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BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL EXIGENCY PLAN

Subject to the authority of the President and the Board of Trustees, the following is the Financial Exigency Plan for Bowling Green State University.

A. Definition of Financial Exigency

Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis which so seriously jeopardizes the University's academic programs and the ability of the University to fulfill its mandatory obligations to the public that the termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts is necessary. Projections of enrollment, instructional subsidies, and other sources of revenues must demonstrate both to the faculty and to the administration that the shortage of funds will be so severe and persistent that there is no reasonable alternative to a change in the nature and character of the Institution.

B. Declaring Financial Exigency

The Senate Executive Committee, as the representative body of the Senate, shall constitute the faculty group to participate in the decision by the Board of Trustees to declare that a state of financial exigency exists at Bowling Green State University.

1. When the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has heard the arguments of the administration concerning the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency, the SEC shall draw its own conclusions concerning the claim of the severity of the diminishing resources of the University and the impact of the crisis on the quality of academic programs.

2. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall report the results of the SEC's deliberations to the faculty as a whole and to the Faculty Senate. The Senate may choose to endorse SEC's conclusions or to draw its own conclusions about the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency.

3. The general reaction of the faculty as reported to the Secretary of the Senate, along with the formal opinions of SEC and the Faculty Senate, shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Trustees.

4. The Board of Trustees shall consider these opinions and the recommendations of the President, together with all other relevant information, in deciding whether or not to declare a state of financial exigency. The responsibility of declaring financial exigency rests with the President and the Board of Trustees.

5. The SEC shall annually review with the administration the state of the University's financial condition relative to exigency until the Board of Trustees revokes the financial exigency state.

C. Procedures for Implementation

Probationary and tenured faculty contracts can be terminated only through program curtailment. There are three basic options available as part of program curtailment: 1)
consolidation of previously separate units; 2) reduction of an existing unit; or, 3) elimination of an existing unit.

**Step 1:** The group charged with identifying program units which are to be curtailed shall be the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). Units shall be defined as to include, but not limited to, activities, offices, services, functions, degree programs, academic specializations, departments, divisions, centers, and institutes in the academic area. If in the process nonacademic areas are identified for financial savings, these shall be stated to the administration and included in the Committee’s report to the Senate.

**Membership of the Committee:**

The membership of this Committee (CAP) shall include:

- the faculty membership of SEC, including Faculty Senate Officers (9),
- one representative from the Council of Chairs, selected by the Council of Chairs,
- one representative from the Council of Deans, selected by the Council of Deans,
- the chief academic officer of the University,
- the undergraduate and graduate members of SEC (non-voting),
- two faculty, selected by the SEC and Com/Com, to provide desirable pertinent expertise not otherwise represented among the Committee membership.

The Committee on Academic Priorities shall be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall serve as Secretary to the Committee.

**Criteria to be Used for Program Curtailment:**

Criteria for program curtailment are, unranked:

- importance to the academic mission of the University,
- quality, as determined by periodic reviews and evaluations,
- enrollment patterns,
- cost-benefit and revenue relationships,
- number of programs served,
- frequency with which a service is rendered,
- recognition of equal opportunity principles.

**Step 2:** Before a program unit is recommended to the Senate for curtailment, this Committee shall state its rationale for curtailment of the unit and allow the unit opportunity to provide additional information.

**Step 3:** The Chair of the Committee shall report the recommendations of the Committee, along with the basic rationale for these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for its timely consideration. The Faculty Senate may choose to endorse or to modify these recommendations.
Step 4: The recommendations of the Committee, and the resulting action of the Faculty Senate, shall be forwarded to the President for implementation. Once a decision has been made to curtail a program unit, University administrators shall terminate individual faculty contracts only after vigorous good faith efforts have been made to reassign these faculty members, to offer them early retirement options, or to make other appropriate arrangements.

D. Rights of Faculty

1. Faculty on probationary contract shall not be denied tenure or have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for consolidation, reduction, or eliminations.

2. Faculty with tenure shall not have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for elimination.

3. The President shall inform by registered mail the individuals whose appointments are to be terminated providing each with a statement of the criteria and procedures by which the decision was reached.

4. Any faculty member who believes termination has resulted from a prejudicial use of the foregoing procedures shall have the right to appeal within 15 days of the receipt of the notice and shall have the right to a timely hearing before a Board of the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee. No appeal can be heard which is based upon a challenge to the existence of exigency or to the procedures outlined in this document.

E. Financial Exigency Declared by State

If financial exigency should be declared by the Board of Regents or the State Legislature, the procedures described in this document shall be followed in their entirely at Bowling Green State University.

F. Short-term Financial Crisis

A short-term financial crisis involving a shortfall of funds within a single academic year or fiscal period is to be distinguished from a state of financial exigency. Because contractual obligations of the University are fixed within a given contract period and should not be invalidated, there are little or no salary savings gained from a financial crisis requiring immediate action. The administration should share with the SEC its alterations and plans for reallocating the University's financial resources without termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts.

Approved by Faculty Senate 10-18-82
Approved by Board of Trustees 2-11-83
The Administrative Staff Council meeting was called to order at 1:30 by Chair Cary Brewer. He announced that Richard Edwards was not able to attend the meeting as scheduled because of a last-minute conflict in his schedule.

Judi Roller, chair of the Bylaws Subcommittee, distributed a revised draft of the Administrative Staff Council bylaws. Each section was discussed, and further revisions were suggested, in particular to Article 3-Elections. The subcommittee will re-draft the bylaws and incorporate suggested changes. It was moved by Richard Lenhart and seconded by Gregg DeCrane that the bylaws be temporarily adopted as a working document until the final draft is approved. A vote on the bylaws should be possible by the January meeting. The motion was approved, with one negative vote.

It was then agreed by the Council members that the January meeting should be changed from January 5 to January 12. (The January 12 meeting will be in the Taft Room.)

As agreed at the October meeting, a committee had been established to develop a plan for administrative staff in the event of the financial emergency which would be brought about by passage of State Issues 2 and 3. Zola Buford, chair of the committee, gave a brief report. Other members were Peace Champion, James Litwin, Harold Smith, Gregg DeCrane, Pat Fitzgerald, Susan Darrow, and Suzanne Crawford. The Committee drafted short term and long term recommendations, based on contributions that administrative staff could make to solve a financial emergency. The committee had agreed that if Issues 2 and 3 passed, they would meet again on November 10 to draft further recommendations and would call a meeting of the full Administrative Staff Council on November 11. If the Issues failed, the committee would continue to work on a general statement of financial emergency contingencies.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45.

Norma J. Stickler, Secretary of Administrative Staff Council

NEXT MEETING: DECEMBER 1, OHIO SUITE
Every employee report to the manager. The week's report should be submitted every Monday to the manager. The manager will review the report and provide feedback.

The manager will then send the report to the department head for approval. The department head will review the report and provide feedback to the manager.

The manager will then send the report to the CEO for review. The CEO will review the report and provide feedback to the manager.

The manager will then send the report to the board of directors for approval. The board of directors will review the report and provide feedback to the manager.

The manager will then send the report to the shareholders for approval. The shareholders will review the report and provide feedback to the manager.
Administrative Staff Council
September 6, 1984
Minutes


J. Martini opened the meeting at 1:35 p.m. He announced that Jim Harris has left the University. His position on the ASC will be filled by Kevin McHugh. Introductions of the Executive Committee and all ASC members then took place.

The goals and objectives for 1984-85 were reviewed. These will include:

- development of an administrative staff professional leave policy - the professional development committee will work on this
- the evaluation and merit committee chaired by Wayne Colvin will continue compiling information
- a committee will be established to look into the possibility of direct ASC representation to the Board of Trustees
- the guest speaker program will continue, Susan Caldwell, Dr. Paul Olscamp, and possibly the college deans will be invited
- increased communication with constituents will occur
- our relationship to the role and mission statement will be discussed
- health care benefits will be studied
- continued and increased University committee representation will be attempted
- the establishment of an administrative staff scholarship will be investigated
- the exigency committee will be revived and will develop a statement of procedure
- a committee will be established to look at salary equity among administrative staff
- further investigation regarding on campus child care will take place

Jim Litwin and Kathy Hart presented the Professional Development Committee report. This report included the following items:

- a replacement to fill Joan Gordon's position is needed
- persons interested in working on this committee should contact Litwin, Hart, or Martini
- the workshop policy will be forwarded to the Vice Presidents for approval
- a workshop agenda is being developed; these will include a follow-up to the computer program, a session on evaluating performance, and one on getting organized
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL COMMITTEE

By-Law Committee - Bob Arrowsmith, Norma Stickler

Election Committee - Jill Carr (Chair)

Evaluation/Merit Committee - Wayne Colvin, Nan Edgerton, Joan Morgan, Norma Stickler

Ferrari Award - Joyce Kepke (Chair)

Financial Exigency - Greg DeCrane, Zola Buford, James Litwin, Pat Fitzgerald

Handbook Committee - Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, Paul Yon

Professional Development Committee - Kathy Hart, James Litwin, Ruth Friend

Scholarship Committee - Bob Arrowsmith, Zola Buford, Deb Heineman, Jane Wood

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Human Relations Commission - James Corbitt

Insurance Committee - Suzanne Crawford

Library Committee - Ann Bowers

Monitor Advisory Committee - Joan Gordon

Parking Appeals Committee - John Buckenmyer

President's Panel - Cary Brewer

Telephone Committee - Pat Fitzgerald

University Computing Council - Joseph Martini

As of August 31, 1984
seconded by G. DeCrane. The motion carried; 13 in favor, 5 opposed, 2 absentions.

