity in its publications.

A staff member proudly proclaimed the University's logo and praised the rule that it must appear on all publications. We had reviewed a large packet of publications, and we were puzzled as to what logo was referenced. The staff member explained it was "*the small rectangular design that appears on letterheads with a tower on the left and the University's name in a block on the right.*" We looked again and could not find that "logo" on a single cover of the fifteen publications we had examined. Finally we discovered a small version inside some of the publications in a location where it does not serve a logo's purpose whatsoever. It is never prominently displayed on the covers where it could serve its important purpose.

One needs merely to drive around town and look carefully at a few well-known business establishments to learn about the importance of a graphic identity or logo. Although the University is not a business, there are some business-like practices that are worth emulating. There are many in the area that display their logo consistently, uniformly, and repetitively every time.

A logo does not need to be a symbol and in most cases is not. It is frequently called a **logo-type** rather than a logo because it is simply the way a name is always portrayed. It is always in the same font, the same style, same manner. It always appears the same.

We recommend that the University establish a graphic identity and enforce it to apply to all publications and other communications emanating from the University. It should be on every piece of mail, literature, or anything else that comes out of the University. This logo-type can be almost any font or type face. Sometimes schools use a design element with it, but that is not necessary. If it can emphasize the qualities the University wants people to focus on that is better, but just find a way to print the name attractively (and make it easy to read), and do it the same way every time. No other logos should be utilized at the University. Don't compete with yourself. No departmental or program logos should be used. The University needs to be recognized in a single way. Even the Foundations and the Alumni Association should find a way to use the University logo-type along with their own name in whatever publications they produce. Unless this is done, the University's identity will remain weak and unclear.

Public Relations

The University's public relations currently is perceived almost entirely in terms of its media relations, so our concentration will be on that. Media relations is handled through a Coordinator of Media Relations who reports directly to the Director of Public Affairs. This Director reports to the Vice President for Advancement, but also has worked closely with the President. There was virtually a dual-reporting arrangement.

The public affairs office reports that *“the good news is getting to the media, but people just don’t seem to recognize it.”* There were so many complaints coming into that office last fall that they began sending copies of all press releases to all University staff and major constituents, so that they could be more aware of what was being sent out. That seemed to improve the situation, but it has not changed the negative perceptions that continue. **The public relations focus should move away from “explaining” problems and concentrate on aspirations and how they will be achieved.**

Local media without exception are sensitive to the challenges. They all claim a genuine interest in the University and believe it is an essential component of the community. It is our impression that whatever problems there might be regarding the University’s image, the new President can change them easily if he handles the situation with sensitivity. **We recommend that the President plan to meet with representatives of the local media on a monthly basis. Meetings with the general reporting staff to get to know them and to allow them to ask questions of interest is especially advised. We also recommend that the Public Affairs Director and the Coordinator of Media Relations meet regularly with representatives of the media. Good relationships should be developed.**

XI. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

_____ ULM's Faculty Senate has seen good times and bad. In the past few years, its influence may have increased as it has become active (some say more disillusioned). "*We have an obligation to try and impact things,*" a faculty member declared. "*Perhaps the new President will consider good ideas coming out of the Senate,*" said another. While this Faculty Senate, like most nationally, may not be a totally accurate reflection of the faculty it represents, it is a sounding board for a certain breadth of faculty opinion and President Cofer should accord it respect and give it his ear.

The Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate are generally sound; indeed, much better than most we have seen. Nonetheless, we suggest the President appoint an ad hoc committee to make recommendations to him by December 2002. The Committee should be charged to make recommendations based on two provisos: 1) Those affected by decisions should have a voice in their making (particularly faculty and to a lesser degree students, not administrators) and 2) recommendations are subject to the final authority of the President of the University (Appendix E). We offer the following:

1. Change the name to "The University Council" and make the body more representative but retain a large majority of faculty members.
2. The "Council" should be clearly authorized by the President of the University.
3. Article I., Section 2. The present number is inefficient and should be changed to "one senator elected for every twenty general faculty members.... with "each college entitled to at least one senator."
4. We suggest adding three student members selected by the student government.
5. Each Vice President, not the President, should sit on the "Council" as ex officio nonvoting members. The President should be invited to speak at the outset of each meeting he attends.
6. Article VIII. The Committees should be changed to more nearly match the Committees of the Board. (This may need to be stayed subject to Board revision

of its Committee system.) Ideally, “Council” Committees would be Academic Affairs, which would include faculty welfare; Student Affairs; Finance and Institutional Advancement. From time to time there would be issue-oriented ad hoc committees.

7. Changing the title President of the Senate to “Chair of the Council.”

We recommend that President Cofer appoint an *ad hoc* task force to consider campus governance consistent with the recommendations in this Report. Further, we believe that President Cofer should communicate regularly with the entire faculty by means of “Dear Colleagues” letters and e-mails that outline the University’s conditions and address special issues. Whether or not faculty allegations of “the excessive secrecy” of the previous administration are merited, President Cofer should endeavor to keep faculty and staff well-informed of the University’s condition and knowledgeable about the critical choices the institution faces. Faculty and staff may not agree with his decisions, but they should know what those decisions are and the values behind them.

The Board of Supervisors

_____ ULM is most immediately governed by a Board of Supervisors. The President of the System is Dr. Sally Clausen, who is an experienced and skilled former university president. She is widely viewed as understanding ULM’s plight and supporting its needs.

