

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

REVIEW

NOVEMBER 2005 - JANUARY 2006

**James L. Fisher, Ltd**

Gene A. Budig, former Chancellor, University of Kansas and  
former Commissioner of the American Baseball League  
James V. Koch, Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and  
President Emeritus, Old Dominion University  
Alvin J. Schexnider, Interim President, Norfolk State University and  
Former Chancellor, Winston-Salem State University  
Kenneth A. Shaw, Chancellor Emeritus and  
University Professor, Syracuse University and  
Former President, University of Wisconsin System  
Martha W. Tack, Professor of Educational Leadership and  
Former Senior Executive for Presidential Initiatives, Eastern Michigan University  
Farris W. Womack, former Vice President of Finance, University of Michigan and  
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill  
Michael Worth, former Vice President for Development, George Washington University and  
Director of Development, University of Maryland College Park  
James L. Fisher, Chair, Review Team  
**James L. Fisher, Ltd**  
January 27, 2006

## Table of Contents

**Recommendations are numbered and in bold print throughout the text .**

Introduction.....	Chapter I, p.1
Overview.....	Chapter II, p.3
Academic Programs.....	Chapter III, p.16
Technology.....	Chapter IV, p.23
Faculty.....	Chapter V, p.26
Students.....	Chapter VI, p.36
Strategic Planning.....	Chapter VII, p.46
Administrative Organization and Personnel.....	Chapter VIII, p.48
Budget and Finance.....	Chapter IX, p.52
Intercollegiate Athletics.....	Chapter X, p.58
Institutional Advancement.....	Chapter XI, p.66
Auburn University Montgomery.....	Chapter XII, p.74
Governance.....	Chapter XIII, p.81
Senior Officers.....	Chapter XIV, p.108
The Next President.....	Chapter XV, p.112
Members of the Review Team.....	Appendix A, p.115
Interviewees.....	Appendix B, p.120
Interview Form.....	Appendix C, p.125
Index of Materials Used in the Review.....	Appendix D, p.128
Suggested Auburn University Board of Trustees Code of Ethics.....	Appendix E, p.129
Auburn University Board of Trustees Audit Committee Charter.....	Appendix F, p.130
“The Enlightened Board”.....	Appendix, G, p.132
<i>The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure</i> .....	Appendix H, p.137
<i>The 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities</i> .....	Appendix I, p.145

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

On December 12-16, 2005, a team of eight higher education professionals, none of whom have any present or past association with Auburn University (AU), reviewed the general condition of the university (Appendix A). The Review included assessing materials and conducting interviews from November 18, 2005 through January 27, 2006.

The purpose of the Review was: 1) To assist the Board of Trustees in assessing the condition of the university; 2) To advise on the attitudes of university constituencies; 3) To candidly identify and address issues and opportunities affecting the university; 4) To recommend a tentative agenda for the future which could be used as a tentative strategic plan; 5) To recommend to the Board of Trustees more efficient and effective governance premises and a more legitimate Presidency; 6) To assist the Search Committee in establishing Presidential criteria; 7) To be of value to prospective Presidential candidates; and 8) To help the Board and the Search Committee assess and illuminate conditions that would make the Presidency more attractive to first-rate candidates.

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

- General condition of Auburn
- Academic programs
- Faculty
- Students
- Administration
- Technology
- Budget and finance
- Intercollegiate athletics
- Fund-raising
- Public relations
- Governance
- Other issues and conditions presented during the course of this Review.

The team also focused on problems and prospects facing the next President and his or her most desirable characteristics.

Before beginning interviews, team members read and evaluated materials assembled by Auburn staff and confidential position papers prepared by the Interim President and the chief academic and chief financial officers. All counted, interviews and groups included over 250 persons including faculty, students, staff, alumni, elected/appointed officials, area residents, local business persons, members of the Board, benefactors, and potential benefactors, professionals at the

regional and national levels, persons selected because of special knowledge and randomly selected persons (Appendix B). Interviewees were selected based on position, stratified random sample, and random sample. All private interviews were confidential and followed a general format that included 19 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**

Auburn University is a bustling institution that enrolls 23,400 students on its main campus in Auburn, Alabama and an additional 5,400 students on a smaller regional urban campus in Montgomery (AUM). A prototype flagship, land-grant public Carnegie Research Extensive institution that will spend \$664 million in 2005-2006, Auburn is widely regarded as a strong institution with numerous points of pride---among them some enviably strong academic programs, laudably extensive public service outreach, significant research and development activity, and an extremely loyal set of alumni.

The university on its main campus attracts students whose standardized test scores easily exceed both national and southern averages and in 2005, 31 percent of entering freshmen ranked in the top ten percent of their high school graduating classes. At the graduate level, Auburn is the alma mater of six American astronauts.

Founded in 1856 as the East Alabama Male College, Auburn originally was affiliated with the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The institution's first building was constructed in 1859; however, the College languished until 1872, when it became a public Morrill Act land-grant institution (the first in the South) and was refashioned as the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama. There ensued many decades of enrollment and programmatic growth. In 1899, the institution was renamed Alabama Polytechnic Institute but it was not until 1960 that it became the familiar Auburn University we know today. Auburn's Montgomery campus began operation formally in 1967.

Today's Auburn University offers academic programs in 13 distinct colleges and schools on the main campus. The university's offerings are exceedingly comprehensive and include business, education, engineering, law, pharmacy, social work and veterinary medicine. Slightly more than 80 percent of the institution's main campus students are pursuing a baccalaureate degree. These students are predominantly full-time (92 percent) and 68 percent come from Alabama. In contrast to most institutions nationally, a majority of Auburn's undergraduates is male (almost 52 percent) and relatively young (the mean age of an Auburn undergraduate is 21, substantially below the national average). The undergraduate student body is not notably diverse, with Caucasians

accounting for approximately 88 percent of all undergraduates (the situation is quite different at AUM, as we note below).

Traditionally, Auburn has exhibited academic prowess in a variety of engineering disciplines and may still be the first and only institution in the country to offer a major in the wireless aspects of electrical and computer engineering. The most recent *U.S. News and World Report* college issue ranked Auburn's engineering programs collectively 67<sup>th</sup> in the nation.\* In recent years, the university's business programs have vaulted forward in terms of quality; *U.S. News* ranked them a commendable 57<sup>th</sup> in the nation and *Forbes* ranked them 53rd. This is one of the reasons that 28 percent of all undergraduates on the main campus choose to major in a business discipline. External authorities also have good things to say about several of Auburn's liberal arts programs, notably history and economics (which actually is located in the business school). Auburn offers more than 130 baccalaureate degree programs, 64 masters programs and 40 doctoral programs.

Auburn's student body always has evinced a perceptible preference for academic programs that have well-identified occupational and vocational outcomes. An alumna might have been speaking for many, when she put it to us, "*One of the reasons you attend Auburn is to obtain the credentials necessary to get a good job.*" The prosperity of agriculture, architecture, engineering, business, education, the health sciences, and specialty majors such as aviation management and logistics reflect this inclination.

Similarly, at the graduate level, both the university's strengths and student enrollment mirror such general preferences, though over the years Auburn has visibly increased its commitment to many humanities disciplines, and the social and behavioral sciences. Fully four percent of Auburn undergraduates, for example, chose to major in psychology. By nearly any standard, the university is a broader and more diverse institution today than it was even twenty years ago.

Despite a set of public difficulties, Auburn is financially sound, not overly burdened by debt and maintains a strong bond rating. Whatever other difficulties the institution has experienced, its financial standing has never been in question. Further, both the main campus and the Montgomery

---

\* The reader should bear in mind that such rankings are questionable. However, they are used in countless college and university publications.

campus are attractive and well-maintained. *"The campus now is beautiful and we appreciate this,"* praised a mid-level administrator on the main campus.

One cannot tour either campus without emerging with a sense of an institution that is expanding. Numerous capital projects have been completed in recent years and more are on the way. The 2005-2006 budget contains \$94.8 million in anticipated capital expenditures and another \$36.5 million in 2006-2007.

Auburn students tend to be enthusiastic about the institution. *"This is a great place!"* commented a senior business major, while a junior education major was full of praise for Auburn's teacher education programs, which have provided her with early opportunities to observe and participate in actual K-12 classroom situations. *"By the time we graduate, most of us are ready to die for Auburn,"* commented a chemistry major with perhaps a bit of exaggeration. *"I'm really impressed with the time most faculty are willing to spend with me,"* enthused a mechanical engineering sophomore.

One reason for Auburn's continuing popularity is its moderate cost, at least when compared to the typical flagship, land-grant institution nationally. *Kiplinger's* magazine recognized this when it recently named Auburn one of its best buys in higher education.

A portion of the pleasure that undergraduate students associate with Auburn and their apparent commitment to the institution is related to Auburn's intercollegiate athletic teams, especially football and basketball. Many (though not all) Auburn students revel in the university's competition inside the Southeastern Conference (SEC) and appear to derive considerable satisfaction from the conviviality connected to attending athletic contests and following the Tigers. On occasion, students are a bit defensive about the role of intercollegiate athletics and mutter that *"The football team runs the place,"* but a clear majority seems to regard the SEC milieu as an important part of their overall educational experience. And, they often have the pleasure of rooting for winning teams. Auburn has won numerous SEC championships in many different men's and women's sports, but especially baseball, basketball, football, swimming and diving, and track and field.

There are several objective quantitative measures of student satisfaction. Freshmen retention was 85 percent in 2004; 65 percent of Auburn freshmen graduate within six years, a number that compares favorably with most public institutions in the SEC. This retention performance is outstanding, for given Auburn's funding, student characteristics and the like, this exceeds *U.S. News'* predicted retention rate by fully 13 percent. No doubt this helps explain why Auburn recently finished first among public institutions in Alabama in terms of surveyed student satisfaction.

That said, once those students depart from their alma mater, only 10.9 percent [Council for Aid to Education] of the institution's alumni base contributes financially to the institution on an annual basis. This is well below what one might expect of a flagship, land-grant state university. Nonetheless, though still in the "quiet phase," the Auburn's capital campaign for \$500 million is progressing well. This suggests extraordinary untapped potential.

The typical new Auburn freshman student achieves a score of 24 on the American College Test (ACT), which places them well above the national average of 20.9. Indeed, Auburn's student body academically is the best qualified in Alabama. Nevertheless, the performance of Auburn seniors on national examinations that are used by professional schools in areas such as business, law and medicine are only average.

Auburn's outreach activities are impressive. The Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station and the Alabama Cooperative Extension System lead the way for 1,000 or more programs and thrusts that extend the university's impact. The university's student-led War on Hunger has justifiably garnered international attention.

The faculty is large (more than 1,300) and generally well qualified. As many as 96 percent of full-time faculty hold appropriate terminal degrees in their discipline and hundreds have achieved national recognition for the quality of their research, published scholarship and performances. While Auburn faculty have a variety of gripes about their institution that sometimes fester in the hot house atmosphere of a small university town, and although the University Senate has voted "no confidence" in the President or the Board of Trustees several times (most recently in 2001), as a group faculty are loyal, committed and hard-working. "*All things considered, this place really has been good to me,*" commented a tenured liberal arts faculty member who on occasion has crossed



swords with the administration. The typical faculty member is dismayed by the bad publicity Auburn has received on a rather continuous basis in recent years, and by what faculty perceive to be unfortunate administrative decisions. *“We’re saddened by what the Board has done to our institution,”* commented a faculty member to the accompaniment of many nodding heads. Other faculty expressed variations of this senior faculty member’s opinion, *“The Senate does not represent our views and persists in causing trouble with the Board and the administration.”* Another senior faculty member opined, *“But, these issues have not affected what we do in our classrooms and labs.”* Representative of the views of many other faculty, he continued, *“I’m really impressed with my colleagues. Most of them are first class. We have a few laggards, but the typical faculty member here is talented and productive.”*

Faculty morale at Auburn is mixed, but improving. Late in the course of this Review, we received copies of a 2002 survey of faculty, staff and administrative morale conducted in conjunction with the Southern Association of College and Schools (SACS) review of the university. Given the circumstances, this survey predictably revealed major morale problems and almost disastrous levels of distrust among several of the most important university constituencies. Clearly, circumstances on campus and inside the Board of Trustees have changed since then, usually for the better. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to regard these survey results as irrelevant, for they represent heartfelt concerns and feelings. Equally however, it would be unwise to assume that the same results would be generated were a similar survey to be undertaken in 2006. Morale has improved, though nearly all agree the university has a long way to travel before campus relationships can be considered normal and trust rebuilt.

**(1) In this vein, several interviewees suggested that a faculty club on campus would enhance relationships between faculty and administration. While faculty, staff and administrators do informally gather on campus, especially in the Auburn Hotel and Conference Center, a faculty club may be an idea that should be considered.**

Auburn University is a good academic institution with a host of reputable, nationally accredited programs. Some of these programs have received national and international recognition. Its achievements are many. Still, when one takes a more Olympian view of the university, it appears to fit into the *“good, but not great”* category (the words of a national higher education leader). The president of a peer institution commented, *“They’ve never really been able to turn the*

*corner at Auburn. They're doing lots of nice things, in fact some excellent things, but no one yet would put them into the elite group of land-grant institutions nationally, or even in the South."* Said a former land-grant university president, *"They're a big ship that is bobbing along comfortably, but they are not really approaching their potential. They're in the middle of the pack in nearly everything."* A knowledgeable member of the Board of Trustees offered much the same view and assigned Auburn's academic programs an overall grade of "C+."

Thus, *U.S. News* ranks Auburn 85<sup>th</sup> among national universities and 38<sup>th</sup> among public universities. Both of these rankings are nothing to be sneezed at. Still, they place AU in the middle of the pack among "east of the Mississippi, south of Virginia" public land-grant institutions. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill at 27<sup>th</sup>, Georgia Tech at 38<sup>th</sup>, Florida at 50<sup>th</sup>, Georgia at 58<sup>th</sup> and North Carolina State at 78<sup>th</sup> lead Auburn. Tennessee is tied with Auburn for 85<sup>th</sup>. Alabama (104<sup>th</sup>), Florida State (109<sup>th</sup>) and Kentucky (120<sup>th</sup>) trail it among the institutions in *U.S. News'* Category I and II institutions. While one should not confuse the *U.S. News* rankings with judgments issuing from God, they are generally useful indicators.

Similarly, where research and development activities are concerned, Auburn ranked 102<sup>nd</sup> nationally in FY 2003, trailing all of the above institutions plus others such as Clemson, Louisiana State and Mississippi State. When the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (2 December 2005) listed the 54 top institutions in 2004 in terms of their licensing and patent revenue, Auburn did not make that list, though Florida, Florida State, Georgia, Georgia Tech, North Carolina State, North Carolina Chapel Hill, Mississippi and Clemson did. Even so, Auburn did generate more than \$5 million via technology transfer this past year and has developed a set of especially productive research areas, including asphalt research, cellular and molecular biosciences, food technology and safety, fisheries and aquaculture, forestry, fuel cell research, information technology and poultry. The new research park the university formally initiated by shoveling spades of dirt in November 2005 eventually should provide stimulus to these efforts.

Other measures could be adduced to lend support to the notion that Auburn University is good, but not great. A dean captured this notion when he commented, *"As a university, we often perform well, but we certainly can do lots better if we get our act in order."*

**(2) Our view, based upon the individuals to whom we have talked both on- and off-campus, the materials we have read, and external rankings we have seen, is that the institution has underperformed in recent decades relative to its overall potential. The reasons for this are many, but problems of leadership, governance and perception feature prominently on that list. Fundamental reforms, visible to all, are necessary if this situation is to be reversed. Reformulating governance, followed by the appointment of a strong, visionary and exceptional new President from outside of the institution are the two primary needs.**

There is little argument that the university's tribulations over the past decade or more have injured its reputation and diminished the perception of numerous members of the public of its intrinsic worth. There has been excessive turnover in the presidency and the other key positions such as the Provost. It is almost unheard of for a flagship, land-grant institution of higher education to be placed on probation by its regional accrediting agency (in this case, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, SACS).

The Board of Trustees is widely perceived to be dominated by one individual and several newspapers have editorialized in favor of that member's immediate resignation. Our investigations suggest this Board member (Mr. Robert "Bobby" Lowder) did overstep his appropriate Trustee role on multiple occasions in the past and that he permitted and even encouraged the notion that he was the power behind the scenes at Auburn. Perceptions persist that Mr. Lowder *"has a financial hold over other Trustees"* and even over some members of the university's staff. Bobby Lowder is clearly a "lightning rod"

We were advised that several current members of the Board of Trustees have, or have had, significant business associations with Mr. Lowder; although, third-party investigations concluded that those associations did not place the independence of these Trustees in serious question. Nor did we discover any evidence that any trustee had voted against his/her will because of Mr. Lowder's influence, though by their very nature, such circumstances would be difficult to detect. Further, we were advised that among the Governor's criteria for recent Board appointments was a prospective Board member's ability to exercise independent judgment. And, numerous interviewees reported that the most recent appointments, Charles McCrary and Samuel Ginn, are highly regarded and clearly independent. Many feel these new developments, taken together, significantly diminish concerns prompted by past behavior. And, to the consternation of some, it is significant to note that

during the course of this Review, no current university officers, including administrators, faculty, members of the Athletic Department, or others, reported that Mr. Lowder had attempted recently to influence them inappropriately or to micromanage in any way. Nor were there any concerns about his commitment to Auburn, his intelligence, his attendance at Board meetings or his preparation.

***Whatever, in the majority of interviews, both in group and private sessions, persons unequivocally stated words to the effect that Auburn's problems would be solved by "getting rid of Bobby Lowder." This certain admonition was stated from virtually every quarter both on and off-campus: faculty, alumni, benefactors and potential benefactors, persons associated with other institutions and associations.***

Yes, this single-minded position is naïve, because Mr. Lowder has had rather little impact on Auburn's admissions standards, its only moderate research funding levels, Auburn students' distinctly average performance on national examinations, and similar performance variables. On the other hand, he has given the university significant gifts and reportedly has been influential in increasing AU's operating and capital budgets. While certain of Mr. Lowder's actions over time can and should be criticized, it is also true that he has become a convenient scapegoat for any and all of Auburn's problems and shortcomings. And, to paraphrase Shakespeare, often the blame lies not with him, but instead with other members of Auburn's on- and off-campus constituencies.

**(3) With all of this controversy, it would not be surprising for Mr. Lowder to step down and become an emeritus Board member (Auburn University By-Laws, Chapter II, Section 1.7). While this would immediately improve external perceptions, one must also bear in mind that he has done many good things for Auburn and could be a very valuable asset if he honors accepted university governance principles. Should he continue on the Board, he (and others) must forswear old ways of doing things and set out on a new course as suggested in this Review and a proposed Code of Ethics in Appendix E. This Review, which was unanimously supported by the Board, notably including Mr. Lowder, is a sign they are prepared to do this. In any event, the substantive issues facing the university must be addressed without historic rancor from any party.**

**(4) An important point: one of the most revealing aspects of the interviews was the notion that only others had to change. When asked if they believed that the internecine**

**warfare was detrimental to Auburn, all agreed, but believed that the efforts to fix the situation had to come from other parties. At Auburn, all “representative” groups must change both in terms of constitutional premises and attitude!**

The Interim President, a veteran state educational official, is regarded as principled, savvy and shrewd, and an individual who did not turn out to be the “*stand still, do nothing,*” or “*under the thumb*” administrator many thought he would be. Indeed, Dr. Ed Richardson came to campus with an action agenda that placed strong emphasis on the removal of the SACS probation. He soon succeeded in doing so and deserves great praise for this. In other arenas, he has moved forward so vigorously that this has made a variety of constituencies uncomfortable. For example, he is filling high-level administrative positions that some feel should be left to the new President and he has pushed forward with strategic planning and a possible reorganization of the university's programs in agriculture. A frequently voiced worry is that his actions will foreclose the legitimate vision and options of the next President and/or that this signifies that “*the Interim President seeks to become the permanent President.*” Nearly all members of the Auburn community are grateful to him for his contributions and effort, but believe that the university now needs an outside president who is generated by an uncompromised national search.

As noted above, the Board does not have a healthy image. “*In the past, the Board of Trustees has been full of sycophants,*” is the charge of a higher education leader who also alleged that, “*possible conflicts of interest have existed*” on the Board. “*Even if they’re not legal conflicts of interest, they look bad and demolish the image that the Board and its friends are operating in the best interests of the university. It’s not easy to reclaim a clean image once that perception gets around.*” Further, the reports about financial relationships between Board members, and even university staff, invite serious questions.

**(5) Hence, the perception abounds that undesirable connections and conflicts exist even though the Board has adopted a Conflict of Interest policy. The problem is that the Policy does not address some of the issues that plausibly could exist.**

Some Board actions over time have received national attention. The perception is widespread that the Board often is willing to override academic judgments and that it frequently engages in micromanagement. A frequent example proffered in this regard is the belief that a

previous Board forced the adoption of a grade forgiveness policy over the objections of academic administrators in order that said policy could be used to keep athletes eligible. Another example relates to the allegation that a previous Board forced the adoption of an admissions exception policy that could be used to admit to specific colleges applicants put forward by the Board members.

**(6) We neither mean to suggest that we are in command of all the facts that relate to such situations, nor do we intend to offer our own view on who was right and wrong. Rather, we wish to underline that in nearly every case, Auburn emerged a loser after these events. Perception becomes reality. Locally, the effects have been poisonous; nationally, the examples have been unfortunate. The reality is that many of Auburn's internal quarrels and governance machinations have been reported by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *New York Times* and similar national media outlets. Like it or not, one cannot consistently have issues with the likes of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), SACS and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) without sustaining reputational injuries. This must cease and the Board and the next President should lead the way to a more rational and less contentious course.**

**(7) A senior administrator observed to us that both the Board and the Faculty Senate seem to have difficulty differentiating between policy-making (the Board's legitimate function) and management (the legitimate province of the administration). One area where tension has arisen as a result is with respect to the composition and revision of the main campus *Faculty Handbook*. There should be no question whether the Board has the legal authority to approve the content of the *Handbook*; it has that legal authority, however, that authority should be exercised through the accountable President. A board should not be directly involved with the faculty handbook. While a faculty handbook should be an extension of the university bylaws, the handbook should be the product of a faculty and administration working together. At Auburn, the salient question is the extent to which the President should honor the advice of the University Senate. The general answer, which we develop in greater detail in a section below, is that the President ordinarily should defer to the judgment of the faculty when academic issues are being considered, but need not give the same deference to faculty views when other topics are at issue (for example, those dealing with finances and facilities).**

Intercollegiate athletics, and especially football, at Auburn are often perceived outside of Alabama to be “*out of control*.” This notion has two variants. The first relates to behavior at and around football games. Weekend home football behavior has been representatively characterized as “*an alcohol party*” that begins as early as Wednesday when RVs and other vehicles are allowed to park in designated areas. We were told this is actually an improvement over what used to hold true.

On the weekend of the November 2005 Alabama game, five students were stabbed and there were several assaults, one rape, thirteen incidents involving leaving the scene of an accident, plus numerous driving under the influence charges. News stories of these events hardly evoked images of a bucolic football weekend on a liberal arts campus. An elected official commented, “*The administration says it is concerned about all this, but they really don't do much to stop it. Perhaps it's gotten too big for them to stop.*” Further, the almost narcotic economic effects of huge football crowds have caused many local business leaders and officials to turn their heads away when outrageous behavior occurs. Nevertheless, when a typical football weekend generates \$70,000 or more in campus damages that must be repaired, something is well off kilter.

**(8) Although recent efforts have been mounted to monitor and control football game behavior, the existing plan should be refined and individual persons should be held responsible for both its preparation and enforcement.**

The second aspect of “out of control” relates to recurring violations. Auburn has been placed on probation by the NCAA many times and currently is on probation because of violations pertaining to its men's basketball program. The interest of boosters and even members of the Board of Trustees in athletics at times “*have been suffocating*” (the view of a national journalist) and “*have compromised our academic mission*” (the view of many faculty).

**(9) A recent (27 November 2005) article in the *New York Times* disclosing that Auburn was one of eleven universities to accept student-athletes who graduated from a high school the *Times* termed “*a storefront operation*” did nothing to dispel “out of control” notions. The athletic administration responded that these athletes were “NCAA qualifiers” and hence could be admitted. Auburn should tread thoughtfully here as it considers “specials” who are qualified, “partials” and “non-qualifiers.” For instance, is Auburn taking too many “partials”**

**and “non-qualifiers”? NCAA eligibility, after all, does not constitute a very high standard and is conspicuously below the university's usual admissions standards.**

**(10) The bogus high school situation came on the top of many other incidents, including the infamous and embarrassing airplane ride by several of the university’s leaders (including Board members) to Louisville to recruit a football coach and had not received permission from the University of Louisville to talk to its coach. In the past (before the appointment of the Interim President), legitimate questions existed about whether the President of the university truly was in charge of intercollegiate athletics and whether he actually could fire a prominent coach if that coach were a rule breaker or an embarrassment. Abolition of the Board's athletics committee was a good step in the direction of restoring institutional integrity on these issues, but more remains to be done. These incidents need to become ancient history. The able new athletic director, a new President and an enlightened Board of Trustees have the ability to engender this development. The truth is many aspects of Auburn’s intercollegiate athletic programs are noteworthy. Graduation rates, for example, exceed those of many other institutions and in recent years AU has taken firm steps to integrate athletes into the academic side of the institution.**

Still, whatever one might make of the events that have trailed Auburn like a plague, it is hard to deny that they do damage to Auburn’s reputation. Plausibly, this is one reason why Auburn’s “peer evaluation” rating in the annual *U.S. News* survey (3.0 out of 5.0) is substantially lower than those accorded many other flagship, land-grant public universities that it seeks to emulate. Sustained adverse national publicity cannot be helpful to anyone or anything at Auburn. Further, the negative spin-off from the unenviable portions of the university’s recent past is evident in Presidential Consultant John Kuhnle’s report. Dr. Kuhnle concluded, *“For a successful Presidential search to take place, the current perception of Auburn will need to be overcome.”*

Hence, even though the university’s overall performance is strong and admirable in many categories, its reputation has been debilitated by a series of events, many of which have occurred in the past ten years. In many cases, it is the structure and governance of the institution that is at fault. In other cases, it is the institution’s traditions and culture (one external observer suggested that Auburn was “early 20<sup>th</sup> century” in its thinking about governance). In still other cases, individual misdeeds and ill-informed judgments are the villain, though the Board's structure and regulations



appear in many situations to abet these mistakes. In yet other cases, mediocre leaders have not challenged the institution to live up to its potential.

**(11) None of the aforementioned deficiencies is incurable. The university's structure, rules, and regulations can be, and should be, changed. Similarly, the culture of Auburn can be altered, albeit only over time, if enlightened leaders on- and off-campus truly make the decision to do so and subsequently do not vacillate. Further, unwise decisions and unfortunate directions can be reviewed and revised, presumably under the leadership of an energetic, visionary and highly capable new President who has the unmistakable support of a newly enlightened Board of Trustees.**

**(12) Change, indeed major change, is absolutely required if Auburn University is to attract a stable of highly qualified Presidential candidates. The message to all constituencies must be unmistakable---that the Board and the campus have turned a visible corner. Auburn must seek, appoint, compensate and support a new President from outside of the campus who has not been ground down and co-opted by recent events, or neutered by the institution's long-standing, often arcane ways of doing business. To be sure, that new President must understand and respect the traditions of Auburn and its numerous strengths. He/she cannot be a bull in the china shop and must recognize and appreciate what some term "*the Auburn way*." Still, this President must be capable of embarking on a new path, unencumbered by past history and wounds, and have the courage to navigate strong winds.**

### III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Auburn offers more than 130 baccalaureate degree programs, 64 masters programs and 40 doctoral programs. These programs are offered in thirteen colleges and schools on the main campus. The university's offerings are exceedingly comprehensive and include business, education, engineering, law, pharmacy, social work and veterinary medicine. Auburn has earned disciplinary accreditations in virtually every academic discipline where such approval is available.