J. Litwin agreed to write a memo to Administrative Council regarding this motion.

Council members received a copy of a memo from Suzanne Crawford requesting input for the upcoming review of our insurance package. Comments and questions should be forwarded to Jill Carr by 12/22. She will compile all comments and forward them to S. Crawford. P. Fitzgerald requested that S. Crawford attend a full council meeting to talk about insurance options.

J. Martini announced that Marshall Rose has resigned from the Council. The Executive Committee will pursue finding his replacement.

G. DeCrane presented the budget report. Current balance $1638.09. G. DeCrane suggested that we request the same amount next year, $1550.00.

W. Colvin moved that we accept this suggestion. Motion seconded by J. Sharp. Motion carried.

Z. Buford reported that the Financial Exigency Committee is reviewing the exigency policy. Our lack of representation is very evident on the CAP Committee. We need to request to send a representative to this committee.

J. Martini indicated that ASC needs a liaison to Faculty Senate and to the Classified Staff Advisory Committee. We also need someone to serve on ACGFA.

The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Jill Carr
Secretary
ASC
5. Insurance Issue - Joe

Send feedback to Sue Crawford now.
A consultant has been selected and will soon start the process.
Joe will ask Sue Crawford about the time frame of the consultant.

6. Exigency Committee - Zola

Have reviewed university policy.
Pat F. and Jim L. met with Art Neal to discuss having ASC membership on CAP committee. Neal was supportive and asked to send me a statement of rationale. Pat F. prepared the statement and it will be forwarded by Joe.
The possibility of a position paper is being explored.

Other items - Joe

- Joe read a letter from Dr. Olscamp in regards to an advocacy council on minority concerns. A copy of the letter was distributed - responses should be directed to Joe, Jill or Gregg.
- Micro Computer Workshop was discussed - Jan. 29 session has 30 sign ups.
- Minutes of Classified Employees Council will be circulated.
- The Ferrari Award plaque was passed around - when corrections are made it will be displayed in the Administrative Staff Personnel Office.

Next meeting is February 7 in the Taft Room.
Adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregg DeCrane
Vice-Chairperson
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
JUNE 5, 1985
AGENDA

1. Introduction of New Members
2. Election Update
3. Scholarship Update
4. Report from Personnel Welfare Committee - all members meet 1st Tues of each month
5. Insurance Update - decision letter in draft or insurance
6. Report from Professional Development Committee - PhD new staff one - will work on pay leave policy next year
7. Report from Exigency Committee
8. Review of Goals Set for 1984-85

Scholarship
$x700 - need 13600 tuition by end of Dec.
95% will be paid for - Allen
- Thanks Pat for info / Allen will help with info / Allen"
The workshops presented this year have been successful. One additional committee member is needed. This group will meet during the summer. Next year's emphasis will be the finalization of the leave policy.

Z. Buford reported that ASC should have a representative on the CAP committee in order to deal with the financial exigency issue.

G. DeCrane requested that all concerns and goals for future reference be referred to him. Two that need immediate attention are: the PERS situation and a review of committee representation (we should have a rep on the athletic committee and on the space utilization committee).

Certificates of Appreciation were distributed to out-going members.

A resolution regarding the service of Zola Buford was read. A motion was made by P. Yon to accept this resolution. Seconded by P. Fitzgerald. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Martini expressed thanks to all who have worked together this year.

G. DeCrane expressed appreciation to J. Martini for a job well done.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Carr
Secretary
REPORT OF EXIGENCY COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Zola Buford, Peace Champion, Sue Crawford, Gregg DeCrane, Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, Jim Litwin, Harold Smith

BASIC ASSUMPTION - It was the opinion of the committee that the present university community be maintained; i.e., every effort should be made to maintain the current staff.

RATIONALE - The university has been operating under very austere budget and staff restrictions for the past several years and further eroding would lead also to an eroding of our quality.

PROPOSALS - With the above basic assumption in mind, the committee recognized that the passing of Issue 3 may, indeed, call for some means of meeting the proposed reductions in state subsidy of 9.75 million. We approached the problem from two standpoints, i.e. 1) an immediate but temporary cash savings to the university and 2) a long-term, but more permanent, savings plan. To accomplish No. 1 (the immediate savings), the following ideas are proposed:

A. Time-Flexible Work Schedule, i.e. 4-day work week
   10 month contract
   with options depending on needs of office and/or employee's discretion
B. Benefit reductions, i.e. insurance, PERS pick-up--with employee being given a benefit package option (no dental but optical, etc.)
C. Salary reductions, across the board
   pro-rated by salary
   across volunteer group

The above options are those this committee would propose for further consideration to meet the Phase I or 4.6 million rollback by June 1, 1983 and represents the immediate and temporary
To accomplish No. 2; (The long-term and permanent savings),
the committee proposes a reconfiguration of staff which could
include:
A. Hiring freeze, assignment of current staff members to
other and/or additional duties, possible retraining of
current staff to fill new duties

And finally
If it becomes necessary to reduce or eliminate programs,
then, 1) the unit facing reduction should have input into
that reduction, and 2) if program is eliminated, then current
employees of such a program should be moved into the staff
reconfiguration procedures.

The foregoing is a progress report only; if Issue 3 fails and
we aren't faced with a 9.75 million cut-back, we shall continue to
work and refine this report and bring it to the Administration Staff
Council for acceptance of the report and then to the entire
Administrative Staff for adoption before sending it forward.

However, if Issue 3 passes, then we shall have a written
proposal for distribution/discussion to give to you at a meeting
at 4:00 p.m. Thursday, November 10--the meeting will be in the
Alumni Room.
8. Question arose about the existence of the faculty exigency policy statement. It was confirmed in the President's Office that a statement does exist and was approved by the Board of Trustees in February of 1983. It was also confirmed that the exigency statement is entitled "Bowling Green State University Financial Exigency Plan" thus no particular mention made in the title of the document to faculty as opposed to other staff members.

9. It was then agreed that the ASC Exigency Committee would obtain a copy of the University document and review it. Each member would be responsible for reading the document and returning to the committee meeting with questions relative to the applicability of the document to the administrative staff. It may be possible to simply accept the University document as being applicable to our group or we may feel that it is necessary to prepare our own statement.

10. A copy of the Bowling Green State University Financial Exigency Plan statement is attached to these notes. A meeting has been arranged for October 23 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room on the second floor of the Administration Building. We have also made an appointment for Mr. Phil Mason to meet with us beginning at 3:00 on that same date. Please come prepared with a review of the document and your questions for Mr. Mason to interpret.

Attachment
APPENDIX A

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
FINANCIAL EXIGENCY PLAN
Subject to the authority of the President and the Board of Trustees, the following is the Financial Exigency Plan for Bowling Green State University.

A. Definition of Financial Exigency

Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis which so seriously jeopardizes the University's academic programs and the ability of the University to fulfill its mandatory obligations to the public that the termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts is necessary. Projections of enrollment, of instructional subsidies, and other sources of revenues must demonstrate both to the faculty and to the administration that the shortage of funds will be so severe and persistent that there is no reasonable alternative to a change in the nature and character of the Institution.

B. Declaring Financial Exigency

The Senate Executive Committee, as the representative body of the Senate, shall constitute the faculty group to participate in the decision by the Board of Trustees to declare that a state of financial exigency exists at Bowling Green State University.

1. When the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has heard the arguments of the administration concerning the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency, the SEC shall draw its own conclusions concerning the claim of the severity of the diminishing resources of the University and the impact of the crisis on the quality of academic programs.

2. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall report the results of the SEC's deliberations to the faculty as a whole and to the Faculty Senate. The Senate may choose to endorse SEC's conclusions or to draw its own conclusions about the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency.

3. The general reaction of the faculty as reported to the Secretary of the Senate, along with the formal opinions of SEC and the Faculty Senate, shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Trustees.

4. The Board of Trustees shall consider these opinions and the recommendations of the President, together with all other relevant information, in deciding whether or not to declare a state of financial exigency. The responsibility of declaring financial exigency rests with the President and the Board of Trustees.

5. The SEC shall annually review with the administration the state of the University's financial condition relative to exigency until the Board of Trustees revokes the financial exigency state.
C. Procedures for Implementation

Probationary and tenured faculty contracts can be terminated only through program curtailment. There are three basic options available as part of program curtailment: 1) consolidation of previously separate units; 2) reduction of an existing unit; or, 3) elimination of an existing unit.

Step 1: The group charged with identifying program units which are to be curtailed shall be the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). Units shall be defined as to include, but not limited to, activities, offices, services, functions, degree programs, academic specializations, departments, divisions, centers, and institutes in the academic area. If in the process nonacademic areas are identified for financial savings, these shall be stated to the administration and included in the Committee's report to the Senate.

