

General Faculty Meeting November 19, 2014

A General Meeting of the Faculty was held on November 19, 2014 in the Dolan Science Center Auditorium and began at 2:04 pm. The following members of Faculty Council (FC) were in attendance: Roy Day (Chair), Barbara D'Ambrosia (Vice-Chair), Gerry Guest (Secretary), Ryan Allen, Scott Allen, Ruth Connell, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt, Tina Facca, Jean Feerick, Simon Fitzpatrick, Dwight Hahn, Simran Kahai, Dan Kilbride, Marc Kirschenbaum, Gloria Liu, Annie Moses, Mike Nichols, Alissa Nutting, David Shutkin, Elizabeth Stiles, Sheri Young, and Tom Zlatoper. The following member was absent: Linda Koch.

The exact attendance of the meeting was not taken but clearly exceeded a necessary quorum (40).

Minutes

I. Chair's Announcements

- A. Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting, October 22, 2014.
No corrections were offered; the minutes were taken as approved.
- B. The slides of the presentation at the November 12 Town Hall on Finance and Enrollment are posted on the JCU Blackboard course titled Faculty Business – Sensitive.
- C. Today's presentation from Richard Mausser is posted on the JCU Blackboard course titled Faculty Business – Sensitive.
- D. Today's presentation from Dan Kilbride will be posted on the JCU Blackboard course titled Faculty Business – Sensitive.
- E. Possible Special General Faculty Meeting: Wednesday, December 3 (to continue discussion of item V on today's agenda).
- F. Next Faculty Council meeting: Wednesday, December 10 (if necessary).
- G. The CAS Dean Search Committee has been formed and will be reporting to the Faculty at the January 28 General Faculty Meeting.
- H. Nominations for the Curtis Miles Award are now open. The call for nominations was distributed by email.
- I. A Search Committee for the BSOB Dean will be formed soon.

J. Faculty Council has formed an *ad hoc* committee on governance.

II. Annual Report to the Faculty by Richard Mausser, Vice-President for Finance, on the Financial State of the University.

In response to an anticipated question, Mausser declared that we are not going to declare financial exigency this year. He noted that JCU had had very clean audits (seven in all) over the past year.

Turning to his PowerPoint slides, Mausser discussed the following:

Operating Budget (Revenues). Income from student fees is up this year, but graduate tuition revenues are flat. Net room and board are up this year.

Operating Budget (Expenses). We are forecasting a \$650,000 deficit for this year. Compensation accounts for 65-70% of our expenses.

The Dashboard slide shown details aspects of our balance sheet, endowment, and key ratios (Department of Education Stability Ratio, Composite Financial Index).

The question-and-answer period then followed. Bob Kolesar noted that it would be useful to look at compensation percentages now that we have switched over to a new employee classification (Faculty and Staff vs. Faculty, Staff, and Administrators). Mariana Ortega asked what percentage of our expenses is given over to Academics and whether any money is going to new research initiatives. Mausser responded that the percentage of the budget given over to academics has remained the same over recent years. Marc Kirschenbaum asked if endowment income could be used for salary increases? Mausser noted that we currently spend about 5% of our endowment each year but that still leaves us with a budget deficit. Using endowment funds for salary increases would put us above 5%, an imprudent financial move. In response to a question from Jim Lissemore about a budget listing marked "Reserve for Capital Spending," Mausser noted that this line continues to be unfunded. The target number given in the PowerPoint was \$1,600,000, but Mausser noted that we are spending more than that per year on our IT infrastructure and on buildings. Mike Martin asked how it was that salary spending went from \$37 million (last year) to \$39 million (this year) when the faculty salary increase pool was only \$200,000 last year. Mausser noted that it also included new hires and staff raises. Marc Kirschenbaum asked for confirmation that four new hires alone accounted for an increase of \$900,000. Mausser confirmed this. Gloria Liu asked how accurate are our projected budget figures; Mausser replied that they are fairly close. Sheila McGinn asked for clarification about the Composite Financial Index; Mausser replied that being in the 5 to 7 range is typical. Sheri Young asked if Mausser might come back with more detail on some of today's questions. Roy Day asked why our CFI went from 6.6 to 4.0 (FY 11 to FY 12); Mausser replied that it was caused mostly by a drop in our endowment value.

