

General Faculty Meeting

April 22, 2015

A General Meeting of the Faculty was held on April 22, 2015 in the Dolan Science Center Auditorium and began at 2:05 pm.

The following Faculty Council members were in attendance: Roy Day (Chair), Barbara D'Ambrosia (Vice Chair), Gerry Guest (Secretary), Scott Allen, Paul Challen, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt, Tina Facca, Jean Feerick, Simon Fitzpatrick, Dwight Hahn, Simran Kahai, Dan Kilbride, Linda Koch, Cindy Lenox, Gloria Liu, Annie Moses, Mike Nichols, David Shutkin, Elizabeth Stiles, Sheri Young, and Tom Zlatoper.

The following Faculty Council members were absent: Ryan Allen and Alissa Nutting.

The exact attendance of the meeting was not taken but clearly exceeded the necessary quorum of 41.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance via email.

Minutes

I. Chair's Announcements

- A. Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting on March 25, 2015. No corrections were offered and the minutes were taken as approved.
- B. Information Technology Survey. You have received emails about this; please try to complete it before it closes this week. A high response from faculty will be helpful in planning.
- C. Rich Mausser will be here later in the meeting to discuss the fact that several faculty members have had fraudulent tax returns filed in their names.
- D. This is the last Faculty Meeting of this academic year. Faculty Council will meet in early May to elect Council officers.

II. Items for Business

- A. Election Committee: Final call for nominations (David Shutkin). Some vacancies remain on the slate. Per a suggestion from Roy Day, nominations will close on April 23 at 5 pm and the election will follow.
- B. Proposals from CAP to be sent for a faculty vote (Mike Nichols). Nichols thanked members of the Committee for their service.

a) Proposal to Continue Cohort Advising. Jim Lissemore moved that the proposal be sent to the faculty for a vote with the qualification that the program be approved for the next two years (seconded Elizabeth Stiles). In the ensuing discussion Lissemore noted that he likes the model, although it is a lot of work and it needs to be applied consistently; more development and useful data is needed. It is for this reason that he moves that we re-examine the program in two years. Brent Brossmann asked whether enough faculty were involved during the second year and whether the model is sustainable. Maryclaire Moroney replied that we have just had two large classes of freshmen – nearly 800 each year – and that faculty advising cohorts ranged largely in size (some advisors in business and the sciences had over 20 new students). On the advising website, there is now an 80+ page advising guide with the how-to's of advising. Mike Setter commented that the new model makes it easier for getting to know one's advisees. Dan Kilbride noted that he had advisees interested in business in his cohort and that he felt comfortable in advising them. Moroney noted that more resources are being developed. With the discussion ended, the motion passed by an overwhelming majority. Nichols noted that if the motion passes in two years the program would come back to CAP.

b) Proposal for Revisions to the Original Core Document. At the last Faculty Council meeting, it was decided that the changes labeled I and II in the proposal do not require a vote. Categories III through V do require a vote. Brent Brossmann moved that sections III to V be sent to the faculty for a vote (seconded Dianna Taylor). There was no discussion and the motion passed overwhelmingly.

c) Proposal to establish a minor in Humanitarian Action and Technology. Dan Kilbride moved that the proposal be sent to the faculty to a vote (seconded Peter Kvidera). There was no discussion and the motion passed overwhelmingly.

C. Report of the Compensation Committee (Dan Kilbride). Note: Kilbride's PowerPoint presentation is on the faculty council website under Reports.

Kilbride began his report by noting that there are vacancies on the Committee for next year and urged people to run. He thanked the Committee for their work and also thanked Jerry De Santo, Rich Mausser, Jeanne Colleran, Brian Williams, Jim Krukones, and Kathleen Lis Dean (as well as her graduate assistant).

The Committee spent its time this year developing a salary proposal, studying the Conflict of Interest policy, and meeting with departments (as far as time allowed).

The salary proposal is not yet done and will consist of a new comparator group as well as salary benchmarks.

IPEDs data shows that we have fallen below average in some ranks (professor, associate professor). The comparator numbers used here are medians of averages. There was some discussion concerning an instructor whose salary is listed as \$91K.

CUPA data also shows some erosion in salaries over the past three years. Mindy Peden noted that our salary pool is the problem here; how do we get more control over that pool? Kilbride responded that net tuition revenues are the chief indicator here and our comparators are doing better. We also, however, need to press the administration on this issue. Brent Brossmann asked if we can calculate in dollars how far we are below the benchmarks when we look at this erosion. Jim Krukones responded yes.

Using CUPA data, we would currently need \$878K to reach the 50th percentile for average departmental salaries (or \$355K to reach the 40th percentile; \$1.35 million for the 60th percentile).

Turning to the salary proposal being formulated, Kilbride noted that we currently use two comparator groups for salaries (CUPA, IPEDS) and that they are used unsystematically. The Committee is working on devising a small peer group and an aspirant group. A larger group is being developed as well (peers, aspirants, competitors) in order to calculate disciplinary benchmarks. Kilbride noted that Rich Mausser would prefer a small comparator group of similar schools. In the Fall semester, the Committee hopes to present the small peer-aspirant group for open hearings.

In the ensuing discussion, Mindy Peden asked whether we should resist the notion that certain disciplines should earn more. Paul Lauritzen asked if there a commitment from the President or Provost to accept the committee's proposal if approved by a faculty vote. Kilbride responded no.

Dianna Taylor noted that it was important to have AACSB accredited schools in the comparator group. Kilbride responded that this is being taken into account.

III. New Business – none.

IV. Adjourn – the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerry Guest
Faculty Council Secretary