President Clausen and the Board of Supervisors expect President Cofer to “*fix this situation.*” While the Board has in the past not often intruded itself excessively into the operation of the institution, President Cofer can expect it now to monitor ULM’s progress closely. “*The Board expects an early change in attitude on the campus at Monroe,*” said a Board member. Other Board members indicated their strong support for the new President.

In Summary

The Review Team has attempted to outline changes which need to occur. The task ahead is daunting but a strong University President and a supportive internal and external community can accomplish what needs to be done. As Margaret Meade once said, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed individuals can change the world; indeed it’s the only thing that ever has.”

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The University must balance its budget and stabilize operations.**
- 2. The President-elect must be visible on and off campus to faculty, staff, students, community, public officials, and business leaders.**
- 3. The President should avoid the perception that he and other senior administrators are isolated on the seventh floor of the Library and Conference Center.**
- 4. The campus and its buildings must be cleaned, trash collected, urgent repairs made, and paint applied.**
- 5. The University must seek additional funding to supplement its operations through a variety of means including but not limited to consideration of new revenues through increased tuition and fees for high cost programs such as Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences, and intensified grants production at federal and state levels. President Clausen should inform state legislators about ULM's financial condition and request specific assistance and initiate contact with congressional leaders to obtain earmarked assistance in speciality areas (i.e., the School of Toxicology could be useful in analyzing chemicals of mass destruction).**
- 6. ULM must augment its recruitment efforts.**
- 7. ULM must increase its partnership with local schools and accentuate the many legitimate positives associated with its academic programs.**
- 8. The President should direct a process whereby ULM produces an academic and institutional strategic plan consistent with the new realities which includes time-lines, accountable officers, and estimated costs.**

- 9. ULM must improve its quality of campus support services and strive to achieve a freshman retention rate in the 80s.**
- 10. ULM should aspire to reach a six-year graduation rate of about 65 percent.**
- 11. President Cofer should initiate a process whereby all academic programs on the campus are evaluated in terms of their cost, relevance, and viability.**
- 12. ULM should review its liberal and general education core curriculum with an eye towards strengthening minimum requirements in the future.**
- 13. ULM must review closely its inconsistencies in University generated credit hours with an eye toward reasonable parity and reduced costs.**
- 14. ULM should review its master's and doctoral level programs that are unproductive based on student enrollments, cost, and program quality.**
- 15. Allied Health and Rehabilitation Professions, Nursing, and Pharmacy should be recombined into a single college with separate schools.**
- 16. Liberal Arts and Pure and Applied Sciences should be combined into a single College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.**
- 17. President Cofer should open immediate discussions with Delta Community College in order to ascertain areas of mutual interest.**
- 18. ULM should spread its hiring nets more broadly throughout the country and beyond.**
- 19. ULM should address aspects of diversity in hiring faculty and administrators.**

- 20. ULM should emphasize its devotion to merit and market factors in dispensing faculty salary increments.**
- 21. The State of Louisiana should increase staff salaries by an amount sufficient to allow its universities to attract and retain necessary staff personnel.**
- 22. The President, through the chief academic officer, should provide the campus governance organization with a set of time-lines for development of a meaningful post-tenure review policy for faculty and ask the Senate to generate a recommendation for him to consider.**
- 23. Faculty members should police their own ranks through a policy that enunciates the AAUP standard of academic freedom.**
- 24. Additional resources must be devoted to nourishing residence hall life and other student support areas such as campus security, counseling, and student health.**
- 25. The University should investigate the charges that more than a handful of students register for courses, receive financial aid, and then essentially stop going to classes.**
- 26. The size of the faculty must be aligned with student enrollment.**
- 27. ULM should immediately use its resources earmarked for deferred maintenance.**
- 28. President Cofer should give extensive consideration to working with the city in closing off some streets, changing their traffic flow, installing speed bumps, utilizing traffic circles and gates, and restricting movement on to the campus late in the evening.**

- 29. President Cofer should talk with experienced state officials about ULM's facilities management and planning needs and then move rapidly to improve this situation.**
- 30. ___President Cofer should give early consideration to privatization and outsourcing options in both the auxiliary and non-auxiliary areas of the institution.**
- 31. The new President needs to ascertain if appropriate senior personnel are present on the campus who are capable of moving the University where it needs to go in the area of technology. If none are available, then he must move ahead to bring appropriately skilled and experienced people to the campus.**
- 32. President Cofer should streamline the administrative management at ULM and reduce the number of individuals reporting to the President.**
- 33. Intercollegiate athletics, which should be viewed as one of many student activities supported by the University, should report to the new student affairs vice president or to the chief finance officer.**
- 34. Fiscal stability must be restored to intercollegiate athletics at ULM. Three options that must be considered are: a) moving to Division 1-AA to try to generate more game attendance and revenues and reduce travel costs by playing more teams within the state (including Louisiana Tech), b) playing Division III level (non-scholarship football), or c) dropping football altogether.**
- 35. Ultimately, ULM must: a) increase the revenue generated by its intercollegiate athletics programs; b) reduce costs; or, c) pursue a combination of the two.**
- 36. There are too many people reporting directly to the Vice President of Advancement. The new President should consider addressing this situation and either transfer unrelated offices elsewhere or add staff to the division.**

