

Henderson State University Faculty Senate

Minutes of March 2, 2005

Members Present: Aneeq Ahmad, Lea Ann Alexander, Angela Boswell, Betsy Fulmer, Catherine Leach, Charles Leming, Mike Matthews, Steve Carter, Henry Perez, Bruce Smith, Laura Storm, Carol Underwood, Richard Miller, Randy Duncan, Linda English, Jamie Engman, Patti Miley, Marielle McFarland, Jules Mollere, Brett Serviss, Darlene Wills, Mitzi Bass, Woody Jolley, Alan Wright

Members Absent: Marty Campbell, Duane Jackson, Kenneth Taylor

Mike Matthews called the meeting to order at 3:16 pm.

The February 2, 2005 minutes were approved.

Guest Speakers:

- **Dr. Robert Houston, Vice President of Academic Affairs** (see Appendix I for complete report) :
 - Dr. Houston read the proposed new mission statement:
 - There are problems with advising transfer students because it is difficult to determine course equivalencies. In the near future, transfer students will meet with the Registrar during their first semester at HSU to make sure they are on the right track with their courses. When funds allow, a new position will be created and will be responsible for:
 - Initial advising for all transfer students.
 - Conducting the degree audit.Arkansas is developing a common course numbering system and the equivalencies will be available online. They will also be included in the online degree audit system. Until these things occur, there is a booklet in the Registrar's Office that lists equivalencies between HSU and community college courses, and the Registrar's Office will guarantee answers to advisors' questions within twenty-four hours. Mr. Gattin has also recently emailed a URL to faculty that list the course equivalencies.
 - Summer loads recommendation: averaging 20 students between 2 classes with no fewer than 6 students in one class.

Science courses with labs will be difficult to handle this way since instructors can only teach one course. A system of departmental averaging may be required in the sciences so that large lower level courses can be averaged with smaller upper level ones, thus allowing courses to be taught in the major as well as the General Education courses. Dr. Houston asks that departments discuss the recommendation and send additional concerns to him as soon as possible.
 - Dr. Houston proposes having our Fall Break on October 3 and 4 (this is when OBU has it). The Fall Break will be for students and teaching faculty. Staff, 12-month faculty and administrators will work their usual hours. If we have a Fall Break, the Fall Semester will start earlier:
 - August 17-- Faculty Conference
 - August 18 and 19 – Registration
 - August 22 – First day of classes
 - The North Central Assessment Review is scheduled for February 26 and 27, 2006.
 - More faculty members need to take the UCLA faculty survey so we can receive feedback on it in preparation for the North Central visit. A similar survey will soon be given to our seniors.
- **President's Report** (see Appendix II for complete report) :
 - The Senate discussed the possibility of merit pay at length. There is concern that it will cause divisiveness and will cause much larger problems than the dollar amounts warrant. Looking at systems in place at other schools was suggested. A goal of a merit system might be to award smaller raises to people who are not doing their jobs well. The Faculty Senate feels morale and salaries are too low right now to do something like that. Some members of

the Senate feel Faculty Excellence awards should be added to the recipients' base salary, amounts of awards increased, and the number of awards given be increased.

- **Motion made and carried:** The Faculty Senate is not interested in considering a merit pay system until we all receive cost-of-living adjustments.
- A few senators suggested that the University needs to look into other more intrinsic ways to motivate faculty.

Committee Reports:

Academics Committee (see Appendix III for the complete report):

- There was miscommunication with Computer Services regarding when evaluation reports were needed. In the future they will be available before tenure and promotion decisions are made.
- The Academics Committee does not consider the proposed change in the drop date to be an improvement over current policy. Tom Gattin does not think the proposal will make it out of the UAC because it is not supported.
- Employing a consistent Faculty Work Load policy across the departments will be very difficult but inequities will continue if load policies continue being made at the department level.
- **Motion:** The Academic Committee's motion to eliminate the phrase "and must be consistent throughout the University" from the Faculty Work Loads section of the Faculty Handbook failed with 5 yeas and 15 nays.

