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Minutes of Meeting

Members Present: Professors Joe Dennin, David Downie, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, James He, Chris Huntley, Ginny Kelly, Alison Kris, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), L. Kraig Steffen, Stephanie Storms, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Deans Lynn Babington, Bruce Berdanier, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson

Invited Presenters: Elizabeth Hohl, Marti LoMonaco, Mike Andreychik, Tracy Immerso, James Simon

Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Chair Rafalski offered a round of thanks, especially to the Executive Secretary and the Secretary of the General Faculty.

In turn, Prof. Rakowitz congratulated the Chair for his excellent service to the Council.

Prof. Rafalski proposed reordering the agenda to take up item 4.g first since Prof. Elizabeth Hohl, a member of the reporting subcommittee, was in attendance. There were no objections to reordering the agenda.

4. g. Subcommittee to consider Faculty Handbook committee on NTT Faculty

Prof. Mulvey, chair of the subcommittee, thanked Prof. Hohl and the other members of the subcommittee for their great work on the subcommittee. She briefly reviewed the subcommittee’s three-page report, which had been included in the packet of materials, noting that the report included the subcommittee’s unanimous recommendation that a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty be established, along with its detailed rationale for this recommendation, and other matters that came up but were considered beyond the charge of the committee. The floor was opened up for questions.

Prof. Dennin asked about the committee’s view of how the elections for the non-tenure track faculty members would be conducted.

Prof. Mulvey responded that this item was deliberately left out of the proposal. The principle is that the contingent faculty representatives should be elected by the contingent faculty members and that this should be arranged by the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Hohl noted that once Human Resources comes up with list of potential adjunct representatives, several names could be forwarded and voted on. She further noted that it is important to routinize the establishment of the members.

Prof. Rakowitz praised the process as long overdue, but asked if the committee had considered eligibility limitations for the committee members.

Prof. Mulvey said the committee did not see a need for eligibility limitations, but she did note that the committee was concerned that contingent faculty members might need to be replaced (by our usual process) if they weren’t teaching at Fairfield for their entire terms.

Prof. Hohl added that the committee members hoped there would be a self-selection process.

Dean Crabtree responded that many of Handbook committees have ex officio members and asked if this option had been considered.

SVPAA Fitzgerald supported this suggestion, explaining that, though this option was not discussed within the committee, having a mix of full-time and part-time and administrators would be a good idea.
Prof. Thiel thought that item 2 under Specific Duties needed clarification. A contingent faculty member with a problem should go to their chair and then their Dean, but given the language under Item 2, a contingent faculty member might feel that it would be appropriate to take a personnel problem to this committee.

Prof. Mulvey explained that, under other matters, the committee members were considering setting up an ombudsperson for problems that might require independent mediation. They did not anticipate this subcommittee receiving individual or personnel complaints, and intended that the chair or dean should still be the first stop for a contingent faculty member with those kinds of concerns.

Prof. Mulvey recommended that we remove the word “concerns” to make it suggestions. Prof. Crabtree explained that it is a Dean’s responsibility to tell people where they need to turn to have an issue discussed. If the word “concerns” came out, it might imbue any issue with an affective dimension.

Chair Rafalski thanked Profs. Hohl and Mulvey for the report and opened the floor to entertain motions about the proposal.

**MOTION** (Mulvey/Fitzgerald): To recommend that the General Faculty amend the *Faculty Handbook* (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. **Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.**

   **Membership**
   Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

   **General Purpose**
   To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

   **Specific Duties**
   1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
   2. To receive concerns and suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
   3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
   4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
   5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

SVPAA Fitzgerald endorsed as a healthy suggestion the motion to include General Faculty members as well as part-time faculty members, who teach 40% of courses at the University. He offered an amendment to give the SVPAA or her designee voting privileges, since faculty and administrators often work together to solve problems and should have equal status. Although the SVPAA has veto power, he noted that it’s helpful to have an equal voice.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.** (Fitzgerald/Downie): To insert into the original motion “The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be a voting, *ex officio* member.”

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT.** (Mulvey/Dennin) To replace “a voting” with “an” in the motion to amend.
Prof. Steffen asked about the frequency of committees on which the SVPAA sits without voting power, since the person’s presence is designed to provide expertise.

Prof. Mulvey said that administrators being given voting privileges on committees has been haphazard and does not have any underlying principle about expertise.