It is commonly agreed on both campuses that in past years the evaluation of the university's academic programs was rather lax. Programs "*simply flowed along like Old Man River*" (the assertion of a dean) never stopping, unless some public disaster arose, or student enrollment disappeared. There are signs that this situation is being remedied and even reversed, though it still is too soon to say whether the current emphasis on rigorously assessing and even eliminating academic programs will persist.

**(13) Interim President Richardson has placed the influence of his office behind the evaluation of academic programs, as has Provost Heilman, who bears most of the responsibility for ensuring that it actually occurs. One of the focal points of this analysis has been the university's academic programs and outreach efforts in agriculture and related disciplines. We recommend this analysis continue and that great care be taken to incorporate faculty and constituent input into the process, but that no decisions are reached until the new President has had sufficient opportunity to review them. This need not represent a great delay, as it is obvious that it will take considerable time and effort to consult with agricultural interests, on- and off-campus.**

Based upon our conversations with experts external to the campus, we are inclined to agree with those who believe that some of Auburn's agricultural programs may be out of date. To be sure, the nature of agriculture in the United States and Alabama has changed dramatically over the years and it is not always clear that the university's programs, research and outreach have adjusted accordingly. Thus, it is quite appropriate that the university now reassess what it is doing in agriculture and related disciplines and think about how it might structure its activities more

effectively. The university must become much more future oriented rather than reflecting where agriculture, resource extraction, conservation, forestry and similar activities have been in the past.

**(14) Yet, to be fair, the need to assess academic programs is not confined to agriculture. Auburn does boast a group of academic programs that legitimately are nationally ranked. However, most programs are not nationally ranked by recognized authorities and there has been a tendency to equate program size with program excellence. Main campus undergraduate teacher and graduate school administrator education programs provide useful examples in this regard. They are big, but are they also excellent? How do we know? We applaud the move toward the assessment of academic programs and strongly recommend that the process continue. The assessments should involve external experts who do not have any vested connections to Auburn University as well as reliance upon appropriate statistical measures such as research and publishing productivity, alumni satisfaction, external funding, employer satisfaction, and the like.**

### **Core General Education Program**

The first thing to note about Auburn's general education program is that much of it reflects a set of State of Alabama curricular requirements that originally were designed to reduce the difficulties encountered by the graduates of the state's numerous two-year colleges when they transferred to the state's four-year public institutions.

Auburn's core undergraduate curriculum consists of 13 courses and 41 semester hours. Its special strength resides in its writing and literature requirements, where four courses are mandated.

Each college or school specifies in the *Bulletin* what courses its students should take throughout the usual undergraduate four years at Auburn. In many cases, this advice/set of requirements includes very few electives that would permit a student to sample areas of the university not usually associated with her major. This is a national phenomenon that is a logical result of powerful disciplinary accrediting agencies that impose their wills upon institutional curricula.

We are distressed to see that many, perhaps most students, at Auburn are able to earn a baccalaureate degree without showing some mastery of a foreign language. Auburn's students will graduate into a world that is increasingly global in character. Whether it is markets, finance, culture, agriculture, military affairs, health, law, or the environment, the international implications of individual, group and national actions cannot be denied. Who at Auburn will communicate with 1.3 billion Chinese, or 1.1 billion Asian Indians, or with an approximately equivalent number of individuals world-wide whose first language is Spanish? Spanish already is the second language of the United States and has become the de facto first language in many locations. Auburn University graduates should not be tongue tied in the face of these developments.

We strongly encourage Auburn to thoughtfully reconsider its general education requirements and, among others, the following recommendations:

**(15) Auburn is shortchanging its students if they do not have some ability to communicate with, or understand, a foreign language. A language is the primary repository of a culture. Despite the many excellent international exchange programs that Auburn makes available to its students, it is, in effect, telling its students that they need not really worry about understanding other cultures, or even being able to communicate with the largest minority group in the country. We recommend that Auburn require foreign language study (or demonstrated competence) of all candidates for baccalaureate degrees. To do otherwise is to deny the nature of the world in which Auburn students will live and compete.**

Similarly, it is possible for an Auburn undergraduate degree recipient to graduate without ever having taken a course that deals explicitly with gender, race, or other cultures (though the two world literature courses could perhaps fill this bill). Many of the same arguments apply as were true for foreign language mastery, though here we note that gender and race introduce different considerations as well.

**(16) We recommend that all Auburn undergraduates either be required to complete one course that deals explicitly with gender, race and other cultures, or that the world literature courses are reformulated to include explicit coverage of these topics. Note that we are not calling for courses that propound only one point of view, or which impart politically correct propaganda. Indeed, we would expect to see a variety of viewpoints and approaches**

represented. We are, however, insistent that Auburn students should think critically about these issues at some time in their undergraduate careers.

(17) Another hole in Auburn's numerous undergraduate curricula is the absence of a computer/Internet literacy course. Understanding how computers work and their potential for good and evil, being able to utilize fundamental word processing and spreadsheet programs, and being able to utilize the Internet and having an understanding of concepts such as search and data mining---these are almost irreducible fundamentals to enlightened citizenship today. One may not have had to be the master of these things twenty years ago, but times have changed. It is increasingly impossible for individuals to function as literate, participating citizens without minimal mastery of these skills. Accordingly, we recommend that Auburn require every candidate for a baccalaureate degree to complete a course that guarantees computer/Internet literacy, or demonstrate such by means of a widely administered test on campus. Ideally, students should demonstrate this mastery within their first 30 semester hours. We believe that a significant majority of Auburn students will arrive at the institution already in possession of these skills and thus this requirement will not affect them. It is the other less fortunate students about whom we concerned.

(18) Finally, we note that Auburn apparently does not administer a writing competency exit examination to its undergraduate students. We suspect we preach to the choir when we note how essential it is for Auburn graduates to be able to write cogently and coherently. Alas, completion of the two-course freshman writing sequence does not always guarantee that proficiency (as numerous faculty and some Board members informed us) and, in any case, students transfer into the institution, or drop in and out. Therefore, we recommend that Auburn require every candidate for a baccalaureate degree to pass a writing competency exit examination after they have completed 90 semester hours. Failure to pass the examination should mean failure to graduate.

(19) We understand that the imposition of these requirements would require Auburn to redo its undergraduate curricula. We also comprehend that many of the university's professional programs would find this a very difficult task. Nonetheless, retrospectively this will be recognized as a small cost to pay if it guarantees that Auburn graduates have completed a rigorous education program and in addition are equipped to compete in, and

**understand, the world in which they will live. We believe the core curriculum constitutes a major test for the institution and action here will demonstrate the extent to which Auburn is truly committed to appropriate undergraduate education. We note in a section below that the academic performance of Auburn seniors on critical professional admissions tests in business, law and medicine is no better than average; some might venture mediocre. AU must take steps to remedy this situation and these steps begin with reformulating its core general education program.**

**(20) At the same time, we strongly recommend that Auburn ramp up the assessment of its undergraduates and focus especially on what they learn while at the university, not only in their core general education program, but also in their respective major courses of study. Pre-testing and post-testing are appropriate, as are student portfolios, alumni and employer surveys, student performance on national professional examinations in disciplines such as business, engineering, law and medicine and instruments such as the National Survey of Student Engagement. Auburn has little ability today to demonstrate what its students actually learn during their time on either campus; this must change.**

#### **Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station and the Alabama Cooperative Extension System**

The Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station and the Alabama Cooperative Extension System are large operations that together expend more than \$100 million annually. Some of Auburn's responsibilities in these arenas are shared with Alabama A&M University. Nearly everyone seems to agree that these programs must change emphasis and focus, but thus far no consensus has arisen about what their futures should be. One reason for this is that their futures are inextricably connected to the university's academic programs in agriculture and related disciplines.

**(21) The received wisdom about these programs is that they do some very good things; however, they are out-of-date; their faculty and staff have become too reliant on federal dollars and do not aggressively seek other funding sources; their research is out-of-date; they do not address the large, corporate, production-oriented agriculture that has arisen nationally and in Alabama in recent decades; they haven't figured out how to relate efficiently to Alabama A&M and how to serve African-American agricultural participants; the number of experiment stations could and should be reduced to a half dozen; and, they tend to neglect**

**vital questions of resource management, conservation and extraction. It is beyond the competence of this team to evaluate these assertions. Nonetheless, the ubiquity of these comments suggests that the on-going evaluation of agricultural programs (which we believe is necessary and should continue under the Interim President) must take them into account. Open forums could be scheduled around the state which would invite all concerned parties to express themselves. This would clarify the issues and save the next President from taking the heat for raising the question. At some point, outside uninvested consultation will surely be needed.**

### **Research**

Auburn is not a Top 100 research institution, but it is close. There is no question that it should be. If it is able to maintain its current research momentum, it is likely to do so by the end of the decade, perhaps before. However, further increases in rank will prove to be difficult, as it is a quantum jump away from even the 90<sup>th</sup> ranked institution (Florida State); it would take more than a 25 percent increase in Auburn's research and development expenditures (while Florida State stands still) for this to occur. Truth be told, Auburn's ranking is a bit disappointing, although we hasten to point out that many of the institutions ranked above AU have medical schools, more generous funding levels, and the like. Hence, in some ways, the table below compares apples and oranges.

<u>FY 2003 Research and</u>		
<u>Institution</u>	<u>Development Expenditures</u>	<u>National Ranking</u>
Florida	\$439.7 million	25 <sup>th</sup>
UNC CH	\$390.5	29 <sup>th</sup>
Louisiana State (all LSU campuses)	\$314.7	39 <sup>th</sup>
Georgia	\$299.7	41 <sup>st</sup>
NC State	\$286.0	45 <sup>th</sup>
Alabama Birmingham	\$284.5	47 <sup>th</sup>
Kentucky (all UK campuses)	\$272.1	52 <sup>nd</sup>
Tennessee (all UT campuses)	\$217.4	63 <sup>rd</sup>
Mississippi State	\$165.9	85 <sup>th</sup>
Clemson	\$153.0	89 <sup>th</sup>

Florida State	\$152.3	90 <sup>th</sup>
Auburn (all AU campuses)	\$124.1	102 <sup>nd</sup>
Mississippi (all UM campuses)	\$ 85.4	127 <sup>th</sup>
Alabama Huntsville	\$ 46.6	153 <sup>rd</sup>
Alabama Tuscaloosa	\$ 34.2	177 <sup>th</sup>

Nevertheless, Vice President for Research Michael Moriarty has infused new energy into the university's research operation. He is knowledgeable, determined and appears to be well connected on the national research stage. He is the primary motivating force behind the university's new research park, for which the first spades of dirt were turned in November 2005. The research park has great potential because nothing like it exists until one gets to Atlanta. However, naysayers argue that "*Auburn is arriving late to the party*" and this particular notion of a research park is a bit old fashioned, or at least out of date. Ultimately, in our view, the two critical variables that will determine its success are: (1) the volume of creative endeavor that AU faculty generate; and, (2) the skill with which the university is able to advertise and vend those creations to outside firms. We shall see.

**(22) We believe Auburn should, in its next Strategic Plan, make increasing research activity and funding a very high priority. Auburn is the state's comprehensive land-grant research institution and should increase its focus on research and development. Yes, UAB expends more funds on research and development, but most of those expenditures are narrowly focused in medical areas. It falls to Auburn to carry the state's research flag in most disciplinary areas.**

**(23) We also think it sensible for the institution to slow the rate of growth in its undergraduate enrollment (and thereby raise standards) in order to devote more attention and resources to graduate programs and research.**



#### IV. TECHNOLOGY

Both campuses of Auburn University evince a strong and continuing commitment to the use of technology in instruction and research. This is particularly evident on the main campus, which has made lists of the most wired campuses in the nation. The university currently is in the middle of an \$8.0 million, five-year network infrastructure upgrade that will, among other things, bring all campus buildings up to category five wiring specifications (very good indeed for communication and networking purposes). The Board of Trustees has approved the notion of a new information technology building that will house the university's central activities in this area.

Every faculty and staff member who wishes a microcomputer had one and we did not encounter anyone who does not have high speed access to the Internet. Slightly more than 2,000 PCs and Apples are available for student use in laboratories, residence halls and the library in 79 different locations. The university's residence halls feature Ethernet connections and there is a jack for every pillow. Auburn sells this high speed access for approximately \$15 per month (an appropriate way to finance such). Much of the campus is wireless, though several students and faculty complained that *"coverage is spotty."*

Where Auburn really shines among large public universities is in the number of multimedia classrooms it has deployed. More than 300 technologically enhanced classrooms exist; each of these classrooms boasts a microcomputer with CD and DVD capability, a VCR, Internet access and a large screen. In addition, some of these rooms have white boards. Nearly every Auburn faculty member, then, has the opportunity to utilize modern technology to teach his/her courses, if they are so inclined and so trained. Therein lays the rub. *"Lots of us really don't know how to use all that stuff,"* admitted a faculty member who clearly spoke for others.

**(24) We recommend that Auburn continue its current instructional technology training sessions for faculty, but give additional consideration to how it can attract into those sessions those faculty who at this stage are unsophisticated in that technology. In this regard, we recommend that the university consider small, departmentally-based instructional sessions and one-on-one sessions for faculty as a means to reach the uninstructed. Further, it should provide faculty both with exemplary examples of the use of instructional technology and summarize empirical evidence that relates to student learning when such technology is used.**

**Auburn must now move beyond the bragging stage concerning the ubiquity of its instructional technology to a much greater concern for whether faculty are really using that technology and using it effectively.**

Auburn's current distributed model for providing instructional technology and support services seems to be working well, though the arrangement is confusing to some. Some portions of the university are supported by the institution's central information technology unit, while others are supported by college- and school-based personnel and units. Auburn doesn't have a Chief Information Officer, or Chief Technology Officer. Instead, it has 14 IT leaders that operate loosely under limited centralized coordination. Auburn does operate a central microcomputer leasing program that is accompanied by four-hour guaranteed turnaround time for service. Those units that purchase their own microcomputers may obtain the same service via a maintenance contract, though some colleges and schools choose to do this for themselves. By and large, allowing the colleges and schools to choose their own way in this area seems to work tolerably well.

A degree of increased centralization, however, would be merited on occasion. For example, Auburn actually operates several different e-mail systems because some colleges and units have their own. It appears that the School of Veterinary Medicine and the College of Science and Mathematics maintain their e-mail systems. One consequence of this (as we personally can vouch), is that it can be difficult to find an e-mail address for some faculty and staff and this problem is exacerbated when traffic between the two campuses is at stake. This is frustrating, duplicative and expensive.

**(25) We recommend that the university adopt a single e-mail system that is easily accessible and transparent to all individuals on both campuses. Further, we recommend that the next President consider appointing a Chief Technology Officer (CTO) who will ensure that technology issues come to the President's attention. *Inter alia*, the CTO should make recommendations concerning the advisability of technology standardization in some areas, carefully weighing the benefits of independence and service against the cost economies that likely would flow from standardization.**

This is not a call to stamp out Apple computer use (the fear of one faculty member), or a call to centralize the funding and control of all computer laboratories. It is a call to recognize that

Auburn is spending millions of dollars each year on information technology and these expenditures bode to increase substantially in the future. The institution simply must think more globally about its IT investments and the appointment of a CTO would represent one of many steps in this direction.

Like many institutions, Auburn is in transition in terms of the administrative software systems that it utilizes. The main campus now is moving to SCT Banner (AUM already is substantially there), though not without hiccups and problems. This will enable main campus students more easily to register for classes on the Internet, access their grades and an unofficial transcript, and determine what courses remain for them to take when they graduate (only some of which students told us they can accomplish now without considerable effort). This is not an inexpensive proposition and will cost in the range of \$12.0 million.

**(26) AUM's payroll and financial work are performed on the main campus. Both campuses would benefit from having unified information and personnel systems. There is money to be saved here, as the institutions have learned when they have purchased certain software licenses jointly, for example, McAfee Virus Protection and a variety of Microsoft licenses. Experience on other campuses suggests there are additional funds that might be saved by joint licensing and purchases; we recommend that the new President explore the ways to do so.**

Interestingly, Auburn does not appear to be on the outer envelope of connectivity to other institutions and internet capabilities. It is an Internet 2 institution, but is not on the Lambda Rail. It has superb connections to some institutions (Georgia Tech), but mediocre connections to the three University of Alabama campuses. That said, Auburn currently does not appear to be experiencing bandwidth problems, at least partially because it has become skillful in detecting abusive downloading of movies and music by its students.

## V. FACULTY

When John Cardinal Newman, in *The Idea of the University*, wrote that “the faculty is the university,” he may have presaged the recent circumstances of Auburn University. In the midst of persistent turmoil and institutional strife, the typical faculty member at Auburn has generated solid, consistent, productive performance. Presidents come and go, as do students. Intercollegiate athletic teams have good seasons and bad seasons and coaches arrive and depart. The faculty, however, remains and provides continuity and substance to the academic enterprise. If faculty members faithfully teach their classes and in the process hold their students to high standards, diligently pursue their research, and undertake their outreach, then all, or nearly all, is right in the academic universe.

So it has been at Auburn University, where the representative faculty member simply has lowered her head and attempted to ignore the internecine political spats that have speckled the institution’s recent history. Auburn may sue SACS and be placed on probation by the NCAA, but the typical faculty member has not permitted this noise to disrupt his work. *“I really don’t pay much attention to all of those things,”* confessed a productive engineering faculty member who spoke for many. *“The Board can do crazy things and the Senate politicians can whine to their heart’s content, but I simply tune them out,”* said a faculty member from the fine arts who was full of what she described as the *“magnificent achievements of my students.”* Many others echo these sentiments.

Thus, academic life has proceeded apace at Auburn University despite disruptive governance and adverse publicity. The university’s funded research has been growing at a 17 percent annual rate in recent years; faculty scholarly work has increased visibly; and, record numbers of students are being taught. Most faculty deserve kudos for these efforts.

Auburn’s faculty has been growing in talent and achievements, not the least because it has become more national in background over the past few decades. Faculty ranks now include individuals with degrees from the nation’s very best graduate schools and the faculty no longer is *“a sinecure for individuals with degrees from comparatively weak regional graduate schools”* (the trenchant observation of a faculty veteran).

A serious problem regarding faculty assessment exists at the university. The *Faculty Handbook* states that every faculty member must be evaluated prior to April 30<sup>th</sup> of each year by his/her department chair or unit head. The faculty member is supposed to provide a current Curriculum Vitae, along with supporting evidence, to support the evaluation. The department chair or unit head then is supposed to prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member, to which the faculty member has an opportunity to respond.

The problems with this process are several. First, we found evidence that some department chairs or unit heads simply don't carry out the evaluation as required. Second, we found other chairs and heads who grossly violated the deadline for the evaluation. Third, we found cases where the chairs and heads satisfied the time line, but failed to generate a meaningful written evaluation. Sometimes the written evaluation consisted of "You're doing fine, Joe, keep it up" (a characterization).

**(27) We recommend that the President ask the Provost to standardize the process by circulating implementation guidelines; that the chairs and heads be engaged in training and that this training explicitly be given to new chairs and heads; that the Provost monitor the evaluation process each year to ensure that it is carried out to satisfy both the letter and the spirit of university's regulations; that the deans be held responsible for demonstrating that appropriate and rigorous evaluation of every faculty member occurs annually; and, that the Provost consult with the University Senate to determine if the *Handbook* provisions concerning annual faculty assessment need to be changed or updated.**

**(28) A vital step in the movement of any non-tenured, probationary faculty member toward tenure is that faculty member's third year review. This is the time when faculty should receive strong, direct and helpful advice about their progress toward tenure, or lack thereof. Most probationary faculty members have been receiving such counsel and the university typically has not shrunk from giving a year's notice of termination to probationary faculty who are not up to standards after three years. This is as it should be; we recommend the Provost monitor this process closely and that the deans be held responsible for appropriate and rigorous third year faculty evaluations, which clearly should be comprehensive, written, and note in detail any deficiencies in quantity or quality of performance the probationary faculty member must remedy. If the deficiencies are**

significant, then the probationary faculty member should be terminated. The burden here is on the faculty member, not the university.

(29) Auburn should not recommend any faculty member for tenure who does not clearly meet the institution's standards. This is, or should be, a very high standard. Auburn will not rise into the ranks of the nation's best public flagship institutions if it does not insist on high levels of performance. Our observation is that the university has been too willing to assert, or believe, that probationary faculty members, or those seeking promotion, have earned "national reputations," even when it is abundantly clear that the individual would not merit top land-grant institutions. Auburn must raise its sights.

(30) We also note that the *Handbook* contains performance criteria for promotion and tenure, but none explicitly for salary increments. One is left to guess that the same criteria apply. We recommend that the *Handbook* be amended to contain explicit criteria that apply to the application of salary increment funds. The criteria (which might closely approximate promotion and tenure criteria) should also clarify the process by which salary increment funds are dispensed and allow for the use of salary increment funds to remedy market, salary compression, gender, race and other discrimination problems. The aim should be to make the process transparent and to provide general guidelines for the salary increment process, not to catalog the entire universe of possibilities.

Still another aspect of faculty evaluation relates to the possibility of post-tenure review. Interim President Richardson and a variety of other individuals, including some members of the Board of Trustees, believe that post-tenure review is important and necessary for Auburn. They point out that approximately 60 percent of all institutions of higher education in the United States now have some form of periodic review of tenured faculty. They also argue that Auburn's legislative proposals "*will receive a more sympathetic hearing if we can demonstrate that are policing our own ranks.*"

Against this, some faculty point out that tenured faculty are evaluated every year and therefore "*we have post-tenure review every year at Auburn.*" They also fear that post-tenure review will be used as a club to punish those who speak out on critical issues. "*There's a climate of fear here now and post-tenure review would simply accentuate the situation,*" warned one faculty

member. Some faculty also advocate that “*the administration explain tenure better*” and more convincingly to the citizens and legislators of the state.

**(31) None of these arguments, pro or con, are new and they have been repeated many times throughout the United States. Post-tenure review, however, is spreading throughout the country and we recommend that Auburn develop its own policy in this regard. Tenure was never meant to be a refuge for the incompetent, nor a promise of lifetime faculty job security, regardless of performance. It is designed to protect the academic freedom of faculty so that they can freely profess their disciplines; in order to achieve that goal, some degree of job security is necessary.**

With few exceptions, academic freedom is firmly entrenched in American higher education and at Auburn University, which has adopted the AAUP’s *1940 Statement* on academic freedom as one of its guiding principles. Some argue that in the past Auburn has in fact punished faculty who have spoken out on critical issues in front of the institution and that it has done indirectly by abolishing programs, merging departments, eliminating positions, and the like. *Prima facie*, these charges cannot immediately be dismissed.

Accordingly, **(32) we recommend that Interim President Richardson, the new President, and the Board of Trustees reaffirm their unequivocal support for the AAUP’s *1940 Statement* on academic freedom. However, as we note in a section below, the *1940 Statement* also contains language that admonishes faculty not to introduce extraneous material into their classrooms (for example, criticism of the President or the Board that has nothing to do with their class); to exercise restraint in their public statements and professional relationships; and, to identify clearly that they do not speak for the institution when they make public utterances, for example, in the media. All parties concerned would do well to review what the *1940 Statement* actually says rather than stylized versions of what they have traditionally have heard it says.**

**(33) We recommend that the development of a post-tenure review policy proceed, but that no action be taken prior to the appointment of the new President. The new post-tenure review policy will be developed and accepted more easily if all parties concerned have clearly stated their acceptance of the AAUP’s *1940 Statement*. The post-tenure review procedures**

should be firmly rooted in the usual faculty evaluation process, provide for remedial activities designed to improve a faculty member's performance, provide for sanctions up to and including eventual dismissal, and provide opportunity for a faculty member to appeal a judgment to appropriate groups of faculty peers and eventually to the President. This should occur only after a well-defined set of steps have been taken and the faculty member clearly has been afforded due process.

### **Diversity and Gender**

(34) Just as Auburn's student body is considerably more male dominated than student bodies nationally, its faculty also contains a strong majority of males. This composition is changing, however, and at the assistant professor level, as many women as men now are being appointed to positions. What remains to be seen is if these young women faculty members will be promoted to higher rates and retained over the years. Historically, some academic departments and units at Auburn earned reputations of being very difficult places for women to work. While things are changing, a significant number of interviews with faculty and staff reported that "residual and overt" discrimination continues to exist. The Provost's Office has addressed possible gender problems in faculty salaries, but some of the social and disciplinary difficulties women faculty encounter are not easily quantified. The Provost's Office must continue to monitor carefully faculty appointment, assessment, promotion, tenure and salary increment processes to ensure that women are treated equitably.

Moving Affirmative Action from the President's office to Human Resources confirmed the opinions of many that diversity and gender considerations are not that important at Auburn. The perception is that there is no mechanism to collect and consider complaints, and Auburn would rather be sued than make real changes.

African-American faculty and staff often feel that a true commitment to increasing African-American representation is wanting. They cite "*turnover, resignations and smiles*" rather than action.



More than one of every four Alabamians is an African-American. One need only walk around Auburn's campus to see that the representation of African-Americans at AU is far below this. This must change.

**(35) We recommend that the new President, backed by the Board, enunciate a strong and unmistakable statement underlining that Auburn intends to be open and welcoming to all of the citizens of Alabama and beyond and that it intends to vigorously recruit and retain minority students and staff, and African-Americans in particular. Quotas should not be utilized; they are both demeaning and illegal. However, it is reasonable to expect an increasing number of searches to include women as well as African-American and other minority candidates in groups of finalists for positions throughout AU. It is similarly reasonable to expect that over the next few years, several highly qualified African-Americans or other minorities and women will be appointed to senior administrative positions including deanships, vice presidencies or the presidency. Auburn must publicize its values, cast its nets wide, pursue strong candidates with vigor, and be prepared to pay the market in order to accomplish its goals. Over a period of time, the word will circulate and momentum will build. The campus will be strengthened as a result and the university's support throughout the state will climb.**

**Additionally, we recommend:**

**(36) The Executive Director of Affirmative Action could be returned to the office of the President and retitled, "Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action."**

**(37) A diversity plan should be refined, and an audit should be conducted at least every two years with progress reports presented to the Board.**

**(38) Exit interviews should be conducted with employees and students who leave the university, especially persons of color and women.**

**(39) Diversity training should be required for all administrators.**

**(40) Mentoring programs should be considered for new faculty especially for persons of color and women.**

### **Faculty Salaries**

Auburn has made significant progress in faculty salaries in recent years as a result of a conscious campaign to place itself in the middle of peer institutions in the SREB group. Even so, as the table below demonstrates, the main campus trails its regional peer institutions by several thousand dollars at each rank and by more than that compared to doctoral institutions nationally. These gaps are not excessively large, and do not take into account potential differences in the cost of living among the institutions being compared.

**(41) Nevertheless, if Auburn wishes to rise to the top of its peer group, then it must be prepared to attract and retain nationally competitive faculty with necessary financial packages. Once again, we believe that Auburn should apply the same drive for excellence that it applies to its football team to its faculty and academic programs.**

**(42) We recommend that Auburn continue its program of increasing its faculty salaries relative to its peer institutions and national averages. While faculty recruitment, retention and happiness depend upon many factors in addition to compensation, Auburn is unlikely to build a world class faculty if it does not offer highly competitive compensation packages. We believe the Board of Trustees should adopt the goal of placing Auburn at the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of its regional peers and thereafter at the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally (a goal that has long been adopted by Virginia). It should then devise a program that will lead to the fulfillment of this goal. Such action will help ensure the vitality of Auburn's faculty in the future.**

On the Montgomery campus, a similar salary situation exists, except that AUM faculty salaries are a bit more competitive with that institution's regional peer institutions. However, AUM also trails national averages for comparable institutions by substantial amounts.