- 37. The University Associates program should be separated from the Annual Fund. It should be treated as a typical Major Gifts program and its giving should be reported separately as such.**
- 38. Athletic fund-raising and reporting responsibilities should be transferred to the Development office along with necessary staff. Athletic and academic giving prospects should not be solicited multiple times each year.**
- 39. Consideration should be given to merging the Athletic Scholarship Foundation into the ULM Foundation.**
- 40. Efforts should be made to find adequate resources to improve the staffing and funding of the Development program.**
- 41. Serious attention should be given to beginning early planning for a capital campaign to be implemented in the not too distant future. The necessary staffing for a campaign should be commenced. A campaign consultant should be appointed relatively soon to help guide the University in campaign planning and in the necessary build-up of staff.**
- 42. Alumni support and involvement must be increased. The alumni office budget is inadequate. President Cofer will have to become visibly involved to ensure new resources.**
- 43. The President should plan and conduct an early blitz of alumni chapters and other groupings of alumni around the region and beyond.**
- 44. The public relations focus should move away from “explaining” problems and concentrate on aspirations and how they will be achieved.**

- 45. The President should consider transferring the Graphic and Technical Services department from business operations to public affairs, where similar operations and responsibility for University publications are located.**
- 46. All publications should be planned, designed, and finally approved for content and design by the public affairs office. This regulation must be enforced.**
- 47. ULM must establish a graphic identity and enforce it to apply to all publications and other communications emanating from the University.**
- 48. Someone qualified should take a close look at the operation of the publications office operation and provide regular critiques of publications. Perhaps a consultant would also be advisable.**
- 49. The President should plan to meet with representatives of the local media on a monthly basis. Meetings with the general reporting staff to get to know them and to allow them to ask questions of interest is especially advised.**
- 50. The Public Affairs Director and the Coordinator of Media Relations should also meet regularly with representatives of the media. Good relationships should be developed.**
- 51. President Cofer should communicate regularly with the entire faculty by means of “Dear Colleagues” letters and e-mails that outline the University’s conditions and address special issues. He should endeavor to keep faculty and staff well-informed of the University’s condition and knowledgeable about the critical choices facing the institution.**
- 52. President Cofer should appoint an ad hoc task force to consider campus governance consistent with the recommendations in this Report.**

53. Finally, we emphasize again, that above all, the new President must be highly visible as he conducts the new course for the University; he must be as compassionate as he is incisive; share his plans with all interested parties; and, at once, be both a part of and apart from those who care deeply about the University of Louisiana at Monroe.

APPENDIX A

James L. Fisher

Review Team Chair

James L. Fisher is the most published writer on leadership and organization in higher education today. He has written scores of professional articles and has also been published in such popular media as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Times*, and *The Baltimore Sun*. The author or editor of eight books, his book, *The Board and the President*, "clearly established him as the nation's leading authority on the college presidency," wrote Michael Worth of George Washington University reviewing in *Currents*. His *The Power of the Presidency* was reviewed in *Change* magazine as "... the most important book ever written on the college presidency" and was nominated for the non-fiction Pulitzer Prize. His most recent book, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, has been reviewed as "...a major, impressive, immensely instructive book, ...a virtual Dr. Spock for aspiring or new college presidents, and ...a must read for all trustees." His newest book, *Positive Power*, will be available in bookstores everywhere in January 2002 and he recently received a grant from the Kauffman Foundation to do a new book on the effective college president to be published by 2003.

A registered psychologist with a Ph.D. from Northwestern University, he is President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE) and President Emeritus of Towson University. He is presently Professor of Leadership Studies at The Union Institute and a consultant to boards and presidents. He has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia and has been a consultant to more than three hundred colleges and universities. He coined the term institutional review and has conducted hundreds for private and public institutions.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at eleven private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he presently serves as a trustee of the Marine Military Academy, Millikin University, and the Florida Institute of Technology. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded twelve honorary degrees. At Illinois State, The Outstanding Thesis Award was named by the faculty The James L. Fisher Thesis Award. The faculty at Towson University recommended that the new psychology building be named after Dr. Fisher, and the CASE Distinguished Service to Education Award bears his name.

While president at Towson, his government relations activities were sufficient to overturn gubernatorial vetoes. *The Baltimore Sun* wrote that he was a "master educational politician....under his leadership, enrollment doubled, quality went up and costs went down." In Washington, *Newsweek* magazine reported that, while President at CASE, his national campaign, The Action Committee for Higher Education (ACHE), resulted in "more than \$1 billion in student financial aid." CASE also created and orchestrated the "America's Energy is Mindpower" campaign, "Higher Education Week" and "The Professor of the Year" awards. For several years, he did a popular daily radio commentary on WBAL in Baltimore and has been an occasional OP/ED feature writer for *The Baltimore Sun*. Through the years, Dr. Fisher has been encouraged by leaders in both parties to run for Governor or Senate.

Gene A. Budig

Brief Biography

Dr. Budig served as President of the American League for six years (1994-2000) and oversaw the operations of 14 clubs and the construction of \$2.2 billion worth of new ballparks. Major League Baseball is a \$3.7 billion a year enterprise. He is now the Senior Advisor to the Commissioner of Baseball, a Visiting Scholar at the College Board, and a member of the faculty at Princeton University. He has bachelors through doctoral degrees from the University of Nebraska.