III. Report to the Faculty by Dan Kilbride, Chair of the Faculty Council Committee on Finance, Faculty Compensation, and Work Related Policies.

Kilbride reported that the Committee has four main tasks for the year:

- Track compensation data across peer institutions
- Devise a salary proposal
- Deliberate on the Conflict of Interest policy (and perhaps come up with a proposal)
- Visit departments

The presentation was structured around PowerPoint slides, which included the following:

IPEDS data for 2013-14. Salaries were broken down by rank (JCU vs. comparators). There was some uncertainty as to why our Instructor salary was listed as averaging \$91,575.

IPEDS median ranks over time. Our Assistant Professor salaries are now at 108.8%. Sheila McGinn asked why median salaries were used here. There was some uncertainty about this, but Paul Shick noted that it is perhaps what we are given from IPEDS.

A graph showing FT faculty from 2004 to 2014 charted a decline over time. Jim Lissemore asked if that was true for our comparators as well.

Salary Proposal. The Committee is working on a salary proposal for this year. Other factors relating to compensation will be treated in subsequent years. They are developing a new list of comparator and aspirant institutions (and new criteria for determining them). In the past, we have used IPEDS and CUPA. The latter has about 300+ schools. The Committee would like to complete this proposal so that it might be voted on next semester. Such a proposal would represent an important initiative on which faculty and administration could work together.

Conflict of Interest Policy. Kilbride reported that there was some confusion as to what this policy covered. Was it strictly relating to financial issues? The Committee received a response from Jeanne Colleran and Jerry DeSanto that the answer is "no," the policy also relates to academic issues and work load.

The Committee held open hearings on the new policy and received emails. There was widespread offense taken with the policy's rollout and enforcement, which was perceived as a "Sign it or else" ultimatum. No faculty input was asked for in the development of the policy. No faculty input was stipulated in the policy for the resolution of conflicts.

Agenda for remainder of the year. The Committee plans for finish up meetings with academic departments, work on a salary proposal, work on the Conflict of Interest policy, and maintain a collaborative relationship with the administration.

In the ensuing discussion, Jeanne Colleran agreed that the initial Banner lock-out provision was offensive. But she also noted that we have a fiduciary obligation here. This policy will serve as a mechanism for disclosure. Bob Kolesar asserted that faculty do not have to sign this statement and that policies concerning the faculty should be discussed with the faculty. Colleran respectfully disagreed, noting that it was disingenuous to say that there are no ramifications for not disclosing a conflict of interest. Kolesar noted that faculty do not have to sign the agreement if there is no conflict of interest.

Roy Day showed a graph of full-time faculty vs full-time equivalent faculty from about 2000 to 2014 as well as a graph of the student/faculty ratio (also comparing FT vs. FTE). The implications of considering FT vs. FTE were noted.

IV. Proposal for Faculty to endorse the Fair Trade Resolution prepared by the Students for Social Justice

Sheila McGinn spoke in favor of the Resolution noting that it touches on social justice issues relevant to the mission of the university. Will such a change cost us money? Yes, but probably not a lot. Roy Day noted that there is already *ad hoc* support of fair trade on campus. We are being asked for an endorsement here. Barbara D'Ambrosia noted that an electronic vote (if held) would not take place until there were other ballot issues to consider. Rich Clark asked about the overall cost. Rich Mausser responded that we've already adopted some fair trade practices and could check with Aramark about the cost of any new ones. Follett is already doing this. Jim Lissemore moved that we send the resolution to the faculty for a vote of endorsement (seconded by McGinn). The motion passed.

V. Consideration of the Resolution to form a collaborative relationship between the Faculty and the University Strategic Planning proposed by the Science Chairs. This proposal was developed by the Science Chairs after their request for time at a Faculty Meeting to discuss the role of Academic Affairs in the University Strategic Planning process and the resources dedicated to Academic Affairs was approved by Council. The Science Chairs' letter is available on the JCU Blackboard course titled Faculty Business – Sensitive.

No time remained for this item. Sheila McGinn moved that a special meeting be held on December 3 to discuss this item (seconded by Bob Kolesar). The motion passed.

VI. New Business

VII. Adjourn (the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:17 pm)