

Tuesday October 13, 2009

SUB 143

1:00 pm

PSO Meeting to discuss proposed SBOE policy changes.

Guest: VP for Finance and Administration Chet Herbst

At the meeting today Dawn began by stating the proposed policy changes have been pulled from the Thursday SBOE meeting. She was told, "They don't know when this will come back on the agenda, or if it will at all."

Chet gave some background and history to the proposed policy:

- He first commented that faculty at each institution as well as regional legislators were opposed or had serious reservations about this policy. He believes for this reason, the agenda item was removed.
- Administrators began last year by seeking guidance on what could and could not be done during times of financial exigency should the need to invoke it arise. They wanted some legal guidance with regards to teaching faculty and officers, or non-classified staff.
- The initial language came up from legal counsel from UI, BSU, and ISU – and it was unclear if this was a new policy or simply a clarification on existing policy. The language was meant to clarify the current policy, however the language of the policy was controversial and left things open.
  - "Non-classified employees, who serve pursuant to contract of employment containing a stated salary are not guaranteed such salary in subsequent contracts or appointment, and such salary is subject to adjustment during the contract period due to financial exigency or due to institution action to reduce budgetary expenditures."
- Administrators had a teleconference to discuss the nature of this language and encouraged it to be removed from the August State Board agenda before faculty returned, otherwise it would have looked as if they were trying to sneak the language in.
- To some people the proposed language seemed to create a middle ground between financial exigency and normal operating procedures. This was not the intent, the original intent was to clarify existing power.

- LCSC did not object to the appearance of this on the SBOE agenda, however, they stated they could not support or vote for the issue. There is also a belief this issue will not be brought up again.

Dawn then explained her involvement in the matter:

- Per SBOE policy, the deadline for a request to speak at the open forum of the meeting was yesterday. Since she wasn't aware of the wishes of PSO, she submitted her request to speak as an individual because she felt strongly about the issue. Then, after the meeting today, if there was a desire for her to speak on behalf of PSO, she would have taken our thoughts forward.

Chet reiterated the fact that the removal of this agenda item shows the Board is listening and that our voices can be heard.

Questions:

There still has not been clarification on financial exigency?

- The policy attempted to clarify what steps could be taken prior to declaring financial exigency, however, with the clarification it would seem as if exigency is not necessary.
- Chet mentioned there was an attempt to address the situation of furloughs, and how they could be handled for faculty and non-classified staff.

There was discussion on the possibilities of furloughs and the legal aspect of them for contracted employees, however, any information on furloughs is purely speculative at this point in time.

While this issue is moot at this point in time, Dawn will keep any and all comments and thoughts on the subject in case it comes up again in the future. If anyone has anything to add to the matter, please forward their thoughts to Dawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Quintero