#### AAUP Average Salaries by Rank, 2004-2005 (000's)

Associate      Assistant

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Professor</u>
Auburn Main	\$92.0 (7th)	\$65.3 (8th)	\$57.4 (11th)
Alabama, Tuscaloosa	\$90.7	\$65.6	\$52.1
Clemson	\$90.6	\$67.2	\$60.2
Florida	\$96.0	\$69.1	\$59.5
Florida State	\$88.4	\$62.4	\$58.0
Georgia	\$92.8	\$64.7	\$57.7
Georgia Tech	\$119.0	\$82.9	\$72.3
Kentucky	\$90.0	\$64.1	\$57.7
Mississippi	\$83.2	\$65.1	\$54.5
Mississippi State	\$79.3	\$62.3	\$52.7
North Carolina CH	\$112.7	\$77.2	\$65.8
North Carolina State	\$94.8	\$70.3	\$61.9
Tennessee	\$91.1	\$68.9	\$58.3
South Carolina	\$92.1	\$65.7	\$59.2
Group Average	\$93.8	\$67.9	\$59.1
Public Doctoral			
Average Nationally	\$97.9	\$68.6	\$58.3
-----			
Auburn Montgomery	\$68.4 (3rd)	\$55.9 (3rd)	\$48.7 (2nd)
Austin Peay	\$61.1	\$52.9	\$41.8
Jacksonville State	\$67.0	\$58.8	\$46.7
Middle Tennessee	\$73.9	\$55.7	\$46.8
North Alabama	\$62.2	\$54.1	\$47.0
South Alabama	\$80.8	\$61.3	\$51.6
Troy Main	\$63.1	\$49.2	\$41.0

Group Average	\$69.6	\$55.4	\$46.2
Public Masters Degree			
Average Nationally	\$76.7	\$61.0	\$51.2

### **Faculty Teaching Loads**

Auburn University is a very diverse institution and hence the assignment of teaching loads is a complex process. Much depends upon a faculty member's discipline, experience, research productivity, class sizes, assignments to units such as the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, and so forth. This is one of the reasons why legislative attempts to specify standard faculty teaching loads seldom are successful. The academic world simply is too variegated. Eventually, however, the university's students must be taught and the number of faculty available to do so, though flexible, is finite. On a year-around basis in 2004-2005 (including the summer), Auburn's 1,190.7 FTE faculty (this number includes partial FTE for graduate assistants) generated 652,170 semester hours of credit, or 547.7 per FTE faculty position. Credit hours generated per FTE faculty position ranged from a low of 180.1 in veterinary medicine to 938.8 in the College of Business.

**(43) Once again, what do these data tell us? If we very roughly approximate every university course as three hours, then the typical Auburn faculty member handled  $547.7/3 = 182.6$  students per year (again, including the summer sessions). This is a very respectable number for a flagship, land-grant, doctoral research institution. It translates to a typical faculty member handling about 75-80 students in a usual semester. Given that the university offers approximately 40 doctoral programs and a variety of professional programs, most of which have highly demanding accrediting standards, this is an acceptable level of productivity. If there is a lesson to be drawn, it is that the typical Business faculty member (and for that matter, the typical faculty member in departments such as Biological Sciences, Health and Human Performance, History and Sociology) subsidizes faculty members and programs in the remainder of the university. This is hardly immoral, but it should be recognized and those departments that perennially handle the most students not only should receive recognition and thanks for their efforts, but also receive appropriate support resources for their considerable labors. We recommend that technology, graduate assistant**

**and similar support allocations take differential student loads into account. Auburn should not ignore or starve its golden geese.**

## VI. STUDENTS

Students regard Auburn as an integral part of their being, something to be cherished and drawn upon. They are apprehensive about leaving. They generally applaud campus life, including “football Saturdays,” and regard their undergraduate experience as being superior and matching or exceeding any institution in the country. We note here that minority students interviewed echoed these feelings. They were especially appreciative of the multi-cultural center. Concerns were generally fairly standard across campus, i.e., food, parking, drinking, et al. Virtually all were laudatory about faculty and staff availability and attitudes. Typical student comments: *“I wish there were good jobs here for college graduates. I would stay at Auburn in a minute.”* *“Of course, I would enroll at Auburn again,”* said an African-American student leader. Another said, *“I found a life here and will be encouraging my younger sister and brother to attend when they graduate high school.”* *“Football is an important part of the Auburn culture,”* a member of the marching band said, *“It will never change because it is a pride factor and a big one.”*

Auburn’s main campus undergraduate students (we deal with AUM students in a separate section) constitute the best qualified large campus student body in Alabama. Previously noted ACT scores demonstrate this. A significant proportion of AU students emanates from a family where neither parent attended college. Auburn students are *“serious, amazingly polite, generally hard-working, courteous, not particularly cosmopolitan, somewhat religious, and fun loving”* (the combined, but repeated comments of many individuals). Said a faculty member who came to Auburn from the north, *“I am still knocked over how many times my students say to me, ‘yes, ma’am, no ma’am.’”* *“I may have to stir them up to gain an intellectual reaction,”* opined another faculty member, *“but they always treat me with respect.”*

Many faculty are pleased with the intellectual curiosity of their students. *“Because of who they are and where they come from, we frequently introduce them to the world of ideas and this really can be quite exciting and rewarding,”* commented an admiring faculty member. *“I’m always thrilled when the alums come back and I can see how well they have done,”* said a senior faculty member. Opening academic and career goals, then, is a major role of Auburn faculty and Auburns students typically are very appreciative. *“I’ll always be indebted to the architecture faculty for the attention they gave me,”* praised an alumnus who spoke for many others in additional academic areas.

Again, as noted above, the student body is not racially or ethnically diverse and is what one student termed, “*a white bread study body*” (88 percent Caucasian). Compared to student bodies nationally, it is more heavily male (51+ percent men). Though 42 percent of this year’s freshmen came from out of state (802 from nearby Georgia, 255 from Florida and 162 from Tennessee), Auburn’s students as a group are not heavily traveled and many have no international experience whatsoever. Therefore, Auburn’s student body would benefit greatly both from an increased number of international students attending classes here, and from increased number of Auburn students studying abroad, either for entire semesters or for short course experiences of a few weeks.

**(44) Elsewhere, we have recommended reformulating the core general education program to include additional international and multicultural material. A logical complement to that is a quantum leap upward in Auburn’s international student activity and representation, both here and abroad. Auburn should pay students’ passport application fees (as several other internationally minded institutions do), actively advertise international opportunities for its main campus students, and upgrade its international recruiting and admissions efforts. This represents much more than a touchy-feely prescription; it is vital if Auburn students are to be educated well and prepared for the world in which they will live and compete.**

Alcohol easily is the drug of choice for Auburn students. Marihuana and other drugs are commonly available on campus, according to undergraduates, but they also report that “*the highs here most often come from drinking, not from smoking or popping.*” What is unclear to students is the extent to which the Auburn administration truly is opposed to underage consumption and abuse of alcohol. “*They tell us one thing, but then they let lots of things go on football weekends and other events.*”

The apparent upcoming demise of the position of Vice President for Student Affairs has been greeted with considerable consternation by those who know it is going to occur. However, no formal announcement has been made and this has left the Student Affairs division up in the air. Their conclusion, with which it is difficult to argue, is that their efforts have been devalued and that the non-academic sides of student growth are about to be deemphasized. If true, this would be unfortunate, as we believe it is essential that Auburn tend to, and cultivate, the out-of-classroom

activities of students. This is all the more so because of the non-cosmopolitan, small town, first generation college student backgrounds of many Auburn students. A significant proportion of student retention and graduation problems stem from non-academic problems, including substance abuse, but also lack of social adjustment problems, mental health, and the like. Auburn should not forfeit this field. Each year, the National Survey of Student Engagement demonstrates that students who are more involved at an institution earn higher grades, are more likely to graduate, are more satisfied, and contribute more often to the annual fund. These results speak for themselves.

**(45) We recommend that the new President enunciate a visible commitment to the activities supported by the Student Affairs division and that a search be initiated for a Vice President for Student Affairs. However, this commitment (which will require resources) must be accompanied by rigorous requirements for the Student Affairs division to demonstrate its productivity and usefulness. It is not enough for Student Affairs to assert without evidence its programs make a difference. For example, are students who participate in student activities at Auburn retained at a higher rate than other students? Do they earn higher grades? Do they contribute to the alumni fund more often? These are among the types of evidence that Student Affairs must be prepared to provide if it seeks to maintain its role at Auburn University. Auburn should actively attempt to mold and shape its campus culture; it is a mistake to allow that culture to evolve in a laissez faire environment.**

### **Student Recruitment, Admissions and Related Service Issues**

According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (25 November 2005), the State of Alabama can expect only a very modest increase (0.6 percent) in the number of high school graduates over the next ten years. This underlines an important reality threat for Auburn, which historically has been heavily dependent upon full-time undergraduates as students. The golden years of rapidly expanding high school enrollments are coming to an end. Further, the growth in high school enrollments that is occurring nationally is concentrated among Hispanic/Latino and Asian-American students, population segments which the university historically has not attracted in substantial numbers. Nationally, 12.8 percent of all Americans are African-American, 13.7 percent are Hispanic/Latino and 4.1 percent are Asian-American and these population segments are growing much more rapidly than Caucasians.



Alabama's population is 26.4 percent African-American; contrast this to the percent enrollment of African-Americans at Auburn (7.86 percent). The institution matches up more closely to Hispanic/Latino populations (two percent in the State and one percent at Auburn) and the Asian-American population (approximately 0.8 percent in the State and seven percent at Auburn). According to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, when compared to all 30 public and private institutions in the state, only one private institution, Samford University, has a lower percent of African-American students than Auburn (2004).

The moral to this story, however, should not be a focus upon where the State of Alabama has been demographically, but where it likely is headed. Minority population groups almost surely are going to grow more rapidly in Alabama than Caucasians unless Alabama somehow divorces itself from the rest of the American economy (which isn't going to happen). If Auburn wishes to increase its headcount enrollment in the future, then it must pay more attention to the minority student applicant pool. This implies both additional admissions focus on minority applicants and programs designed to augment the academic credentials of all applicants who otherwise might have difficulty satisfying Auburn's admissions standards.

Further, Auburn draws about one in every three of its students from outside Alabama and in Fall 2005, 41 percent of its main campus freshmen came to AU from outside of Alabama. If the university wishes to maintain its status as a national institution that draws applicants from around the country, then it must find a way to tap burgeoning minority enrollment pools.

In addition, Auburn's focus on full-time, conventionally aged college students rather than part-timers and adults (except at the Montgomery campus) poses an additional problem, because much of the future growth in headcount enrollment in higher education will come from older students and part-time students, many of whom will opt for distance learning in one form or another.

**(46) If Auburn seeks to increase its enrollment above current levels, then likely it will have to change both the nature of its programmatic offerings and its admissions strategies. First, we recommend that Auburn increase its admissions focus on minority student prospects, particularly African-Americans, but also Hispanic/Latinos and Asian-Americans. These population segments simply are growing too rapidly for Auburn to regard them with**

what faculty member labeled “*almost benign neglect.*” At Auburn, it is also important that the university provide increased funds for minority grants and programs.

(47) Second, we recommend that Auburn increase its evening course offerings.

(48) Third, we recommend that Auburn survey its adult students and the more mature members of the community to determine what support services they would like the university to offer (for example, child care). These students are likely to be less interested in football games and more interested in certifications, convenience, distance learning and the like. More than 80 percent of Auburn Montgomery students work full- or part-time and AUM has adjusted its scheduling and programs to recognize this. The home campus needs to imitate this good example, often by means of distance education (see below).

(49) Fourth, we recommend that Auburn place increased emphasis upon fulfilling the immediate educational needs of the Alabama public. To wit, for 13.8 percent of Alabamians, a baccalaureate degree is their highest level of educational attainment (the comparable percent is 16.9 nationally). Only 7.3 percent of Alabamians claim a graduate or professional degree (compared to 9.7 percent nationally). Clearly, one can make the case that Alabamians are relatively undereducated in terms of higher education. Auburn should make express plans to address this situation and publicize and fund its intentions. Such an initiative will be good for the State and good for the university. Our next recommendation commends one of several ways Auburn might do so.

(50) Fifth, we recommend that Auburn explore the ways and means whereby it can distribute an increased proportion of its courses and programs via distance learning techniques. It already offers 21 distinct degree programs (primarily in business, education and engineering, though solely at the graduate level) via distance learning techniques and it should increase that number. The Auburn web page reports that 2,100 student registrations were processed from distance education students in 2004-2005. This is commendable, but relatively modest, given Auburn’s flagship, land-grant status. While many institutions (including Auburn) are utilizing asynchronous distance learning models to teach students via CDs, DVDs and computers, the future probably belongs to institutions that successfully mount synchronous distance learning models that utilize high speed, broadband connections

**to distribute courses to students in real time and provide for live give and take between professors and students. Auburn has the opportunity to leap frog other institutions that now utilize older, asynchronous distance learning models that seldom allow live interaction between faculty and students and, in any case, are burdened by very high drop out rates and sometimes disappointing student satisfaction levels.**

**(51) Sixth, we recommend that Auburn consider more “2 + 2” undergraduate degree completion distance learning programs in conjunction with the community and technical colleges in Alabama. In essence, these institutions offer the first two years of an academic degree program and Auburn offers the final two years, often utilizing facilities and support provided by the two-year institutions. Nationally, this model has proven to be both popular and effective.**

Many campuses have found ways to offer a portfolio of programs that are attractive to many different constituencies, which in essence choose those items that appeal to them and ignore the rest. Distance learning, in particular, is capable of addressing students who otherwise might be ignored.

### **Student Quality**

The mean ACT score attained by high school seniors nationally in 2005 was 20.9. Auburn’s entering freshmen score above that national average. The 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile range at Auburn is 22 – 26 on the ACT, with the mean for the entering 2005 class being 24.1. Thus, entering Auburn freshmen are better qualified than the national mean, 20.9 and substantially more qualified than the typical Alabamian headed to college. Auburn, then, is a selective admissions institution even though it admitted 84 percent of its applicants this past year. It appears that the word goes out about Auburn. *“Don’t apply if you can’t cut the mustard,”* one student advised us.

While we would not necessarily suggest that Auburn should change this aspect of its admissions process, we can observe that many of the college and university ranking systems utilize an institution’s admission denial rate as one measure of its selectivity and quality. Auburn, with only an 18 percent applicant denial rate in 2005, does not appear to be very selective, if one only focuses on this statistic. The reality is, however, that it actually is reasonably selective because

students perceive that they must have better than average qualifications if they are going to apply to the institution. There is something good to be said in favor of the current arrangement, but it is not conducive to higher external rankings.

Faculty report they encounter some “*outstanding students*” in their classes. “*The range is rather wide here,*” commented a professor from the physical sciences, “*but a lot of our students are very good and could make it anywhere.*” Faculty frequently comment that Auburn enrolls many first generation college students who need intellectual maturation, but can turn out to be hungry, ambitious and very strong students once they learn the ropes.

As noted in a previous section, Auburn historically has not undertaken very quantitative assessment of its students and hence cannot say a great deal about the institution's value added. There are, however, some measures that relate to the performances of graduating students on national examinations that permit some inferences about the quality of education. The performances of main campus seniors on the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT) are detailed below. In three of the past four MCAT examination periods, Auburn students scored slightly above the national average and most recently, they scored noticeably below the national average. It is difficult to draw a strong conclusion from these data except to say that Auburn students usually approximate national averages on the MCAT.

<u>MCAT Exam Date</u>	<u>Auburn Mean</u>	<u>National Mean</u>
August 2003	25.0	24.7
April 2004	26.5	25.0
August 2004	25.0	24.3
April 2005	22.7	25.0

Auburn student performance on the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) yields about the same conclusion, though on the GMAT, Auburn students have performed slightly below the national average the past two years.

<u>GMAT Exam Date</u>	<u>Auburn Mean</u>	<u>National Mean</u>
-----------------------	--------------------	----------------------

2004	509.0	519.6
2005	510.2	518.4

The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) provides another statistical measuring post. Scores are available only for the 2000-2001 academic year. Here again, Auburn students perform below the national averages, though not by large amounts.

	<u>Auburn Mean</u>	<u>National Mean</u>
Verbal Section	453	476
Quantitative Section	560	595
Analytical Section	566	591

LSAT (Law School Admission Test) data are available for Auburn students and they indicate that Auburn students score at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, or right at the national average. However, in 2003-2004, 1,364 individuals who claimed Auburn applied to law schools around the country; 238 were offered admission, or about one out of every five. A total of 102 ultimately registered at a law school, 32 of which were “Top 100” law schools. Thus, only about three percent of Auburn students who applied to law schools ended up attending a “Top 100” law school. While this is hardly an outstanding performance, it no doubt reflects in part the increasingly competitive nature of law school admissions nationally.

What should we make of these data and these performances? Auburn students end up in the middle of most national distributions with respect to their test scores on national professional admissions examinations such as the MCAT, GMAT, LSAT and GRE. *A skeptic would note that the typical Auburn student matriculates at the university with ACT scores well above the national average, but they appear to fall back to the mean by the time they graduate.* Of course, the comparison groups are not the same. The MCAT, GMAT, LSAT and GRE populations are considerably more selective than those that take the ACT. An optimist would note that Auburn students can be, and frequently are, nationally competitive on these professional examinations. The typical student doesn't overwhelm these examinations, but he/she performs acceptably compared to other college seniors headed for graduate and professional schools. Our take on this is that the

institution's performance in this arena probably merits a C grade---not outstanding, but hardly a failure.

**(52) We recommend that Auburn's new President commission the Provost to examine the pre-professional curricula of the university and attempt to determine statistically where the institution is doing a good job and where it might be falling short. Auburn enrolls the most talented group of high school students of any institution in the state and arguably its performance on professional examinations should earn a grade higher than a C. The university would not long tolerate only average performance by its football team and it should be equally concerned about the performance of its graduating students.**

Needless to say, the majority of Auburn students do not immediately go on to a graduate or professional school. Unfortunately, the university currently does not possess extensive data that track what its students do in job markets after they graduate. Only 12 percent of May 2005 graduates replied to an e-mail survey and hence little can be said about the labor market experiences of Auburn graduates, though the verbal tradition is that they do well and typically find employment quickly because so many of them pursue occupationally and vocationally oriented undergraduate majors.

**(53) We recommend that Auburn's new President direct all those necessary to find the ways and means of tracking Auburn graduates. This is a good idea for a variety of obvious reasons, including fund raising.**

Graduate student quality is good to above average in terms of national test scores, but some faculty complain they are unable to attract the very best students either because of the inadequate stipends they are able to offer, or because of Auburn's rural location.

The typical Auburn student is pleased with his/her education. *"This place has opened doors for me,"* praised a junior education major. A fine arts major was full of compliments for the time, in and out of class, that her faculty are willing to spend with her. *"They are committed."*

Student complaints are surprisingly typical and focus on food, parking, campus lighting, costs and the like. More than a few students, however, are displeased with the institution's

residence halls, which some say approach being “*out of control.*” They decry alcohol and drug abuse, noise and unchecked, obnoxious behavior. Furtively, some students imparted to us their unhappiness about Auburn’s image as a football school and believe, true or false, that athletes receive inappropriate preferential admissions, academic and social treatment. “*You’d have to do something really bad to get kicked out of here if you’re a really good athlete,*” speculated a humanities student. Even if this perception is false, it is hurtful to the university.

## **VII. STRATEGIC PLANNING**

Large organizations cannot prosper without a strategic planning process. We emphasize the word process, because even the best strategic plan usually becomes out-of-date quickly, sometimes even before it has been printed and distributed. We live in a dynamic, rapidly changing world that requires numerous mid-course corrections. Thus, good strategic plans must be updated annually and we recommend that Auburn prepare to do so. Strategic planning exercises are extremely valuable because they force fundamental questions, for example, who are we and what are we really attempting to accomplish? What do we value? What are our priorities?

**(54) These are questions that Auburn clearly needs to answer about itself, but often has not. Thus, there is a need for strategic planning that involves all of the university's important constituencies. However, any university's strategic plan must reflect and incorporate the energy and vision of its President. Good planning is always top down, then fleshed out, refined and improved by the input of others. Thus, even though it is appropriate for AU to assemble data that will support that process, actual strategic planning should await the advent of the new President. We recommend that strategic planning be placed on a hold until the new President is appointed.**

**(55) For the immediate future, we suggest that the acceptable recommendations in this Review be used in lieu of a strategic plan. Administrative officers should be assigned specific recommendations to which timelines would be attached and those officers evaluated in this light. Indeed, some institutions have used reviews in this manner for many years.**

Among the salient questions that a strategic planning exercise should address (recognizing that Strategic Planning is advisory to the President who is responsible to the Board of Trustees) are:

- How large should the Auburn University student body become?
- How selective in admissions should the university become?
- How can the university improve its admission and retention of minority and international students?



- Should the university implement a significant increase in its out-of-state tuition and fees?
- Should increased emphasis be placed upon graduate programs and research? If yes, what does that imply for resource allocation?
- What should the role of the Montgomery campus be?
- Should the university develop additional non-contiguous campus space in the City of Auburn?
- Should the university's programs in agriculture and related disciplines be reorganized and refocused?
- How can the university stimulate the scholarly productivity of faculty?
- How should the university organize its outreach activities in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?
- What is necessary for the Auburn's seniors to improve their performances on national professional placement examinations?
- How can Auburn improve its national reputation and the rankings of its academic programs?
- What is the appropriate role of intercollegiate athletics at Auburn?

## VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

In this Chapter, the reader should bear in mind that while a president belongs to the board, the administration, both the organization and the personnel, belong to the president. Whatever follows should be considered in light of the judgment of the next President.

*“Who’s on first?”* a middle level administrator asked us facetiously during our visit. This question was prompted by the excessive levels of administrator turnover that have occurred in recent years at Auburn plus the large number of “Interim” and “Acting” administrators in key positions throughout the institution. Two presidents have departed since 2001 and there have been four provosts since 1998. Given this upheaval, *“it is remarkable that Auburn has done so well”* (the observation of a former President).

One reason that Auburn has continued to perform well despite instability in the upper administrative ranks is that, by and large, its middle level administrator corps and the deans are capable, solid and committed. *“We do the job day after day, sometimes without recognition or thanks, but we show up for work and do our level best for Auburn,”* commented an administrator from that group. However, some reported that the deans were *“too autonomous.”*

Auburn’s overall administrative organization exhibits many jerry-built characteristics whereby odd reporting relationships exist. Further, the administrative structure often appears to have developed in response to individual skills, personalities and friendships rather than on the basis of management theory and evidence.

We suggest that the next President consider the following:

**(56) Except in extenuating circumstances, there should be no more than six or seven line officers reporting to a single individual.**

**(57) The Provost currently has approximately 30 individuals reporting directly to him. This number is grossly excessive and should be reduced dramatically.**

**(58) All officers reporting to the President should be annually evaluated, or more often, according to a design similar to the one suggested in Chapter XIII to the Board for the evaluation of the President, and in turn, those reporting to these officers should be evaluated and so on throughout the organization. This recommendation definitely includes the Chancellor at Montgomery who presently appears largely unchecked by any specific evaluative criteria.**

**(59) Consider combining the Director of the Alabama Cooperative Extension System and the Associate Provost for University Outreach (see organization chart on page 51).**

**(60) We recommend that a new position, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs be considered who would be responsible for promotion and tenure, hiring, etc. and would provide staff help to the Provost.**

**(61) The Vice President for Student Affairs position should be resurrected and filled after a national search. The new incumbent should report to the President, not the Provost.**

**(62) A chief technology officer should be appointed and probably should receive the title of vice president. He/she should report to the President along with the other vice presidents, the Provost, and the athletic director. (Review the current position, Executive Director, Information Technology.)**

**(63) The Director of External Affairs position should be re-titled Executive Assistant to the President or Chief of Staff and assume responsibility for all Presidential staff including the Assistant Board Secretary, who should report directly to the office of the President rather than to the Board.**

**(64) Space management and campus planning and facilities should be assigned to the Executive Vice President.**

**(65) A Vice President (or Senior Vice President) for Advancement should be appointed, preferably with a fund raising background, and assigned responsibility for**

**all fund raising including athletics, public relations, marketing and alumni affairs. The Executive Director of Alumni Affairs should report to this Vice President as should a Vice President for Development and a Director of Communications and Marketing.**

**(66) The Provost should formally be designated as the second officer of the institution and the individual who serves as the acting CEO in the absence of the President.**

**(67) It must be understood that the new President will have the ability to refashion the university's administrative structure and to re-slot, promote, or terminate vice presidents and individuals who report to him/her. In effect, every individual who reports to the new President informally should submit his/her resignation to the new President.**

**(68) See the following organization chart. Our administrative organization would look like this:**

**(Click to [http://www.auburn.edu/administration/specialreports/fisher\\_organization.pdf](http://www.auburn.edu/administration/specialreports/fisher_organization.pdf) to access the chart.)**

**See Organization Chart**

## **IX. BUDGET AND FINANCE**

**(69) Auburn is a well-managed, financially sound institution that consistently receives favorable audit reports. The university maintains significant financial reserves and does not support excessive debt. Its basic financial ratios are favorable and are the envy of many of other institutions. We applaud Auburn University for this performance and, not surprisingly, recommend more of the same.**

Executive Vice President Large and his colleagues deserve praise for their judicious management of the institution's scarce resources. Faculty and staff sometimes chafe at the rules and influence of those who are in charge of the institution's finances, but it is clear that AU has prospered under this approach.

The Auburn University system collectively was appropriated slightly more than \$215 million from the State of Alabama in 2004-2005. It is difficult to compare states and universities because of: (1) differences in curricula and programs; (2) differences in fiscal definitions; and, the practice of some states to not appropriate tuition revenue. Nevertheless, the table below provides some very rough comparisons of the extent of the state support for Auburn's main campus in comparison to peer institutions that are "south of Virginia, but east of the Mississippi." Within that group of institutions, Clemson, Florida State, Georgia Tech, Mississippi State, North Carolina State and South Carolina probably provide the most apt comparisons because they are similar to Auburn in terms of their missions and programs and do not have M.D. medical programs that distort their numbers.

*The evidence suggests that Auburn is not funded as well as either its peer institutions in surrounding states, or as well as those institutions that are most comparable to AU in terms of their missions and programs. Auburn ranked 11<sup>th</sup> among the fifteen institutions listed below in terms of state government appropriations per FTE student in FY 2004. The mean state appropriations per FTE among the six comparable institutions are almost fifteen percent higher than that of Auburn.*

**(70) It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Auburn's state funding per student is mediocre. This is evidence in support of the hypothesis advanced by a senior administrator---  
"Given the level of funding, we achieve at a very high level. The State of Alabama is getting a**

*bargain at Auburn.”* We are inclined to agree, though we hasten to point out that it is notoriously difficult to compare institutions’ funding because of differences in missions, programmatic mixes, definitions, treatment of tuition revenues, and the like. Nevertheless, the incoming President should be supported by the Board in making the case that Auburn deserves additional financial support. It seems reasonable, for example, that Auburn’s funding per FTE should approximate the large group average of \$10,134, or the comparable group average of \$9,533. All things considered, Auburn is a superb investment for the State of Alabama.