Previously, he headed three major state universities, each with enrollments of more than 23,000 students. The institutions were Illinois State University, West Virginia University, and the University of Kansas. He was a Professor of Higher Education Finance at ISU, WVU, KU and the University of Nebraska. Over a period of 23 years he was responsible for the educational programs of 520,000 students.

Dr. Budig was responsible for the administration of \$8.1 billion in educational funds, both public and private.

He is a retired Major General, Air National Guard. His last assignment was Assistant to the Chief, National Guard Bureau, a federal agency with components in all 50 states and 573,000 members and an annual operational budget of nearly \$9 billion.

He was appointed Chief of Staff for the Governor of Nebraska, serving three years early in his career.

He was recognized as one who could raise large amounts of private money for the public good at three state universities. He headed successful fund drives at WVU and KU. He played a leadership role in Major League Baseball Charities, especially as it related to the creation of education and recreation programs in the major cities.

James V. Koch

Brief Biography

James V. Koch is Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and President Emeritus at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. Dr. Koch served as President of Old Dominion 1990-2001. Prior to that, he was President of the University of Montana, 1986-1990. An Exxon Foundation study of American college presidents selected him as one of the 100 most effective college presidents in the United States. During his tenure at Old Dominion, the University recorded its first Rhodes Scholar, developed the largest televised, interactive distance learning system in the United States, and initiated more than \$300 million in new construction.

Dr. Koch is an economist who has published seven books and 70 refereed journal articles in the field. His *Industrial Organization and Prices* was the leading text in this specialty for several years. The focus of his current research is the economics of e-commerce. He has taught at institutions ranging from Illinois State University to Brown University, the University of Hawaii, and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. His *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, co-authored with James L. Fisher, is regarded as the definitive work concerning college presidents and their boards. He has been individually or collectively involved in the assessment of more than 30 presidents and institutions of higher education.

Dr. Koch earned a B.A. degree from Illinois State University and his Ph.D. degree in Economics from Northwestern University. He has received three honorary doctoral degrees from universities in Japan and Korea and has received a host of honors from organizations such as the Urban League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and several regional economic development agencies.

Paul E. Wisdom

Brief Biography

Paul E. Wisdom is most noted for his exceptional leadership in generating support for higher education institutions. His crowning achievements were the orchestration of a \$50 million gift (1997) to Florida Tech, one of the ten largest ever received in American higher education and his counsel in enabling Rowan University to receive a \$100 million gift in 1994.

Preceding his vice presidency at Florida Tech, he was vice president at Colorado State University, Lafayette College, Towson University, and assistant dean of faculty at Illinois State University. At Illinois State he was also a member of the English faculty where he served as a member of the Executive Committee and the Salary Committee, and co-taught Illinois State's first course in African-American Literature.

He is now living in Colorado.

Farris W. Womack

Brief Biography

Farris W. Womack served as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for the University of Michigan from 1988 until his retirement in 1996. During his tenure at Michigan, the University's endowment increased dramatically and one of the largest construction programs in the school's history was completed successfully. Since his retirement, he has maintained an active consulting practice specializing in the financing and administration of higher educational institutions.

Prior to his Michigan tenure, he was Controller of the State of North Carolina, a position he held while he continued to serve the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as its Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance. Womack's tenure in North Carolina was marked by significant growth in the University's endowment.

Womack began his career in higher education at Henderson State University in Arkansas where he served as Assistant to the President. After taking time off to finish his doctorate, he spent four years at Arkansas State University and in 1975, he returned to the University of Arkansas where he rose through the ranks to become Executive Vice President in 1979.

In 1981, he left higher education for a two-year period to serve as the Chief Fiscal Officer for the State of Arkansas and the Director of the Department of Finance and Administration. That was one of the most challenging periods financially because the country suffered through a prolonged recession that dramatically reduced general revenues available. Under his leadership, the State survived the downturn and continued to deliver necessary services.

Womack has served as a member of the National Advisory Board of the First Commercial Corporation, an Arkansas Bank Holding Company; as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Environmental Research Institute of Michigan, and as a member of the Investment Advisory Committee of the Michigan State Employees Retirement System, the 13th largest pension fund in the United States.

His consulting practice includes major research universities and a number of related corporations. The future of the research university has been the subject of much of his writing and speaking.

APPENDIX B

Interviewees:

Stephanie Abell, Benefactor
Ron Alexander, Dept Chair
Bill Arrington, Graduate Faculty
Mike Baer, Senior Vice President, Program & Analysis, ACE
Alicia M. Bardwell, Student
Tommy Barham, President, ULM Foundation
Richard Baxter, Vice President, University Advancement
Don Beach, Benefactor
Robert Beason, Dept Chair
Dennis Bell, Faculty
Jennifer Belton, Student
Chuck Bennett, Alumnus
Ronald Berry, Dept Chair
Art Bethke, Graduate Faculty
Stephanie Blackmon, Dir, Human Resources
Sandra Blake, Faculty
Pat Blankenship, North Monroe Hospital
Benny Blaylock, Dept Chair
Jason Bluford, Student
Mikal Bonnal, Student
Sarah Marie Bonner, Student
Harold Bounds, Part-time Faculty
William Bourn, Dean
Karen Briski, Graduate Faculty
Debbie Brossett, Faculty
Debbie Brotherton, Dir, Soil-Plant Analysis Lab
Harry Brotherton, Dept Chair
Carlette Browder, Assoc Dir, Admissions
Courtney M. Brown, Student
Crystal Ann Bruchhaus, Student
Elsie Burkhalter, Board of Supervisors
Danielle D. Butler, Student
Jim Caldwell, Faculty Emeritus
Mike Camille, Faculty Senate
George Campbell, Senior Vice Pres, Regions Bank