Membership of the Committee:

The membership of this Committee (CAP) shall include:

--the faculty membership of SEC, including Faculty Senate Officers (9),
--one representative from the Council of Chairs, selected by the Council of Chairs,
--one representative from the Council of Deans, selected by the Council of Deans,
--the chief academic officer of the University,
--the undergraduate and graduate members of SEC (non-voting),
--two faculty, selected by the SEC and Com/Com, to provide desirable pertinent expertise not otherwise represented among the Committee membership.

The Committee on Academic Priorities shall be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall serve as Secretary to the Committee.

Criteria to be Used for Program Curtailment:

Criteria for program curtailment are, unranked:

1. importance to the academic mission of the University,
2. quality, as determined by periodic reviews and evaluations,
3. enrollment patterns,
4. cost-benefit and revenue relationships,
5. number of programs served,
6. frequency with which a service is rendered,
7. recognition of equal opportunity principles.

Step 2: Before a program unit is recommended to the Senate for curtailment, this Committee shall state its rationale for curtailment of the unit and allow the unit opportunity to provide additional information.
Step 3: The Chair of the Committee shall report the recommendations of the Committee, along with the basic rationale for these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for its timely consideration. The Faculty Senate may choose to endorse or to modify these recommendations.

Step 4: The recommendations of the Committee, and the resulting action of the Faculty Senate, shall be forwarded to the President for implementation. Once a decision has been made to curtail a program unit, university administrators shall terminate individual faculty contracts only after vigorous good faith efforts have been made to reassign these faculty members, to offer them early retirement options, or to make other appropriate arrangements.

D. Rights of Faculty

1. Faculty on probationary contract shall not be denied tenure or have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for consolidation, reduction, or elimination.

2. Faculty with tenure shall not have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for elimination.

3. The President shall inform by registered mail the individuals whose appointments are to be terminated providing each with a statement of the criteria and procedures by which the decision was reached.

4. Any faculty member who believes termination has resulted from a prejudicial use of the foregoing procedures shall have the right to appeal within 15 days of the receipt of the notice and shall have the right to a timely hearing before a Board of the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee. No appeal can be heard which is based upon a challenge to the existence of exigency or to the procedures outlined in this document.

E. Financial Exigency Declared by State

If financial exigency should be declared by the Board of Regents or the State Legislature, the procedures described in this document shall be followed in their entirety at Bowling Green State University.

F. Short-term Financial Crisis

A short-term financial crisis involving a shortfall of funds within a single academic year or fiscal period is to be distinguished from a state of financial exigency. Because contractual obligations of the University are fixed within a given contract period and should not be invalidated, there are little or no salary savings gained from a financial crisis requiring immediate action. The administration should share with the SEC its alterations and plans for reallocating the University's financial resources without termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts.

Approved by Faculty Senate 10-18-82
Approved by Board of Trustees 2-11-83
NOTES FROM ASC EXIGENCY COMMITTEE
October 2, 1984

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Zola Buford, Peace Champion, Gregg DeCrane, Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, Jim Litwin, Harold Smith

A meeting of the ASC Exigency Committee met to pursue the development of an exigency statement for the Administrative Staff Council. Listed below are some of the discussion comments made at this meeting:

1. It was a consensus that it was still important to have an exigency statement which would cover the Administrative Staff. Some members of the committee believed it should be an all University statement as opposed to a statement covering only faculty and/or administrative staff. It was further suggested that the Administrative Staff Council request the Administrative Council to form a committee to prepare an all University policy.

2. It was then suggested that any exigency statement would have to be a guideline statement or a position paper only since an exigency policy would be difficult to enforce at the time of a true financial crisis. An exigency policy could not go beyond the powers possessed by the President and Board of Trustees.

3. But it was questioned if we develop one for administrative staff, how binding would this statement be.

4. It was further suggested that any policy statement developed by the Administrative Staff Council should be in the form of a guideline or a position paper only. There was considerable opposition to calling it a policy.

5. It was reported that Dr. Olscamp encourages the participation of the Classified Staff Advisory Council and the Administrative Staff Council in developing such recommendations.

6. Discussion followed relative to the positions of faculty and classified staff as compared to that of administrative staff members. For example, many faculty are covered by tenure policies approved by Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. In addition the classified staff fall under the State Code procedures relative to any dismissal, termination, etc. It was felt that no such policies and/or code exists for administrative staff members.

7. It was then suggested that the Administrative Staff Council finish a position paper and forward it to the Administrative Council along with the request that it be reviewed in light of the statements from the other two groups.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Phil Mason
FROM: Zola Buford
RE: ASC Exigency Committee Meeting—October 23

October 4, 1984

This is to confirm the ASC Exigency Committee meeting on October 23 at 3:00 p.m. in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room on the second floor of the Administration Building.

The purpose of this meeting is to review the University exigency plan statement as approved by the Board of Trustees and to ask for your interpretation of the applicability of this document to the Administrative Staff Council. The committee members will be reviewing the document and will probably come with questions relative to the official interpretation of the policy statement.

Thank you for your willingness to meet with us.

vs/18

cc: Peace Champion
Sue Crawford
Gregg DeCrane
Susan Darrow
Pat Fitzgerald
Jim Litwin
Harold Smith
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Zola Buford, Peace Champion, Gregg DeCrane, Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, Jim Litwin, Harold Smith

A meeting of the ASC Exigency Committee met to pursue the development of an exigency statement for the Administrative Staff Council. Listed below are some of the discussion comments made at this meeting:

1. It was a consensus that it was still important to have an exigency statement which would cover the Administrative Staff. Some members of the committee believed it should be an all University statement as opposed to a statement covering only faculty and/or administrative staff. It was further suggested that the Administrative Staff Council request the Administrative Council to form a committee to prepare an all University policy.

2. It was then suggested that any exigency statement would have to be a guideline statement or a position paper only since an exigency policy would be difficult to enforce at the time of a true financial crisis. An exigency policy could not go beyond the powers possessed by the President and Board of Trustees.

3. But it was questioned if we develop one for administrative staff, how binding would this statement be.

4. It was further suggested that any policy statement developed by the Administrative Staff Council should be in the form of a guideline or a position paper only. There was considerable opposition to calling it a policy.

5. It was reported that Dr. Olscamp encourages the participation of the Classified Staff Advisory Council and the Administrative Staff Council in developing such recommendations.

6. Discussion followed relative to the positions of faculty and classified staff as compared to that of administrative staff members. For example, many faculty are covered by tenure policies approved by Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. In addition the classified staff fall under the State Code procedures relative to any dismissal, termination, etc. It was felt that no such policies and/or code exists for administrative staff members.

7. It was then suggested that the Administrative Staff Council finish a position paper and forward it to the Administrative Council along with the request that it be reviewed in light of the statements from the other two groups.
8. Question arose about the existence of the faculty exigency policy statement. It was confirmed in the President's Office that a statement does exist and was approved by the Board of Trustees in February of 1983. It was also confirmed that the exigency statement is entitled "Bowling Green State University Financial Exigency Plan" thus no particular mention made in the title of the document to faculty as opposed to other staff members.

9. It was then agreed that the ASC Exigency Committee would obtain a copy of the University document and review it. Each member would be responsible for reading the document and returning to the committee meeting with questions relative to the applicability of the document to the administrative staff. It may be possible to simply accept the University document as being applicable to our group or we may feel that it is necessary to prepare our own statement.

10. A copy of the Bowling Green State University Financial Exigency Plan statement is attached to these notes. A meeting has been arranged for October 23 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room on the second floor of the Administration Building. We have also made an appointment for Mr. Phil Mason to meet with us beginning at 3:00 on that same date. Please come prepared with a review of the document and your questions for Mr. Mason to interpret.

Attachment
Three members of the newly formed Exigency Committee for ASC met Friday afternoon, October 21. Those in attendance were Zola Buford, Sue Crawford, and Jim Litwin. The Executive Committee of the ASC had also appointed Harold Smith and Greg DeCrane to this committee both of whom were absent because of prior commitments.

The meeting was spent in discussion of the committee makeup and brainstorming some ideas relative to the exigency issue. It was the opinion of the three members present that the committee needed to have somewhat wider representation. Thus we are asking that the ASC Chair appoint the following additional members to the committee: Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, and Marshall Rose.

During the brainstorming session, the following ideas were put forth. Even though a financial exigency may be declared as a result of the passage of Issues 2 and 3, it was the considered opinion of the committee that the present University community is to be maintained. The University has been operating under very austere budget and staff restrictions for the past several years and it is of the opinion of the committee that effort should be made to maintain the current staff. In order to achieve this goal, the following ideas were proposed.

1. Time flexible type contract; i.e. the employee works a four-day work week instead of five or a ten-month contract instead of twelve. Perhaps the option to be made at the employee's discretion.