Finance Committee (see Appendix IV for the complete report):

- Separate Line-item Travel Budget: The Finance Committee feels that this should be postponed until all faculty receive salary increases.
- **Proposal:** Faculty Senate proposes that all Henderson faculty receive a minimum salary increase of 4% for FY2005/2006 as a cost of living adjustment.

In addition, the Senate commends the cooperative efforts of faculty and administration to reduce the earnings gap and salary compression at all ranks. In order to accomplish this without compounding the problem further, we urge that recommendations of the Salary Study Committee be effected within two years.

Procedures Committee (see Appendix V for the complete report):

- **Motion:** Since the Procedures Committee has included 15-hour faculty members on past ballots of full-time faculty members, be it resolved that until changes are approved in the Faculty Handbook, 15-hour faculty members be included on ballots with the recognition that they are free to resign. Motion passed with 17 yeas, 1 nay, and 2 abstentions.

Operations Committee:

- Issue of creating/appointing a Faculty Senate webmaster was sent back to committee.
- Changes in the copy of the Faculty Handbook that appears on the HSU web page were reported. Refer to item 9 in the President's report on "Discussions with Dr. Dunn" for these.

Buildings and Grounds Committee (see Appendix VI for the complete report).

Old Business

- **Drop Day issue** – Faculty Senate took no action.

New Business

- A proposal to limit the number of committees faculty members may be on was submitted. Sent to Operations Committee for consideration.
- Faculty are expressing serious concerns about whether or not Ektron is an improvement over FrontPage. Some feel Ektron is inferior and that we should return to FrontPage.

- Online evaluations of Dr. Dunn and other administrators in the future are sent to and tabulated by an outside entity before the results are sent back to Henderson. Our answers are not traceable.
- The proposed Fall Break and whether it receives faculty support was tabled until the April Faculty Senate meeting. The Senate is in favor of some form of Fall Break.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Marielle McFarland,
Secretary, Faculty Senate 2005

Appendix I

President's Report -- Faculty Senate March 2005 Meeting

Discussion with Vice President Houston – Feb 28, 2005

1. I requested that advisors not be asked to make decisions about the transferability of courses taken at other institutions in Arkansas or elsewhere.

Dr. Houston said he would discuss this issue with Mr. Gattin.

2. With regard to the issue of "merit pay" that was raised in our discussions with Dr. Houston at the last Senate meeting, I asked what he thought about proceeding on this topic. We briefly discussed how the Senate might be involved by possibly looking at several systems that are used elsewhere. He said he would discuss the issue with Dr. Dunn and with the Deans.

3. I asked if any issues that directly involved Henderson were raised at the recent COPLAC meeting that he and Dr. Dunn attended. He mentioned that three schools from Oregon, Texas, and Tennessee had submitted applications for admission, and that the organization was growing and might possibly admit more than one school from a state.

4. I shared a proposal on summer salaries that the Senate Finance Committee has prepared for submission to the Senate. A provision of the proposal asks that a final decision on policy be forthcoming soon. Dr. Houston said he would bring a proposal to the Senate meeting.

5. We discussed the Fall break issue. No decision has yet been made on this, other than we will likely have one. The days and dates are still under consideration.

6. Problems with the switchboard that were discussed with Dr. Dunn last month were asked about. Dr. Houston and Dr. Dunn both feel the menu system needs to be improved, which is what several faculty had mentioned originally. Dorris Wright is to work on an improvement of this system with David Epperhart.

7. A proposal from a member of the faculty will be presented to the Senate to limit the number of committees that faculty serve on at any one time. The Senate had discussed committee assignments with Dr. Houston at the last meeting. His feeling on this issue was that a faculty member should simply refuse committee assignments if these became excessive.