Natalie Campbell, Student
George Cannon, Supt., Monroe City Schools
Mary Frances Caronis, Faculty
Holly Casey, Faculty
Monte Chapman, Benefactor
Joyce Choate, Assistant Dean
Sally Clausen, President, University of Louisiana System
James Cofer, President-elect, ULM
Susan Cole, Part-time Faculty
Charles Collier, External Auditor
Larry Cook, Student Dept Head, SGA
Lindsay Elaine Cook, Student
Jan Corder, Dean
Kelli D. Corley, Student
Rory Cornish, Dept Chair
Andre Coudrain, Chair of the Board of Supervisors
Walter Creekmore, Associate Dean
Michael Crider, Dept Chair
Pearson Cross, Faculty
Betty Cummins, Benefactor
Camille Currier, Administrative Staff
Kathy Davenport, Dept Chair
Bob Davidge, Board of Supervisors
Aikiah Gencie Davis, Student
Billy Davis, Student
Kathy Davis, Dept Chair
Sharee Lynn Davis, Student
Chris Dawson, Alumnus
Tom Deal, Owner, TV Station KARD
Sharon Denise Dee, Student
Kitty Degree, Benefactor
Rebecca DiCarlo, Dir, Library
John Drew, Part-time Faculty
Denise Duplechin, Dir, Career Services
Leslie Erin Dyess, Student
Robert Earle, Esquire
Virginia Eaton, Graduate Faculty

Virginia Eddleman, Associate Dean
Sue Edmonds, President, West Monroe West Ouachita Chamber of Commerce
Peggy Edwards, Associate Dean
Donna Eichhorn, Faculty
Robert Eisenstadt, Dept Chair
Susan Eller, Faculty
Larry Ellerman, Campus Security
Leilani E. Evans, Student
Heather Y. Ezell, Student
Carroll Falcon, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Louisiana System
Carlos Fandal, Dean
Joe Farr, Farr's Insurance Company, Foundation Officer
Joseph Feldhaus, Graduate Faculty
Judy Fellows, Benefactor
Richard Fewell, Ouachita Parish Sheriff
Valerie Fields, Dir, Student Development
Ray Ford, Benefactor
Stephen Fox, Faculty
Roy Frosten, General Manager, TV-8
Jeff Galle, Dept Chair
Jo Galle, Honor Faculty
Michael Gray, SGA President & Board of Supervisors Student Rep
Annie Jean Green, Student
Victor Lamar Green, Student
Frances Gregory, Assistant Dean
Fred Groves, Faculty
Janet Haedicke, Presidential Search Committee
Kayla Haltom, Student
Ashley Hammerbeck, Student
Jim Hardin, Benefactor
Brooke Nicole Harris, Student
Jesse Hartle, Student
Pat Hebert, Dept Chair
Patricia Helsel, Part-time Faculty
Marques Ray Hendrix, Student
Anna Hill, President, Faculty Senate
Ronald Hill, Graduate Faculty

William Hoefler, Dept Chair
Frank Hoffman, Part-time Faculty
Susan Hoffmann, Bank One
Helen Hogan, Dept Chair
Glenda Holland, Dept Chair
Linda Holyfield, Alumna
James Hood, Dean
Jeff Hood, Assoc Dir, Enrollment Services
Richard Hood, Executive Assistant to the President
Derren Paul Howard, Student
Gary Huckabay, Dir, Student Union
Remona Hudson, Faculty
David Irwin, Dean
Rusty Jabour, Dir of Strategy/Communications, University of Louisiana System
Rene Jackson, Dept Chair
Joe Jacobs, Benefactor
Artis Isaiah James, Student
Beverly Jarrell, Dept Chair
Peggy Jelks, Faculty
Ellie John, Part-time Faculty
Howard John, Part-time Faculty
Amie T. Johnson, Student
Bonnie Johnson, Faculty
Dale Johnson, Dean
Ellen Johnson, Graduate Faculty
Joanne C. Juett, Part-time Faculty
Sam Juett, Economic Development, City of Monroe
Paul Karlowitz, Dept Chair
Bette Kauffman, Dept Chair
Larry Kelley, Exe Dir, Univ Planning & Analysis
Tex Kilpatrick, Board of Supervisors
Rabbi David Kline, Part-time Faculty
John Knesel, Graduate Faculty
Mervin Kontrovitz, Dept Chair
Darrell Kruger, Faculty
Joe Lane, Part-time Faculty
Hank Largin, Dir, Sports Information