<u>FY 2004</u>	
<u>General Fund Appropriation</u>	
<u>Institution</u>	<u>Per FTE Student</u>
Auburn Main	\$ 8,041 (11 <sup>th</sup> of 15)
Alabama	\$ 6,363
Clemson	\$ 7,621
Florida	\$10,929
Florida State	\$ 8,043
Georgia	\$12,698
Georgia Tech	\$10,735
Kentucky	\$13,672
Louisiana State	\$ 9,175
Mississippi	\$ 5,105
Mississippi State	\$11,051
North Carolina	\$15,389
North Carolina State	\$13,142
South Carolina	\$ 6,603
Tennessee	\$13,438
Group Mean	\$10,134
“Comparables” Mean	\$ 9,533

### **Tuition and Fee Levels and Policies**

According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, these were the in-state tuition and fees charged by Auburn and a group of its peer institutions in 2004-2005:

<u>Institution</u>	<u>2005-2006</u> <u>Tuition and Fees</u>	<u>2005-2006</u> <u>Out-of-State T&amp;F</u>
Auburn Main	\$5,278 (5 <sup>th</sup> of 13)	\$14,878 (10 <sup>th</sup> of 13)
Alabama, Tuscaloosa	\$4,864	\$13,516
Clemson	\$8,816	\$18,440
Florida	\$3,094	\$16,579
Florida State	\$3,208	\$16,340
Georgia	\$4,628	\$16,848
Georgia Tech	\$4,648	\$18,990
Kentucky	\$5,812	\$12,798
Louisiana State, Baton R.	\$4,515	\$12,815
North Carolina, CH	\$4,515	\$18,313
North Carolina State	\$4,338	\$16,536
South Carolina, Columbia	\$7,314	\$18,956
Tennessee, Knoxville	\$5,290	\$16,060
Group Average	\$5,102	\$16,236

Among the thirteen institutions, Auburn ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in terms of its 2005-2006 in-state tuition and fee charges. Two institutions (Clemson and South Carolina) are outliers in this regard. Auburn ranks 10<sup>th</sup> among the thirteen institutions when out-of-state tuition and fees are the focus. Thus, Auburn charges in-state students a bit more than the typical peer flagship state university in the southeast, but charges out-of-state students significantly less (about nine percent less than the average).



Should these tuition and fee charges be adjusted? We see no reason to change Auburn's position with respect to in-state tuition and fees. It is the middle of the pack in that regard and is only three percent above the regional average.

**(71) Where out-of-state tuition and fees are concerned, however, we recommend that the university clarify its intent and consider increases. Is it intentionally under pricing its peer institutions in order to attract out-of-state students (who constituted more than 40 percent of the 2005 freshman class)? Or, unintentionally, is it simply leaving a large slice of revenue on the table?**

In 2003-2004, the main campus generated 23,507 FTE students. Roughly one-third of these students, or about 7,800, come to the university from outside Alabama. If this number of students were charged the current regional average for out-of-state tuition and fees, then Auburn would earn an additional \$10.6 million in tuition and fees. Such revenues would pay for a wide variety of good things that could include higher faculty salaries to additional student scholarships.

Of course, higher out-of-state tuition and fees no doubt would reduce the number of out-of-state applicants. Further, the university as a whole would not really augment all of the additional \$10.6 million in revenue because higher out-of-state tuition and fees would make out-of-state tuition remissions (for example, for athletes) more expensive.

Nonetheless, **(72) we recommend that the new President examine the out-of-state tuition and fee circumstances on the main campus and consider alternatives.**

Auburn Montgomery	\$4,720 (1 <sup>st</sup> of 7)	\$13,690 (3 <sup>rd</sup> of 7)
Austin Peay	\$4,635	\$13,947
Jacksonville State	\$4,040	\$8,080
Middle Tennessee	\$4,600	\$13,912
North Alabama	\$4,282	\$7,930
South Alabama	\$4,502	\$8,312
Troy Main	\$4,678	\$8,682

Group Average	\$4,494	\$10,650
---------------	---------	----------

**(73) In contrast to the main campus, tuition and fee levels on the Montgomery campus tend to be among the highest in the region, at least with respect to many of its peer institutions. Here, we recommend that the new President have the Chancellor examine this situation. Given the nature of the Montgomery student body, is it desirable for that campus to have among the highest tuition and fees within the region for comparable institutions?**

### **Tuition and Fee Waivers**

We note that Auburn's 2005-2006 budget contains \$30.1 million that supports tuition and fee waivers. Of this amount, \$23.8 million is counted as revenue, presumably coming from the State, though this is not entirely clear. The remaining \$6.3 million, however, is a large amount of money and apparently consists of self-funded waivers. Perhaps another explanation exists, but we did not encounter it.

**(74) We recommend that the new President examine closely how these funds are utilized and in particular ascertain if these funds are used productively. If Auburn were an independent institution, it would undertake sophisticated analyses to determine what it was obtaining in return for these expenditures. A similar analysis should be performed here.**

### **Auxiliary Services**

Auburn University's main campus supports a large and diverse set of auxiliary activities that typically do not receive any general fund tax support. AU's current budget includes \$66.7 million in expenditures within its auxiliaries, which include residence halls, hotels and the like.

The university's financial statements reveal an enviably solid financial situation within the auxiliaries. Debt levels are not high; fund balances are admirable; and, the university has made progress toward refurbishing the physical facilities within several of its auxiliaries, for example, several of its older residence halls. Parenthetically, retooling ancient residence halls so they fit current needs is both necessary and expensive.

**(75) Today's students simply expect far more from their residence halls than was true even a decade ago. They desire larger rooms, up to date technology, bathroom facilities and activities. Hence, it is not possible simply to update an existing room; more often than not, the walls must be knocked out in order to accommodate these desires.**

**(76) In addition, Auburn is short of residence hall space, at least as things currently stand. It has committed to constructing additional university-owned residence hall space and we encourage them to continue to move in this direction. At the same time, we recommend that the institution give even more thought to public-private partnerships whereby private developers build and operate facilities that eventually the university will own. This approach will reduce AU's debt exposure and transfer some of the risks of development to the private sector. Numerous campuses have gone this route in recent years and Auburn should specifically examine how it might do so as well.**

**(77) Based upon student comments, we also urge the Student Affairs area to examine student behavior and standards in its residence halls. Student reports suggest that alcohol and drug abuse occur more often than the university cares to admit and that some of the residence halls do not provide the positive experiences that both AU and students have the right to expect. This situation should be investigated closely and appropriate remedial strategy devised.**

**(78) At the same time, however, it is appropriate that Auburn engage its institutional research personnel to undertake empirical studies designed to determine if, to put it simply, the residence halls really work. Do they result in higher retention and graduation rates, higher grade point averages, or increased student participation in campus activities? Do they produce higher student satisfaction and greater participation in the alumni fund? If not, why not? AU will be able to fashion a much more intelligent residence hall strategy if it possesses such knowledge.**

## **X. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

Intercollegiate athletics occupy an almost larger than life role at Auburn University. When 87,451 Tiger fans fill every available seat in Jordan-Hare Stadium for a home football game, a palpable, though in some ways almost indefinable, spirit of energy and group unity captures Auburn and its many constituencies. Time-honored shouts of “War Eagle!” readily identify tens of thousands of Auburn fans world-wide, but this is not always accompanied by understanding by outsiders. There are sociologies attached to Tiger athletics and, for that matter, to SEC athletics, that often are difficult for outsiders to comprehend. Auburn and the SEC evoke unity of purpose, pride, and magnificent entertainment, along with generous amounts of tribalism and almost religious attachments to being a fan. All in all, Auburn athletics and the SEC, are distinctive, perhaps unique, in the context of American higher education.

A member of the SEC, Auburn played its first football game in 1892. Things have changed since then. The university budgeted more than \$35 million during this fiscal year for intercollegiate athletics and related support activities such as the marching band and academic support. Football accounted for \$6.34 million of this total, with men's basketball (\$2.40 million) and men's and women's basketball (\$1.55 million) next highest among the sports. Commendably, Auburn budgeted \$1.17 million for academic support for athletes and, inter alia, operates a large and well-appointed student athlete academic development center.

The sheer financial size of Auburn’s intercollegiate athletics operations attracts attention. Witness the recent community interest in the football coach’s seven-year contract, which was widely reported to be worth more than \$2.0 million annually. Concern often seemed to be more about how the decision was made rather than about the size of the financial package.

Auburn's expenditures for intercollegiate athletics may seem high, and they are in a national context, but actually they are substantially below those of several of its SEC competitors, notably Florida, Florida State, Georgia and Tennessee. Nevertheless, Auburn has been more than competitive in the SEC and nationally and has numerous conference championship and several national championships to show for it. Auburn's comparatively penurious approach to intercollegiate athletic expenditures (at least by SEC standards) is small comfort to those who object to such expenditures as a matter of principle, but they are best considered within an SEC

perspective. What is common and acceptable in the SEC is not necessarily the order of the day in the Atlantic Ten or Big Sky Conferences.

Auburn sponsors eleven women's sports and nine men's sports. Yet, whether Auburn satisfies the dictates of Title IX with respect to gender equity is not clear to some outside observers. The university argues that it satisfies acceptable interpretations of Title IX and neither any court, nor the NCAA, has ruled differently.

**(79) We recommend, nevertheless, that the new President re-examine the precise ways in which Auburn currently satisfies Title IX requirements.**

There are many very positive things to be said about intercollegiate athletics at Auburn University. The institution's programs have run at least small financial surpluses for approximately a decade and on occasion they funnel some dollars to the academic side of the university's house. These are accomplishments duplicated by few institutions in Division I-A athletics, the majority of which struggle to keep their heads above the financial waves. If there is a danger here, it is in the wholesale dependence of the entire intercollegiate program on the financial success of Tiger football teams. Auburn football feeds and subsidizes nearly all of the other sports.

Graduation rates for Auburn's athletes have improved substantially over the years and the NCAA reports indicate that it is at or above national averages in many sports; this is true for African-American athletes as well. Of 55 NCAA Division I football teams that competed in post-season bowls this year, only seven had NCAA Academic Progress Rates higher than Auburn, though 32 had football team graduation rates that exceeded Auburn. The Academic Progress Rates takes into account the number of players on a team and the extent to which they stay in college, stay eligible and graduate.

**(80) Even so, the graduation rate for student athletes is still too low. Further, the graduation rate for "special admissions" student-athletes (those who do not qualify for regular admissions) is less than one-half of that for the overall student body. *"These individuals are the key to our football and basketball success,"* commented an insider. It is clear that there must be room for progress here. We recommend that the Athletic Director focus on these individuals, determine how and why they are failing, and see what can be done to**

improve their academic performances. Otherwise, one might easily conclude that Auburn admits these individuals extracts their athletic performances, and then tosses them aside.

(81) Among other considerations, we recommend that Auburn mandate individualized tutoring programs for its special admission student-athletes. Special admission students come to Auburn with academic weaknesses, but also with high expectations for athletic performance (otherwise they would not have been admitted, given their academic credentials). A specifically tailored support tutoring and academic support program should be developed for each special admission student that he/she should be required to follow. Each special admissions student should be informed even during recruiting that this will be expected of them. In our view, while some prospective student-athletes may not be thrilled by this prospect, their parents or guardians (and their high school principals and coaches) will view this requirement favorably. Further, each year an outside evaluation should be conducted to learn what works and what doesn't. Additionally, research should be conducted to help Auburn to determine which special admission student-athletes have the best chance of being successful and others who, for motivational and other reasons, simply are quite unlikely to make it. If Auburn cannot improve its graduation rate for these students, then it should reduce their numbers.

(82) We recommend that the contracts of Auburn's coaches always include provisions dealing with both student academic achievement and rules compliance. Coach's contracts and annual evaluations usually reward coaches for successful seasons; they also should include rewards related to student progress and running a clean program.

(83) Presently, the Athletics Department conducts on line interviews of senior athletes. We suggest that the Standing University Senate Committee be involved and that face-to-face exit interviews occur for each graduating senior athlete and each athlete who leaves before his/her eligibility is used up. The purpose of the interviews would be to learn of problems, compliance or otherwise, that need to be addressed. This information should be reported to the President and the Athletic Director in a private meeting.

The overall student-athlete support system is impressive. The Student Athlete Support Services program assigns student athletes to one of its student counselors who stays with the student

until he/she graduates or leaves the university. Tutorial assistance, course registration and overall academic management are a part of this service. Auburn also provides personal and professional development through its NCAA sponsored, nationally recognized CHAMPS/ Life Skills program; the new, outstanding Academic Center for Athletes facilities make this task easier. As one faculty interviewee said, *“In recent years they have been serious about working with us when students need help. Yet, I have never been approached about a grade change.”* When asked, others in the group echoed the sentiment about grade changes.

In contrast to circumstances at some other institutions, Auburn's athletes have been integrated into the university's academic life and Intercollegiate Athletics financially supports tutors who assist both athletes and other students. A new Athletic Director (Mr. Jay Jacobs) has deliberately undertaken to improve the image of Intercollegiate Athletics and he has made impressive progress in that regard. A number of interviewees commented about the managerial improvements since the new Director of Athletics was appointed. One interviewee commented on how hard the department works to stay clear of NCAA violations. Another said, *“The new Director is young, but sincere and hard working; people want him to be successful and they trust him.”* Another described the new environment as *“family like”* saying that, *“We can get emotional about issues, but in the end we will do what is right for the program and Auburn.”*

The university passed through its most recent NCAA certification process rather well (and has done the same with respect to SEC reviews) and thereby garnered a set of deserved commendations for the directions it has taken. It is notable that Auburn now employs five individuals in the compliance section of its intercollegiate athletic administration and advertises in its materials that compliance is of *“the utmost importance.”* An individual with coaching experience observed that, *“I have been in a number of coaching positions, and this is the tightest (most rigorous) program I have seen. It is fair but constraining.”*

These efforts deserve applause and support. They have required much effort and commitment and represent a desirable “New Auburn.”

**(84) We recommend that the new President demonstrate his/her early and vocal support for the “New Auburn” as it applies to intercollegiate athletics; the athletic director should continue as a direct report. Without undercutting the athletic director, the President**

**should visit with coaches and athletic squads to spread the good word and go out and talk with alumni and supporters to underline the university's academic values and institutional commitments.**

That said, this perception still exists on-campus and throughout the nation that intercollegiate athletics (and especially) football are *“the tail that wags the dog”* at Auburn. The scandals, missteps and probations that we mentioned in our introductory section have not been forgotten and Auburn still finds itself on NCAA probation. The institution apparently holds an unenviable national record in that regard. Over and over again, concerned faculty told us that intercollegiate athletics were *“wildly overemphasized.”* Commented the president of another institution, *“Traditionally, there simply has been little sense of proportion to athletics at Auburn.”*

There remains an inability on occasions for Auburn personnel to confront intercollegiate athletic issues in an open and collegial fashion without things becoming personal and sometimes ugly. As one interviewee put it, *“We have no well-established, respected ways of getting to ‘yes.’ Instead, ‘end arounds’ those who are in authority become the rule rather than the exception.”* Another provided a different interpretation: *“If the people at the top would lead—follow the rules--most things could get worked out and there would be no need for ‘end arounds.’ ”*

What all concerned with Auburn's welfare need to understand is that these perceptions often are shared nationally. Thus, when individuals who are not aware of Auburn's many academic and programmatic achievements think of the university, it often is in terms of its intercollegiate athletic programs, and in more than a few cases, that perception is not helpful. Yes, Auburn has a brand, and the closer to home one is, the more positive that brand tends to be. But, the world is larger than Alabama and the southeast. Hence, on occasion, Auburn's brand is not helpful to the university and may harm its constituents in a variety of employment and academic program ranking situations. Some individuals know and judge Auburn only on the basis of what they read about its intercollegiate athletic teams and their fans. Alas, over the past few decades, that publicity has been a mixed bag.

In December 2003, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools placed Auburn on probation for failure to comply with several of its criteria for accreditation. Two of these criteria relate to intercollegiate athletics: Rule 5.52 and Rule 5.53. Rule 5.52 pertains to oversight of



athletics. The Association cited Auburn for "...failing to demonstrate the existence and implementation of sufficient safeguards to ensure that ultimate control over the athletics program rests with the chief executive officer" (Board micromanagement and interference by alumni groups). Rule 5.53 deals with financial control of the athletics program. Here the Association cited Auburn for having insufficient control over the Athletic funds held in the Athletic Foundation. We are pleased to report that it appears that the university has made considerable progress in addressing these two issues since December 2003. Decisive action by the Interim President and the Board of Trustees resulted in a new Board policy on Intercollegiate Athletics. Further, the new Board statement requires that all funds received by affiliated organizations spent on athletics be controlled and overseen by the President. But, negative impressions linger much longer than probations.

**(85) Auburn should maintain transparency whenever possible with respect to all intercollegiate athletic programs. There will always be a certain amount of mystery surrounding any high profile athletics program, but the more transparency about its operations the better. Campus and community ignorance about the program is partly the result of keeping too much information under wraps. Public release of budget information would be helpful. For example, how many people know the burden placed on football to help fund the overall program? Or, how many know that a small minority of I-A intercollegiate athletic programs actually operate in the black? The President's annual report and this report for starters will constitute a move in the right direction.**

It is only fair to note that intercollegiate athletics has not been the only malefactor in terms of generating negative media coverage. Publicity relating to Auburn's Board of Trustees, the musical chairs instability among the university's top administrators, legal suits against SACS, battles with the AAUP, and so forth, also have injured the institution, even when Auburn may have had elements of virtue on its side. *"These guys are very good at shooting themselves in their foot,"* is the sardonic observation of an official in a disciplinary accrediting agency.

It is almost axiomatic that one *"should never argue with anyone who buys their ink by the barrel"* (that is, one is ill-advised to argue extensively with newspapers). It is analogously unwise to be perceived continually as an adversary of accrediting agencies, the NCAA, the AAUP, and

similar well-established regional and national organizations. Simply put, it is very difficult to win battles of perception in such circumstances. It is one thing to be brave, but quite another to be judicious.

**(86) To be sure, some national perceptions of Auburn are based upon out-of-date stereotypes and represent unfortunate regional ignorance. Many institutions in the Old South battle such perceptual odds. Still, if Auburn is to assume its justified place in the higher education sun, it must turn over a new leaf and demonstrate to any and all that intercollegiate athletics are under control (and here we unmistakably mean under the control of the President of the university), that Auburn unmistakably is an institution that will follow the rules, and that it will not tolerate those who are rule breakers. (This includes Boosters as well as staff.) Board members must stay completely out of the management of intercollegiate athletics. Auburn University is too fine an institution with too great a potential to allow any single area of the institution, or any single group of individuals, to deter its progress.**

**(87) We recommend that the President and the Athletic Director (with the visible support of the Board) announce a zero tolerance policy for serious NCAA violations. Secondary violations always are likely to occur and an effective compliance program will deal with them quickly by informing the NCAA of action taken. Major violations, however, require a much heavier hand. Auburn must clearly state to coaches and other intercollegiate athletics officials that they will be held accountable for major violations in their sport and that they will be punished, including the possibility of termination, if substantive violations occur. We recommend their contracts contain such language.**

**(88) Further, we recommend that the university clearly enunciate this policy to its fans and boosters and that it make a conscientious attempt to inform major fan and booster groups of the institution's stance, the nature of NCAA rules, and how Auburn intends to deal with violations. Finally, in this regard, we recommend that the university sever its relationship with any fan or booster organization that is found to encourage or abet the violation either Auburn or NCAA rules concerning intercollegiate athletics.**

**(89) We recommend that the new President participate in the NCAA outreach program for new presidents and chancellors. This program provides new presidents with the**

**opportunity to learn about NCAA policies and issues from key NCAA staff and retired Division I-A presidents. It is an excellent way for a new CEO to obtain independent views and to assemble contacts that can be invaluable when objective, external advice is needed.**

**(90) Finally, we recommend that each Board member sign a statement, not unlike its conflict of interest statement, which indicates that the Board member in question understands the university's athletics policies and intends to abide by them. It is absolutely essential that all Board members abide by their own policies (as well as those of the SEC and the NCAA) and that they publicly support the President in administering and implementing those policies.**

## **XI. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT**

In conversations with more than one hundred alumni and students (most selected completely at random), we have never encountered such deep feelings for a university. We were there on the weekend of the Iron Bowl and were completely swept up in an orange wave. *“In Auburn, a mixed marriage is between an Auburn alum and an Alabama alum.” “Auburn graduates own the farm; Alabama graduates drive the tractors.” “War eagle!”*

Yet, it is incongruous with such enthusiastic alumni that only 10.9 percent contributed to the annual fund in 2005 [Council for Aid to Education]. Auburn ranks number 102 tied with the University of Utah, University of Texas Southwest Medical Center and University of Wisconsin-Stout. University of Virginia ranks number 10, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill number 18, University of Florida number 27, University of Georgia number 45 and ***University of Alabama number 22***. These figures speak for themselves.

***Knowledgeable persons agree that the margin of excellence for a greater Auburn will be private support.*** This support will need to come from major gifts from alumni as well as other individuals, corporations and foundations. The alumni participation rate does not itself produce gifts, but it is an indicator of other things. It is often called the “love index,” and Auburn’s “love index” is too low! If alumni do not participate in annual giving, they probably will not become major donors down the road. And, alumni giving influences other things. Typically, foundation officers ask, *“What percent of your alumni contribute,”* and their prime concern is not the amount of the annual fund but the percentage. Corporate executives and major givers ask the same question.

Yes, there are some fairly plausible explanations for the low rate which include questionable Board practices, administrative and faculty leadership, bad publicity and administrative organization. These issues are addressed elsewhere in this Review. In this section, we look more closely at the administrative organization in the advancement area.

For starters, the current organization chart includes separate vice presidencies in development and alumni affairs (Apparently, the alumni vice presidency will be re-titled an executive director.). This bodes unnecessary potential conflict between the “friend raisers” and the “fund raisers.” All university “friend” raising, indeed all public relations, should be translated into

resource generation, more pointedly, into fund raising. Logically, this means that there should be a single officer in charge of all institutional advancement activities (development, alumni, public relations, publications, and often government relations) and that officer should usually be an experienced fund raiser who is more likely to think in terms of bottom line. We note here that a number of big universities do have separate vice presidencies in public relations, but not three vice presidents dividing up the advancement turf. Auburn further compounds the problem by having a Director of External Affairs who is in the President's office. What a discordant!

### **The Board of Trustees**

As will be detailed in the following chapter, the university's most pressing need is governance, both the constitutional premises and the behavior of Board members. The By-Laws must be reformed and restructured, Board members and elected officials must stay out of university management, and the appropriate roles of all parties must be clearly defined. Until this is done, the appointment of a new President and the other changes needed for a greater Auburn will be marginalized or fail.

**(91) The Board must assume a more active role in institutional advancement. A permanent Board committee should be established which relates effectively with the university Foundations; indeed, we believe the Board should be represented on each Foundation board.**

The Alumni Association will be considered below; Foundations, including an athletic foundation, exist solely to provide resources to fund the programs of the university and all of the organizational and personnel decisions should be under the aegis of the **accountable** president or a presidential delegate. Simple if followed, but not so at Auburn today. Too many at Auburn believe that with money comes authority, like the owner becoming the head coach. The common maxim for all boards should be, **"Stay out of management and give, get, or get off."**

### **The President of the University and Advancement**

In an institution as large and complex as Auburn, the president must exercise control over the reins of the advancement program and be the ubiquitous and forceful leader setting both the

direction and the pace. While board members must be fully vested in the overall objectives, its spirit and management are the president's daily responsibility. This means exercising control over relationships with the media, contact with the alumni and the general public, leaders in government and the cultivation and solicitation of principal donors and donor prospects. Yes, a good chief advancement officer will, in effect, point the president in the right direction and "move his/her lips." But in the end, the president calls the shots.

And the score at Auburn: All the Boards are too involved in trying to run the university, they bicker among themselves and with each other; there are more leaks than the White House; alumni are confused; principal donors are uncertain; the Presidents have been selective in their attention, or at times completely absent; and a group of generally competent advancement professionals try to run on a muddy field with no quarterback and no offensive plays. (Football metaphors are appropriate at Auburn)

Yet, remarkably, our study suggests that Auburn's advancement functions have made progress in this organizational turbulence, an environment that includes not only the well known controversies but also poor lines of communication, unclear assignment of responsibilities and poor leadership.

### **Fund Raising/Development**

The development program appears to be following established best practices. The total staff numbers about 90, including 40 fund raisers. The resources available to the program are generally adequate. The staff includes development officers who are based in academic units, with ordinarily questionable dual reporting to the dean and to one of two associate vice presidents in the central development office. Nonetheless, there appear to be good relationships between the unit-based development officers and central development. Advancement services, including prospect research and management, is handled by the central office, and alumni records are centralized in the development office. The current information system is adequate but not state-of-the-art. The office considered a conversion to the Banner system but made a decision to defer the conversion until an updated version becomes available within the next two years.

Major gifts fund raising is quite decentralized, but a centralized prospect management system appears to be working. Major gift officers manage portfolios of about 150 prospects. All components of the university, including athletics, participate in a centrally-managed prospect-clearance system for all prospects rated as capable of giving \$25,000 or more. The central development staff includes a prospect manager, with overall responsibility for coordination of the prospect-management system. It was reported that the deans are, in general, capable fund raisers and eager to increase private support.

Major gifts fund raising is primarily staff-driven, but there has been progress in developing a volunteer structure in connection with the campaign, including campaign committees in some 18 cities. Volunteers, including members of the foundation boards and campaign committees, participate in some solicitations, but more frequently act as “door openers,” preparing the way for solicitations by development staff. However, “door opening” is only a partial role for Board members and volunteers; they should often, after careful grooming by staff, “make the ask themselves.” Many people give because of who asks them, and the person who asks should have given more than the person being asked. We were advised that the Interim President has not had time to actively participate in fund raising.

The extensive materials provided for the Review did not appear to include financial details on the campaign. A \$500 million goal will be announced on February 3, 2006. This is a significant goal in light of several false starts toward a campaign in recent years, a feasibility study that recommended a more modest goal, and the broader controversies that have affected the university.

However, the potential for much greater support exists and a new Auburn can realize this potential. A recent electronic screening of alumni identified 5,000-6,000 alumni with the capacity for major gifts, including many who were previously unknown and/or uncultivated, and there are 3-4 known prospects with the capacity for gifts in the \$50 million range.

For good reasons, we think the approach to the current campaign was appropriately conservative, including an extended silent phase. We note here that several donors felt that their commitment to Auburn transcended all of the current and past controversies. We should all have such “far seeing” donors.

## **Communications/Marketing**

The quality of publications is generally impressive as were a number of the initiatives that the communications/marketing office has accomplished in the past three years, including strengthened external and internal communications and an organized approach to media relations. The communications/marketing program appears to include the components usually found at major universities and generally to follow accepted best practices.

The office has developed a standard graphic identity program and is working to implement it university-wide. The strategy is to use the “look” of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration as a “wedge” and to work with the academic units toward its gradual adoption as the campus-wide standard. The process is hampered by the fact that some individual academic units employ communications officers, who are even less closely tied to the central office than their development counterparts. Some schools publish their own magazines and other materials and not all follow the university graphics standards.

**(92) There is a lack of clarity regarding the purpose and leadership of the communications/marketing program. The office is led by an Assistant Vice President, while development and alumni affairs rank higher. At most universities, communications/marketing is on par with fund raising and alumni affairs, and we believe all should be directed by a single Vice President for Advancement. Moreover, the existence of an individual within the President’s office with the title “Director of External Affairs” creates confusion about roles and responsibilities. Such good people without a general!**

## **Alumni Affairs**

Alumni Affairs includes many fairly typical standard programs. The work of this office has been particularly complicated by issues involving the Alumni Association leadership, the Board of Trustees, and the President.

One area of sensitivity is the alumni magazine, which is published by the Alumni Affairs office, with, by our reading, has too much input from the leadership of the Alumni Association. The magazine has been nationally recognized for its quality. However, it has sometimes included letters-



to-the-editor critical of the Trustees and the administration. The university administration provides partial funding for the office; although, at one point in the past, was cut off, later to be restored.