2. Reduction in salary. To be accomplished by:
   a. Across the board
   b. Prorated based upon salary
   c. Across a volunteer group

3. Reduction in benefits
   a. Insurance
   b. PERS pick-up
   c. Employee being given the opportunity to choose benefit package retained

4. Hiring freeze

5. Reduction in staff

6. Freeze on equipment and capital improvements

7. Utilizing group bids both within the institution and inter-institutional on forms, equipment, transportation, etc.
8. Utilizing student volunteers in lieu of paid employees

9. Reconfiguration of existing staff including a tutoring program

10. Centralization of services; i.e. central word processing, central photocopying, etc., academic advising

Many other ideas were suggested such as early retirement, reduction of larger units before smaller, are any actions taken to be temporary and if not, the need to define the length of the exigency, a need to review the contract staff classification committee report.

At this meeting no attempt was made to define exigency although a copy of the Faculty Senate statement on exigency was reviewed.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, October 28 at 2:00 in the Administration Building Second Floor Conference Room. At this time a chair is to be selected by the committee, new and absent members are to be updated on the proceedings of the October 21 meeting and procedural matters need to be discussed and resolved.
NOTES FROM ASC EXIGENCY COMMITTEE
October 23, 1984

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Zola Buford, Peace Champion, Gregg DeCrane, Susan Darrow, Pat Fitzgerald, Jim Litwin, Harold Smith

GUEST: Dr. Richard Eakin, Vice President for Planning and Budgeting

The Exigency Committee of the Administrative Staff Council met on October 23, 1984 to review Appendix A of the Academic Charter entitled "Bowling Green State University Financial Exigency Plan". The purpose of this review was to determine whether or not this exigency plan covered the concerns of the Administrative Staff. Below are listed some general comments and statements made by the members of the committee.

1. It was the consensus of the members present that the document does not cover the Administrative Staff. Even when the administration is referred to in the document, it would appear that "the administration" is actually higher administration or the administrative council. The document refers to means of procedures for implementation and rights of faculty. In these areas the implementation of declaring an exigency for the Administrative Staff does not appear to exist nor are any rights of staff members addressed.

2. There was no representation from the Administrative Staff Council on the Committee on Academic Priorities which would be charged with the identification of program units which are to be curtailed.

3. Suggestions were made to meet with the chair of the Faculty Senate and explore the possibility of revising the Financial Exigency Plan to cover the Administrative Staff.

4. Another suggestion was to review the options developed last year by this committee, develop and refine them to present as a separate exigency plan.

5. When Dr. Eakin joined the group, he indicated that the document was "all inclusive" and all staff members, both faculty and administrative, would be affected by the document at the time of a financial exigency.

6. After considerable discussion, it was suggested that perhaps the first step should be to seek representation to the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). In this way, the Administrative Staff could be represented at the time curtailment of any program or unit would be reviewed.

7. It was finally agreed that the members of the committee would like to have some time to review in their own minds the effectiveness of the various approaches to the Financial Exigency Plan as it relates to the Administrative Staff Council.

8. It was further agreed that the committee would meet again on Tuesday, November 13, at 2:00. The meeting will be held in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room on the second floor of the Administration Building.

cc: Joe Martini, Chair, Administrative Staff Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: ASC Exigency Committee Members
FROM: Zola Burford
RE: Exigency Committee Meeting - November 13

November 19, 1984

Only three members were present for the scheduled Exigency Committee on Tuesday, November 13, at 2:00 p.m. Therefore, only a brief discussion took place and it was then decided that we must have more members of the committee present in order to continue.

The committee meeting has been rescheduled for Tuesday, December 4, at 2:00 p.m. in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room on the second floor of the Administration Building. Please notify me as soon as possible if you will be unable to attend at that time.

vs/1
MEMBERS PRESENT: Zola Buford, Peace Champion, Sue Crawford, Gregg DeCrane, Pat Fitzgerald, and Jim Litwin

As a result of the meeting of the ASC Exigency Committee, it was decided that the following will be pursued.

1. A meeting will be arranged with Don Boren, Chair-Elect, and Art Neal, Chair of the Faculty Senate, relative to investigating the possibility of an Administrative Staff member being named to the CAP Committee (Committee on Academic Priorities Committee). It was the consensus of the group that the Role and Mission Statement definitely emphasizes the "inclusion policy" and it would be extremely difficult for all elements of the University community to participate if not represented.

2. Gregg DeCrane and Pat Fitzgerald agreed to draw up a brief proposal letter requesting a change in Appendix A of the Academic Charter to include an Administrative Staff member on the CAP Committee along with the rationale for requesting this change. This proposal will be presented to the Executive Committee of ASC for approval before being forwarded to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.

Discussion again centered around the need for developing a position paper relative to Administrative Staff members and any future financial exigency. It was agreed that we would follow the above steps first and then perhaps develop the position paper to be included as an appendix to the Charter of the Administrative Staff Council.

Finally, the Chair of the Exigency Committee was instructed to report to the full council as to our past meetings and the directions our deliberations were taking.

cc: Joe Martini, Chair, Administrative Staff Council
December 27, 1984

MEMORANDUM

TO: Greg DeCrane
   Assistant Vice President
   Student Activities

FROM: Pat Fitzgerald

RE: Exigency/CAP Committee

Jim Litwin and I met with Art Neal for lunch and discussed the exigency plan along with our need to be included. He suggested a letter to him with the request and reasons as we had discussed earlier. Hence here is a first draft of a request. Edit, rework, add to, delete as you see fit and get back to me.
The Administrative Staff Council hereby requests representation within the University Exigency Plan as approved by the Faculty Senate October 18, 1982 and approved by the Board of Trustees February 11, 1983. Such representation would be through membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) which is described under Section C, Step 1 of the University Exigency Plan.

Reasons:

1. The exigency policy was originally drafted by the Faculty Senate and then accepted by the Board of Trustees before the inception of the Administrative Staff Council. Were it to be written now as a University policy it would most appropriately include a representative of the Administrative Staff Council.

2. The new "Statement of Role and Mission of Bowling Green State University" states in the epilogue that "...creative administrative leadership will be required for attaining desired goals." This same administrative leadership should be consulted and informed as part of the CAP also.

3. Under Article II, Section 7: Shared Responsibilities of the University Academic Charter passed by the Board of Trustees June 17, 1982, "certain responsibilities are shared in varying degrees by all the basic groups of individuals within the University Community." Section (c) and (e) in particular refer to providing "forums for the discussion of problems facing higher education in general and BGSU in particular; reviewing and making recommendations about the annual budget to be recommended to the Board of Trustees through the President." Such participation seems to recommend participation on the CAP.
4. Because the CAP will be identifying units to be curtailed within the academic area including "activities, offices, services, functions, degree programs, academic specializations, departments, divisions, centers, and institutes" which are supported, and influenced by many administrative areas within the BGSU community, the input from staff representing those areas would enhance the decision making process.

5. Non-academic areas may also be subject to curtailment recommendations by the CAP and should also be represented in such deliberations by the ASC which represents the 300 contract employees on campus.
MEMORANDUM

TO:    Zola Buford
FROM:  Joe Martini
RE:    Financial Exigency Committee

Could you provide me with a brief update on the current status of this committee, in particular,

- actual membership
- request to Faculty Senate for membership on CAC
- things yet to be done (if anything at all)

This information will permit ASC to continue its work on this issue.

Thanks.

sal

xc: Gregg DeCrane
Administrative Staff Council  
Executive Committee  
September 24, 1985  
Minutes

Members Present:  Jill Carr  
Dick Conrad  
Gregg DeCrane  
Jack Gregory  
Deb Heineman  
Jim Sharp  
Paul Yon

Members Absent:  Jim Corbit, Patrick Fitzgerald

DeCrane distributed Susan Caldwell's response to our inquiry regarding the merit pay policy. (Copy attached.) Discussion produced two further questions for Caldwell: Where is the policy written for general distribution, and when was said policy formulated? DeCrane will pose these questions to Caldwell.

One update to the Network: John Barley, CMA, assigned to Barry Piersol.

Dr. Eakin's response to the recommendations of our Evaluation Committee was distributed. (Copy attached.) The memo will be referred to the Merit Committee for response.

DeCrane advised that 33% of the 85-86 Administrative Staff membership is new, suggesting a very high turnover rate. Possible reasons include new positions, planned turnover, and retirement replacements. The subject will be referred to the Needs Assessment Committee for further review.

Guest speakers for the rest of the year were finalized, thanks to Heineman: Don Eorlan, November; March, Sue Crawford; June, Shad Hanna; and Dick Newlove and Sharon Stuart, yet to be announced.

DeCrane will find out the status of our request for membership on the Exigency Committee, and so advise the ASC.

DeCrane will also speak informally with Paul Postyu, Editor of the Monitor, concerning the coverage of our ASC meetings.

Heineman advised that all committee assignments are almost complete, with a complete listing to come soon.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Sharp, Secretary
December 12, 1985

To: Gregg DeCrane  
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs  
Student Activities and Orientation

From: Don Boren, Chair  
Faculty Senate

I am sorry to report that the Senate records do not indicate that the Senate Office ever received a request from Administrative Staff Council for membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). If you would please send me either a new or a copy of the old request, I will refer it to the Committee on Committees.

jm
MEMORANDUM

TO: Don Boren
   Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
       Chair, Administrative Staff Council

DATE: December 18, 1985

SUBJECT: Membership on CAP Committee

Thank you for your response to my inquiry concerning Administrative Staff Council representation on the Committee on Academic Priorities. Please find enclosed a new copy of the original request.