8. Problems with faculty web pages and the current Ektron system were discussed. I stated that although the Ektron system is supposed to be easier to use, some faculty do not like it because they are not able to do things on their web pages that were possible with the Frontpage program. I pointed out that several changes have been made in web page development without input from the faculty, deadlines have been imposed that are unrealistic or at least inconvenient, and, in this case, possibly an inferior program is being used to replace a better one, one that faculty are already trained to use!

9. I stated that faculty would like to evaluate the head of Computer Services in the same way that he and Dr. Dunn were being evaluated. Dr. Houston thought that was reasonable.

10. I asked when results of the UCLA survey might be available to the faculty. Members of the Senate had expressed an interest in the data as a measure of faculty morale. Dr. Houston said there would be a third attempt to increase faculty participation in the survey which to date has not been very high. He stressed that the survey is important to Henderson as it relates to assessment issues that were raised by our last North Central (I think the name is now something else) review.

11. The “summer transition program” that was offered last summer for the first time will likely be offered again according to Dr. Houston. Last summer, enrollment in the program was limited to students that did not meet the admission requirements. The program was designed to bring the students to a level that would enable them to be admitted to the Fall term. There were problems with the program that first summer. The program will likely be enlarged this year to also include students that have met the enrollment requirements but who may also benefit from the program by better preparing them for their first semester in college. Larry Grant will administer the program again and Dr. Sommer will work closely with him on it.

Appendix II

Discussion with President Dunn – Feb 28, 2005

1. Dr. Dunn opened our conversation with a presentation of financial figures relating state funding to the university’s budget. Henderson’s actual expenditures from state funding have dropped from 53.03% in FY1997 to 45.92% in FY2004 representing a “dollar” decline of \$2.8 million. This decline does not mean that the money was not spent, but instead, it means that tuition, fees, etc had to be raised to make up the difference in state funding levels.

2. As to state funding during the upcoming fiscal year, the situation looks better but no decisions have yet been made by the legislature for the funding of higher education. Dr. Dunn was hopeful that the funding level would be sufficient for a 5% increase in salaries. This figure would include dollars for across-the-board increases, faculty promotions, base salary adjustments, and adjustments deemed necessary by the Salary Study Committee.

3. We briefly talked about the “merit pay” issue that I had previously discussed with Dr. Houston.

4. Dr. Dunn scheduled a voluntary meeting with the faculty for Tuesday afternoon of this week, and plans to have additional meetings with the faculty.

5. I informed him of the faculty desire to evaluate the head of Computer Services. He said that he and Fred Worth had discussed this in the fall, and to the best of his recollection, he thought that the Technology Committee was supposed to develop an evaluation. I said that I would further investigate this.

6. Dr. Dunn and I had discussed the “summer transition program” in some depth at our meeting prior to the last senate meeting. He has since forwarded information to me about the students which I will briefly summarize. At the end of summer, seven students were rated “likely to succeed”, and of these, six are still enrolled with GPA scores over 2.0. Three students were rated “unlikely to succeed” but were admitted in the Fall. Only one of these is still in school and is not doing well. Based on these results, and as indicated by Dr. Houston, the program will be offered again this summer but with changes.

7. I indicated to Dr. Dunn that the switchboard problems were under review according to Dr. Houston but that opening of the post office during the noon hour had not been accomplished as requested last month. He said he would take care of this (and he did – all of you should have received an email from Tim Jones about this). Since our meeting, Dr. Dunn has asked Dorris Wright to look at options for changes in the switchboard menus.

8. We briefly discussed the University web page problems that were more completely discussed with Dr. Houston.

9. Problems with the copies of the Faculty Handbook on the Henderson Web Page were revisited. Last month it was noted that two different copies of the handbook could be found by searching the web page. Shortly after that discussion, one of the copies was removed at the request of Dr. Dunn. The current copy dated 2000 is up to date with regard to revisions. I requested that changes be made in the title page and that an additional page be added after the title page indicating the date and section number of any revisions. These changes have already been posted on the web. Hopefully, this will reduce confusion that has been generated by the 2000 date that appears on the title page. This is the original date of acceptance of the fully revised handbook that was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2000.