**(93) The office is led by an interim Vice President and a search for an Executive Director of the office (to replace the Vice President position) is currently underway. This search should probably be stayed until the next President reviews the organization and personnel of the advancement area.**

**(94) Unfortunately, there is no organized alumni association program to mobilize Auburn alumni in support of the university's budget requests at the state level. However, an able Director of External Relations has developed a cooperative effort with the University of Alabama for approaching the state on behalf of both institutions. More should be done here.**

Alumni leaders seemed to be primarily concerned with Board of Trustees' issues, the role of the Alumni Association in university governance and a Political Action Committee that has been organized relevant to the Board of Trustees. Unfortunately, there were few comments on alumni programs or the direction of the Alumni Affairs office.

A concluding note about alumni associations: An alumni association is not a governing board and should not be represented as a governing board; alumni, yes, but not those selected by an alumni association. For the alumni constituency to be represented in governance is to also justify the representation of faculty, students and staff. A governing board then becomes even more politicized as each group represents its interest rather than the greater university. An alumni association exists for love of alma mater and should represent a way for payback to alma mater, for what many consider the best years of their lives.

### **Government Relations**

**(95) For years, Auburn did not receive its "fair share" from the state, but this changed significantly upon the appointment of Dr. Richardson and Mr. Sid McAnnally, both of whom have deep knowledge of the political environment of the state and the legislative process. Auburn's position and influence in the state budgeting process has moved up. Their ability to forge a relationship with the University of Alabama System has also greatly improved**

**financial opportunities. While to some this may be an organizational anomaly, it works. Mr. McAnnally should stay in the Office of the President with a title change (Executive Assistant to the President or Chief of Staff) and retain the government relations responsibilities.**

### **Relationships Among Advancement Offices**

It appears that the relationship between the development office and communications/marketing is working because of the two able officers in charge. A separate development communications unit was recently transferred to communications/marketing and development seems to be satisfied with the support they are receiving. Relationships between development and Alumni Affairs have been strained at various points, but there appear to be better relationships today.

Despite the efforts at cooperation at the staff level, the current organizational structure hinders a more integrated approach to institutional advancement. Moreover, the staff leaders of all three offices—alumni relations, development, and communications/marketing -- have difficulty gaining access to the current President and are left unclear as to the President’s priorities. Their communication with the President is primarily through the Director of External Affairs, who seems to function almost as the de facto chief advancement officer. This does not make for a harmonious concert.

**(96) It would be easy to make recommendations for re-organization of the advancement offices and implementation of policies to bring about a more coordinated university-wide approach. It would seem obvious to suggest that the President needs to be more engaged in fund raising and that there is a continuing need to develop more extensive volunteer leadership for fund raising and other purposes. However, significant changes should not be made until a permanent President is in office.**

**(97) The new president may want to consider two alternatives. The first would be to appoint a single chief advancement officer with overall responsibility for alumni affairs, development and communications/marketing, perhaps a “Senior Vice President,” with each of the three areas reporting to him or her. This is the design we would prefer. (A “vice**

**president” title is especially vital for development, since it confers credibility on the chief development officer in his or her interactions with alumni and other sources of support.)**

**(98) As a second alternative, a number of large universities, both private and public, have two vice presidents in the advancement area—a Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs (or similar title) and a Vice President for Communications and Marketing (or similar title), both reporting to the President. The advantage of this model is that the attention of the Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs will not be distracted from fund raising by the considerable and growing demands of broader communications and marketing priorities and that it provides a “seat at the table” (that is, in the President’s cabinet) to the important communications/marketing function.**

**(99) We emphasize here again the choice of these alternatives should be made by the new President, in light of his or her own preferences and experiences and reading of the situation at Auburn. Certainly, re-organization is essential. Having independent offices for alumni affairs, development, and communications/marketing simply does not provide a platform for effectiveness in advancement and always has the potential for destructive competition, infighting, inefficiency, and failure.**

**(100) In either of the two models described above, Alumni Affairs should report to the same university officer who has responsibility for development. Separating development and alumni relations does not serve the best interests of a university nor the long-term strength of either program. That is a generic reality.**

These things reported, we close this section by emphasizing the truly positive impressions resulting from our visit. The dedication and loyalty of the staff, alumni, volunteers, faculty and students with whom we met —indeed, their love for Auburn—was palpable. Even those who had complaints or concerns expressed them in the context of their desire to see the university succeed. That spirit and commitment is a great asset. The next test will be the willingness of all parties to join together in changing the operating premises of each constituent organization which would enable the President to lead Auburn to a new and finer era.

## **XII. AUBURN UNIVERSITY MONTGOMERY**

Auburn's Montgomery campus is located on a 500-acre campus on the eastern side of the City of Montgomery near highway I-85. Approximately 5,400 headcount students (about 85 percent undergraduate) attend UAM in a typical fall semester.

AUM is a surprising institution to those who do not know it well. It holds separate accreditations with SACS and with individual disciplinary accrediting agencies. For example, AUM's business programs hold AACSB accreditation and its highly regarded MPA program is accredited by NASPAA. In contrast to some urban campuses, AUM boasts residence halls, intercollegiate athletic teams and a host of campus-based activities. AUM has graduated more than 28,000 individuals since its founding in 1967.

The Montgomery campus academic programs focus on business, the liberal arts, education, the sciences and nursing. AUM does not offer engineering degree programs, but does offer pre-engineering along with a dozen other pre-professional programs, including pre-law and pre-pharmacy. Currently, AUM offers 27 baccalaureate degree programs, ten masters programs, 4 specialist programs and one doctoral program.

AUM always has placed a strong emphasis on the use of technology in its instructional activities. This has proven to be attractive to its mobile, employed, mature student body.

Auburn Montgomery is not a research campus, although some faculty undertake activities that result in externally refereed scholarly productivity. Still, the *Faculty Handbook* makes it clear that teaching is the primary duty of AUM faculty. That emphasis is apparent in the attitudes and comments of faculty, who typically do not view themselves as in competition for research dollars and like with Auburn's main campus faculty. We believe this distinction is appropriate.

**(101) We do note, however, that the *Faculty Handbook* says almost nothing about how salary increments are distributed. There is no statement of criteria (although one might assume criteria from the tenure and promotion statements), no statement of how salary dollars are distributed, no statement in favor of merit salaries, no statement to support salary increments that might address gender or racial inequities, or salary compression, etc. Perhaps such statements exist somewhere at AUM. If so, then we recommend they be placed**

**in the *Faculty Handbook*. If not, then such statements should be developed and placed there after they have been approved by the Chancellor.**

More than 80 percent of AUM students hold a job in addition to their studies; 56 percent work 20 hours or more per week. Many AUM students (about 25 percent) are part-time and they are older than the typical main campus Auburn student. This is among the reasons that AUM does not apply the same admissions standards to undergraduate students as the main campus.

**(102) AUM places somewhat less emphasis on ACT scores and high school grade point averages when it is considering the admissions applications of students who are older, are successfully raising a family, or who are military veterans. We recommend that this philosophy continue.**

In contrast to the main campus, 65 percent of AUM students are women and 40 percent are members of minority groups, predominantly African-Americans. Coupled with the more mature nature of the AUM student body and the fact that so many hold a job in addition to their studies, this means that AUM's academic, programmatic and outreach activities differ substantially from those of the main campus. We commend Auburn both for recognizing these realities and for encouraging AUM to develop its own independent responses, for example, its own independent capital campaign that focuses on its specific needs.

**(103) At least in terms of titles, AUM appears to be relatively lean. In addition to the campus Chancellor, there are only two vice chancellors. There are six academic school deans plus a dean for the library. While some individuals believe that AUM should develop substantially more schools, departments and institutes, we recommend that AUM resist the temptation to do so and instead continue to operate a lean and well-defined administrative structure. This will not only economize on resources, but also will encourage multidisciplinary interactions among faculty and students.**

Library resources at the Montgomery campus are satisfactory, if not good. AUM's library holds more than 300,000 books, subscribes to more than 1,500 journals and periodicals and has the valuable ability to borrow items quickly from the main campus library.

**(104) We recommend that the library continue to emphasize electronic access to library materials and to enhance the ability to its decentralized student body to access those materials from throughout the region. The unmistakable key here is for AUM to undertake joint purchasing and subscriptions with the main campus library. This will maximize AUM's library resources at the lowest possible cost.**

AUM's faculty appears to be well qualified; more than 80 percent of permanent faculty hold the appropriate terminal degree in their discipline. However, in Fall 2004, 43 percent of its faculty were adjunct or part-time. Student comments about these faculty are generally favorable, but mixed. Representative is the comment of a 35-year old business student who observed, *"I've had some great part-timers who really had lots of great examples to contribute, but then I've also had a couple of cancelled classes and they were unprepared. AUM needs to crack down on this. That's not what we're paying to receive."*

**(105) We recommend that AUM ensure that all adjunct and part-time faculty are appropriately trained and supervised; that all of their classes are evaluated by students each semester; that a full-time faculty member visit the class of every adjunct or part-time faculty member at least once a year; that adjunct and part-time faculty be invited to department meetings and gatherings; and, that specific programs and resources be devoted to supporting and improving the teaching of adjunct and part-time faculty at times and places convenient to them.**

**(106) In a section above, we encouraged the main campus to expand and retool its distance learning efforts. Some of that activity should take place on the AUM campus, for example, that relating to distance learning in public administration, or in urban education. We recommend that the main campus and AUM consider how AUM might participate meaningfully in enhanced distance learning activities for the university as a whole.**

**(107) A current issue on the AUM campus relates to the upgrading and expansion of its intercollegiate athletic programs. AUM intends to move from an National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) affiliation to Division II of the NCAA. Division II explicitly is a "scholarship" division and hence AUM will find it necessary to invest additional resources**

**into athletic scholarships. Further, we were told that AUM intends to add three additional sports. All of these things, it is said, will be revenue neutral. We regard this issue, even if it is seriously put forward, as nonsense.**

**(108) We believe Interim President Richardson immediately should freeze in place AUM's intercollegiate athletic programs. The freeze should include and forestall the movement to NCAA's Division II. It is not clear to this team how, in net terms, Division II athletics will be good for AUM.**

The institution's student body is, from our interviews, substantially uninterested in AUM's intercollegiate athletic teams. This hardly came as a surprise, given that AUM's typical student is a mature adult who holds a job and is raising a family. Attendance at a soccer match or basketball game is less important to such students than child care, internships and career placement. *"I couldn't care less if AUM even has athletic teams,"* said a student who represented many.

We were unable to determine how much the proposed move to the NCAA's Division II will cost AUM. Whatever that cost, those dollars would generate more student benefits if invested in items such as scholarships, improved parking, internships, and the like. AUM apparently believes that more athletic teams and a higher level of competition will improve student morale, change external perceptions of the campus for the better, and match AUM with institutions that it regards as its academic peers. Perhaps, but these are hypotheses for which there is only limited support. Unless a public urban campus has a large enrollment and, in addition, has doctoral research status (UCLA, UAB, UNC-Charlotte, University of Illinois at Chicago, Georgia State, South Florida, Portland State), its athletic teams typically evince little interest and support within its community. On the contrary, on smaller, non-doctoral campuses, athletic teams tend to be fiscal drags that generate little public support.

The most vexing questions relating to AUM are how the campus should relate to the main campus and, indeed, whether it should have any relationship at all. There are three basic models that might be put forward:

- AUM becomes a free-standing institution and probably adopts a name that does not include Auburn in its title and hence operates programs that are totally independent of the main Auburn campus.
- AUM retains its AUM name and relationship as a constituent campus of Auburn University, but does so as a branch campus whose programs and standards are consistent with, and often based upon, home campus programs and standards. The Chancellor of AUM reports to, and is appointed by, the President of the Auburn main campus.
- AUM adopts a model that incorporates aspects of both of the previous models. To some extent, this is the current situation.

**(109) After much consideration, we have concluded that a hybrid of the third model would provide the greatest benefits to AUM students and the Montgomery community. We recommend that AUM retain its name and its role as a campus inside the Auburn University system. We believe that areas exist where AUM ought to have very close connections to the main campus, but that other areas exist where the connections ought to be minimal. Further, the Chancellor of AUM should be appointed by, report to, and be assessed by the President of Auburn University's main campus.**

We see the following benefits flowing from a close relationship between the two campuses (these may be read as recommendations in most cases):

**(110) AUM will maintain the advantage of the Auburn name. "Montgomery State College," or "University of Montgomery" would not carry the same cachet with students or prospective faculty. By the same token, if AUM wants the Auburn name, then truth in advertising requires that there be substance attached to the Auburn label.**

**(111) Significant savings can be obtained with respect to the purchase of a variety of items. Earlier, we noted that joint purchases of computers, Internet connectivity, software licenses, expensive financial and records systems all could produce non-negligible savings for AUM.**



**(112) AUM and the home campus can extend to other professional programs the current nursing model whereby a single dean is in charge of both programs. This will benefit both institutions. In some cases, it will raise AUM's standards and visibility. The arrangement also will provide the main campus with a viable urban laboratory that it should exploit to the fullest. Currently, the main campus talks more about urban outreach than it actually delivers. We believe that education is the most likely next candidate for a joint deanship which would also provide placements for urban student teaching.**

**(113) Joint deanships and closer academic collaboration should result in the extension of a much larger stable of graduate programs to AUM. This will clearly benefit AUM students and the Montgomery community.**

**(114) Student transfer should become easier as AUM and the main campus are regarded as a single institution. Currently, AUM students justifiably complain that *"they treat us as if we are transferring from Troy State or somewhere."* Course transfer must be transparent, easy and not result in lost credits if students adhere to joint campus agreements that must be negotiated in detail.**

**(115) Increased faculty interchange should occur as main campus faculty teach on occasion in Montgomery and AUM faculty teach on occasion in Auburn. This will result in greater understanding and better education.**

**(116) Maintaining AUM as a campus within Auburn University should minimize mission overlap and programmatic duplication, which will save AUM students and Alabama taxpayers money. Our recommendation with respect to intercollegiate athletics at AUM is consistent with this spirit.**

**(117) The idea of creating a "system," including AUM and perhaps other components of AU, has been floated. We are dubious of this prospect, and there appears no compelling need militating for change. A more useful approach would be the determination of those issues, if any, that impede the current structure and then**

**rationalize those rather than create a costly “system” that would consume valuable time and money with only a marginal return. We recommend it be dismissed or tabled until the next President is appointed.**

**(118) We recommend that the new President spend significant time on the AUM campus, get to know it and Montgomery well, consult widely, and then consider the preceding recommendations, along with others that are generated by this analysis.**

### **XIII. GOVERNANCE (This Chapter goes to the root of Auburn's problems.)**

#### **Internal Governance**

Internal university governance mechanisms at Auburn are advisory to the President. Three primary bodies exist for Auburn employees to make their views known and to provide advice to the President: the University Senate, the University Staff Council and the Administrative and Professional Assembly.

As with all institutions of higher education, the key organization is the University Senate which has contested aspects of its role with the Board of Trustees. The Senate has voted "no confidence" in the Board and some of its members have argued that the Board takes actions without sufficient respect for the views of the Senate. Some faculty members believe the Board cannot change the contents of the *Faculty Handbook* without faculty consent, though both Alabama statutes, the *Faculty Handbook* and the Constitution of the University Senate all unmistakably underline that faculty governance actions and opinions are advisory to the President.

To many faculty, however, the issue is one of respect. *"The Board sometimes acts as if we are little children and they pay no attention to our views,"* complained a senior faculty member. To others, the salient issue is bad management decisions by the Board that have had many adverse results, including continual Presidential and Provostian turnover, probations, legal suits and interminable bad publicity. *"I know the Trustees want to help Auburn,"* said a department chair, *"but can't they see they're killing us?"* *"They've made us a laughing stock,"* claimed an administrator.

Against this, some members of the Board of Trustees see faculty as unnecessarily adversarial, combative, self-righteous, egotistical, and more concerned with their own power than the overall welfare of the university and its students. Some faculty are regarded off-campus as professional grippers and trouble makers. *"Why don't they stick to their work?"* a well educated alumna asked us. While faculty may have won national publicity battles with the Trustees, the same perception does not always obtain in Alabama, where many citizens view faculty as spoiled, overpaid individuals who don't work a full week. Some members of the Trustees pick up on this sentiment and on occasion they in turn become unnecessarily adversarial with respect to faculty.

The University Senate contains a strong majority of faculty members, but also contains students, staff and administrators. Some faculty aver that they would prefer a Faculty Senate that did not contain students and staff. We agree.

**(119) An ideal senate includes only elected faculty with top administrators appointed by the president as ex officio non-voting who provide information and service senate committees. Students give voice through student government. The ideal senate committee arrangements closely mirror the committees of the governing board and are typically staffed by the same university officers who staff board committees. However, it is not structure alone that is at fault at Auburn, it is even more a reflection on personalities.**

The most commonly held view on campus is that the Senate's leaders represent ten to thirty percent of faculty. The perception of the median faculty member is that the Senate frequently does not speak for him/her and that *"the same faculty politicians serve year and after year and they just talk, talk, talk."* *"They don't speak for everyone, or even a majority in many instances,"* observed a department chairperson. *"They are selected democratically, but they are not an accurate representation of our faculty,"* commented a dean. *"They are too slow as a group and too many of them are simply too bitter,"* suggested another department chairperson. Both senior and junior faculty join in this spirit, i.e., *"The only ones that have time for campus politics are those who neither teach well nor publish,"* said a senior faculty member. Another more generous comment, *"They mean well but they do more harm than good."*

Nevertheless, on a few issues that have galvanized faculty, the Senate has represented faculty interests rather well. An illustration is the several disputes with and over presidents. In some cases, the Senate has defended a president (President Muse) and in other cases has been a vocal critic (Presidents Funderburk and Walker). In still other incidents that have involved the Board of Trustees, the Senate often (though not always) has reflected the views of a majority of faculty. This is not to imply that the Board of Trustees or the President was always opposed to a particular issue in question.

Past experience has led some faculty to believe they can push out a president if they make enough noise. This is a completely unwholesome attitude. Presidents Funderburk and Walker are

put forward as examples, whether or not the circumstances are apt. There are more enlightened and effective ways to evaluate presidents as offered in Chapter III of the By-Laws, Section 2.6. It has not been lost on some faculty that their complaints led at least indirectly to SACS placing Auburn on probation. One of the results of this mindset has been campus division, adversarial relationships and general unhappiness. Further, it has diminished Presidential stature and effectiveness and plausibly will make it more difficult for the university to attract highly qualified candidates for its soon to be open Presidency.

**(120) We recommend that Auburn continue with its University Senate governance arrangement even though it has generated mixed results over the years. However, we recommend that the next President commission a de facto task force on governance staffed by the Provost, or his representative, and include only elected faculty. That task force may wish to consider a variation of the model above. The task force should make recommendations to the President within six months of being commissioned. During the interim, President Richardson and Provost Heilman should take special pains to communicate frequently with the Senate and to communicate the Senate's views faithfully to the Board of Trustees. Trust must be built and rebuilt. Faculty should be listened to with respect, providing they are courteous and not disruptive.**

Senate members, in turn, should understand that communication need not imply agreement and that they are indeed advisory to the President or a Presidential delegate on all issues. Senators also should underline that some among them bear joint responsibility for the unproductive battle lines and tremendous lost of trust that have arisen within the institution. *Ad hominem* attacks and rumor mongering are quite unlikely to advance the discussion of any issue, but they always diminish the productivity of the university. These points understood, as we point out below, administrators should give strong deference to faculty views when issues relating to academic standards and curriculum are the subject.

We offer no pointed suggestions about the University Staff Council and the Administrative Professional Assembly. Persons interviewed in each group seemed uniformly capable, reasonable and committed. Both groups deserve attention and a serious ear.

### **Board of Trustees and Governance**

Auburn University's Board of Trustees numbers fourteen members, thirteen of whom are appointed by the Governor with approval of the State Senate. The Governor is an ex-officio member. Trustees serve seven-year terms and are eligible for one reappointment. Ten of the appointed members reside within nine districts within the state and three are at-large members.

Historically, an appointment to Auburn's Board of Trustees was highly political in character and *"often was a recognition of financial and political support provided to the Governor or the Democratic Party"* (the words of a political scientist). Appointments still understandably reflect political realities, but recent additions to the Board evidence a much greater concern for filling the Board with individuals of wisdom, appropriate influence and financial means to support the university. Many of the current members of the Board are highly accomplished individuals. It is, according to many, the best collective group of Trustees Auburn University has had in years. Yet, we must also note here that some deans and faculty that have attended Board meetings report that *"Trustees seem too delighted in confronting members of the academic community."*

Auburn University is a good institution which, according to this Review, is always in a state of brewing or erupting conflict. The principal players are the various constituent groups, most of whom do not recognize the Board of Trustees as the central and ultimate authority. Yet, the Board By-Laws, quite correctly, give the Board the "entire management and control" of the university (Chapter II, Section 2.1). These conditions have resulted in an essentially neutered Presidency, an ineffectual senior administration and an anxious and unhappy community. End runs have become the order of the day as faculty, students and staff understandably bypass the administration and are bound to go directly to the Board, elected officials and any other source for partial nourishment.

***Why? The root of the problem lies in Auburn's unenlightened constitutional premises. Roles of the various university constituent groups are either ill- or undefined, the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees are replete with implied invitations to conflict and micro-management, and the Presidency is effectively compromised. In such circumstances, a kind of anarchy invariably becomes the order of the day.***

**(121) The answer; the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees must be reviewed and dramatically revised in light of enlightened management procedures and the historic canons of higher education governance. From this new definition of roles and relationships, every**

**policy and practice must be reviewed and aligned. We recognize that in several areas state laws would need to be changed; so be it! Our task is to present a rational design that works for university governance.**

### **Rationale**

Numerous national task forces and organizations have concluded that the office of the college or university president has been gradually but measurably diminished in stature and authority. While governing boards have continued to hold presidents accountable, presidents have less and less leverage to get the job done. Auburn University is a classic example.

And, the greatest deterrent to achieving an effective presidency today is ***the state of board and campus governance***. The governing board is responsible for establishing policies, and campus governance (i.e., Auburn's *Faculty Handbook*) is the responsibility of the president of the institution (or should be). Both the condition of the university presidency and the research on effective leadership and organizational behavior speak strongly to this point as do many national higher education commissions. In public universities, this unfortunate condition is sometimes compounded by inappropriate roles assumed by alumni associations, foundations, elected officials and even board members themselves. Here again, Auburn is a dramatic example.

The result has been diminished influence and respect for the office of the president. There are few things about which a president can be benevolent for many faculty now expect as rights (granted by governing boards) conditions that presidents formerly could grant (or not) as privileges. And, there is a powerful difference. The result has been a growing tendency for governing boards to become involved in the administration of institutions. This involvement has led to ever closer relationships between boards and faculty, students, staff, alumni and other constituents, absent the president, and the ultimate estrangement of all groups from one another. The president, to survive at all, must become a master at pandering to each group until he or she becomes essentially neutered or succumbs to their collective ineptitude as the obvious scapegoat. ***No board has ever successfully led an institution nor has constituent management proven effective.*** Countless faculty petitions, board executive sessions, mismanagement, accreditation problems and harried presidents attest to this truth. Parenthetically, these conditions conveyed to potential enlightened presidential candidates invariably stem their interest.

The constitutional premises of any effective organization must clearly define the roles of invested parties. For a university, this role delineation includes the board, faculty, staff, students and alumni, for it is from those premises defined by a constitution and bylaws that all policies, practices and behaviors should flow. From these, every dimension of a university is affected: governance, curriculum, fund raising, admissions, organization, finance, assessment, morale, and yes, civility. Controversial subjects are invariably treated in an atmosphere of confusion and eventual conflict resulting in unhappy parties and mediocre results. The only exceptions, and they are short lived, are when a dancing president is able to negotiate those troubled waters. Bear in mind, that these exceptions are *always temporary*, and even the most agile president ultimately exhausts his/her referent skills. For instance, at Auburn, the longer President Richardson stays in office with these conditions, the more difficult his course.

Although a university is a corporation, it is unlike a business and unique only because of two conditions that have come to be considered fundamental: *academic freedom and shared governance*. There are two primary documents that are generally accepted as standards against which the condition and conduct of a university are measured: *The AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and *The AAUP 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*. Both faculty and administration consider these documents as essential roots for university governance.

### ***The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See Appendix H, pages 137-144)***

*The 1940 Statement* was enacted after a series of joint conferences that began in 1934 between representatives of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC). Later, *The Statement* was officially endorsed by more than 100 professional organizations. Briefly, academic freedom means freedom in teaching and research and is considered a fundamental declaration for the protection of the scholar/teacher and student. Tenure is a means of ensuring academic freedom and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to persons of ability. Both conditions carry obligations on the part of the teacher, but *under certain circumstances, tenured individuals can be terminated*. Under academic freedom, the teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and publication of results, subject to the adequate performance of other academic duties. However, research for monetary return and external consulting for supplemental compensation should be based on an understanding with the institution's authorities.



Academic tenure means that at the end of a probationary period (not to exceed seven years), faculty should have continuous employment, *subject to termination for adequate cause*, except in the case of retirement for age, *or because of extraordinary financial exigencies*. It is also advisable to give at least one year's notice if a person is to be terminated or not granted tenure at the end of the probationary period.

However, the *1940 Statement* also adjures faculty to avoid introducing extraneous material into their classrooms and to exercise appropriate restraint in their professional utterances and their relationships with their colleagues. Further, faculty should make it clear that they are not speaking for their institution when they exercise their First Amendment rights off campus. These clauses often are ignored by faculty and others in favor of an interpretation of the *1940 Statement* that implies that it licenses unlimited and unrestrained expression by faculty in any arena. Not so.

**The 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (See Appendix I, pages 145-150)**

This *Statement* was directed primarily to governing board members and presidents under an assumption of "*shared responsibility and cooperative action*" among the components of an institution. Generally, board members do not know it, nor do many faculty members. It is the academic underpinning for the widely held notion of "*shared governance*" in American higher education. Board members, presidents, administrators and faculty should know and take *The Statement* seriously, but it is subject to considerably broader interpretations than *The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

It is important to note that although *The Statement* is promulgated as the joint statement of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), ACE and AGB did not endorse *The Statement*. 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 "*commend it to institutions and governing boards.*" *The Statement*, in any case, is not intended to serve as an exact blueprint or as a defense in instances of controversy among the various interested parties of an institution.

*The Statement* speaks of the president's special obligation "*to innovate and initiate....*," to "*envision new horizons....*," and "*at times, **with or without support**, infuse new life....*" While *The Statement* emphasizes the role of the faculty, in several places it clearly states that the faculty

"*recommends*" to the president who then acts, or, in turn, "*recommends*" 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 determined by the responsibility of each party for the particular matter under consideration. Valid points are also made about the generally debilitating nature of unilateral action on the part of presidents and the importance of standard procedures for areas of responsibility, authority, and continuing review.

It states that the faculty's primary area of responsibility should be to determine the curriculum "*after an educational goal has been established,*" but even here, it points out, final institutional authority goes to the president and the governing board. Rarely, however, would a president or a governing board make any academic judgment against faculty recommendation, but under certain conditions, there have been exceptions. Typically, however, the president (not the governing board) would ask the faculty to reconsider the matter.

*The 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, including faculty salaries; the appointment of a president; and the appointment of chief academic officers. Note that *The Statement* says nothing about the evaluation of presidents or other institutional officers.

*The Statement* also assumes that the faculty, along with the board "*delegates authority*" to the president. Here we take **exception** to *The Statement* for the faculty is neither the originating nor the legal authority; *the board has all and grants all authority*. To grant authority without accountability is a recipe for turmoil. The only way a faculty can delegate authority to a president is in unfortunate instances where governing boards have granted the faculty the power to do so. And in such cases, the president is really caught in an unbridgeable dichotomy and substantive change is virtually impossible.

The faculty should play a major role in setting requirements for degrees and determining when requirements have been met. And faculty members should have an important voice in the curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the academic process. But the strongest language used in *The Statement* in this regard is:

*"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 board." ....subject to "the time element."*

*The 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 president, who may or may not endorse their 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 the faculty and students of the board position.