If you have any questions, please call.

Thanks for your help Don. Have a relaxing and enjoyable holiday break.

GD:dkh

MEM/27
The Administrative Staff Council hereby requests representation within the University Exigency Plan as approved by the Faculty Senate October 18, 1982 and approved by the Board of Trustees February 11, 1983. Such representation would be through membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) which is described under Section C, Step 1 of the University Exigency Plan.

Reasons:

1. The exigency policy was originally drafted by the Faculty Senate and then accepted as University Policy by the Board of Trustees before the inception of the Administrative Staff Council. Were it to be written now as a University policy it would most appropriately include a representative of the Administrative Staff Council.

2. The new "Statement of Role and Mission of Bowling Green State University" states in the epilogue that "...creative administrative leadership will be required for attaining desired goals." This same administrative leadership should be consulted and informed as part of the CAP also.

3. Under Article II, Section 7: Shared Responsibilities of the University Academic Charter passed by the Board of Trustees June 17, 1983, "certain responsibilities are shared in varying degrees by all the basic groups of individuals within the University Community." Section (c) and (e) in particular refer to providing "forums for the discussion of problems facing higher education in general and BGSU in particular; reviewing and making recommendations about the annual budget to be recommended to the Board of Trustees through the President." Such participation seems to recommend participation on the CAP.

4. Because the CAP will be identifying units to be curtailed within the academic area including "activities, offices, services, functions, degree programs, academic specializations, departments, divisions, centers, and institutes" which are supported, and influenced by many administrative areas within the BGSU community, the input from Administrative Staff representing those areas would enhance the decision making process.

5. Non-academic areas may also be subject to curtailment recommendations by the CAP and should also be represented in such deliberations by the ARC which represents the 300 Administrative Staff employees on campus.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Rex Eikum
Chair, Committee on Committees

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
Chair, Administrative Staff Council

DATE: May 27, 1986

SUBJECT: Administrative Staff Membership on CAP

Could you please inform me of the status of Administrative Staff's request for membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities? Don Boren's memo to you of January 10, 1986 requested that this matter be taken up by Com/Com.

GD: dkh

ASC/5

cc: Deb Heineman, Chair-elect
Administrative Staff Council

Jim Sharp, Secretary
Administrative Staff Council
APPENDIX A

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
FINANCIAL EXIGENCE PLAN
BOYLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
FINANCIAL EXIGENCY PLAN

Subject to the authority of the President and the Board of Trustees, the following is the Financial Exigency Plan for Bowling Green State University.

A. Definition of Financial Exigency

Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis which so seriously jeopardizes the University's academic programs and the ability of the University to fulfill its mandatory obligations to the public that the termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts is necessary. Projections of enrollment, instructional subsidies, and other sources of revenues must demonstrate both to the faculty and to the administration that the shortage of funds will be so severe and persistent that there is no reasonable alternative to a change in the nature and character of the Institution.

B. Declaring Financial Exigency

The Senate Executive Committee, as the representative body of the Senate, shall constitute the faculty group to participate in the decision by the Board of Trustees to declare that a state of financial exigency exists at Bowling Green State University.

1. When the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has heard the arguments of the administration concerning the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency, the SEC shall draw its own conclusions concerning the claim of the severity of the diminishing resources of the University and the impact of the crisis on the quality of academic programs.

2. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall report the results of the SEC's deliberations to the faculty as a whole and to the Faculty Senate. The Senate may choose to endorse SEC's conclusions or to draw its own conclusions about the present or anticipated existence of a state of financial exigency.

3. The general reaction of the faculty as reported to the Secretary of the Senate, along with the formal opinions of SEC and the Faculty Senate, shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Trustees.

4. The Board of Trustees shall consider these opinions and the recommendations of the President, together with all other relevant information, in deciding whether or not to declare a state of financial exigency. The responsibility of declaring financial exigency rests with the President and the Board of Trustees.

5. The SEC shall annually review with the administration the state of the University's financial condition relative to exigency until the Board of Trustees revokes the financial exigency state.
C. Procedures for Implementation

Probationary and tenured faculty contracts can be terminated only through program curtailment. There are three basic options available as part of program curtailment: 1) consolidation of previously separate units; 2) reduction of an existing unit; or, 3) elimination of an existing unit.

Step 1: The group charged with identifying program units which are to be curtailed shall be the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). Units shall be defined as to include, but not limited to, activities, offices, services, functions, degree programs, academic specializations, departments, divisions, centers, and institutes in the academic area. If in the process nonacademic areas are identified for financial savings, these shall be stated to the administration and included in the Committee's report to the Senate.

Membership of the Committee:

The membership of this Committee (CAP) shall include:

--the faculty membership of SEC, including Faculty Senate Officers (9),
--one representative from the Council of Chairs, selected by the Council of Chairs,
--one representative from the Council of Deans, selected by the Council of Deans,
--the chief academic officer of the University,
--the undergraduate and graduate members of SEC (non-voting),
--two faculty, selected by the SEC and Com/Com, to provide desirable pertinent expertise not otherwise represented among the Committee membership.

The Committee on Academic Priorities shall be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall serve as Secretary to the Committee.

Criteria to be Used for Program Curtailment:

Criteria for program curtailment are, unranked:

1. importance to the academic mission of the University,
2. quality, as determined by periodic reviews and evaluations,
3. enrollment patterns,
4. cost-benefit and revenue relationships,
5. number of programs served,
6. frequency with which a service is rendered,
7. recognition of equal opportunity principles.

Step 2: Before a program unit is recommended to the Senate for curtailment, this Committee shall state its rationale for curtailment of the unit and allow the unit opportunity to provide additional information.
Step 3: The Chair of the Committee shall report the recommendations of the Committee, along with the basic rationales for these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for its timely consideration. The Faculty Senate may choose to endorse or to modify these recommendations.

Step 4: The recommendations of the Committee, and the resulting action of the Faculty Senate, shall be forwarded to the President for implementation. Once a decision has been made to curtail a program unit, University administrators shall terminate individual faculty contracts only after vigorous good faith efforts have been made to reassign these faculty members, to offer them early retirement options, or to make other appropriate arrangements.

D. Rights of Faculty

1. Faculty on probationary contract shall not be denied tenure or have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for consolidation, reduction, or elimination.

2. Faculty with tenure shall not have employment terminated on the basis of financial exigency unless the program unit with which such faculty are primarily associated has been targeted for elimination.

3. The President shall inform by registered mail the individuals whose appointments are to be terminated providing each with a statement of the criteria and procedures by which the decision was reached.

4. Any faculty member who believes termination has resulted from a prejudicial use of the foregoing procedures shall have the right to appeal within 15 days of the receipt of the notice and shall have the right to a timely hearing before a Board of the Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee. No appeal can be heard which is based upon a challenge to the existence of exigency or to the procedures outlined in this document.

E. Financial Exigency Declared by State

If financial exigency should be declared by the Board of Regents or the State Legislature, the procedures described in this document shall be followed in their entirety at Bowling Green State University.

F. Short-term Financial Crisis

A short-term financial crisis involving a shortfall of funds within a single academic year or fiscal period is to be distinguished from a state of financial exigency. Because contractual obligations of the University are fixed within a given contract period and should not be invalidated, there are little or no salary savings gained from a financial crisis requiring immediate action. The administration should share with the SEC its alterations and plans for reallocating the University's financial resources without termination of probationary and tenured faculty contracts.

Approved by Faculty Senate 10-18-82
Approved by Board of Trustees 2-11-83
Recognized Staff

1. Time-Flexible
   - maintenance of present freeze procedures
   - options depend on work cycles and/or employee's discretion
   - e.g., 4-day work week, 10-month contracts

Mediated By:

1) Reconfiguration of Staff
   - individual staff members have new assignments
   - some retraining necessary

2) Centralize Functions
   - offices are consolidated, e.g., academic advising, programming

3) More Student Volunteers/Interns
   - use cooperative education model

4) Consortium Arrangements
   - coordinate functions with nearby colleges and universities

Options

Salaries
- across the board
- prorated by salary level
- across a volunteer group

1. within offices
2. across offices

Benefits
- insurance
- PERS pick-up
- choose benefit package

1. No Staff Reductions for immediate savings
2. Long-term, not immediate Form

Financial
- program or staff reduction in budget
- details be right up to the last
- only program, not personnel, maintained
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIRING FREEZE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- maintenance of present freeze procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediated By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) RECONFIGURATION OF STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- individual staff members have new assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- some retraining necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: ASC Executive Committee
FROM: ASC Personnel Welfare Committee
DATE: March 12, 1991
RE: Financial Exigency

In June 1976, Faculty Senate tabled action on a financial exigency plan with one rationale provided as to this delay being the need to hear from other staff, i.e. administrative and classified, regarding the plan (see attachment A). By October 1982, Faculty Senate had revised the plan and adopted it. The Board of Trustees approved the plan on February 11, 1983 and it was incorporated into the Academic Charter (see attachment B). As stated in the Plan, the group charged with identifying program units (and thus positions) to be curtailed is the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). Membership includes faculty and administrators as well as a graduate and undergraduate student representative, but excludes at the present time a representative from administrative staff and classified staff.