Penny Lawrence, Student
Greg Leader, Dept Chair
Cindy Leath, Coordinator, Annual Fund
Lynn LeBlanc, Dir, Climate Research Center
Douglas Lee, Asst Vice President, University of Louisiana System
Scott Legan, Graduate Faculty
Veronica Lewis, Faculty
Lynn Lincecum, Chair-elect, Annual Fund
Derle Long, Dir, Band
Jimmy Long, Board of Supervisors
David Loudon, Dept Chair
Otis LoVette, Graduate Faculty
Chip Lyman, Benefactor
Malcom Maddox, Regional Chairman, Hibernia National Bank
Dale Magoun, Dept Chair
Jay Marx, Benefactor
Trevor Melder, Faculty
Bill McConkey, Graduate Faculty
Charles McDonald, Dean
Megan Colleen McLellan, Student
Philip Medon, Associate Dean
George Mehaffy, Vice President, Academic Leadership & Change, AASCU
Nancy Meinel, Alumna
Lakeedra Renee Melancon, Student
Melissa Melancon, Graduate Faculty
Pat Melton, Dept Chair
Chris Michaelides, Faculty
Diane Miletello, Alumna
Carolyn Minder, Faculty
Saul Mintz, Benefactor
Sonia Miranda, Student
James Moore, Benefactor
Lynn Morris, Graduate Faculty
Ronnie Myrick, Foundation Board Member
Lewis Nabors, Faculty
Mark V. Nash, Student
Tom Nicholson, Benefactor

Dave Nicklas, Vice President for Finance and Administration, University of Louisiana System
Merrill Nicklas, Faculty Emeritus
Elmer Noah, Alumnus
Joni Noble, Part-time Faculty
Dave Norris, Mayor, West Monroe
Farren Victoria Norwood, Student
Bruce Olberding, Graduate Faculty
Mona Oliver, Faculty
Lea Olsan, Faculty
Ray Owens, Part-time Faculty
Eric Pani, Dean
Gail Parker, ULM Budget Officer
Keith Parker, Dept Chair
Michael Parker, Graduate Faculty
Tammy Parker, Faculty
Tiffany Michelle Pepper, Student
Ralph Perri, Dir, Financial Aid
Ashlyn Lynette Perrine, Student
Alcee Joseph Perry, Student
Frank Pezold, Associate Dean
Walter Pirron, Part-time Faculty
Brenda Poole, Student
Georgiann Potts, Dir, Marketing & Public Relations
Charles Pryor, Faculty
Clifford Pugh, Graduate Faculty
Gordon Pugh, Board of Supervisors
Morris Rabb, Alumnus
Tom Rakes, Provost
Bill Ramin, Dir, International Students
Dean Reardon, Graduate Faculty
Linda Reid, Dept Chair
Dan Reneau, President, Louisiana Tech University
John Rettenmeyer, Faculty
Gene Rice, President, AAHE
Stephen Richters, Dept Chair
Mignon Riley, Faculty
Trevor Tristian Riley, Student

George Roberts, Dept Chair
James Robertson, Registrar
Mahmoud Saffari, Vice President, Enrollment Management
Joe Saunders, Part-time Faculty
Sharmilee Sawant, Student
Azime Saydam, Faculty
Georg Schaeffer, Annual Fund Officer
Marvin Schulte, Graduate Faculty
Pam Shepherd, Benefactor
Justin Sherman, Faculty
Carl Shetler, Board of Supervisors
Kay Shipp, Alumna
Winfred Sibille, Board of Supervisors
Don Smith, Dean
Jerry Smith, CEO, St. Francis Medical Center
Ruth Smith, Dept Chair
Jonyelle Lashandra Snow, Student
Mark Somers, Graduate Faculty
Kathy Spurlock, Editor, *News Star*
Red Stevens, Councilman, Monroe City
Robert Stevens, Faculty
Ken Stickney, Editor, *News Star*
Daniel Strickland, Editor, *PowWow*
Gary Stringer, Faculty
Lawson Swearingen, Departing President, ULM
Gene Tarver, Councilman
Kim Taylor, Faculty
Carl Thameling, Graduate Faculty
Luke Thomas, Dept Chair
Laura Thompson, Graduate Faculty
Shelby G. Thompson, Student
Kim Tolson, Faculty
Robert Turner, Controller/Vice President Business Affairs
Martha Upshaw, Dept Chair
Mike Vining, Basketball Coach
Bruce Wampler, Associate Dean
Don Weems, Alumnus

Bill Weirick, Dir, Facilities and Planning
Dale Welch, Dept Chair
Jo Anne Welch, Graduate Faculty
Tom Whatley, Dir, Computing Center
Cathy Whipple, Part-time Faculty
Jack White, Professor Emeritus
Lawrence White, Alumnus
Glen Williams, Alumnus
Jeff Williams, Dept Chair
David Williamson, Dept Chair
Harold Williamson, Dept Chair
Cecile Willis, Purchasing Officer
Dawn Wilson, Asst Vice President for Planning and Student Affairs, and Spl Asst to the
President, University of Louisiana System
Mike Woods, Board of Supervisors
David Wright, Board of Supervisors
Amy Yates, Graduate Faculty
Arlen Zander, Faculty
Judy Zaunbrecher, President, Alumni Association
Seventeen Anonymous Faculty, Staff, Students and Townspeople

APPENDIX C
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT MONROE
REVIEW INTERVIEW W FORM

Name

Title

Date

We have been asked to review the condition of the University of Louisiana at Monroe. Please respond in terms of your impression of the following. Your answers will be kept in confidence.