Unfortunately, some governing boards (as well as some presidents) have misunderstood *The Statement's* call for faculty participation in decision making as a plea for close association between all decision making parties. A board does no service by being directly involved in "good" relationships with faculty; rather, a board should be concerned that "good and effective" relationships are established by the **accountable** president. This has resulted in countless instances of board/faculty/student formal associations, each potentially compromising the role and ability of the president and the efficiency of the institution. The faculty member or student will quite understandably say, *"If I can get it from the board, why bother with the president or the dean...?"* And the accountable president is left precariously between the three --- and all parties are less happy and less effective. But when things go bad and they invariably do in hard times, the president and other administrators pay the bill.

As noted above, a separate problem is associated with the membership and participation of faculty, staff, or students on the board's committees. While some have suggested that this practice "opens communication," it too is a *certain* recipe for future grief and failure. There are three major reasons why faculty, staff, or students **should not** be members of board committees. First, as noted above, this practice enables individual campus constituents to go around the president and deal directly with board members. Only the president, or the president's authorized representatives, should deal directly with the members of the board, and only the president should represent the *entire* university to the board.

Note that removing faculty, students, and staff from the committees of a board does not mean that these individuals should never talk with board members. *Rather it means that when they do so, it should be a privilege extended by the president, and not considered to be a right.* Thus when an academic affairs committee is considering the subject of tenure or summer salaries, the president or a presidential delegate would typically invite elected and other faculty representatives to speak to the committee and present their views. But this should be an invitation extended by the president, or his/her agent, and a privilege extended, not a right. This will diminish disruptive and counterproductive behavior and contribute positively to the image of the president as the legitimate leader.

The board should, by means of a policy it adopts, charge the president with keeping the board informed about developments on the campus (There should be written presidential reports prepared for every board meeting.) and charge the president to provide the board with opportunities to interact with faculty, students, and staff, both in committee meetings (where they should not sit at the table with committee members, but be called upon as appropriate) and at lunches, lectures, tours, concerts, athletic activities and other events.

The second reason why faculty, students, and staff should not be members of a board's committees proceeds directly from leadership theory and empirical evidence. Those who exercise authority should also be held accountable. Faculty, staff, and students cannot be held accountable for anything related to the overall operation of a university except as individuals. Collectives cannot be held accountable. Only the board, and specifically the president, can ultimately be held accountable for the operation and prosperity of a university. Authority must be joined with accountability, and faculty, student, and staff membership on board committees violates this fundamental rule.

The third reason why faculty, students, and staff should not be members of a board's committees is that there exists a conflict of interest. Individuals consistently vote on issues which directly affect their own circumstance and welfare. This is inappropriate. Note once again, however, that removing faculty, students, and staff from a board's committees does not mean that they should be ignored. Far from it. Instead, they should be called upon by the president (or his/her designees) for their views as appropriate. This is all that is called for by both the traditions of university governance and the empirical research on effective management and leadership.

A direct corollary of the previous point is that vice presidents and other staff should participate in committee or board meetings only as the designees of the president and they should not be voting members. The vice presidents or other staff and line administrators assigned to work with board committees or the board, including those who perform the secretarial and financial duties for the board, should be assigned by the president (not the board) and clearly understand that they are the president's agents. Once again, only the chair of the board and the president ultimately should speak for the university, and in the far greater measure, the president.

### **Auburn University**

Auburn's constitutional premises are fundamentally problematic for they significantly reduce the legitimacy of the President and invite inevitable conflict between the invested parties. **The most important functions of the governing Board should be the appointment and evaluation of the President who should be exclusively accountable for the conduct of the university.** Auburn's By-Laws range from being questionable, incomplete or vague to too prescriptive; nor are they consistent with enlightened corporate management principles or the *1966 AAUP Statement* which, as noted above, does not call for **formal** relationships between a governing board, or faculty or students or staff. Rather, as noted above, a president is bound to notify, in writing, both the faculty and the board of any dissenting positions.

In sum, the most important condition a board can give to a president is legitimacy, and position legitimacy is sadly wanting at Auburn. Once again, all **formal** relationships between the Board and the university community should be channeled through the accountable President so that members of the community will clearly understand that their role in decision making is clearly a **privilege** granted by the President and not a **right** granted by the Board. Auburn University's governance culture is a fragile arrangement that has resulted in a general state of anxiety and distrust, a compromised ever-changing administration, Board micro-management, ineffective, often contentious, faculty governance and inappropriate alumni involvement.

**(122) It is unfortunate that so much of the creative and productive energy of the faculty, the Trustees, the alumni and others is being spent in activities that contribute not one whit to the academic improvement of Auburn University. One wonders what could be accomplished under circumstances that are more favorable, but the prospects for improvement are not easily and readily apparent. Identifying leaders for the reformation is urgently needed and the tasks cannot be done by a new President acting alone. The Trustees,**

faculty leaders and alumni must play a decisive and transforming role. All parties must bear in mind that the key to Auburn's good future will not be the Board of Trustees, the University Senate or the Alumni Association but the President of the university, as so it has been with every great university. The following By-Laws' changes are offered in this light.

(123) The Board should immediately appoint an ad hoc committee to consider the following By-Laws' changes during this time, and perhaps beyond. An outside consultant should be appointed to work as counsel to the Board during this Presidential search process.

### **Proposed By-Laws' Changes**

(124) We note at the outset that the By-Laws of Auburn University, The University of Alabama and Troy University are extraordinary in several ways. It is unusual that three public institutions in the same state have constitutional premises that are so divergent. These constitutional provisions invite review by the State's elected representatives and the Governor.

## **BY-LAWS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF AUBURN UNIVERSITY**

**Legend:** (Comments are in parentheses and *italics* print, ~~suggested deletions are crossed out~~, and suggested additions are in **bold print**.)

### **CHAPTER I**

#### **THE UNIVERSITY**

##### **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

1.1 Auburn University is a public corporation and instrumentality of the State of Alabama, created and existing by virtue of amended Amendment No. 161 (formerly Section 266), Constitution of Alabama of 1901, and Section 16-48-1, *et seq.*, Code of Alabama 1975.

1.2 Auburn University is a land-grant university of the State of Alabama.

As a land-grant university, Auburn is dedicated to service to Alabama and the nation through its three divisions of instruction, research, and extension. Instruction is the academic process on campus between professors and students. Research is carried on continually to increase knowledge. Extension programs provide educational services and special assistance throughout the State.

1.3 Auburn University consists of two campuses. The principal campus unit was originally chartered in 1856 and is located in Auburn, Alabama. The second campus was authorized by

the Board of Trustees pursuant to action of the Alabama Legislature in 1967 and is located in Montgomery, Alabama. These educational units, together with certain authorized adjuncts of each, constitute Auburn University, for which the Board of Trustees is the governing body.

## CHAPTER II

### BOARD OF TRUSTEES

#### SECTION 1. General Provisions

- 1.1 Under Alabama constitution and statutes, Auburn University is governed by a Board of Trustees.
- 1.2 The Board of Trustees consists of ~~fourteen~~ **sixteen to twenty** members, ~~as follows: one member from each congressional district, as these districts were constituted on January 1, 1961,~~ **at least one member from Lee County, two \_\_\_ at-large members, at least six or more of which shall be alumni of the university.** ~~and the Governor and the State Superintendent of Education, who are members ex officio, with full voting powers. When the current State Superintendent of Education leaves office, another at-large member will be appointed.~~

*(There should be from sixteen to twenty members. This would enable more efficient committee work as well as broader representation and potential fund raising possibilities. Unless there are compelling reasons, the Governor should be eliminated from the Board and replaced by an at-large gubernatorial appointee(s) along with replacing the State Superintendent with an at-large gubernatorial appointee and additional at-large members depending on the size of the Board and their ability to contribute to the university without regard to congressional districts. Certainly, the Governor should have an important voice in the appointment of Board members.)*

- 1.3 New members of the Board of Trustees are appointed by ~~an appointing committee~~ **the Governor and confirmed by** ~~by and with the advice and consent of the State Senate,~~ and hold office for a term of seven years, and until their successors are appointed and qualified, but in no event longer than one year after completion of the term of office. **No member of the Board shall serve more than two consecutive terms.**

*( The Appointing Committee should be eliminated and replaced by the Governor, or the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, or the Governor and the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, i.e., in Virginia board members are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the General Assembly; in North Carolina the Governor and the Board of Governors appoint board members without legislative confirmation; and in Florida the Governor makes board appointments with Senate confirmation.)*

- 1.4 Vacancies occurring in the office of trustees from death, resignation or other cause are

appointed by the ~~appointing committee~~ **Governor and confirmed by**, ~~by and with the~~  
~~advice and consent of the State Senate.~~

- ~~1.5 The President pro tempore or another trustee who he/she designates, along with another Trustee elected by the Board of Trustees, will be members of the appointing committee. The Governor and two members of the Auburn Alumni Association Board of Directors selected by the Auburn Alumni Association shall be the other members of the appointing committee.~~

*(Eliminate. Whatever, the Alumni Association should be completely eliminated from selecting university Board members. Such a provision gives an alumni association undue influence and invites confusion and potential conflict. Alumni, yes, but they should either be selected by the Governor or a special committee of the Board.)*

- ~~1.6~~ **1.5** No trustee may receive any pay or emolument other than actual expense incurred in the discharge of Board duties.

- ~~1.7~~ **1.6** No employee of Auburn University is eligible to serve on its Board of Trustees.

- ~~1.8 The presidents of the Student Government Associations at Auburn University and Auburn University at Montgomery serve ex officio as advisory members to the Board of Trustees.~~

*(Eliminate. While student and faculty leaders may attend public board meetings, to give them a constitutional and **unaccountable** voice reduces the legitimacy of the Presidency. Periodically, the President may (and should) invite them to Board functions or to speak to the Board or Board committees; and of course, student and faculty organizations may request, or be requested, to speak at Board meetings. The key here is to legitimize as much as possible the university Presidency.)*

- ~~1.9 The immediate Past Chair of the Auburn University Senate and immediate Past President of the AUM Faculty Council will be elected as non-voting advisors to the Board of Trustees replacing their predecessors at the next Board meeting after assuming that status.~~

*(Eliminate. Any formal faculty association with the Board should be eliminated.)*

- ~~1.10~~ **1.7** Emeritus status shall be conferred automatically when a member of the Board of Trustees completes a term or terms of service. The emeriti members **may attend meetings** ~~shall serve~~ in a non-voting ex officio capacity in appreciation for service to Auburn University.

## **SECTION 2. Authority and Responsibility of the Board**

- 2.1 The entire management and control over the activities, affairs, operations, business, and property of Auburn University shall be completely and absolutely vested in the Board of Trustees of Auburn University.



- 2.2 In the exercise of its responsibility and authority, the Board determines policy; reviews existing policy; periodically evaluates the **President and reviews the mission of the university.** ~~administration and management of the University; approves the missions, role and scope of the University and each of its major divisions; and provides ultimate accountability to the public and the political bodies of Alabama.~~ Any authority delegated by the Board shall be subject to the ultimate authority of the Board.

*(Unaltered, this Section invites Board micro-management. The role of the Board is to determine the condition of the university, primarily through Presidential review (evaluation) which will be detailed below in the By-Laws Chapter III, Section 2.6.)*

### **SECTION 3. Officers**

*(Too many presidents. Change President of the Board of Trustees to Chair. This assumes the Governor is not on the Board.)*

- ~~3.1 The Governor serves ex officio as President of the Board of Trustees. The duties and responsibilities of the President of the Board include:~~

~~3.1.1 To report to and be responsible to the Board.~~

~~3.1.2 To preside over meetings of the Board.~~

~~3.1.3 To call special meetings of the Board in the manner provided by statute.~~

~~3.2~~ **3.1 A President pro tempore Chair and a Vice Chair President pro tempore of the Board shall be elected by the Board at its annual meeting. The duties and responsibilities of the Chair of the Board include:**

**3.1.1 To report to and be responsible to the Board.**

**3.1.2 To preside over meetings of the Board.**

**3.1.3 To call special meetings of the Board in the manner provided by statute.**

**3.1.4 To perform such other duties as assigned by the Board.**

**3.1.5 To appoint members of the standing committees of the Board and to establish special committees of the Board and appoint members thereof. To designate the chairperson and vice-chairperson of all committees as appropriate.**

**3.2.4 No member of the Board may be elected to the office of Chair President pro tempore more than four complete consecutive terms.**

**3.2.2 1 Vacancies in the office of Chair President pro tempore shall be filled by the Vice Chair**

~~President pro tempore.~~ The **Chair President pro tempore** shall serve until the next annual meeting. Such partial term as **Chair President pro tempore** shall not count as a term as set out in paragraph ~~3.21.~~ **3.2.**

3.2.3 **2** In the absence of the **Chair President** and the ~~President pro tempore~~, the Vice **Chair President pro tempore** shall serve temporarily as **Chair President pro tempore**.

3.2.4 **3** Vacancies in the office of Vice **Chair President pro tempore** shall be filled by election of the Board at the first meeting held after the office becomes vacant. The Vice **Chair President pro tempore** shall serve until the next annual meeting.

~~3.3~~ The duties and responsibilities of the ~~President pro tempore~~ of the Board include:

~~3.3.1~~ To perform the duties of the ~~President~~ of the Board in the absence of the ~~President~~.

~~3.3.2~~ To report to and be responsible to the Board.

~~3.3.3~~ To perform such other duties as assigned by the Board.

~~3.3.4~~ To appoint members of the standing committees of the Board and to establish special committees of the Board and appoint members thereof. To designate the chairperson and vice chairperson of all committees as appropriate.

*(Eliminate. In Section 3.1)*

3.4 **3.3** The Board shall ~~elect and~~ appoint the President of Auburn University, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

3.5 **3.4** The Board shall elect and appoint the Secretary to the Board of Trustees, who shall **be a member of the Board and shall** serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Board. **The Secretary may be assisted by a university officer appointed by the President of the university.**

*(The Board Secretary should be assisted by a Presidential appointee. To appoint other than a Board member, is to threaten Presidential legitimacy and to invite potential staff problems. The present arrangement may work now, but the future is clearly problematic.)*

**3.5 The Board shall elect and appoint a Treasurer, who shall be a member of the Board and shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Board. The Treasurer may be assisted by a university officer appointed by the President of the university.**

*(Same as 3.4 above.)*

3.6 The Board of Trustees may elect such other officers as it may deem necessary and such officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

#### SECTION 4. Standing Committees

- 4.1 Standing committees, composed of members of the Board, shall be those as established in Chapter II, paragraph 4.4, of these By-Laws. Also, there may be special committees composed of members of the Board.
- 4.2 Each year, during the annual meeting of the Board, the **Chair President pro tempore** of the Board shall appoint members to the standing committees and special committees of the Board who shall serve until their successors are appointed.
- 4.3 Each standing committee of the Board shall be composed of ~~six~~ **at least four or five (depending on the size of the Board)** members of the Board. ~~Four members of a standing committee shall be present to review issues assigned to a committee. At least three members shall be present for official committee meetings.~~

*(Four or five members contributes to more efficient committee work and broader representation.)*

*(The detailed work of the Board should be done in the Committees which, except in unusual situations, should meet only in conjunction with regular meetings of the Board. To do otherwise invites mini-boards, micro-management and conflict. There are too many committees for scope, context and efficiency. A smaller number*

*of committees staffed by Presidential appointees ordinarily should meet in conjunction with regular Board meetings at which time they make reports. Ideally, these same officers should also be assigned to staff parallel committees of a faculty governance organization. Please read carefully the attached (Appendix G) draft paper: "The Enlightened Board."*

- 4.4 Standing committees of the Board are:

*(At Auburn, there are nine Board Committees (too many). It would be best for Auburn to have four or five standing committees with sub committees and ad hoc committees as needed. These are considered generic in institutions of similar size and complexity: Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement. As noted above, here again, each committee should be staffed by a Presidential appointee.*

#### Suggested Auburn University Board Meeting Agenda

1. 8:00 AM committee meetings (breakfast available). Board chair and President circulate independently from meeting to meeting.
2. 11:00 AM executive committee meeting. Committee chairs report and other agenda items considered.
3. 12:00 PM invitation-only luncheon. 20 to 25 minute address by distinguished faculty, staff or student.
4. 1:00 PM Board meeting. Agenda:
  - A. Chair's report (brief)
  - B. President's report
  - C. Minutes of last meeting approved
  - D. Committee reports
  - E. Old Business
  - F. New Business
  - G. Executive Session

*The following reorganization should be considered: Audit Committee, Property and Facilities Committee and Investment Committee would be eliminated and responsibilities added to the Finance Committee (the name would be changed to **Committee on Fiscal Affairs, Investment, Property and Audit**; however, the portent of Sarbanes-Oxley may call for a separate standing audit*

*committee which need not meet at every Board meeting)(see Audit Committee Charter, Appendix F); Agriculture Committee would be eliminated and responsibilities added to the **Committee on Academic Affairs**; Auburn University at Montgomery Committee would be eliminated and added to the Executive Committee and its various functions considered by the appropriate standing committee; and a new **Committee on Institutional Advancement** created. The Student Affairs Committee would be renamed **Committee on Student Affairs**.*

*This arrangement would reduce the number of Board standing committees to five, foster broader understanding and appreciation and reduce both the amount of time and the prospect of micro-management.)*

- ~~4.4.1 **Executive Committee.** During intervals between meetings of the Board, and subject to such limitations as may be required by law or specifically imposed by the Board, the Executive Committee may make recommendations to the President and/or the Board in all areas of University affairs as it may deem appropriate. This committee may provide recommendations for Board action matters of policy relating to laws and regulations governing duties and powers of the Board. The committee may review matters of University legal involvement, receive reports of internal and external auditors, and oversee presidential evaluation. Recommendations on commemorative activities of the University, including naming of buildings and awarding of honorary degrees, may be the responsibility of this committee, as well as other matters referred to it by the Board of Trustees or the President of Auburn University.~~
- ~~4.4.2 **Academic Affairs Committee.** The Academic Affairs Committee may consider and provide recommendations for Board action policies relating to the academic freedom, tenure and promotion of faculty, faculty and staff personnel matters and the overall academic program, including long range plan development, review of existing academic programs, approval of new academic programs, missions statements and statements of role and scope, and other matters related to the orderly development of the University. Further, the committee has the responsibility of receiving from the President and reviewing matters relating to campus governance.~~
- ~~4.4.3 **Audit Committee.** The Audit Committee may consider policies and take other actions as set forth in the Audit Committee Charter attached as Exhibit A to these By-Laws concerning oversight in areas of financial controls and reporting and administration of the Code of Ethics. Click for Audit Committee Charter.~~
- ~~4.4.4 **Finance Committee.** The Finance Committee may have as its responsibility oversight of fiscal policies of the University. Specifically, the committee may consider and provide recommendations to the Board on annual operating budgets as developed by the President, programs of employee benefits, and general guidelines for proposing legislative budget requests.~~

- ~~4.4.5 Property and Facilities Committee. The Property and Facilities Committee may consider and provide recommendations to the Board for action policies related to management of properties of the University, construction and renovation of facilities, consideration of the President's recommendations for project architects and engineers, and other matters concerning the properties of the University. It may consider the recommendations of the President for capital expenditures and building priorities and make recommendations to the Board.~~
- ~~4.4.6 Investment Committee. This committee may consider and provide recommendations to the Board for action policies governing investment practice and procedure. This would include selection and evaluation of external investment advisors, proposing investment objectives, and ensuring proper control and safekeeping of investment funds. The President and the Chief Fiscal Officer of the University shall act in an advisory capacity to the committee.~~
- ~~4.4.7 Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee may consider and provide recommendations to the Board for action policies related to programs of agriculture, operation of the agriculture experiment stations, cooperative extension system and agricultural lands.~~
- ~~4.4.8 Auburn University at Montgomery Committee. The Auburn University at Montgomery Committee may consider and provide recommendations to the Board or the appropriate committees of the Board for action policies related to Auburn University at Montgomery.~~
- ~~4.4.9 Student Affairs Committee. The Student Affairs Committee may review for alignment with institutional mission and student needs—the totality of programs serving student needs that enrollment management, counseling, remedial programs, career and life planning, financial aid, and co-curricular activities. In addition, the Committee may assess the current and ideal allocation of resources to those programs; set standards for and keep track of student satisfaction and retention; reflect and make recommendations to meet projected changes and developments in students' needs over the next years; keep current on student support programs in higher education; and determine and review data required from the administration, compare it over time, and assess it in the light of data from other institutions.~~

#### **4.4.1 The Executive Committee.**

**A. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair, the Vice-Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, and the Chairs of the standing committees: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Advancement, and Fiscal Affairs, Investment, Property and Audit (at least one member shall be an alumnus/alumna of the university); and the President of the university, ex-officio non-voting.**

**B. The Committee shall meet in conjunction with regular meetings of the Board or at the call of either the Board Chair or the President of the university, or upon written request signed by five (5) members of the Board presented to the Board Chair or to the President of the university. Except in an emergency, as determined by the Chair or the President of the**

university, no meeting shall be called unless at least three days previous notice shall have been given to the members.

C. \_\_\_\_\_ members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business before the Committee. *(The number depends on the number of Board members on the Committee.)*

D. Should it be necessary, the Committee shall have and may exercise all the powers and authority of the Board in the transaction of the business of the university between meetings of the Board except (a) insofar as such power and authority may have been specifically limited by the Board or applicable law, (b) for selling university-owned real estate, (c) for dismissing or electing the President of the university, (d) for approving the basic academic program of the university, (e) to discuss vacancies on the Board, and (f) to amend the By-Laws of the Board.

E. The Committee shall be responsible for annually reviewing and reporting to the full Board the relevance of the mission and the state of the long range/strategic plan of the university.

F. The Committee shall oversee Presidential review (evaluation) and compensation.

G. The Committee shall make recommendations on commemorative activities including naming of buildings, honorary degrees and other matters assigned by the Board of Trustees.

H. The Committee shall nominate officers of the Board and when appropriate make recommendations on Board membership.

I. The Assistant Secretary of the Board shall keep minutes of their proceedings and actions, and shall transmit copies of the same to each member of the Board within a reasonable time following each meeting. A review of any actions of the Committee shall be a regular order of business at each meeting of the Board, and such actions shall be subject to revision and alteration by the Board, provided that no rights of third parties shall be affected by any such revision or alteration.

**4.4.2 The Committee on Academic Affairs.** The Committee on Academic Affairs shall be concerned with programs and policies pertaining to academic freedom, the curriculum of the university (including the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, Alabama Cooperative Extension System and Montgomery campus), the granting of earned degrees, the recruitment, appointment, promotion and dismissal of academic personnel, affirmative action and equal opportunity in the academic areas, research leaves and sabbaticals, the library, and other matters of an academic nature, and shall ensure that all academic programs are consistent with the mission of the university. The Committee shall be staffed by an officer of the university appointed by the President.

**4.4.3 The Committee on Fiscal Affairs, Investment, Property and Audit.** The Committee on Fiscal Affairs, Investment, Property and Audit shall review the budget, salary and benefits recommendations presented by the President and shall recommend a budget to the Board for its approval. The Committee shall assume responsibility for the investments of the university. The Committee shall be concerned with the capital budget and campus master planning. The Committee (or sub committee) will recommend to the Executive Committee and the Board the external auditor of the university; communicate directly with the external auditor of the university in all matters pertaining to the university audit; obtain from the Treasurer of the university the auditor's management letter and management's response thereto; report to the Executive Committee or to the Board on the conduct of business and financial activities of the university to assure that performance is consistent with generally accepted accounting standards. The Committee shall be staffed by an officer of the university appointed by the President. (See Appendix F "Audit Committee Charter" on financial controls and administration of the Code of Ethics (Appendix E.)

**4.4.4 The Committee on Student Affairs.** The Committee on Student Affairs shall be concerned with the physical, social, and psychological needs of students as well as with policies pertaining to student activities, including athletics. Among others, the Committee shall have responsibility for enrollment management, counseling, career and life planning and financial aid. The Committee shall be staffed by an officer of the university appointed by the President.

**4.4.5 The Committee on Institutional Advancement.** The Committee on Institutional Advancement shall be concerned with policies and procedures relating to informational and promotional programs, fund raising efforts, government relations, and alumni relations. The Committee shall be staffed by an officer of the university appointed by the President.

4.5 The Board of Trustees will establish such special committees as it deems advisable.

4.6 All members of the Board are entitled to attend any committee meetings.

4.7 Each standing or special committee will provide reasonable prior public notice of scheduled meetings and will prepare and maintain minutes of its meeting except for meetings of the Executive Committee in Executive Session.

*(If necessary, OK, but would be better left out.)*

4.8 All matters considered by standing or special committees shall be reported to the Board with an advisory recommendation for action by the Board. The report shall include a summary of committee members' comments on the matters reviewed and suggestions for further administrative action.

*(The main work of the Board should always be done in committee!)*

~~4.9—Annually, faculty members shall be appointed as a non-voting advisory member of most~~

~~standing committees. The appointments will be made by the President pro tempore as follows:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Affairs Committee—Chair of University Senate~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ As provided in paragraph 4.91, recommendations for other appointments shall be made to the President pro tempore for other committees as follows:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Finance Committee and Investment Committee—one from AU College of Business and one from AUM School of Business~~

~~Property and Facilities Committee—one from College of Engineering or College of Architecture, Design and Construction~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Agriculture Committee—one from College of Agriculture~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Auburn University at Montgomery Committee—one from AUM~~

~~Student Affairs Committee—one member of the faculty~~

~~4.9.1 The University Senate shall submit a list to the President of three faculty members from within the faculty of the college or campus stated above. The President, in consultation with the Dean(s)/Chancellor of the college or campus, shall select a name from that list or if no name is selected, shall request the University Senate to forward additional names until a member is selected. The recommendations will then be forwarded to the President pro tempore so that the appointments can be made at each annual meeting.~~

~~4.10 The President of the Student Government Associations of Auburn University and Auburn University at Montgomery shall serve as non-voting advisory members of the Student Affairs Committee~~

## **SECTION 5. Meetings**

5.1 The Board shall hold one regular meeting during each quarter of the calendar year, in accordance with a schedule determined by the Board at its annual meeting. Other meetings may be called and held as provided by law. Reasonable public notice of scheduled meetings will be given.

5.2 The annual meeting of the Board is held on the first Monday in June at Auburn, Alabama, unless the Board, in regular session, determines to hold this meeting at some other time and place.

5.3 Special meetings may be called by the **Governor Chair of the Board** on at least ten days written notice; and shall be called by the **Governor Chair of the Board** on the written application of any three members of the Board, in the manner provided by applicable law of



the State of Alabama.

- 5.4 In lieu of notice, a written waiver of notice of any meeting shall be sufficient provided such waiver is signed by all members of the Board.
- 5.5 The members of the Board of Trustees may recess at any regular or special meeting from one date to another as established by approved schedule or at the call of the **Chair President Pro Tempore**, and at such adjourned meeting they may transact any business relating to the affairs of the university.
- 5.6 An agenda for Board and committee meetings will be prepared by the President of Auburn University, in consultation with the **Chair President pro tempore**, and mailed to Board members at least seven days in advance of meetings. This requirement does not preclude consideration of matters proposed by the **President Chair** or members of the Board which could not reasonably have been included in the agenda. Subject to approval by majority vote of those present the Board may consider any other item of business.
- 5.7 Vote by proxy shall not be permitted. This does not preclude a member of the Board of Trustees not present at a meeting from having entered into the minutes for that meeting an opinion on any agenda item on which action is taken, provided that such personal views should be submitted in writing.
- 5.8 In emergency situations, committees may meet by telephone conference or video conference.**

## **SECTION 6. Quorum**

- 6.1 One more than half of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day until a quorum is present.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **ADMINISTRATION**

#### **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

- 1.1 The administration of Auburn University, under the authority of the Board of Trustees, is unified in the Office of the President.

