

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
Monday, June 8, 2015 - 3pm
Union Konza room

Attending: Barbara Anderson, Brad Burenheide, Tori Culbertson, Stu Duncan, Gloria Holcombe, Andy Hurtig, Gary Leitnaker, Laurel Littrell, David Rintoul, and Spencer Wood (Chair)

Absent: Lynn Carlin (Liaison for Provost Office), Byron Jones, Tim Keane, Drew Smith, and Mark Weiss.

Visitors and guests: Cheryl Johnson, Jeff Morris, Cindy Bontrager, Steven Graham

1. Spencer Wood, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. He welcomed new members to the meeting and thanked our guests for their attendance, especially during this very hectic time.
2. New Business
 - A. Budget news / possible furloughs

General discussion over the budget and furlough issues. What can we take from what happened?

Cheryl Johnson began by giving some background of what they were trying to work with. She and her counterparts at Emporia and Pitt State visited daily in the morning and evening about how to handle these administrative furloughs being mandated by the State. They wanted to make sure not to be too prescriptive, so they used some broad-based guiding principles. Unit leaders, department heads, etc. were directed to work through who was essential. Not having gone through something exactly like this before, they were not prepared. However, in view of what has now happened, they have worked to develop a process to be vetted by Faculty Senate, University Support Staff Senate, and others.

Jeff Morris reported how at first they tried to have documents vetted, but it was quickly apparent that the process was taking longer than the time they had available, and they had to act because it became urgent to get something up and running. It was noted K-State's expectations are different than the State's. Under State rules, a regular furlough (to save funding) rather than an emergency furlough requires that we give employees a notice of 30-days. However, an emergency furlough is different, and it wasn't clear that the State statute provides a deadline for advance notice. He related how so many had unique questions related to their specific situations. These were legitimate questions, but answers were not immediately available for all of them. Administration was given

conflicting information at times and therefore, it was difficult to give accurate answers and this caused a little confusion.

Cindy Bontrager wanted to make very clear this was mandated out of Topeka, and was not a funding issue. She was able to provide a little more background on how this came about. They were not allowed to put certain announcements, as desired, due to constraints and instruction given to them. The cost of preparing to implement the furlough was likely very high; it would be a good exercise to calculate the cost.

It was asked why this potential situation was not made public sooner to employees, especially in view of the fact there were notices on the KU website the week before. All confirmed they began work on getting information to employees as soon as they were given notice from the Regents on Tuesday night. They were working with it on Wednesday morning first thing. It was noted that perhaps just a message of reassurance could have been given earlier. This needs to be considered in the event of a future high-anxiety situation, such as this one. The emotional and psychological impact of this has taken a toll on many.

Authority to pay is still an issue, even though furloughs were not imposed. A *balanced* budget has not yet been passed by the governor. There has been no tuition reading by the Board, because... again, the budget has not been finalized.

What do we need to do to get the plan in place that was mentioned earlier in the meeting? Again, it was highlighted there was no specific plan or policy in place for this emergency situation. Discussion by all in attendance was had about essential versus non-essential, how different terminology should be used, if at all possible. We are a state agency and that was discussed. Also, what about a continuing resolution? Could that not have been done by the State? Solutions to these issues need to be discussed. This was disruptive to employees all over the state and was very demoralizing. It was a no-win situation. There is a possibility this could happen next year with the budget timing and therefore, this needs to be thought out and in place.

Discussion occurred about payment of those working, despite the furloughs not being imposed. There is concern from employees about being paid "on-time". Risk is very minimal that would occur. It's important to keep in mind that a plan to communicate needs to be in place should something like this occur again. A Qualtrics survey will be going out to get input on how to handle this for future instances. Also, Human Capital Services has put a list out of emergency assistance groups and resources which could aid employees if assistance should be needed. This information is on our website: <http://www.k-state.edu/media/furloughs/county-assistance.html>. It was still asked when and how it should be made known to employees that there is a potential, though very minimal, they wouldn't be paid on time. Employees need to be given reassurance. The

Secretary of Administration should be able to answer whether this could happen. Bontrager will work to find out the answer. It is important to remember this is not being caused by the university, and that they are doing the absolute best they can to get the most accurate information to employees. Perhaps a message stating we understand and hear there a lot of concerns about not getting paid on time – we are doing everything we can to make sure employees are paid on time....

The breakdown of employees listed as essential and non-essential was asked about. There were 8,277 employees deemed non-essential, which is about 65% of the work force, including student workers; 4,380 were deemed essential, which is about 35% of the work force, including student workers. Teaching faculty, administrative assistants, accounting, IT, custodial, GRAs, GTAs, and Police and Security were among the top employees who were deemed essential.

A main take-away should be that the university responded as quickly as they could and will continue to do the best they can to get the information out and have a plan in place for next time. It was noted there should be a differentiation between student workers and faculty and staff.

There was brief conversation about research positions. It was felt there was some disconnect between BOR guiding principles and research positions here, which caused confusion when creating lists of essential and non-essential personnel. This was helpful feedback for future plans for communications about these kinds of crisis situations. Johnson reaffirmed they will send the draft plan to FSCOUP for vetting.

Morris noted that funding source and the entity being worked for, in short... whether someone was a state employee or not, was extremely confusing as well. This is a complex system. Having some common definitions for any future scenarios where this would occur would be important.

Wood thanked all members and visitors for taking the time to attend today.

3. Update: The May 7, 2015 minutes were approved electronically
4. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.