10. I pointed out to Dr. Dunn the motion passed by the Senate last month that stated: "The Faculty Senate endorses current strategic planning efforts and urges that at least one faculty member from each Task Force participates in the preparation of the final report." He stated that the Chairs of the committees would definitely be involved, and that the faculty as a whole would have opportunity to review and offer feedback on the final document.

Appendix III

**Report on the meeting of the
Faculty Senate Academics Committee
February 16, 2005**

Members present: Randy Duncan, George Ann Stallings, Celya Taylor, Carol Underwood, Alan Wright

Members absent: Laura Storm

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Reporting of the student evaluations of faculty

This issue was initially raised by Deans who were concerned that the evaluation reports were not ready soon enough to be considered in making tenure and promotion decisions.

Committee members also noted that the evaluations were useful to faculty as a means of determining what approaches were and were not working in a particular course.

It was suggested that it might speed up the process if evaluations were done through WebCT. This is already being done in some classes. It was pointed out that some students worry about the evaluation being linked to their name because they have had to log in to WebCT in order to do the evaluation. However, students do seem to give more extensive comments with this type of evaluation. Perhaps this is because they know their identities cannot be discerned by their handwriting. This discussion led to a number of questions about the viability of WebCT evaluations.

[The committee chair asked some of these questions in a subsequent conversation with Communication and Computer Services director David Epperhart. Beginning in the fall, a WebCT page will automatically be created for all classes. Even though students do have to be logged in to do an evaluation, no ID number is associated with an evaluation record. Evaluations go to a "third party" (CCS). Currently, WebCT evaluation data is combined with scantron evaluation data in one report. If we move totally to online evaluations there will need to be an incentive for students to do the evaluations. Perhaps they will not be able to see their grades until they have evaluated at least three of their classes.]

Drop date proposal

Committee members had heard pros and cons on the proposal from their colleagues, and the committee was not able to formulate a clear consensus on the best drop date policy. On the one hand, some committee members were concerned about extending the "W" drop until later in the semester. For classes that require individual attention, the instructor is giving time to students who cannot pass or do not intend to finish the course when they could be spending that time with more viable students. For classes that require group work it is only fair to the rest of the students that they know sooner in the semester which of their group members actually intend to stay in the class. On the other hand, the committee felt that eliminating the second drop date took control out of the hands of the faculty. In general, the committee did not consider the proposed change to be an improvement over the current policy.

There was also concern that the proposal that was submitted to the UAC did not contain the following section of the current policy as stated on page 29 of the catalog:

"However, if at a later date, a student submits evidence verified by the Office of Financial Aid that he or she left school due to circumstances over which the student exercised no control, the instructor may award a grade of "WP" if evidence is available to show that the student was passing at the time. Drop forms must be completed by faculty and submitted to the Registrar."

The committee discussed what appeals process would be available to the student if this statement was to be removed from the catalog. Subsequent to the meeting Alan Wright researched this issue and provided the following information:

*On page 36 (of the .pdf version) under **Section 4. Classroom Expression** I found the following:*

Paragraph 2. *Academic evaluation on student performance shall be neither prejudicial nor capricious. Students may appeal by*

[I'll paraphrase because I couldn't cut 'n paste] The student shall contact the faculty member and explain the student's performance, faculty member explains why student received the grade they did, student can go to the chairperson to appeal and then the dean. It seems the Dean is the last avenue of appeal.

I did find this interesting quote. "The faculty member has the authority and responsibility to determine the grade."

It seems to me that the appeals process can cover all the extenuating circumstances that may arise.

[The committee chair addressed this issue in a subsequent conversation with Registrar Tom Gattin. The omission of the two sentences was an oversight. The appeal process statement should have been a part of the proposal. However, Gattin pointed out that this appeal process applies only to students who have stopped attending all classes.]

