

Faculty Senate Minutes January 28, 2002

Present: Terry Cooney, David Droge, John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Juli McGruder, Hans Ostrom, Karen Porter, George Tomlin, Alexa Tullis

Visitors: Nancy Bristow, Alva Butcher, Karen Goldstein, Doug Goodman, Grace Kirchner, Matt Pickard, Steve Rodgers, Rand Worland, Michael Oman

McGruder stated changes to the minutes of 11/19/01. Hanson moved to accept them as revised and this was seconded by Hummel-Berry.

Special Orders: Tullis mentioned that some faculty have expressed dissatisfaction over the new electronic add-drop procedure. Ostrom stated that this issue could be brought up in a later meeting.

A move was made to approve the nominations for honorary degrees. McGruder asked for clarification of criteria. Cooney clarified. Hummel-Berry moved to approve the entire slate of nominees. McGruder seconded the motion.

Report from the Committee Considering Instructors' Salaries:

Matt Pickard gave a brief presentation of the main points in the report. It was emphasized that the main goal of the report, analysis, and recommendation was to develop a salary scale for instructors that was comparable and parallel in structure to that of tenure-line faculty. In his presentation, Pickard described (complete with graphs and tables) some best and worst case scenarios with respect to pay differences between instructors and tenure-line faculty. Pickard also outlined the report's suggestion about how to shift on-going instructors to the proposed pay scale.

Following the presentation, senators asked some questions.

Hanson asked how instructors feel about the proposed changes. Pickard pointed out that no instructors would end up receiving a lower salary with the proposal.

Droge asked about the use of the word "promotion"; specifically, what does this word mean in the context of instructors? Cooney stated that a different word should probably be used. Hanson suggested "advancement" or "rank".

A general discussion ensued about the cost of performing the proposed shift in instructor salary scale.

McGruder moved to have the faculty senate recognize Pickard and Doug Goodman for preparing a clear, comprehensive, and compelling proposal. Hanson suggested making the motion even stronger.

A general discussion ensued about what role the university faculty had in getting the proposed changes in place. It was clarified that faculty can give feedback on the proposal and vote on whether or not to support the proposal. This would, in effect, send a recommendation from the faculty to the salary committee, which would then send a recommendation to the Dean and the Dean would then present the case to the President.

McGruder's motion was put back on the table and it was seconded by another senator. The motion carried.

Report of the Budget Task Force:

Two important facts were considered by the BTF in preparing their report:

- Costs incurred by the University have increased: Medical costs, compensation, electricity, and insurance have all increased.
- Income has decreased: Equity is down due to the stock market

To deal with the decrease in revenue and increase in expenses, Grace Kirchner stated that the Trustees have called for a decrease in pay-out from the endowment to maintain sustainability and an increase in spending on building maintenance to increase or maintain the value of our buildings. They have also approved a >6% increase in tuition.

Senators began to ask questions:

Hanson asked if there were any proposed cuts. Cooney said no, although there may be shifts in use that do not show up in the BTF re-allocation plan. The example given was OIS spending on hardware versus software.

Goldstein predicted that next year and the year after will be worse; since we can only increase tuition like this once, we will need to do other things to increase revenue or decrease expenses.

Kirchner pointed out that, effectively, there have been cuts because our budget has increased less than inflation.

Hanson requested that there be more communication between the BTF and the faculty about long term budget projections so that departments can plan ahead if possible.

Kirchner stated that, although the increase in tuition is above inflation, other schools that have done this have not seen a decrease in enrollment.

Cooney stated that it is difficult to say what makes the most sense to target for cuts within a university. He gave the example of fitness centers: although these can be considered peripheral to education, they do attract new students.

Droge asked if we were getting ready for a fund raising campaign. The answer was no.

Tomlin agreed with Hanson on the need for keeping departments well informed about the state of the budget and the potential for cuts. He also stated that faculty and staff morale should be considered when making cuts.

Goldstein stated that the BTF will be giving a presentation about the university's financial situation to the Trustees and asked if the faculty would like a similar presentation. Senator's nodded their heads. Tomlin made a motion to request a workshop for the faculty. The motion was seconded. Senators also requested that the workshop announcement be sent out to faculty on YELLOW PAPER.

Ostrom asked whether cuts in financial aid were likely to affect diversity. Cooney stated that the university would try very hard not to cut financial aid.

Hanson asked about the rationale for why those who opted not to enroll in the university's health plans received lower health allowances. Goldstein explained that the university doesn't want to give an incentive for young, healthy members to leave the system because this would increase the costs of the plan since only the "expensive" employees would be enrolling. This is one of the big challenges of group plans.

Adjourned about 5PM

Respectfully submitted
Alexa Tullis