#### **SECTION 2. The President of the University**

*(Here again, this important article speaks to Presidential legitimacy and enables the Board to fairly hold the President fully accountable for the conduct of the institution.)*

**2.1. The President of the university shall be the chief executive officer of the university and shall be responsible and accountable for all of the affairs of the university subject to the authority of the Board.**

**2.2. All officers, staff, faculty and other employees of the university shall be under the final authority of the President of the university, who shall exercise overall direction in implementing the policies of the Board.**

**2.3. The President shall be an ex-officio non-voting member of all Board committees.**

**2.4. With the approval of the Board, the President of the university shall appoint all officers, staff, faculty and other employees of the university.**

**2.5. In the case of an extended absence of the President, the duties of that office shall be assigned to a Presidential delegate approved by the Board of Trustees. In the case of disability of the President, the Board of Trustees shall designate an interim President.**

## **SECTION 2. President of the University**

~~2.1 The President of the University shall be elected by and serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees. The Board shall fix the length and terms of the President's employment. The President shall attend all meetings of the Board, unless excused by the Board.~~

~~The President of the University shall be the chief executive officer of the University and, subject to the control of the Board, shall manage, direct and be responsible for the conduct of all the affairs of the University except those which by law or these By-Laws are made the specific responsibility of other persons. The President shall have the power, in the name of the University, to make and execute, or authorize the making and execution of, all contracts and written instruments made in the ordinary course of the operations of the University except those which must be specifically approved and authorized by the Board.~~

~~The President shall prepare and submit to the Board of Trustees an annual report to correspond with the fiscal year of the University and, in addition, any other report the President may deem appropriate or as the Board may require.~~

*(Eliminate in favor of 2.6 below)*

## **2.6 Presidential Evaluation and Compensation**

**2.6.1 The President shall be evaluated, in executive session, at the annual meeting of the Board, according to written objectives, specific and general, developed by the President, discussed with the Board Chair and presented to the Board before the outset of each academic year. The President shall report on these goals at each meeting of the Board.**

**2.6.2 The President shall be formally evaluated by the Board at least every four years or at any other time deemed desirable by the Board. The evaluation shall be conducted by an**

outside evaluator who will be appointed by the Board with approval of the President.

**2.6.3 The Executive Committee shall serve as the President's Compensation Committee and based on the annual evaluation, meet in executive session to review the President's compensation package.**

### **SECTION 3. ~~Other Officials~~ Officers of the University**

**3.1 The Provost and the Chancellor of Auburn University at Montgomery and other officers of the university shall be appointed and evaluated by the President of Auburn University and approved by the Board of Trustees. upon prior approval of the Board. Vice Presidents of Auburn University and the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics shall be appointed by the President upon prior consultation with the Board of Trustees. Such officials shall exercise such powers and perform such duties under the supervision of the President of Auburn University.**

*(This Section strongly invites Board micro-management and Presidential trepidation. Ordinarily, the Board would approve, without consultation, the recommendations of the President. Any concerns of the Board should be obviated by the President's annual evaluation. Either the President runs the university or he/she does not.)*

**~~3.2 The directors of the Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension System shall be appointed by the President, upon prior approval of the Board.~~**

*(Same as above.)*

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **BOARD POLICY STATEMENTS**

#### **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

**1.1 Policies and procedures statements are prepared by the President and approved by the Board of Trustees to guide administrative decisions and Board action. These are disseminated widely distributed on campus in the form of a Policies and Procedures Manual, which is updated as appropriate.**

*(The present additional wording is either misleading or unnecessary.)*

**~~1.2 Board policy statements are approved by majority vote of those Trustees present at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Trustees having a quorum in attendance.~~**

*(See above explanation.)*

**~~1.3 A policy or group of policies may be waived by majority vote at any regular or special~~**

~~meeting of the Board having a quorum present, such waiver may be limited to a specific time period or may be indefinite until terminated by Board action.~~

*(Unnecessary, see above.)*

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

#### **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

- 1.1 A Trustee shall be considered to have a conflict of interest if: (a) such Trustee has existing or potential financial or other interests which impair or might reasonably appear to impair such member's independent, unbiased judgment in the discharge of his or her responsibilities to the university; or (b) such Trustee is aware that a member of his or her family (which for any purposes of this section shall be a spouse, parents, siblings, children and any other relative if the latter reside in the same household as the Trustee), or any organization in which such Trustee (or member, partner, trustee or controlling stockholder), has such existing or potential financial or other interest; or, (c) contracts or financial arrangements between Trustees, or their families, or their companies, exist that plausibly might influence or control the judgment or decision-making of an individual Trustees; or, (d) contracts or financial arrangements exist between Trustees, or their families, or their companies and university employees, that plausibly might influence or control the judgment or the exercise of the assigned university duties of those employees. All Trustees shall disclose to the Board any possible conflict of interest at the earliest practical time. No Trustee shall vote on any matter, under consideration at the Board or committee meeting, in which such Trustee has a conflict of interest. The minutes of such meeting shall reflect that a disclosure was made and that the Trustee having a conflict of interest was not included in the discussion and abstained from voting. Any Trustee who is uncertain whether a conflict of interest may exist in any matter may request the Board or committee to resolve the questions by a majority vote.**

## **~~CHAPTER V~~ CHAPTER VI**

### **AMENDMENT OR REPEAL OF BY-LAWS**

#### **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

- 1.1 Upon approval by the affirmative vote of nine members of the Board of Trustees, these By-Laws shall become effective at the conclusion of the Board's annual meeting in June 1984. \_\_\_\_.**

*(This number should be changed to eleven or thirteen depending on the increased Board size.)*

- 1.2 New By-Laws may be adopted, and By-laws may be amended or repealed, at any meeting of the Board by the affirmative vote of nine members of the Board, but no action shall be taken unless such proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal shall have been given at a previous meeting or notice in writing of the proposed change shall have been served upon each member of the Board at least thirty (30) days in advance of the final vote upon such change, provided, however, that by an affirmative vote of at least nine members of the Board, the requirements for such notice may be waived at any time.

## **SECTION 2. Suspension of By-Laws**

- 2.1 The By-Laws or any one of them may be suspended at any meeting by an affirmative vote of at least nine members of the Board and not otherwise.

## **~~CHAPTER VI~~ CHAPTER VII**

### **REPEALING CLAUSE**

## **SECTION 1. General Provisions**

- 1.1 All rules, orders, regulations, resolutions and by-laws heretofore adopted by the Board, which are in conflict with these By-Laws, are hereby repealed but such repeal shall not affect actions heretofore taken pursuant to such rules, orders, regulations, resolutions and By-Laws.

Approved November 4, 1983; Amended June 2, 1986; Amended December 17, 1991; Revised June 1, 1992; Revised November 6, 1998; Revised June 4, 2001; Revised July 23, 2001; Revised November 16, 2001; Revised June 3, 2002; Revised November 15, 2002; Revised June 11, 2004; **Revised January 2006.**

#### **XIV. SENIOR OFFICERS**

##### **Interim President Ed Richardson**

A good man in a difficult situation, Dr. Richardson well deserves praise for his leadership at Auburn during this tumultuous period. Without question, removing the SACS probation and realigning the athletic program were the major agenda items for his administration, and he achieved early and efficient success. He is intelligent, determined, tenacious, principled and well-connected throughout Alabama and the southeast. While there is the inevitable academic grousing about his exclusive Alabama credentials, his K-12 background, and his associations on the governing Board, most are generally appreciative, even admiring, of Dr. Richardson's leadership during this difficult time. This statement of a veteran faculty member who has not always agreed with President Richardson is generally reflective, *"Ed is a leader and we're much better off because he's here, but I wish he would listen more and get out on campus more."*

**(125) Additional transparency of decision-making and more conversations with Dr. Richardson would be welcomed on campus and would diminish the size of the healthy rumor mill. We also believe that he should be more generally accessible to faculty and staff and spend more time in development activities. He has also been able to distance himself from his former associates on the Board of Trustees, and at the same time, relate effectively to them. No easy task. He comports himself presidentially with warmth and dignity.**

Dr. Richardson did not come to Auburn to sit quietly in his office twiddling his thumbs. He placed an action agenda in front of the Board of Trustees and has been forging ahead on that agenda, often to the fear and displeasure of some campus constituents. *"He shouldn't be doing things that the next President might wish to change or even reverse,"* is a representative comment. We agree, though we also observe that some individuals appear to be opposed to any change and use comments about presidential communication and style as weapons to frustrate reasonable change.

**(126) Further, we believe it is appropriate for Dr. Richardson to continue a variety of processes (for example, defining and applying faculty evaluation procedures, reigning in AUM, program review, post-tenure review and the assessment of agriculture) so that the new**

**President need not start de novo. He should avoid, however, making critical decisions that will bind the new President excessively.**

Every campus president necessarily must take actions that will affect his/her successor; some of these actions will be personnel decisions, which often cannot and should not be avoided. Dr. Richardson is no exception in this regard. From this point, he should tread lightly until his successor has been appointed.

### **Provost John Heilman**

*“He’s the glue that has kept this institution together,”* observed a dean. Provost Heilman is an Auburn veteran, widely respected, and an individual who evokes trust. *“He attempts to include us whenever he can,”* commented an appreciative faculty leader. He is widely viewed as having high standards and as understanding what it is that faculty and staff do on a daily basis. *“He is a complement to Dr. Richardson. They work well together,”* said a faculty member.

Dr. Heilman works extremely long hours and is viewed as being overloaded, not the least because more than two dozen individuals report directly to him and Interim President Richardson has given him several very large assignments in addition to the Provost’s usual duties. Dr. Heilman does not always make decisions rapidly, which can be either good or bad in the current Auburn context. Undeniably, however, his approach to his duties has been soothing to the campus.

Provost Heilman has signaled his intention to step down after a new President has come to campus and become established. He deserves the sincere thanks of the Auburn community for his sterling work in a very difficult and demanding situation.

### **Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Donald L. Large, Jr.**

Vice President Large is highly competent, well versed and respected. He is respected by his associates and devoted to Auburn and has maintained financial and management steadiness during a period of frequent turnover in both the Presidency and the Provost positions. Auburn’s financial position is strong; its balance sheet reflects that strength and the rating agency confirms that rating stability. Nearly everyone assigns him the lion’s share of the credit for Auburn’s very strong

financial posture. *“He’s a very conservative guy, but we’re better off for it,”* observed a faculty member. *“His word is gold at the state level,”* commented an elected official. He presides over what would be an ungainly group of functions, but he coordinates them efficiently and effectively.

Predictably, some faculty and deans believe Mr. Large does not really understand what they do and is too rigid. Others believe his office makes financial decisions that actually end up being academic decisions because of the resources involved. However, all respect him.

**(127) Overall, Vice President Large is a strong, capable and respected chief financial officer. However, faculty members commented that his actions *“would go down easier if he and his folks get out and talk to us a bit more about how these things affect us.”* We agree.**

#### **Vice President for Development D. R. McGinnis**

Vice President McGinnis is a knowledgeable and tested development professional who has made thoughtful initiatives in preparing for the pending capital campaign. He and his associates have responded admirably during this unsettled and distracting period at Auburn. Understandably, the annual fund has not flourished during this time; yet, impressive progress has been made in the campaign; an extraordinary play on past contacts by development staff and volunteers. He also has maintained a generally effective working relationship with his “equal” partners in Auburn’s unusual advancement organization. No easy task.

While we opt for consolidation of all of the advancement functions posthaste, the next President may wish to hold off until the current capital campaign is completed. Our counsel: seek Bob McGinnis’ advice.

#### **Vice President for Research and Associate Provost Michael Moriarty**

(not a direct report but should be noted)

Whatever one’s views of Vice President Moriarty, it is undeniable that the university’s vital research efforts have prospered under his tutelage and leadership. He has energy, ideas and fortitude. *“He’s not easily discouraged, and that’s a good thing at Auburn,”* commented a research-oriented faculty member.



Some faculty and staff quibble with Vice President Moriarty's personal operating style and others believe he doesn't listen enough. Still, his has not been an easy path, given recent events at Auburn. His name implicitly is attached to the university's new research park. *"If this does not go well, he's going to take the fall for it,"* opined a faculty member from the hard sciences. But, this always speaks to one of his conspicuous strengths, namely, his willingness to take intelligent risks and to make tough decisions. *"He's more than a paper shuffler,"* said an admiring life scientist. He's a keeper.

## **XV. THE NEXT PRESIDENT**

**(128) The President of Auburn University will be expected to be many things; indeed, the good future of the university will depend on this appointment. It is crucial that in the process all concerned parties work together for their university. As noted throughout this Review, distrust and lack of respect for each other among the primary constituent organizations have become institutionalized and too many find comfort in frequent recitations of past slights and injuries; new examples are cherished and add fire to an ever ready smolder. That attitude must be put aside, and all who wish Auburn well must focus on a better future for the university.**

**(129) That initiative begins with the Board of Trustees. We labor again: Auburn now has a reputation for Presidential turnover, organizational conflict and micromanagement. Actions on the part of each group will have a deciding effect in the search process. Foremost, the Board must clean up the constitutional premises (its By-Laws) which must intelligently and clearly define the appropriate roles of each constituency: faculty, students and alumni. And, each group must buy into these new delineations.**

### **Qualities of the President:**

**(130) Above all, the President must be a tested leader: a person who has inspired trust and confidence in complex conditions; a visionary who has brought progress without inordinate conflict. One interviewee summed it this way, “*We need a visible President who listens but is decisive...and has a sense of humor, a person who is apart of but apart from us.*” Another said, “*This President should be a superstar with impeccable integrity.*” But, we were cautioned the candidate whose record of “*always being a nice person will not serve Auburn’s needs.*”**

**(131) The President must be a fund raiser of record, or certain promise, who will enthusiastically lead the advancement team to new heights. This same fire must be seen in Montgomery where elected and state officials will join in substantive celebration of the new Auburn.**

**(132) This President must be especially sensitive and committed to improving conditions for minorities and women on the faculty, staff and in the student body and the numbers should reflect this in short order. This must be more than smiles and words, the candidate must have a proven record in this area.**

**(133) The new President should come from outside the university. The Auburn currents are too strong for any insider, regardless of qualification, to be free from prejudicial judgment. Insiders are always hostage to past judgments, associations and perceptions, and few can rise above those conditions.**

**(134) Generally, faculty believe that the President should have impressive academic credentials, others are undecided. Regardless, the history of great universities includes those with impressive academic credentials and persons with virtually no academic experience or impressive degrees. The Board is advised to seriously consider candidates from across a broad spectrum. The important criterion is that the person has successful leadership experiences at a high level, one that includes courage, integrity, sensitivity and progress.**

**(135) The new President must recognize that the scope of personal ability is finite and have a record of appointing superior persons who complement his or her limitations. At Auburn, delegation will be important, and with the appointment of talented top staff must come the authority, as well as the accountability, to exercise their responsibilities. The President, though broadly experienced, must not be a micromanager. At the same time, this President must clearly take charge of every area of the university, regardless of history or conditions; this includes the schools and colleges, athletics and the extension programs.**

**(136) This President must be able to believe when others question, to count every adversary a potential supporter, must not personalize conflict and be transcendently committed to making Auburn the finest land-grant university in the country.**

**(137) This President must understand the political process in Alabama and be able to negotiate these waters effectively. While strength and pride of university are acceptable, arrogance is not, and the condescending academic never wins. This President must be a major factor in bringing different sides together, must be a people person, and comfortable in country clubs or smoke-filled rooms without compromising his/her position.**

**(138) The next President must be in good health and have the physical and mental stamina to work long hours; don't sell this requirement short! Many search committees have taken this for granted, and institutions have suffered. If possible, a thorough physical examination would be helpful.**

**(139) Of course, age should not be material, but we note here that some have suggested that an ideal candidate would be a senior person who would put Auburn "in order" and retire after five to eight years.**

**(140) This President must have a personal warmth about life, a kind of charm, the ability to at once personify the research professor and the "War Eagle."**

**(141) This is a tall order, but one that must be completely filled. There should be no compromise candidates recommended by the search committee. We believe at least three persons who have the unanimous support of the committee should be put forward. Those candidates should be presented to the Board and let chemistry decide the outcome.**

**(142) After the President is chosen, the Trustees will be watched carefully. It will be easy for them to support popular initiatives, but the real test is whether they support the President and stay within the boundaries of policy and out of personnel and programs.**

## APPENDIX A

### **James L. Fisher**

#### **Review Team Chair Brief Biography**

James L. Fisher has been a consultant to more than 300 colleges and universities and 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 ten 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 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 recent book, *Positive Power*, is quickly gaining popularity throughout the United States and internationally:

AThe modern Machiavelli...from Aegon to Zenix...persuasive and to the point,@  
*Baltimore Sun*.

AThere is definitely something happening with this book. We are out of stock already,@  
*National Book Network*

His newest book, *The Entrepreneurial College President* (2004), was published by the American Council on Education/Praeger Publishers. He is presently writing a book on effective corporate leadership which should be published in 2006.

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 has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia. He coined the term institutional review and has conducted hundreds of institutional and governance reviews for public and private institutions and systems. He also conducts board orientations and retreats and consults on presidential searches, evaluations and contracts.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at ten private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he presently serves as a board member of Millikin University, Florida Institute of Technology, Marine Corps University and the Marine Military Academy. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded eleven 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, *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. He was a Senior Adviser to Major League Baseball for three years (2000-2003). MLB is a \$4.4 billion a year enterprise. He served as a Scholar in Residence at the College Board from 2002 to 2005, and was a member of the faculty at Princeton University during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 school years. He is now College Board Professor and Senior Presidential Adviser.

He authored a book on the economics of baseball, *The Inside Pitch, And More*, for the West Virginia University Press in 2004. He wrote another book on leading the modern college and university, *A Game of Uncommon Skill*, for the American Council on Education Series on Higher Education in 2002. He chairs *College Ed*, a national program funded by the Gates Foundation, which is designed to increase college attendance by 15 to 18 percent. He is a member of the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, and a member of the National Center for Innovative Thought.

Dr. Budig has headed three major state universities, each with enrollments of more than 22,000 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 oversaw the administration of \$8.1 billion in educational funds, both public and private.

He is a retired Major General, Air National Guard/United States Air Force. His last assignment was Assistant to the Chief, National Guard Bureau, and the Army and Air National Guard had components at the time 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 (1964-67).

Dr. Budig had responsibility for 7,500 faculty and staff at ISU, 10,500 faculty and staff at WVU, and 12,500 faculty and staff at KU. He led these universities in long-range planning initiatives designed to enhance the learning experience of students. He was one of five executives named to establish a long-term business plan for Major League Baseball, a plan that produced record attendance of more than 72 million fans.

He served on the Executive Committee of the Kansas University Endowment Association during his 13 years as Chancellor (1981 to 1994) and the Association built an endowment of more than \$1 billion. He played a central role in raising funds and determining allocations to a wide array of educational programs.

He was recognized as one who could raise large amounts of private money for the public good at 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.

Dr. Budig has written essays for the Kansas City Star, New York Times, Omaha World-Herald, and USA TODAY. The Associated Press has carried reports of his studies on gubernatorial views in the 1960s and 1970s, and he has authored more than 70 articles for academic journals.

## 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 from 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 nine books and 90 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.

## **Alvin J. Schexnider, Brief Biography**

Alvin J. Schexnider, Ph.D., is Interim President of Norfolk State University. He previously served as Acting President of Norfolk State University from June 2004 to January 2005. A former Chancellor of Winston-Salem State University, he has held faculty and administrative positions at Southern University, Syracuse University, The Federal Executive Institute, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Virginia Commonwealth University and Wake Forest University.

A native of Lake Charles, Louisiana, Dr. Schexnider earned a B.A. degree in political science at Grambling State University. He received the M.A. and Ph.D. in political science from Northwestern University where he held Norman Wait Harris, Ford Foundation and Woodrow Wilson fellowships.

Dr. Schexnider is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and is the recipient of numerous honors and awards including the J. Sergeant Reynolds Award for Outstanding Service in Public Administration, The Grambling State University Distinguished Alumni Award, and the Alpha Phi Alpha Distinguished Educator of the Year Award.

Dr. Schexnider is a coauthor of *Blacks and the Military* (Brookings Institution) and has written extensively on urban politics and civil military relations. He has served on the editorial boards of *Public Administration Review* and the *Journal of Power and Ethics*. He was featured in two documentaries regarding construction of the Alaska Canada Highway, one produced for American Legacy in 2003 and another produced for the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) American Experience Series in 2005.

Dr. Schexnider serves on several boards and committees including the Board of Governors of the Town Point Club, the Executive Committee of the Greater Norfolk Corporation, and the Board of the Early Childhood Initiative of the Norfolk Foundation. From 1992 to 1998, he was a trustee of Marketwatch Funds and from 1998 to 2002, he was a trustee of Wachovia Funds and Municipal Funds. He is a former member of the North Carolina Economic Development Board and the Executive Committee of Richmond Renaissance, Inc. He is also a former Vice President of the Virginia Board of Education and former Chairman of the Southern Regional Council of the College Board. He is married and the father of a son and a daughter.

## **Kenneth A. Shaw, Brief Biography**

Dr. Kenneth A. Shaw is a nationally respected administrator and educator. Recently retired as the tenth Chancellor of Syracuse University, he served as a university president for nearly 30 years. Prior to coming to Syracuse in 1991, he was President of the University of Wisconsin System. Based in Madison, Wisconsin, Shaw presided over the 26-campus system which serves more than 160,000 students. In addition, Shaw was Chancellor of the Southern Illinois University System from 1979 to 1986, President of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville from 1977 to 1979, and Vice President and Dean of the University at Towson State University from 1969 to 1977.

As Chancellor of Syracuse University, Shaw served more than 10,500 undergraduates and 4,000 graduate students on the Central New York campus. Founded in 1870, Syracuse University is noted as a leading student centered research institution which offers both a strong liberal arts and professional studies education. Syracuse is one of 59 members of the prestigious Association of American Universities. Syracuse University was described in the July/August 2001 edition of *Change* magazine as "an institution that has been brilliantly successful over the last 10 years ... in creating consensus for its refined mission, building an infrastructure to support it, and changing its campus culture."

Shaw was recently recognized by authors Fisher and Koch as one of the nation's top entrepreneurial presidents in their most recent book on the subject.

Shaw is the recipient of honorary degrees from eight universities and he was awarded the NCAA's Silver Anniversary Award in 1986. In 2003, he earned the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education's District II Chief Executive Leadership Award.

Shaw is the author of over 40 articles dealing with higher education and leadership. His first book, *The Successful President*, was published in 1999; his second, *Intentional Leadership*, will be published in August, 2005. It deals with the generic understandings and skills that every leader or would be leader needs.

Dr. Shaw is the past chair of the NY State's Commissioner's Advisory Council on Higher Education, a past member of the board of directors of the Student Loan Marketing Association and a past member of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities. He served on the New York State Governor's Commission on Education Reform. Shaw has also served on the boards of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the American Council on Education. In the Syracuse community, he is a member of the boards of directors of the Chamber of Commerce, the Unity Mutual Life Insurance Company, and is the chairman of the Metropolitan Development Association.

Born in Granite City, Illinois, Shaw earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Illinois State University in 1961, a master of education degree from the University of Illinois-Urbana in 1963, and a Ph.D. from Purdue University in 1966.

Shaw presently serves as Chancellor Emeritus and University Professor at Syracuse.

## **Martha Wingard Tack, Brief Biography**

Martha W. Tack is a tenured professor in the Educational Leadership Program within the Department of Leadership and Counseling at Eastern Michigan University (EMU). At EMU, she has served in several leadership positions including senior executive for presidential initiatives and headquarters administrator for the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU); associate vice president for academic affairs; and associate dean in the College of Education. Dr. Tack was responsible for the implementation of the institution's first doctoral program, a Doctor of Education degree in educational leadership. During a leave of absence from EMU, she served as associate dean and tenured professor of educational leadership in the School of Education at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Before her affiliation with EMU, Dr. Tack was a tenured faculty member at Bowling Green State University and the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa where she also served as Assistant-to-the-President and director of the Women's Studies Program.

She was State Coordinator of the Michigan ACE Network for Women Leaders in Higher Education and chair of the 16-member Executive Board. Under her leadership, the Michigan Network received the coveted 2005 American Council on Education National Network and Program Award for Outstanding, Innovative, and Visionary Programs Benefiting Women Leaders. She served on the Board of Trustees of the National Business and Professional Women's Foundation and was Chair of the Foundation's Research and Information Committee. She was a member of the Board of Trustees for The University of Findlay (Ohio) from which she received an honorary doctorate. In 2005, she began a 3-year term as a Trustee for the Mortar Board National Foundation.

Dr. Tack has received external funding to study issues in leadership from several agencies. For example, she and Dr. James L. Fisher were awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to complete and deliver a FIPSE lecture on the "Effective College President." The grant was one of six awarded nationally. She and Dr. Fisher also received research funding from the Exxon Education Foundation. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation have also supported Tack's initiatives.

In addition to numerous articles, she co-authored (with Patitu) an ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report entitled *Faculty Job Satisfaction: Women and Minorities in Peril*. She also has co-authored (with Fisher) two books on college administration: *The Effective College President* and *Leaders on Leadership: The College Presidency, New Directions for Higher Education*.

A native of Eclectic, Alabama, she graduated summa cum laude from Troy State University; received her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from The University of Alabama (Tuscaloosa).



## Farris W. Womack, Brief Biography

<b>Consultant</b> - <u>Universities, Governments, Venture Capital, Internet Companies,</u>	<b>1998 -</b>
<b>The University of Michigan</b> - Ann Arbor, Michigan <u>Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer</u>	<b>1988 - 1998</b>
<b>The University of North Carolina</b> - Chapel Hill, North Carolina <u>Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance</u>	<b>1983 - 1988</b>
<b>State of North Carolina</b> - Raleigh, North Carolina <u>Controller, Chief Financial Officer</u> <i>During my tenure as Controller, I also served as CFO of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</i>	<b>1986 - 1988</b>
<b>State of Arkansas</b> - Little Rock, Arkansas <u>Chief Fiscal Officer of the State and</u> <u>Director, Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration</u>	<b>1981 - 1983</b>
<b>The University of Arkansas</b> - Fayetteville, Arkansas <u>Executive Vice President (1979 - 1981)</u> <u>Vice President for Administration (1977-1979)</u> <u>Director of Budgets (1976-1977)</u> <u>Director of Institutional Research (1975-1976)</u>	<b>1975 - 1981</b>
<b>The Arkansas State University</b> - Jonesboro, Arkansas <u>Director of Institutional Research</u>	<b>1971 - 1975</b>
<b>Previous Experience</b> - <u>Assistant to the President, Henderson State University; Computer Analyst, Reynolds Metals Company; Public School Administrator and Teacher</u>	
<b>EDUCATION:</b> Ed. D. - The University of Arkansas – 1972, <i>Educational Administration</i> M. Ed. - The University of Arkansas – 1958, <i>Educational Administration</i> A. B. - University of Central Arkansas – 1955, <i>History, Political Science, and English</i>	

## Michael J. Worth, Brief Biography

Michael J. Worth has more than thirty years of experience in philanthropic resource development and is one of the most recognized fund-raising professionals in the nation. He served for eighteen years as Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs at The George Washington University and previously served as Director of Development at the University of Maryland College Park. At GW, he planned and directed two major campaigns, including the \$500-million Centuries Campaign. He also served as professional staff to the University's Board of Trustees, with responsibility for board development. He is Professor of Nonprofit Management at the GW School of Public Policy and Public Administration and teaches graduate courses related to the management of nonprofit organizations, fund raising, and nonprofit boards.