Faculty Load Reduction

Below is the relevant section from the Faculty Handbook:

2. Faculty Work Loads

The work load of each faculty member, as to nature and distribution, is arrived at in consultation with the department chairperson, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A normal teaching load is considered to be 12 hours (or 12-15 hours for non-tenure track instructor) of undergraduate teaching or equivalent service.

Adjustments may be allowed on several bases including, but not limited to, class size, class preparation, honors courses, research, teaching of graduate classes, university assignments, etc., and must be consistent throughout the University.

Faculty members engaged in the full-time teaching of graduate courses shall have a load reduction.

The University must offer added compensation to faculty who teach overloads.

Special scheduling considerations shall be given to faculty members teaching off-campus courses.

The committee agreed that the 9 hour load for faculty "engaged in the full-time teaching of graduate courses" was justified and consistent with the policy in place at most institutions. However, there was some discussion about the lack of clarity in the Handbook statement of this policy. Some members thought it should be more specific about the number of hours by which the load would be reduced. Other members favored the current wording that allows departments some latitude in this decision.

The committee agreed that there is no statement that clearly addresses course reductions for faculty who work with graduate students as an overload or for those who teach a mixture of undergraduate and true graduate (6000 level) courses. Prior to the meeting information about such policies was gathered from the three academic deans. None of these policies seem to be available in written form (print or digital).

Ellis College

conversation with Dean Sommer

One course reduction for every 18 hours of overload teaching/research supervision at the graduate level. One reduction for every 6 graduate students worked with in an overload situation?

This system only applies to undergraduate overloads if the course is a graduation requirement.

Only teach 9 hours if teaching all graduate level classes. At present, this does not apply to anyone in the Ellis College.

From the Social Sciences Department:

conversation with faculty member

1 point for every Graduate Student Readings Course we conducted on top of our 12 hour load

1 point for every MLA project or MLA/MSE thesis we chaired

3 points for every graduate course that we taught WITHIN our 12-hour load (i.e. 3 undergraduate courses, 1 grad course)

When we reached the magic "18" points, we received for one semester, one course load reduction (i.e. 3 hour course load reduction).

School of Business

conversation with Dean Linn

No accrued load reduction policy for directing research/theses.

Faculty who teach only graduate classes have a 9 hour load.

Teacher's College Henderson

conversation with Dean Moore

One course reduction for every 8 Research Problems students supervised/taught.

Faculty who teach only graduate classes have a 9 hour load.

Intern supervision is counted as part of load for some faculty. Faculty who supervise interns above their full load are paid per visit.

Obviously, policies are not consistent throughout the university. After some discussion it was the consensus of the committee that such consistency is likely impossible to achieve and would not be desirable if it could be imposed.

The Academics Committee proposes that the phrase "and must be consistent throughout the University" be eliminated from the following statement in the Faculty Work Loads section of the Faculty Handbook: "Adjustments may be allowed on several bases including, but not limited to, class size, class preparation, honors course, research, teaching of graduate classes, university assignments, etc., and must be consistent throughout the University."

The committee also makes the following suggestions. Load reduction policies should be made at the departmental level. Load reduction policies should be clearly articulated and available to faculty in written form.

Report submitted by Randy Duncan

Appendix IV

Finance Committee Report

Submitted by Lea Ann Alexander

Salary Proposal for FY2005/2006

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) published its annual "State of the Profession" report in the journal *Academe* in spring, 2004. It rated Henderson State University's salary for full professors, associate professors and assistant professors each in the lowest category possible (5), indicating that we fall in the lowest 20th percentile (see Chart 1). Only our salaries for instructors were rated above this; the 4 assigned to those salaries places them in the lowest 40th percentile. No other 4-year institution in the state came close to achieving a rating as low as Henderson's. When compensation (salary plus benefits) was assessed, Henderson received the lowest possible rating for faculty in all ranks.