1. GENERAL CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY (STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS)

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

3. TECHNOLOGY

4. FACULTY (QUALITY, MORALE, WORKLOAD, COMPENSATION, ET AL)

5. STUDENTS (CREDENTIALS, MORALE, AWARENESS, RACIAL, NATIONAL, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL)

6. ADMINISTRATION

7. SENIOR OFFICERS

8. BUDGET AND FINANCE (*EMPHASIZE THIS.*)

9. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

10. PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

11. ALUMNI AFFAIRS

12. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

13. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

14. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SYSTEM OFFICERS

15. COMPARATIVE CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY, DOCUMENTATION IF ANY

16. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

JLF 2002

APPENDIX D

Materials Used in the Review:

“Fisher Template”

Former President’s (ULM) Confidential Report

List of University of Louisiana System Board Members

ULM Organizational Chart

ULM Vision 2000 Excellence into the Next Century - Brochure

ULM Strategic Plan (2001-2006)

SACS Institutional Self-Study (1998-99) with Supplement Follow-up Plan

Report of the Reaffirmation Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1999)

Response to the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee (1998-99)

ULM First Follow-up Report (May 2000)

ULM Second Follow-up Report (May 2000)

Response to the Report of the Special Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (June 2001)

Progress Report on Finances (Submitted to SACS in Nov 2001)

ULM Faculty Handbook (updated Handbook found on Web at www.ulm.edu)

Business Operations Plan 2001 (Three-Year Budget Plan)

KPMG Consultant’s Report (Oct 2001)

ULM Capital Outlay Projects 2002-2003

Information Technology Assessment Report (Apr 2000) - Consultant Report from Collegis

Student Policies and Organizational Handbook

Schedule of Classes (Summer and Fall 2001, and Spring 2002)

President’s State of the University Address (Oct 2001)

ULM College of Education and Human Development Release

President’s Responses - 9/11/01

Various Campus Brochures

Recruitment Package

Student Surveys

Campus Publications

Media Coverage - News Articles (Jun-Dec 2001)

University Catalog

Rules of the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System

Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes (Jan 2000 - Aug 2001)

State of Louisiana Legislative Auditor Reports (1997-2001)

Success with ULS Booklet

Average Class Size

Faculty Student Ratio

APPENDIX E

Shared Governance: What It Is and What It Is Not

Although a University is a corporation, it is unlike a business and unique because of two conditions that have long and honored roots in higher education--academic freedom and shared governance. There are two primary documents that most accept as standards in these arenas: The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors and the Joint 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, which is the product of many different organizations. Except in extreme cases, these documents define two of the essential principles upon which modern American universities operate.

Some believe that it is not possible to have effective campus governance, or to have an effective president, if the sentiments of these two documents prevail. We disagree. The major problem on campuses that have had governance difficulties, and presidential failures, has not been with the actual concepts of academic freedom and shared governance. Rather, it is because many campus constituents (faculty, students, administrators, Board members, alumni) do not understand these principles and therefore become mired in conflict that is the product of other, locally developed governance designs that misinterpret the meanings of academic freedom and shared governance.

--The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure

The 1940 Statement was enacted after a series of joint conferences in the 1930s between representatives of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC). Subsequently, the 1940 Statement was endorsed by more than 100 professional organizations. Briefly, academic freedom means that faculty have freedom to pursue the truth as they see it in their teaching and research. It is a fundamental protection for teacher/scholars.

Faculty tenure sometimes is granted as a means of ensuring academic freedom and a sufficient degree of economic security to faculty such that they will be able to sustain their search for truth without inappropriate threats to their position and livelihood because of their views. Academic freedom, *per se*, does not depend upon the existence of the institution of faculty tenure. A gradually increasing number of institutions of higher education have adopted strong academic freedom policies (which have been given the support of law if formally adopted by a governing board and inserted into something similar to a faculty handbook) even while they do not grant tenure. Almost 20 percent of institutions of higher education have substituted some other arrangement such as term contracts for tenure. This is particularly true for faculty who hold appointments in professional schools. Some institutions grant guaranteed sabbatical leaves to continuing faculty who do not compete for tenure and others grant higher salaries to the same group. Our point here is not to endorse or criticize such arrangements, but rather to point out that academic freedom and tenure are not one in the same. One does not necessarily depend upon the

other even though historically they have been tightly associated with each other in American higher education.

In any case, when a faculty member is granted tenure, he/she may not be dismissed except for "adequate cause," or because of "extraordinary financial exigencies." It is customary to provide the faculty member with a one year notice in either of these circumstances. At most institutions, the dismissal of tenured faculty members is as rare as the proverbial hen's tooth, although meaningful "evaluation of tenured faculty" policies are being adopted by an ever larger set of institutions.

It is not commonly understood that the *1940 Statement* also details faculty responsibilities and places limitations upon a faculty member's academic freedom. For example, their academic freedom is "*subject to the adequate performance of their academic duties,*" and "*research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.*" Further, the *1940 Statement* adjures faculty to "*be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.*" And, they must take care to "*remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.*" Many faculty members forget these obligations and restraints and focus only on their right to profess the truth of their discipline as they see fit.

Thus, the notion that the institution of academic freedom gives faculty members license to say whatever they wish, wherever and whenever they wish, is false. The *1940 Statement* is a declaration of faculty rights *and* responsibilities.