The reason that administrative staff did not respond in 1976, was that it did not have an established governing body at that time. During 1982-83, the Administrative Staff Council was formed and was recognized as a legal governing body within the Academic Charter. As early as October 1983, ASC formed an exigency committee which studied various options in lieu of eliminating staff and positions such as flexible work schedules, hiring freeze, reassignment of staff, reduction of full-time staff hours and salary, and benefit reduction packages. The committee's final recommendation was that one plan should exist for the entire University and since the one proposed by Faculty Senate had been adopted, administrative staff should participate in the plan by requesting membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities (see attachment C).

In December 1985 and again in May 1986, requests to the Faculty Senate were made, with appropriate documentation, for membership on CAP (see attachment D). To date no reply has been received. The recognition of both Administrative Staff Council and Classified Staff Council to have representation on all university-wide committees is well established. Article II, Section 5 of the Academic Charter recognizes the Administrative Staff Council as the representative body of all administrative staff. Article II, Section 7, outlines the shared participatory responsibilities of the recognized groups comprising the University community. Article V, Section 1, states that "faculty, together with other members of the University community shall participate in the governance of the University through membership on standing and ad hoc committees." It is time now for both administrative staff and classified staff to have representation on CAP.

The ASC Personnel Welfare Committee thus urges the ASC Executive Committee to again request such representation and a timely response from Faculty Senate. Thank you for your consideration of this request.
MEMORANDUM

TO: ASC Executive Committee

FROM: ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

DATE: March 12, 1991

RE: Financial Exigency

In June 1976, Faculty Senate tabled action on a financial exigency plan with one rationale provided as to this delay being the need to hear from other staff, i.e. administrative and classified, regarding the plan (see attachment A). By October 1982, Faculty Senate had revised the plan and adopted it. The Board of Trustees approved the plan on February 11, 1983 and it was incorporated into the Academic Charter (see attachment B). As stated in the Plan, the group charged with identifying program units (and thus positions) to be curtailed is the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). Membership includes faculty and administrators as well as a graduate and undergraduate student representative, but excludes at the present time a representative from administrative staff and classified staff.

The reason that administrative staff did not respond in 1976, was that it did not have an established governing body at that time. During 1982-83, the Administrative Staff Council was formed and was recognized as a legal governing body within the Academic Charter. As early as October 1983, ASC formed an exigency committee which studied various options in lieu of eliminating staff and positions such as flexible work schedules, hiring freeze, reassignment of staff, reduction of full-time staff hours and salary, and benefit reduction packages. The committee’s final recommendation was that one plan should exist for the entire University and since the one proposed by Faculty Senate had been adopted, administrative staff should participate in the plan by requesting membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities (see attachment C).

In December 1985 and again in May 1986, requests to the Faculty Senate were made, with appropriate documentation, for membership on CAP (see attachment D). To date no reply has been received. The recognition of both Administrative Staff Council and Classified Staff Council to have representation on all university-wide committees is well established. Article II, Section 5 of the Academic Charter recognizes the Administrative Staff Council as the representative body of all administrative staff. Article II, Section 7, outlines the shared participatory responsibilities of the recognized groups comprising the University community. Article V, Section 1, states that “faculty, together with other members of the University community shall participate in the governance of the University through membership on standing and ad hoc committees.” It is time now for both administrative staff and classified staff to have representation on CAP.

The ASC Personnel Welfare Committee thus urges the ASC Executive Committee to again request such representation and a timely response from Faculty Senate. Thank you for your consideration of this request.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chris Dalton
   Vice President for Planning & Budgeting

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
   Chair, ASC

DATE: March 13, 1991

RE: Support Statement

The Administrative Staff Council unanimously approved the following statement at its March 7th meeting:

The Role and Mission Statement of Bowling Green State University emphasizes the importance of creating an environment which promotes multicultural values in students, faculty and staff. An important resource in attaining this goal is the Affirmative Action Office. Administrative Staff Council strongly supports the activities of this Office and recognizes that especially during this academic year, the Affirmative Action Office has promoted its educational mission as well as increased its visibility on campus through a series of training sessions, workshops and informal talks. Administrative staff are urged to participate in these educational programs themselves and to support the participation of staff members whom they supervise by providing appropriate release time.

Resources are required to attain the Affirmative Action Plan's broad objectives of education, advocacy and accountability. Thus it is urged that the Faculty Senate and University Budget Committees recognize the plan for additional personnel and budgetary support for this office. Added resources will allow this Office to continue to increase its visibility and promote a multicultural environment on campus.

If you have any questions, please call.

GD/bal
pc: Marshall Rose
   (ASC Executive)
March 28, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: BGSU Faculty and Staff

FROM: Dr. Paul J. Olscamp

RE: Comments on Implications of Executive Budget for BGSU

We have now received the details of the Governor’s Executive Budget proposals for state support for higher education for the next biennium (1991-92 & 1992-93). The proposed budget, as I have noted below, would cause very significant problems for Bowling Green State University. We are working vigorously with the General Assembly to enhance the funding for BGSU and all of public higher education, but there can be no assurance, given the current budget problems which Ohio faces, that our efforts will be successful. It is only prudent, therefore, to base our planning for 1991-92 on the revenue we would receive under the Executive Budget recommendations. I feel that it is important to communicate to you what this implies for Bowling Green State University for the next biennium and particularly for 1991-92.

Under the Executive Budget assumptions, net instructional subsidy for the BGSU main campus is projected to be approximately $3.6 million (6%) lower next year than our current instructional subsidy for 1990-91. Since this cut is in addition to February’s $1.9 million reduction, instructional subsidy for the BGSU main campus would be $5.5 million (9%) less than the 1990-91 level authorized by the Ohio Board of Regents.

The Executive Budget also recommends that increases in tuition for 1991-92 be limited to 7% or $225 per year, whichever is greater. For Bowling Green, the proposed fee cap would permit a maximum tuition increase of 8% which would generate approximately $4.1 million in additional student fee income for the Educational Budget (assuming our enrollment remains unchanged). Other sources of income for 1991-92 are projected to decrease by approximately $500,000, primarily because the recent mid-year budget reductions have eliminated 1990-91 carryover that could have been used as income in 1991-92. Given these projections (subsidy down $3.6 million, fee income up $4.1 million, other income down $0.5 million) one can readily see that our projected income for next year is essentially unchanged from this year’s level.

With no increase in educational budget income for 1991-92, it follows that any increase in costs for a particular activity or program for next year requires a corresponding decrease in expenditures somewhere else in the budget. Unfortunately, there are many expenditure increases for 1991-92 over which we have little, if any, control. Items such as postage, utilities, scholarships and fee waivers (which increase as fees increase), are budget areas which are either mandated or in which only small savings are possible. We have already made significant budget reductions for 1990-91 in response to the
$1.9 million subsidy cut we received in February. Further, more painful, reductions for 1991-92 appear inevitable in order to fund "unavoidable" cost increases, and to have any hope at all of providing even the most minimal increases in salary and operating budget increases in a few areas where the needs are most critical.

In order to provide the ability to cover "mandated" expense increases and address critical needs in next year's budget, the Vice Presidents and Deans are initially planning, in consultation with appropriate colleagues, for a reduction in our continuing educational budget expenditures on the order of $3.5 million - a little under 3% of our total educational budget. I think that it is important, given that subsidy and fee income for 1992-93 are projected to be only 4.5% - 5.0% higher than for 1991-92, that the majority of our budget reductions be permanent cuts in our base level of expenditures rather than temporary reductions which we try to add back in 1992-93. Therefore, one of the important steps in our planning should involve carefully examining our current activities to determine which of them can be made more efficient or even, in some cases, eliminated without having a significant detrimental impact on the central academic mission of the university. Instructional activities have been protected thus far, but programs and activities outside of the institutional area cannot bear the total brunt of the proposed additional cuts. We will, clearly, also have to examine ways to increase the efficiency of our instructional activities, such as selected increases in class sizes.

We also need vigorously to address ways to hold expenditure increases to the absolute minimum. The largest such increase the past several years has been in the cost of employee health care benefits. I urge you to read the accompanying memo from Bob Martin and Chris Dalton which details the steps we are taking to address the rapid escalation in the University's costs for providing health care coverage for BGSU employees and dependents.

I would like all of you to know that next to the preservation of our essential academic mission, our priority will be to preserve the jobs of continuing BGSU employees of all classifications. This will take precedence over salary increases.

If there is any positive aspect of our current budget situation it is that it provides an opportunity, albeit an unwelcome one, to focus and streamline our activities as we look for ways to cut costs and eliminate lower priority activities. I'm sure I speak for all the members of the central administration in saying that we welcome your suggestions for ways to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of University operations.