We are concerned about the effect that our rating in *Academe* may have on our ability to attract quality faculty members to Henderson. For many who are seeking employment in academia, *Academe's* annual ranking is an important tool in assessing potential employers. Henderson's poor ranking could easily cause many highly qualified applicants to look elsewhere. We feel that it is important to address our salary situation in as expedient a manner as possible. If our poor ranking in *Academe* decreases our ability to attract the best-qualified faculty, the impact on Henderson's overall mission could be long-lasting and significant.

For a number of years, faculty salaries have lagged behind inflation. In the past five years alone, we have experienced a 3.2% net loss of earning power (see Chart 2 and Chart 3). Therefore, Faculty Senate proposes that all Henderson faculty receive a minimum salary increase of 4% for FY2005/2006 as a cost of living adjustment.

In addition, the Senate commends the cooperative efforts of faculty and administration to reduce the earnings gap and salary compression at all ranks. In order to accomplish this without compounding the problem further, we urge that recommendations of the Salary Study Committee be effected within two years.

Summer Enrollment Averaging

Because averaging numbers of students in summer courses could provide for more flexibility in summer class offerings and contribute to creating some equity that is currently lacking, the Faculty Senate Finance Committee proposes that the averaging of course sizes be allowed both between courses taught by an individual and between courses taught in a department during a summer session. We encourage the administration to set an “average point” at a level that will not cause a financial hardship to the institution. (Currently, 10 students are required in a class to result in full salary for the instructor. We suggest that even an enrollment of 15 students per class, with individual or departmental averaging, would result in significant benefits to students and faculty.) Averaging between instructors would be especially helpful in science lab courses, where the required contact time limits individual faculty to teaching only one course during a session. Since the summer is almost here, we are concerned about coming to a decision on this matter.

Separate Travel Budget for Regional and National Association Officers

While members of the committee agree that creating a separate line-item in the budget for travel for this purpose, the committee believes that taking action at this time would detract from our emphasis on salaries for the next fiscal year.

Chart 1: AAUP Rankings for Arkansas

	Cat.	Average Salary Rating			
		PR	AO	AI	IN
Arkansas St. U-Main	IIA	4	4	4	5
Arkansas Tech U	IIB	3	3	3	5
Henderson St U	IIA	5	5	5	4
Hendrix Coll	IIB	3	3	2	
John Brown U	IIB	4	4	4	5
Lyon Coll	IIB	3	4	3	-
Ouachita Baptist U	IIB	4	4	3	3
Southern Arkansas U-Main	IIB	3	3	4	4
U Arkansas-Fayetteville	I	4	4	4	4
U Arkansas-Little Rock	IIA	3	2	2	5
U Central Arkansas	IIA	4	3	4	4
U Ozarks	IIB	4	4	5	3

	Cat.	Average Salary (\$1000s)				
		PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
Arkansas St. U-Main	IIA	65.7	54.6	44.7	33.5	49.0
Arkansas Tech U	IIB	60.8	53.2	42.9	32.6	47.0
Henderson St U	IIA	57.6	48.9	40.3	36.1	48.6
Hendrix Coll	IIB	63.7	52.3	45.9		55.1
John Brown U	IIB	53.8	46.8	39.8	29.2	45.3
Lyon Coll	IIB	59.8	45.8	45.3		48.4
Ouachita Baptist U	IIB	57.4	48.7	42.9	38.6	49.3
Southern Arkansas U-Main	IIB	61.6	51.8	42.2	35.2	46.5
U Arkansas-Fayetteville	I	81.9	61.0	53.2	37.0	64.0
U Arkansas-Little Rock	IIA	71.2	60.2	49.4	34.7	55.9
U Central Arkansas	IIA	64.9	56.0	46.0	36.5	49.0
U Ozarks	IIB	58.7	47.2	37.3	36.3	47.0