Dr. Worth is one of the most widely-known speakers and writers in the field of fund raising and institutional advancement. He has been a frequent speaker at conferences of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

In addition to numerous articles, reviews, and conference papers, he has written or edited five books, including *Public College and University Development* (1985), *The Role of the Development Officer in Higher Education* (1994), and *Educational Fund Raising: Principles and Practice*, published in 1993 by the American Council on Education (ACE) and Oryx Press, *New Strategies for Educational Fund Raising*, published by ACE and Praeger Publishers in 2002, and *Securing the Future: A Fund-Raising Guide for Boards of Independent Colleges and Universities*, published by AGB in 2005.

Dr. Worth has served as a member of CASE's Commission on Philanthropy and as editor of the *CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement*, a scholarly journal related to the fields of alumni relations, communications, and philanthropy. He advised CASE as Special Consultant for Executive Education and has served as a faculty member at the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education. Dr. Worth holds a B.A. in economics from Wilkes College, an M.A. in economics from The American University, and a Ph.D. in Higher Education from the University of Maryland.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **INTERVIEWEES:**

Barnese Adair-Wallace, Staff (AU)  
Mary Ann Aglan, Student (AU)  
Wayne Alderman, Faculty (AU)  
Paul Alexander, Executive Director, Advancement (AUM)  
Dorienna Alfred, Faculty (AU)  
Donna Angarano, Assoc Dean, Veterinary Medicine (AU)  
Cove Aries, Faculty (AU)  
Lee Armstrong, General Counsel  
Shawn Asmuth, Executive Director, Procurement & Payment Services (AU)  
Lynn Bacon, Senior Director, Admin & Records (AUM)  
Connor Bailey, Former Faculty Senate President  
Jim Baird, Alumni (AU)  
Charles Ball, Trustee  
David Beale, Faculty (AU)  
Nancy Bendinger, Alumni (AU)  
Larry Benefield, Dean, Engineering (AU)  
Dan Bennett, Dean, Architecture, Design & Construction (AU)  
Neal Berte, former President, Birmingham Southern College  
Rickey Best, Dean, Library (AUM)  
Doyle Bickers, Director, Admission and Records  
Nedret Billor, Faculty (AU)  
John Blackwell, Trustee; Chair, Property & Facilities Committee  
Wanda Blake, Asst Chancellor, Finance & Admin Services (AUM)  
Rafe Blaufarb, Faculty (AU)  
Betsy Ellen Bloodworth, Student (AU)  
Paul Bobrowski, Dean, College of Business (AU)  
Tim Boosinger, Dean, Veterinary Medicine (AU)  
Claude Boyd, Faculty (AU)  
Robert Boyd, Faculty (AU)  
Edna Brabham, Faculty (AU)  
Marilyn Bradbard, Dept Chair, Marriage and Family Therapy (AU)  
Allyn Bransby, Part-time Faculty (AU)  
Charles Bruce, Asst Treasurer (AU)  
Bob Bulfin, Faculty (AU)  
Rich Burnett, Director, Information Technology  
Gisele Buschle-Dikes, Faculty (AU)  
Sheryl Byrd, Asst Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs (AUM)  
Lauren Renee Cammack, Student (AU)  
Dwight Carlisle, Trustee; Chair, Investment Committee  
Dotty Cavender, Assoc Dean, Human Sciences (AU)  
Dannis Christian, Executive Asst to Executive Vice President  
David Cicci, Faculty (AU)  
Drew Clark, Director, Institutional Research & Assessment (AU)  
Joy Clark, Assoc Dean, School of Business (AUM)  
Miriam Clark, Faculty (AU)  
John Cochran, Dept Chair, Aerospace Engineering (AU)  
Stephen Collier, Program Director, University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Kelly Cramer, Student (AUM)  
George Crandell, Department Head, English (AU)  
Charlie Crawford, Staff (AU)

Evelyn Crayton, Asst Director, Family & Community Development, ACES  
 Ruth Crocker, Director, Women's Studies  
 Grant Davis, Secretary, Board of Trustees  
 Franklin Crawford Dillard, Student (AU)  
 Deedie Dowdle, Director, Communications (AU)  
 Patricia Duffy, Faculty (AU)  
 Jessica Early, Student (AUM)  
 Kelly Eckert, Student (AU)  
 Bill Elder, Athletic Director (AUM)  
 Kim Evans, Head Coach, Women's Golf  
 Lee Evans, Dean, Pharmacy (AU)  
 Evan Everett, Student (AU)  
 John Fletcher, Asst Vice President, Student Affairs/Enrollment Management (AU)  
 Kathryn Flynn, Faculty (AU)  
 Byron Franklin, Trustee  
 Gary Fuller, Mayor, City of Opelika  
 Sharon Gaber, Assoc Dean, Architecture, Design & Construction (AU)  
 Bill Gale, Faculty (AU)  
 Larry Gerber, Professor  
 Jeff Gilbreath, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Linda Glaze, Associate Provost  
 Charles Goldberg, *Birmingham News*  
 Orelal Gonner, Student (AUM)  
 Jane Goodson, Dean, Business (AUM)  
 Robert Gottesman, Internal Auditing  
 Anna Gramberg, Dean, Liberal Arts (AU)  
 Johnny Green, Special Assistant to the President  
 Linda Gresham, Academic Advisor (AU)  
 Lee Gurley, Faculty (AUM)  
 Richard Guthrie, Dean, Agriculture (AU)  
 John Hachtel, AVP, Communications & Marketing (AU)  
 Alan Hackel, Dean, Continuing Education (AUM)  
 George S. Hall, Student (AU)  
 Bill Hamm, Mayor, City of Auburn  
 Lynne Hammond, Asst Vice President, Human Resources & EEO Officer  
 Bill Hardy, Assoc Dean, Agriculture, (AU)  
 Vincent Harris, President, Black Students Union  
 Jack Hawkins, Chancellor, Troy University  
 June Henton, Dean, Human Sciences (AU)  
 John Heilman, Provost  
 June Henton, Dean, Human Sciences  
 Sally Hill, Director, AU Foundations  
 John Hilyer, Faculty (AU)  
 Bert Hitchcock, Faculty (AU)  
 Karen Hoppa, Head Coach, Women's Soccer  
 Andy Hornsby, President, AU Alumni Association Board  
 Mike Hubbard, State Representative, District 79, Lee County  
 Harriett Huggins, Administrative Staff  
 Diablo Hunter, Alumni (AU)  
 Jay Jacobs, Athletic Director (AU)  
 Overtoun Jenda, Associate Provost, Diversity & Multicultural Affairs  
 Kevin Johnson, Student (AUM)  
 Trey Johnston, Owner, J&M Bookstore

Kelly Jolley, Dept Chair, Philosophy (AU)  
 Paul Jungnickel, Assoc Dean, Pharmacy (AU)  
 Bob Karcher, Director, Engineering Student Services (AU)  
 Judd Katz, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs (AUM)  
 Fran Kochan, Dean, Education (AU)  
 Krystyna Kuperberg, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Don Large, Executive Vice President (AU)  
 Willie Larkin, Faculty (AU)  
 Ford Laumer, Professor Emeritus (Marketing)  
 Bayo Lawal, Dean, Sciences (AUM)  
 Jeff Lebo, Head Coach, Men's Basketball (AU)  
 Katie Lee, Director, Bookstore (AU)  
 Bruce Lindsey, Dept Chair, Architecture (AU)  
 A. Lynn Locknow, Faculty (AU)  
 April Love, Editor, *Plainsman*  
 Garnetta Lovett, Faculty (AU)  
 Robert Lowder, Trustee; Chair, Finance Committee  
 Bonnie MacEwan, Dean, University Libraries (AU)  
 Gary Martin, Faculty Senator (Curriculum & Teaching)  
 Carolyn Matthews, Auburn City Council  
 Charles McCrary, Trustee  
 Sid McAnnally, Executive Director, External Affairs (AU)  
 Steve McFarland, Dean, Graduate School (AU)  
 Bob McGinnis, Vice President, Development (AU)  
 Landon Michele McKean, Student (AU)  
 Earlon McWhorter, President Pro Tempore  
 Baker Melson, Director, Facilities (AU)  
 Renee Middleton, Faculty (AU)  
 Barb Miller, Assistant Vice President, Development, Major Gifts (AU)  
 Daniel Miller, Senior Director, Financial Aid (AUM)  
 Debbie Miller, Accountant III (AU)  
 Deborah Miller, Procurement & Payment Services (AU)  
 Jack Miller, Trustee; Chair, Academic Affairs Committee  
 Amit Mitra, Assoc Dean, Business (AU)  
 Michael Moran, Faculty (AU)  
 Michael Moriarty, Vice President, Research (AU)  
 Edward Morrison, Dept Chair, Anatomy, Physiology & Pharmacology (AU)  
 John Mouton, Senior Advisor to the President (AU)  
 Larry Mullins, Dean, Liberal Arts (AUM)  
 Guin Nance, Chancellor, AUM  
 Carlton Neil, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Chris Newland, Faculty (AU)  
 Sarah Newton, Trustee  
 Bill Noblitt, Director, University Relations (AUM)  
 Virginia O'Leary, Faculty (AU)  
 Melvin Owens, Asst Director, Public Safety (AU)  
 Pamela Paine, Faculty (AU)  
 Rich Paneskovic, Faculty Senate President  
 Linda Pearce, Controller (AU)  
 Joe Pittman, Assoc Dean, Graduate School (AU)  
 Mack Portera, Chancellor, University of Alabama System  
 William Powell, Faculty (AU)  
 Anna Beth Presley, Faculty (AU)  
 Jim Rainey, Publisher, *Opelika-Auburn News*  
 Jimmy Rane, Trustee; Chair, Agriculture Committee

Carolyn Rawl, Senior Director, Technology Resource Center (AUM)  
 Glen Ray, Interim Asst Vice President (AUM)  
 Gwen Reid, Assistant Vice President, Development, Capital Campaign (AU)  
 Constance Relihan, Assoc Dean, Liberal Arts (AU)  
 Mike Reynolds, Director, Student Financial Services (AU)  
 Ed Richardson, Interim President  
 Lyla Ridings, Student (AUM)  
 Robert Riley, Governor, State of Alabama  
 Chris Roberts, Faculty (AU)  
 Jackie Roberts, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Admin Services (AUM)  
 Chris Rodgers, Faculty (AU)  
 David Rouse, Dept Chair, Fisheries (AU)  
 Melody Russell, Faculty (AU)  
 Bill Sauser, Associate Dean, Strategic Planning, Business (AU)  
 Morris Savage, Attorney; AU Foundation Board Member  
 Kevin Schaudit, Senior Director, Housing and Student Life (AUM)  
 Stewart Schneller, Dean, Science and Mathematics (AU)  
 Shirley Scott-Harris, Director, Bellsouth Minority Engineering Program (AU)  
 Debbie Shaw, Interim Vice President, Alumni Affairs (AU)  
 Ashley Sherbett, Student (AU)  
 Furman Smith, Faculty (AUM)  
 Gaines Smith, Interim Director ACES  
 Kent Smith, Dean of Students (AU)  
 Marcie Smith, Asst Vice President, Business & Finance (AU)  
 Michel Smith, Dept Chair, Mathematics and Statistics (AU)  
 Donna Sollie, Faculty (AU)  
 Greg Somers, Assoc Dean, Forestry and Wildlife (AU)  
 Paul Spina, Trustee; Chair, Executive Committee  
 Janet Stein, Faculty (AU)  
 Amye Michele Still, Student (AU)  
 Milton Stokey, Alumni (AU)  
 David Stranberg, Faculty (AU)  
 Barb Struempfer, Faculty (AU)  
 Paula Sullenger, Faculty (AU)  
 Frances Svyantek, Part-time Faculty (AU)  
 Jenny Swain, Administrative Staff  
 Jason Taylor, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Martha Taylor, Assistant Vice President, Research (AU)  
 Mary Ann Taylor-Sims, Student Counsel Services (AU)  
 Virginia Thompson, Trustee; Chair, Audit Committee  
 Greg Traxler, Faculty (AU)  
 Bill Trimble, Faculty (AU)  
 Ted Trupp, Rec Services Program Asst III  
 Tommy Tuberville, head Coach, Football (AU)  
 Robert Vecellio, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 John Veres, Executive Director, University Outreach (AUM)  
 Teresa Vest, Director, Budget Services (AU)  
 Jim Vickery, Former President, University of Montevallo  
 Danielle Wadsworth, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Isabella Wai, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Martha Walden, Student (AU)  
 Robert Walker, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
 Janet Warren, Dean, Education (AUM)  
 Herb White, Alumni (AU)  
 David Whitten, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)

Barbara Wilder, Graduate Teaching  
Arlette Wilson, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
David Wilson, Vice President, Outreach  
Hope Wilson, Student (AUM)  
Daniel Winer, Faculty (AU)  
Larry Wit, Assoc Dean, Sciences & Mathematics (AU)  
Barbara Witt, Dean, Nursing (AU & AUM)  
Debra Worthington, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)  
Carole Zugazaga, Graduate Teaching Assistant (AU)

65 Anonymous Faculty, Students, Staff, Townspeople, Alumni  
Conversations with staff at American Council on Education (ACE), American Association of State  
Colleges and Universities (AASCU), Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE),  
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), National Association  
of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)

**APPENDIX C**  
**AUBURN UNIVERSITY**  
**REVIEW INTERVIEW FORM**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

We have been asked to review the condition of Auburn University. 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 (INCLUDING MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION & ALABAMA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SYSTEM)

---

---

---

---

---

3. TECHNOLOGY

---

---

---

---

---

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

---

---

---

---

---

5. STUDENTS (FACULTY ADVISING, STUDENT SERVICES, CREDENTIALS, MORALE, AWARENESS, RACIAL, ET AL)

---

---

---

---

---

6. ADMISSIONS, RETENTION, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL

---

---

---

---

---

7. ATHLETICS

---

---

---

---

---

8. ADMINISTRATION

---

---

---

---

9. SENIOR OFFICERS

---

---

---

---

10. BUDGET AND FINANCE (FACILITIES, ET AL)

---

---

---

---

11. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

---

---

---

---

12. PUBLIC RELATIONS

---

---

---

---

13. ALUMNI AFFAIRS

---

---

---

---

14. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

---

---

---

---

15. BOARD OF TRUSTEES

---

---

---

---



16. MOST IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW PRESIDENT

---

---

---

---

17. MAIN TASKS OF THE NEW PRESIDENT

---

---

---

---

18. COMPARATIVE CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY, DOCUMENTATION IF ANY

---

---

---

---

19. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

---

---

---

---

---

---

JLF 2005

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Materials Used in the Review:**

“Fisher Template”

Confidential position papers prepared by the Interim President, and the chief academic and chief financial officers

Auburn University Organization Chart

Board of Trustees Policy Manual

2005 Board of Trustees’ Meetings Minutes

Faculty Handbook

A & P Handbook

Staff Handbook

AU Facts and Figures

AU Bulletin

SACS Documents

Annual Financial Report and Budget

Tiger Cub Student Policy Manual

Promotional Materials

Strategic/Long Range Plans:

Recommendations of the Twenty-First Century Commission

Recommendations to the Commission on the Role of the University  
in the 21st Century

Analysis of Auburn's Rankings on Measures of Quality

Auburn University Strategic Planning Data

Wear Report

Academic Degree Programs Offered

Press Clippings, June 2005-November 2005

Student Athlete Support Services

College/School Based Magazines

Materials Related to AUM

## **Appendix E**

### **Suggested Auburn University Board of Trustees Code of Ethics**

- 1) To become familiar with, committed to, and abide by the major responsibilities and duties of the Board as set out in the By-Laws of Auburn University.
- 2) To accept the spirit of academic freedom and shared governance as fundamental characteristics of university governance.
- 3) To prepare carefully for, regularly attend, and actively participate in Board meetings and committee assignments.
- 4) To vote and speak according to one's individual conviction, yet to be willing to support the majority decision of the Board and work with fellow Board members in a spirit of cooperation.
- 5) To maintain confidentiality when called for, and to avoid acting as spokesperson for the entire Board unless specifically authorized to do so.
- 6) To support University fund raising efforts through personal giving in accordance with one's means (both annual and capital drives), and to be willing to share in the solicitation of others.
- 7) To understand the role of the Board as a policy-making body and to avoid participation in the administration of policy.
- 8) To understand that the President is the exclusive agent of the Board in the conduct of all university affairs.
- 9) To insure that the conduct of the university by the President be systematically evaluated annually.
- 10) To learn and consistently use designated institutional channels when conducting Board business.
- 11) To insure that any relationships that could be perceived as conflicts of interest are to the distinct and obvious advantage of the university.
- 12) To refrain from actions and involvements that might prove embarrassing to the university and to resign if such actions or involvements develop.
- 13) To make judgments always on the basis of what is best for the university as a whole and for the advancement of higher education rather than to serve special interests.

## Appendix F

### **Auburn University Board of Trustees**

#### **Audit Committee Charter**

*(It is suggested that this be a sub committee of the new Committee on Fiscal Affairs, Investment, Property and Audit unless Sarbanes Oxley demands otherwise.)*

#### **Section I. Purpose**

The primary purpose of the Audit Committee (the “Committee”) is to assist the Board of Trustees in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities in the areas of financial controls and reporting and administration of the Code of Ethics. The scope of the Committee’s activities encompasses the examination and evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of the university’s system of internal controls and the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities.

#### **Section II. Responsibilities**

The Committee shall:

- 2.1. Select and appoint the independent auditor.
- 2.2 Review and approve (or disallow) the fees to be paid to the independent auditor, authorize (or prohibit) the provision of any non-audit services by the independent auditor and consider any questions of resignation or dismissal of the independent auditor.
- 2.3 Meet with the independent auditors before and after an independent audit commences to discuss the nature and scope of the audit and review the auditor’s findings (Such meeting(s) shall be held in the absence of senior administrators, if deemed appropriate by the Committee).
- 2.4 Review the independent auditor’s “management letter,” the internal auditor’s annual report, and senior administrators’ responses, if such items are prepared.
- 2.5 Present the Committee’s review and evaluation of the audit report to the full Board.
- 2.6 Review the results of non-audit services completed by the auditors, if such services have been performed.
- 2.7 Review the internal audit function, and if outsourced, annually review the proposed scope of the internal audit services and related fees.
- 2.8 Monitor Board member compliance with the university’s Code of Ethics policy.
- 2.9 Verify that the university is in compliance with all applicable criteria for accreditation.

#### **Section III. Audit Committee Members**

- 3.1 The Committee shall be comprised of three (3) Trustees, appointed by the **Chair** ~~President Pro Tem~~, each of whom shall be independent Trustees and free from any

relationship that, in the opinion of the **Chair President Pro-Tem**, would interfere with the exercise of his or her independent judgment as a member of the Committee.

3.2 All members of the Committee shall have a working familiarity with basic finance and accounting practices, and at least one (1) member of the Committee shall have accounting or related financial management expertise. Committee members may enhance their familiarity with finance and accounting by participating in educational programs conducted by the university or an outside consultant.

#### **Section IV. Meetings of the Audit Committee**

The Committee shall meet as frequently as circumstances dictate but, at a minimum, it shall meet at least once in connection with the preparation of the annual audit and again before the presentation of the annual audit report to the full Board.

#### **Section V. Implementation**

The Committee, in consultation with the **Chair President Pro-Tempore**, shall develop procedures to implement this Charter.

## Appendix G

**DRAFT: TO BE PUBLISHED**

2005: James L. Fisher<sup>1</sup>

### The Enlightened Board

Transformational (change oriented) leadership, even during settled times, is the only way an organization can achieve and maintain a valid and prosperous condition. Such leadership sets a mood, a dynamic that permeates the entire organization. This organizational disposition is impossible under any other leadership style. Typically, most college and university boards are not constituted or conducted to inspire such leadership. With this in mind, the following prescriptions are offered:

### The Role of the Board

Above all, the board must insure that the president is empowered; only then can the president empower others and not be pressed toward ultimately nonproductive and self-defeating behavior. After appointing a president, the primary role of a board is to review, audit, inspire and evaluate the performance of the institution and especially its CEO. No board should be directly involved in the management of the institution. To do so is to insure an ineffectual president or a brief presidential tenure, for in such a condition the accountable president is effectively neutered and replaced by an unaccountable collective (faculty, staff and/or students). Today, in many institutions, because of politics, micro-management, a deeply entrenched status quo and unaccountable authority, it is impossible for most boards to hold their presidents accountable.

No board or board chair has ever effectively led or managed a college for long; nor has any faculty council or senate. Too many otherwise informed board members forget this classic truth; few would think of running their own affairs this way. Individual accountability must maintain throughout the organization, starting with the president who should

### Model Board Meeting

First day, board members arrive:

1. Ad hoc or special committee meetings during the day,
2. 6:00 PM presidential reception and dinner, perhaps often followed by arts or athletic event (faculty and student leaders often invited).

Second day:

1. 8:00 AM committee meetings (breakfast available). Board chair and president circulate independently from meeting to meeting.
2. 11:00 AM executive committee meeting. Committee chairs report and other agenda items considered.
3. 12:00 PM invitation-only luncheon. 30-minute address by distinguished faculty, staff or student.
4. 1:00 PM board meeting. Agenda:
  - A. Chair's report
  - B. President's report
  - C. Minutes of last meeting approved
  - D. Committee reports
  - E. Old Business
  - F. New Business
  - G. Executive Session
  - H. Adjournment, typically by 3:00 PM.

---

<sup>1</sup> James L. Fisher is the most published writer on leadership and organization in higher education today. He is the author or editor of ten books on the presidency and a consultant to colleges and universities. He has been or is a trustee at ten private colleges or universities and two preparatory schools.

be completely empowered by the board; in turn the president can employ any style that gets the job done, subject to the close, enlightened and regular evaluation by the board.

The president who does not empower others, will ultimately fail the test of evaluation by the board for those affected by decisions should have a voice in their making, but the president as the ultimately accountable officer should be the final authority. This especially applies to faculty. With few, if any, exceptions (informational and some social functions), a board should not engage in formal relationships with others in the college community. The president is the board's; everyone else is the president's, and a wise and enlightened board will ritualize this relationship in its **operating by-laws**. These conditions apply to businesses, companies, and non-profit organizations including government and military organizations, and certainly to **colleges and universities**. It should again be noted that, these things done, the fully empowered president may now be fairly and completely evaluated by the board and either celebrated or exposed in that process.

#### Board

1. All board members must understand and support the mission of the institution and have influence or money or both.
2. The president may be an ex officio, non-voting member of the board, but preferably not on the board at all.
3. The board chair and the president should influence all board appointments.
4. No more than two four-year or three three-year consecutive terms for board members; after which all board members should retire for at least one year.
5. No faculty, students or administrators on board. If students and faculty must be on the board, they should come from other institutions.
6. There should be at least five board committees: academic affairs, business affairs, student affairs, institutional advancement, and an executive committee which includes the board chair, vice chair, secretary/treasurer and all of the committee chairs.
7. The external auditor should be exclusively appointed by the board chair or another delegated board member.
8. Some boards also have separate committees on strategic planning, compensation, and trusteeship, but it is typically best for these functions to be assumed by the executive committee.
9. No faculty or students on board committees, only administrators assigned by the president as agents of the president, although faculty and students should be asked to make presentations to board committees and periodically to the full board.
10. Board members should meet faculty and students socially and occasionally through reports to the board, presentations to board committees, campus tours and events, et al.
11. Other than the president, administrators should not be constitutionally empowered. The president should make administrative assignments to board committees. This clarifies lines of authority regardless of association.
12. Except in highly unusual situations, if a staff person serves as board secretary, that person should report to the president and not the board or the board chair.

13. Don't have any "authorities" on the board unless they are enthusiastically endorsed by the president (other college presidents and other "expert" types).

### The Board Meeting

Board meetings are often either perfunctory or tedious driving good board members to absenteeism or resignation. In addition to reviewing the conduct of the institution, the key to a successful board meeting is twofold: (1) fully updating the board, and (2) maintaining and enhancing the legitimacy of the presidential office. This is typically done poorly. All boards implicitly evaluate the institution and president at every meeting and the enlightened board does an annual explicit presidential and institutional review. This review is conducted according to mutually acceptable predetermined objectives. Every four years, the board, with the approval of the president, should employ a tested outsider to evaluate the president, the board and the institution. **This, done properly, will insure institutional prosperity in perpetuity, and neither the territory of the president nor the board will be violated.**

With this in mind, the following specifics are offered regarding colleges or university boards and their presidents. If these or very similar conditions are not present, any institution involved in controversial issues will result in a presidential disaster or a substantive compromise and the institution will decline. All these recommendations are born from generic replicable research on effective leadership and organizational behavior and are consistent with both the 1940 and 1966 AAUP Statements on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance.

1. At least seven days before each board meeting, the office of the president should forward to the full board written reports on the state of each area represented by a board committee. These reports should serve as an agenda for committee meetings.
2. Long board meetings are a sure sign of micro-management, and an anathema to any organization.
3. The detailed work of the board should be done in board committees staffed by agents of the CEO and committees should meet only at the time the board meets.
4. There should be no more than four meetings per year; three is better.
5. The board meeting should last one day or at the most an evening and one day. If not, top board members will not be attracted or retained.
6. Committee reports should not be labored at length by the committee chair when reporting to the board. Should a committee chair be absent, another committee member should make the report, not a member of the staff. In some circumstances approved by the president, a staff member may briefly augment a committee report.
7. The president should open every board meeting with inspiring, thoughtfully prepared, written remarks. This reestablishes the president at his/her inaugural height and insures a written record.
8. Reorder regular board agenda subjects from time to time (i.e., development is typically too low).
9. The president should always have the opportunity to speak to the board in executive session at the end of each meeting (absolutely no staff, including secretarial, present).



10. Except in emergencies, executive committee meetings should be in conjunction with regular board meetings and reported to the full board.

#### The Board Chair

1. The board has final authority over everything.
2. Always remember the president is the leader of the institution, your main job is to support the president and be certain that the president is evaluated annually and objectively.
3. Comport yourself with diffident consistency.
4. Set an example for other board members.
5. Listen.
6. Lead quietly.
7. Delegate everything but final authority.
8. Praise the president in public, be candid in private.
9. Empower the president constitutionally and psychologically.
10. Do not micro-manage.
11. Remember the institution is your most important denominator.
12. Never have an office on campus.

#### The President

1. Have a vision that is greater than the institution.
2. Stay warmly distant, and from that vantage point, be enthusiastic and as charming as you can, but do not tell jokes, be thoughtful of everyone.
3. Be the leader.
4. Think before speaking.
5. Try not to be directly involved in specific rewards or punishments.
6. Respect your office.
7. Be an authority on higher education.
8. No surprises for the board; tell them more than they want to know.
9. No secrets from any, including faculty. Do not compromise faculty or students in private meetings with the board.
10. After the mission and goals are accomplished, do not ever ask a board what to do, they may tell you.
11. The board chair should be the closest of your professional relationships, but know that the board must always act in the corporate interest.
12. Have regular one-on-one contacts with every board member (calls, breakfasts, luncheons, dinners, athletic and cultural activities).
13. Do not ever play politics with the board. The president is above such things.
14. Do not encourage formal faculty or student access, but do encourage periodic contact with faculty/students.
15. Cultivate the people who are important to board members.
16. Deliver impressive results.

#### In Sum

From the beginning to the end, a board member must remember that he or she cannot effectively run the institution, nor can the board chair; only the instrument of the board, a fully accountable and closely evaluated president, can do that job. At this point, and only at this point, a trustee can intelligently applaud, amend or take issue.

For most institutions, this means reviewing and revising the operating by-laws and establishing annual goals against which the president can be evaluated. Assuming these conditions, a president will be able to soar or stall, and the board will quickly know the difference. **Any approach that is not a strong facsimile of the conditions outlined in this paper is an intellectual compromise and bound to frustrate board members and faculty, inhibit presidents, reduce morale and make significant change virtually impossible.**

## **Appendix H**

*The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*

Click to <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm> to read the statement courtesy the American Association of University Professors Web site.

## **Appendix I**

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

Click to <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm> courtesy the American Association of University Professors Web site.