The next year will, most likely, be difficult and require some degree of sacrifice from all of us at Bowling Green State University. I'm confident, however, based primarily on the extraordinary degree of dedication and commitment that the faculty and staff have to the institution, that Bowling Green State University will weather this temporary storm and prosper in the future.
March 28, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: BGSU Faculty and Staff

FROM: J. Christopher Dalton  
Vice President for Planning & Budgeting

Robert L. Martin  
Vice President for Operations

RE: Need for Changes in the BGSU Health Care Plan for 1991-92

As indicated in the accompanying letter from President Olscamp, projections based on the Governor's Executive Budget recommendations suggest that there will be no increase in BGSU Educational Budget Income for 1991-92. As the President notes, "it follows that any increase in costs for a particular activity or program for next year requires a corresponding decrease in expenditures somewhere else in the budget." Clearly in this environment we must hold expenditure increases to the absolute minimum.

Aside from salary increases, the largest annual expenditure increase for the past several years has been in the cost of employee health care benefits. In two of the past three years these costs have increased more than 20%. For 1990-91, the total cost to all University budgets for employee health care benefit coverage will be approximately $8.4 million dollars. The University pays 94% of these costs (approximately $3600/employee) with employee contributions providing the remaining 6%. The University's share of health care costs is projected to increase 16% ($1.3 million) for 1991-92.

In view of the current and pending budget constraints, the University is unable to continue to increase its contributions toward the provision of employee and dependent health care benefits as it has in prior years. We have asked Costeffex, a health care consulting firm, to review the BGSU health care benefit plan and provide initial recommendations by the end of April on ways to substantially reduce the rate of increase in the University's contributions for health care benefits for 1991-92 and beyond. They have also been asked to conduct an evaluation of our current health care plan and to make recommendations on plan redesign to improve employee costs, utilization and efficiency of service delivery.
The initial recommendations Costeffex provides are likely to involve greater employee sharing in the cost of providing health care benefits, a modification that has already occurred at many other universities in Ohio and nationally. We realize that being asked to increase your contributions to the funding of your health care plan is not pleasant. We hope, though, that you can understand the impossibility of having to reduce the budgets for our other continuing operations by an additional $1.3 million in order to fund the projected increase in health care benefit costs for 1991-92.

As part of the process for preparation of their initial recommendations, Costeffex will be on campus April 3 - April 5 for consultations with employee constituent groups (Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Classified Staff Council Executive Committee, Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee) as well as employee focus groups in order to solicit opinions from faculty and staff on how best to structure the initial changes in the plan. Some of the options to be considered may include: (a) an increase in employee “premium” contributions for single and/or family coverage coupled with the implementation of a Section 125 plan allowing employees to use pretax dollars to pay their health care “premiums”; (b) increasing the amount of eligible expenses (deductible) that the individual/family must pay before benefits are payable; or (c) extending the percentage of eligible expenses (co-payment) which the user(s) of the plan must pay up to the predetermined employee/family maximums.

During the second phase of their evaluations (June - December 1991), Costeffex will be conducting statistical evaluations of the current health care plan and conducting extensive surveys and interviews of employee constituent and focus groups. A goal of this phase will be to improve the design of the health care plan with the aim of limiting cost increases for employees and improving utilization of services. Issues to be considered may include plan utilization, user demographics, provider costs, health maintenance organizations (HMO), preferred provider organizations (PPO), direct service contracts, wellness programs, and cafeteria plans.

We hope you'll have an opportunity to consider these difficult issues regarding the funding of health care benefits and communicate your thoughts to your constituent representatives or to Costeffex. We would also, of course, be happy to hear from you directly. Comments should be sent to Jim Morris, Benefits Manager, Personnel Services, College Park Office Building.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hal Lunde
   Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
      Chair, ASC

DATE: April 8, 1991

RE: Membership on CAP Committee

The Administrative Staff Council's Executive Committee has received the enclosed documentation and recommendation in regard to membership on the Committee on Academic Priorities relevant to the University Financial Exigency Plan.

At its meeting on April 2, 1991 the ASC Executive Committee recommended that the three officers of ASC as well as the Chair of the ASC Personnel Welfare Committee be added to the CAP Committee for purposes of dealing with financial exigency if it should be declared.

Please take this recommendation forward through the proper channels for implementation.

GD/bal
pc: [ASC Exec]
   Ann Bowers, ASC FWC Chair
   Bob Martin, V.P. Operations
April 29, 1991

INTERNAL REORGANIZATION
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE

POLICY STATEMENT

From time to time it becomes necessary to reorganize administrative units within the University to meet newly defined responsibilities or to more efficiently manage unit operations. Most often the purpose of internal reorganization is not to create additional employment vacancies. However, it is recognized that the reorganization will affect the employment relationships for existing personnel. Because these actions may have equal opportunity implications, the Equal Opportunity Committee recommends compliance with the following guidelines:

1. Every effort will be made to ensure that existing employees have secure employment in any reorganization before hiring outside of the affected administrative unit or external to the University. Internal reorganization schemes will not be undertaken merely as a means of demoting, transferring or eliminating existing employees.

2. In any reorganization the University's diversity interests and affirmative action obligations to minorities, women, handicapped, including disabled veterans, and Veterans of the Vietnam Era will be given maximum consideration. To this end, any reorganization plan must be discussed with the Affirmative Action Director before being implemented.

3. Unless the reorganized position directly relates to the previous job functions of a particular employee all similarly qualified employees affected by the reorganization will be given equal consideration.

4. Any additional positions which result from internal reorganization will be filled pursuant to the existing affirmative action hiring procedures. Internal reorganization schemes will not be undertaken to circumvent University affirmative action procedures.
May 8, 1991

Gregg DeCrane
Assistant Vice President
Student Affairs

Dear Gregg:

Several weeks ago I received a copy of your memorandum to Dr. Chris Dalton supporting the resource needs of the Affirmative Action Office in this year's budget process. I shared the memo with members of the Equal Opportunity Committee, and it was my understanding that they would follow-up with a thank you note to you and the ASC Executive Council.

I am deeply appreciative to you and the Administrative Staff Council for your support in this regard. Your letter to Dr. Dalton was important as a sign of support for our efforts this past year. More importantly, your letter conveyed the personal sensitivity that members of the Administrative Staff Council feel for issues of equity, opportunity and diversity in our University. While I am not surprised, it is still invigorating to note the reaffirmation of this significant group to the ideals embodied by our affirmative action and equal opportunity commitment.

The most critical role in achieving our goals in this area must be played by our administrative staff. It simply cannot be done without your substantial contribution. The letter of support to Dr. Dalton is but another indication of the willingness of EGSU's administrative staff to provide the necessary leadership to bring these goals to fruition. Continued best wishes, and please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Marshall Rose, Director
Affirmative Action

MR

XC: Dr. Josh Kaplan
ASC Executive
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Martin
   Vice President of Operations

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
       Chair, ASC

DATE: May 20, 1991

RE: Contract Wording Proposal

As I try to bring closure to my year as ASC Chairperson, I am trying to follow up on the status of various proposals that have been passed on from ASC for further action. In this regard, could you please inform me if any action is in the works concerning the change in wording of Administrative contracts. This was originally presented to you in a memo dated March 13, 1991.

GD/bal
pc: ASC Exec.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Gregg DeCrane  
   Chair, ASC

FROM: Ann Bowers  
       Chair, PWC

RE: PWC Business

DATE: January 17, 1991

Please find enclosed with this memo a few items of business completed by PWC and now being sent to you for Executive Committee information and/or approval.

(1) We were asked to discover if another method of receiving supplemental pay besides the monthly payroll check could be developed. Enclosed is a copy of a memo written by Lori Schumacher based on conversations with Carl Lipp regarding the problems inherent with any other method than payroll.

(2) The PWC wishes to acknowledge the work of the Affirmative Action Office and so approved the enclosed resolution. With the Executive Committee's approval, we would like to bring this before the Council.

(3) After studying our current contracts along with changes in the Handbook which emphasize annual evaluations based on written job descriptions, we are recommending that the contract wording be changed to require that written job descriptions be attached to the contract. Enclosed is our recommended change and rationale for the Executive Committee's approval.

Please let me know if the Executive Committee has need of further information. Thank you.
11/26/90

MEMORANDUM

TO.  Ann Bowers, Personnel Welfare Committee Chairperson

FROM:  Lori Schumacher - Payroll

R.E.:  Payment of Supplemental or additional contracts

As a follow up to our discussion on 10/23/90, following are the reasons cited by Carl Lipp for processing all supplemental or additional contract payments through the Payroll Office:

Any work done outside home department is still considered work, and the University considers this work as wages. The employee has no options as to whether they can decide if they want this money taxed or not. There may be ramifications for the University if employees were paid through the Business Office and the Payroll Office. Any payments totalling $500.00 or over, the Business Office issues 1099 forms. A copy of the 1099 form gets sent to IRS similar to the W-2 form being sent to IRS. Should an employee receive a W-2 form, as well as a 1099 form, IRS may come back on the University and demand an explanation of the two forms. We could ultimately be fined. IRS is getting very picky about misspelled names and inaccurate social security numbers being on both W-2 forms and 1099 forms, so issuing an employee both types of forms would almost certainly be looked upon skeptically by the IRS.
The Role and Mission Statement of Bowling Green State University emphasizes the importance of creating an environment which promotes multicultural values in students, faculty and staff. An important resource in attaining this goal is the Affirmative Action Office. Administrative Staff Council strongly supports the activities of this Office and recognizes that especially during this academic year, the Affirmative Action Office has promoted its educational mission as well as increased its visibility on campus through a series of training sessions, workshops and informal talks. Administrative staff are urged to participate in these educational programs themselves and to support the participation of staff members whom they supervise by providing appropriate release time.