	Cat.	Average Compensation Rating			
		PR	AO	AI	IN
Arkansas St. U-Main	IIA	4	4	4	5
Arkansas Tech U	IIB	3	3	3	4
Henderson St U	IIA	5	5	5	5
Hendrix Coll	IIB	3	2	2	
John Brown U	IIB	4	4	4	5
Lyon Coll	IIB	3	4	2	
Ouachita Baptist U	IIB	4	3	3	2
Southern Arkansas U-Main	IIB	3	3	3	3
U Arkansas-Fayetteville	I	4	5	4	5
U Arkansas-Little Rock	IIA	4	3	3	5
U Central Arkansas	IIA	4	4	4	4
U Ozarks	IIB	4	4	5	3

	Cat.	Average. Compensation (\$1000s)				
		PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
Arkansas St. U-Main	IIA	82.1	68.8	56.6	42.6	61.8
Arkansas Tech U	IIB	75.5	66.5	54.6	42.6	59.3
Henderson St U	IIA	70.9	58.4	48.8	42.7	59.0
Hendrix Coll	IIB	83.3	69.8	58.1		71.8
John Brown U	IIB	68.5	60.8	50.2	37.0	57.9
Lyon Coll	IIB	77.4	58.5	58.5		62.7
Ouachita Baptist U	IIB	72.7	63.6	55.3	49.8	63.3
Southern Arkansas U-Main	IIB	77.4	65.7	54.3	45.9	59.4
U Arkansas-Fayetteville	I	100.4	76.1	66.1	45.8	79.0
U Arkansas-Little Rock	IIA	84.1	72.8	59.6	42.4	67.0
U Central Arkansas	IIA	78.9	69.1	57.2	45.5	60.6
U Ozarks	IIB	71.9	58.5	47.0	45.9	58.3

Chart 2: Consumer Price Index, Department of Labor Statistics

	Percentage change 12 months ended in December							
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
All items	1.7	1.6	2.7	3.4	1.6	2.4	1.9	3.3
Food and beverages	1.6	2.3	2.0	2.8	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.6
Housing	2.4	2.3	2.2	4.3	2.9	2.4	2.2	3.0
Apparel	1.0	-0.7	-0.5	-1.8	-3.2	-1.8	-2.1	-2
Transportation	-1.4	-1.7	5.4	4.1	-3.8	3.8	0.3	6.5
Medical care	2.8	3.4	3.7	4.2	4.7	5.0	3.7	4.2
Recreation	1.5	1.2	0.8	1.7	1.5	1.1	1.1	0.7
Education and communication	3.0	0.7	1.6	1.3	3.2	2.2	1.6	1.5
Other goods and services	5.2	8.8	5.1	4.2	4.5	3.3	1.5	2.5
Special indexes	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Energy	-3.4	-8.8	13.4	14.2	-13.0	10.7	6.9	16.6
Energy commodities	-6.9	-15.1	29.5	15.7	-24.5	23.7	6.9	26.7
Energy services	.2	-3.3	1.2	12.7	-1.5	.4	6.9	6.8
All items less energy	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.6	2.8	1.8	1.5	2.2
Food	1.5	2.3	1.9	2.8	2.8	1.5	3.6	2.7
All items less food and energy	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.6	2.7	1.9	1.1	2.2

CPI total 12.6 % (2000+ 2001+...2004)
 HSU total 9.4 % (same period)
 lost -3.2 % over period

Chart 3: HSU Salary Increases and Bonuses, FY2000/01 to present [data from Lecia Franklin, Controller]

	<u>Increase to Base</u>	<u>Bonus</u>
2000/2001	2.8%	-0-
2001/2002	2.6%	-0-
2002/2003	2% (in January)	-0-
2003/2004	-0-	1.5% (in April 2004 not added to base)
2004/2005	2%	-0-

Appendix V

Report from Procedures Committee Chair

Faculty hired specifically to teach 15 hours rather than 12 hours are not required to be a part of the committee process but they may participate if they wish. This is not stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Should the Handbook state this and include these persons on the ballot? With a notation about their load? Or not include them on the ballots?