--*The 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*

The *1966 Joint Statement*, which has been endorsed by ULM, actually is not "joint." It has been endorsed formally by the AAUP, but not by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) that were involved in its development. Rather, both stated that they "*recognized 'The Statement' as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective jobs of governing boards, faculties, and administrations*" and they "*commend it to institutions and governing boards.*" The *1966 Statement*, in any case, is not intended to serve as an exact blueprint for campus governance, and it is not the final authority when governance disputes occur. It is a good guide and reference.

The *1966 Statement* clearly includes faculty in the governance process and emphasizes their prime role and expertise in questions of academic standards and curricula. Nonetheless, in several places, it states unequivocally that the faculty "*recommends*" to the President, who then acts, or, in turn, "*recommends*" as necessary to the governing board. It speaks to the "*initiating capacity and decision-making participation*" of all institutional parties, and of differences in "*weight*" of each voice, depending upon the subject matter in question. For example, the weight of faculty advice in issues of academic standards and curricula should be much more influential than it is on issues that focus on financial matters.

The *1966 Statement* also warns of the possible debilitating nature of unilateral action on the part of presidents and commends the importance of adopted policies as a means to standardize understanding, procedures, responsibility, and authority in shared governance.

_____ **The *1966 Statement* states that the faculty's primary area of responsibility in shared governance is to determine the curriculum "after an educational goal has been established." But, even here, it carefully notes that the final institutional authority is reserved to the institutional president and the governing board.** Rarely, however, should a president substitute his/her judgment for that of the faculty and then only after extensive discussion and attempts to reconcile divergent views. Equally rarely should a governing board adopt an academic policy that has not been recommended by the faculty. Unless an emergency exists, or the president and faculty have been unresponsive, the governing board should ask the president and the faculty to reconsider the matter in question.

_____ The *1966 Statement* also recommends that faculty and, to a lesser degree, students be involved in long-range planning, decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources, budgeting, the appointment of a president, and the appointment of chief academic officers. Note that the *1966 Statement* says nothing about the evaluation of presidents or other institutional officers by the faculty.

The *1966 Statement* also assumes that the faculty, along with the governing board, "delegates authority" to the president. However, since faculty neither are the originating source of legal authority on a campus, nor have they usually been granted legal authority, they cannot function in this regard. **In the State of Louisiana, as in most other states, it is the governing board that holds all authority and grants all authority. The only way a faculty can delegate authority to a president is if it has been given that authority by the governing board, or even by the president after he/she has been delegated authority by the governing board.**

Faculty involvement in setting academic standards and determining curricula means that faculty should play the major role in determining requirements for degrees and in determining when those requirements have been met. Similarly, faculty should have the dominant voice in determining the curricula, methods of instruction, modes and evaluation of research, faculty status itself, and those aspects of student life that relate to the academic process. Even so, note the strong language of the *1966 Statement*:

On these matters, the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances; and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration

and further transmittal of its views to the president or the board.

Hence, it is clear that faculty recommend policies to the president and to the governing board. And, if a governing board chooses to delegate some decisions to the institution's president or to the faculty, it can just as easily choose to reverse that delegation. **In the 1966 Statement, as in the statutes of the State of Louisiana, the Board reigns supreme.** It does not follow, of course, that the fact that this power has both a legal basis, and roots in widely recognized governance principles, necessarily means that it has been, or will be, used wisely. Authority and wisdom are not the same.

The 1966 Statement does not call for direct, formal contact between the faculty and the governing board. Rather, it calls for faculty (and student) recommendations to the campus president, who represents the campus and who may or may not endorse these positions to the board. It calls for the president to convey "*faculty views, including dissenting views*" to the board and asks the president to inform faculty and students of the board's positions and actions.

Further, while the *1966 Statement* calls for communication between and among faculty, president, and the governing board, it does not ask for faculty or student membership of the board itself, as is the case with students in Louisiana.

_____ **As a matter of fact, many governing boards (as well as some presidents and faculty) have misunderstood the 1966 Statement's call for faculty participation in decision-making as a plea for the close association between faculty members and governing boards. This misunderstanding has resulted in numerous instances of "advisory boards" and "communication devices" designed to "improve communication," and this is the situation with both faculty and students in Louisiana. Each, however, usually compromises the role and ability of the campus president, who can only stand by as faculty members and students pass him/her by and go directly to the board. Such advisory boards and communications committees are an almost foolproof recipe for an ineffectual president, weak leadership, and governance arguments. The Board of Supervisors should ponder this issue.**

_____The point is not that faculty and students should never talk with members of a governing board. Instead, the point is that they should do so through the campus president and with his/her endorsement. To do otherwise is to encourage the development of multiple campus voices, each of which purports to "*speak for the University.*" There is no basis in the *1966 Statement* either for faculty or student membership on a governing board, or for independent faculty and student contact with the board that has not been routed through the president.

In sum, shared governance does not mean faculty, students, the president, and the governing board are somehow "*equal*" in their expertise, vantage points, or authority. **In fact, the principles of governance outlined in the *1966 Statement* make it clear faculty and students make recommendations to the campus president on all matters, even while it acknowledged the salient role and primary expertise of faculty in matters relating to academic standards and curricula. In turn, the campus president is charged with representing all points of view on the campus, not just his/her own, when he/she carries policy recommendations to the governing board. There is no basis in the *1966 Statement* for direct, continuous faculty and student contact with the governing board except as it is routed through, and regulated by, the president. Few principles associated with our academic traditions have been more misunderstood, and more misapplied, than these.**