Resources are required to attain the Affirmative Action Plan's broad objectives of education, advocacy and accountability. Thus it is urged that the Faculty Senate and University Budget Committees recognize and plan for additional personnel and budgetary support for this office. Added resources will allow this Office to continue to increase its visibility and promote a multicultural environment on campus.

Approved PWC: January 8, 1991
CURRENT CONTRACT WORDING

CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

5. **Obligations of the Appointee:** In consideration of the terms of this appointment, the Appointee agrees to perform such professional duties and services as identified in the appointed position title, and/or as may be assigned or changed to the satisfaction of the Appointee's immediate supervisor. It is the responsibility of the officer(s) signing for the University to verify whether or not the Appointee's performance is in accord with prevailing University practice.

PROPOSED CONTRACT WORDING

CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

5. **Obligations of the Appointee:** In consideration of the terms of this appointment, the Appointee agrees to perform such professional duties and services as identified in the attached written position description, and/or as may be assigned or changed, to the satisfaction of the Appointee's immediate supervisor. It is the responsibility of the officer(s) signing for the University to verify whether or not the Appointee's performance is in accord with prevailing University practice.

RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED CHANGE

According to procedures outlined in the Administrative Staff Handbook (see below), written position descriptions are an essential part of the appointment and annual evaluation processes. Position descriptions are subject to revision as part of the annual evaluation process and any revisions become effective with the new contract period. The proposed change in contract wording insures that changes in position descriptions become an integral part of the staff member's contract.

Administrative Staff Handbook, page 27: Appointment Information

"Administrative staff members shall be advised in writing at the time of initial appointment of the primary responsibility of the position including title, salary, and pay period."

Administrative Staff Handbook, page 31: Evaluation Procedure, 4A

"The staff member and supervisor should meet and accomplish the following:

Review and determine staff member's job description and goals for the next contract period and make any changes to the basic job description.

Based on the above agreements, determine evaluation criteria that will be used to assess the staff member's performance.

The staff member and supervisor will confirm the job description, goals and evaluation criteria in writing."

Approved by PWC: January 9, 1991
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Martin
   Vice President for Operations

FROM: Gregg DeCrane
   Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
   University Student Activities

DATE: May 20, 1991

RE: Exigency

For the past four years, ASC has been pursuing the question of exigency as it relates to our role in the process once it is declared (God forbid). The focus of our efforts has been with the Faculty Senate and specifically with the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). The attached information gives you some idea of our effort. I was recently informed verbally by Hal Lunde that the SEC did not feel our request for representation on CAP was appropriate because CAP dealt only with academic priorities. His suggestion was to pursue input in some other fashion such as the University Budget Committee.

I would appreciate hearing from you as to the avenue to pursue relative to ASC having a voice in the exigency process if and when it should ever be declared. A timely response would be appropriate.

GD/bal
enclosure

pc: ASC Exec.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Gregg DeCrane  
   Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Ann Bowers  
   Chair, PWC

DATE: June 6, 1991

RE: Annual report

Attached is the list of accomplishments of the 1990-91 Personnel Welfare Committee. As everyone well knows, most of this year was spent in quickly studying and responding to the mandated fiscal constraints attached to our health benefit package. All other activities seem to "pale" when placed next to this major issue.

The members of this PWC should be commended for their work during this last year. Bob Graham will be going off the committee and off of ASC; however, Cindy Puffer, Pat Faehler, Lori Schumacher, Jacquie Joseph, and Mary Beth Zachary expressed their willingness to continue to serve on next year's PWC. In my opinion, especially since major decisions regarding health benefits will be made next year, this continuation will be most helpful along with the fresh insight brought by new members. Lori Schumacher also expressed an interest in continuing to represent PWC on the University Insurance Committee.

This last year certainly has been a learning experience for me and I have enjoyed working with you. I value both your leadership and your friendship.
Activities of PWC, 1990-1991

1. **Personal Leave Days:** Drafted statement on personal leave days; reacted to several responses from Personnel Office; approved one which will be submitted to Board of Trustees for approval.

2. **Financial Exigency:** Researched background of current policy and sent to ASC Executive Committee with recommendation to request membership on Committee on Academic Priorities.

3. **Reciprocity of tuition fee waivers:** Contacted Ohio Board of Regents to inquire about reciprocity of fee waivers. OBOP leaves this up to individual universities. PWC decided not to take action on this.

4. **Affirmative Action:** Met with Marshall Pose to discuss ways PWC could assist his efforts on campus. To this end, sent to Executive Committee a resolution of support for his office and his programs.

5. **Administrative Staff Contract:** Revised Administrative Staff contract to require that written job descriptions be attached to the contract.

6. **Supplemental pay:** Responded to inquiry regarding the ability of Payroll Office to pay, separate from monthly pay, administrative staff for supplemental work.

7. **Holiday closure:** Discussed holiday closure; decided not to push forward at this time.

8. **Health benefits planning:** Appointed Lori Schumacher as PWC representative on University Insurance Committee; assisted in selection of health care planning consultants; provided information to University Insurance Committee regarding goals and objectives of the health benefit package; surveyed administrative staff and compiled information from surveys for use in next year's long range planning sessions; attended meetings regarding health benefits; and, worked closely with Executive Committee in development of Kaplan Plan.

9. **Administrative Staff recruitment and hiring:** Reviewed Personnel Office's Recruitment and Hiring Procedures for Administrative Staff. PWC represented on meetings to revise these procedures.

10. **Internal promotion:** PWC represented at meetings with Vice President Martin, Marshall Pose and John Moore regarding internal promotion policy passed by ACC during 1990/91 year. This policy appears to be supported by administration, but still in planning stages.

**Potential issues for 1991/92:**

Health benefit package re-structuring; child care; overtime/compensatory time; clarification of documentation of non-renewal; internal promotion policy; relationship of Personnel Office with Administrative Staff Council and administrative staff; and, working with Salary Committee.
July 15, 1991

Mr. Robert Martin  
Vice President for Operations

Dear Bob:

Thank your memo of July 9 concerning the Administrative Staff Council's apparent concern for their lack of representation during University considerations for declaring Financial Exigency. The University is not in a state of Financial Exigency, nor anything close to it. I have no intention of instituting the mechanism for declaring Financial Exigency, and certainly I would not do so until we had already begun the dismissal of full-time continuing employees at the University as a minimum. Generally speaking, Financial Exigency has not historically been declared at universities until the necessity for dismissing tenured faculty arises.

I see no reason at this time to introduce the term "Financial Emergency" into any of the University's formal policies, since I believe instituting procedures for budgetary reductions below the level of Financial Exigency simply ties our hands.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Olscamp  
President

cc: Dr. Josh Kaplan
To: Barb Keeley  
From: Cheryl Carothers  
Date: July 17, 1991  
RE: Vacation Policy

As you are my Administrative Council representative, I would like to bring up an issue that I believe should be addressed by ASC.

Administrative staff who are hired under grant funds are not allowed to take their vacation time for the first year (or longer, if they are part time), and yet cannot take that time with them when the grant runs out. This creates two problems:

1) We are in jeopardy of not getting to take advantage of all the leave time to which we are entitled. This is especially true for employees whose grants run out after one year. (As an example, I am carrying over each year 22 to 25 days because I couldn't use the 20 days accrued the first year. How am I supposed to use all that up, plus what I am accruing today, and still get my work done?)

2) Many, maybe even most of us, are working under the false assumption that unused time will transfer to a pay-off upon termination, and may even be counting on having that money available to them. This creates the possibility of soured relationships upon termination if the employee believes he or she was led astray.

As you know from the memo to Betsy, Nancy, and myself of July 16, our College addressed this problem by making sure we are all aware of that fact, and telling us to be sure to use that time. I have to wonder, however, how many administrative contract employees do not know about this situation, and are blithely letting time accumulate in the belief that it doesn't matter if they don't use up their time, because they will take a pay-off upon leaving.

I don't know if you are aware of how this subject came to be addressed by the College, but it started by my commenting to Ed, in Betsy's earshot, that I wasn't worried about using up my time because it would make a nice cushion against unemployment after the grant ran out. Ed asked how that was possible -- where would the money come from? As I thought about the set-up of the budget, I realized that he was right, and unless the Dean came up with some money after we left, there would be no way to take the accrued time with us. Betsy looked into it with Dean Willis, and I asked Linda and Personnel. Sure enough, the budgets and related policies are not designed for anything but taking your time as it is accrued, and the College doesn't have bundles of money laying around to hand us as we leave.

I believe that the Administrative Council should

1) warn the contract employees about this, so that they will not lose their benefits

2) develop a policy that would allow grant-funded employees to begin taking their time as it is accrued, in their very first year of employment.

3) consider the possibility of educating departments seeking grants funds to plan for the contingency of a person leaving with accrued time for which they would earn a pay-off.

cc - C. Willis