Motion: Since the Procedures Committee has included 15-hour faculty members on past ballots of full-time faculty members, be it resolved that until changes are approved in the Faculty Handbook, 15-hour faculty members be included on ballots with the recognition that they are free to resign. **Motion passed with 17 yeas, 1 nay, and 2 abstentions.**

The relevant portion of the Faculty Handbook is:

3. Faculty Hearing Committee: Membership and Procedures, section b (pgs 34-5).

Respectfully submitted,
Marielle McFarland
Procedures Committee Chair

Appendix VI

Buildings and Grounds Committee report to the Faculty Senate,

During our last Buildings and Grounds meeting, the following items were discussed:

1. campus recycling.
2. overall appearance and improvement of the grounds, including painting of parking lots, rubbish and cigarette butt removal, and stopping vehicle traffic on lawns.
3. campus lighting. The minimum goal is to brighten some of the "dark" areas on the campus. Ultimately, an in-depth overhaul of the outdoor lighting might need to occur.
4. placement of a sidewalk along Richardson Street from 13th Street to 12th Street.
5. slowing traffic on 12th Street. A stop sign at 12th Street and Henderson Street and or a stop sign at 12th Street and Richardson Street would be desirable. The cross walk at 12th and Richardson also needs repainting.
6. placement of the ash cans on campus. Where should they be positioned?

Resolutions and answered questions.

1. Items one, three, four, and five from the above list have yet to be resolved. Our committee will continue to work on these items.

2. John Corley and I met and discussed the options for the removal and continued clean up of rubbish and cigarette butts on campus grounds. He told me that the custodians are responsible for clean up within 25 feet of campus buildings. Mr. Corley said that he would require the custodians to clean and maintain these areas. Alan Jester has also spoken with the custodians about clean up around campus buildings.

3. Mr. Corley also informed me that there is a period each day when the grounds crew is required to clean up rubbish on campus.

4. Mr. Corley also informed me that Physical Plant would hopefully be hiring two additional grounds crew people and two additional maintenance people.

5. I also discussed with Mr. Corley and David Epperhart the intermittent problem of employees of physical plant and computer services driving vehicles across lawn areas on the campus. Both Mr. Corley and Mr. Epperhart were aware of the problem, and Mr. Epperhart said that he would remind the employees of computer services about it. Apparently, some vehicle traffic on the lawn areas is necessary from time to time in order for Computer Services and Physical Plant to do their jobs properly. It was mentioned that if possible, vehicle traffic should be minimized when lawn areas are wet and ruts could easily be formed in these areas.

6. The faculty parking lot west of Evans Hall along 12th Street has been repainted.

7. It was the unanimous decision of the Buildings and Grounds Committee (of the members that were present) that the ash cans be moved 25 feet from the entrances and exits of campus buildings in order to comply with the Governor's new no smoking policy, which eliminates smoking within 25 feet of state buildings. Questions were raised as to whether or not additional ash cans would be required, and whether or not the ash cans should be covered to prevent filling with water during periods of precipitation.

8. The question was asked if there was anyone that periodically walks through the campus buildings to check on building upkeep, maintenance, and other problems. Mr. Corley informed me that there are custodial supervisors that are supposed to do this on a daily basis. I provided Mr. Corley and Alan Jester with a list of several generalized complaints about the state of various buildings on campus.

Mr. Jester stated that four custodial supervisors check the campus buildings daily. He also stated that any problems or concerns regarding custodial services should be directed to him. Mr. Jester also stated that each custodian is responsible for not only cleaning their individual area, but also for performing minor maintenance tasks, such as light bulb replacement, ceiling tile replacement, unclogging drains, etc. Any other maintenance needs that they cannot take care of personally should be reported to the maintenance office at Physical Plant.

Finally, on behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, I would like to sincerely thank Mr. Bobby Jones and Mr. John Corley for working closely with our committee on numerous occasions over the past couple of years in order to allow us to successfully accomplish many of our goals. I would also like to thank Mr. Alan Jester for his helpful comments regarding custodial services.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Serviss, Buildings and Grounds Committee Chair