Prof. Thiel spoke against amendment, since he agreed that an administrator should be allowed to vote. He noted that Deans should not have the opportunity to vote, since they and SVPAA would vote as a block. In this case, however, the administrator should have a vote.

Prof. Greenberg spoke in favor of the motion against allowing administrators to vote, pointing out that we have shared input, not shared governance. Giving the vote to administrators is not warranted. SVPAA Fitzgerald contended that faculty members make decisions about our most important issues. Prof. Greenberg referred the SVPAA to the Yeshiva case and Justice Brennan’s dissent, which points out that faculty are employees, whereas administrators in fact make more fundamental decisions about faculty welfare.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of not giving the administrator voting privileges. Since it is haphazard, we should probably remove the voting privilege for administrators.

MOTION (Thiel/Fitzgerald). To call the question.
MOTION PASSED

MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT PASSED: 12 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstaining

MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED). To insert into the original motion “The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member.”

In returning to the revised amendment, Prof. Mulvey explained that the Subcommittee had omitted putting an administrator on the committee, and was in favor of allowing the SVPAA or his/her designee to serve.

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Downie). To call the question.
MOTION PASSED

MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED) PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed and none abstaining.

Prof. Mulvey added that she would like to remove the words “concerns, and” from the revised motion to clarify what should be brought to the committee.

MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION. (Mulvey/Steffen) To remove the words “concerns and” from specific duties number 2.
MOTION PASSED 15 -1- 0

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the revised motion as an example why we need to review all the committee structures in Handbook Committees.

MOTION AS AMENDED: To recommend that the General Faculty amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Membership
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the
election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose
To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties
1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

7e. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees.

Prof. LoMonaco was invited to present for the discussion on the upcoming meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. She explained that, based on a previous arrangement with the SVPAA, the Conference Committee planned to have 45 minutes for their presentation.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said he did not recall promising that the Committee on Conference would have 45 minutes of the 90 minutes with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Prof. LoMonaco responded that they had talked about the need for sharing time and egalitarianism. How has the committee functioned in past? She noted that there were some years when the committee had the entire first hour and a half, but she claimed that the SVPAA explained that time was needed to present new initiatives to Board. We agreed that we would share that time. In October, the faculty had less than 10 minutes, hence our concern that we have appropriate time.

Prof. Mulvey noted that she had a concern to bring to the Committee on Conference. The Faculty Salary Committee is concerned that faculty positions are being misrepresented to the Board of Trustees. This concern is based on BOT minutes and notes which, as reported in The Mirror, are available online. As Faculty Salary Committee Chair, she spoke to the President about her concerns and he suggested that her concerns would best be put in writing.

Prof. Mulvey reported that some of the information conveyed by the administration to the Board was inaccurate, some was incomplete, and some seemed intended to pit the trustees against the faculty. The Faculty Salary Committee worked all year honestly and openly. We shared our positions with the administration in memos with detailed explanations; we tried to understand the administration’s positions in order to reach common ground. It is unfair to the FSC and by extension to the faculty for our positions to be so misrepresented. As examples, Prof. Mulvey noted that, according to the online Board documents, Executive VP Kevin Lawlor suggested the [FSC] would be “testing the resolve of the senior administration”, and in another meeting, that Lawlor “believes faculty will continue to test the senior administration over the coming weeks or months.” On March 10, Lawlor asserted that “the FSC continues their stance on resisting any healthcare plan design changes” when in reality FSC had written to Lawlor on March 7 reminding him that we had asked the General Faculty to approve and they had approved the creation of a permanent committee to address our shared goal of containing medical cost escalation and that we were prepared to convene this group immediately.

Prof. He inquired who wrote the report.
Prof. Mulvey noted that these reports are included in the Red Book provided to University trustees prior to each meeting.

Prof. LoMonaco noted that she was not surprised, since one of trustees seemed surprised to learn that faculty were concerned about something other than salary. She concluded that the meeting with the Board would be an important opportunity for faculty members to represent their views.

Prof. Greenberg concluded faculty members needed to realize that administrators would never present a disinterested voice to the Board of Trustees. For forty-five years, this has been an ongoing issue. We should also point out that decisions are being made that will impact us. Despite Dean Crabtree’s efforts to prioritize issues, he noted that Executive Vice President Lawlor would make the ultimate decision. Prof. Greenberg expressed concern that the Board of Trustees should be aware that non-academic administrators have ultimate authority about issues regarding the academic division.

Prof. Huntley noted that there was a faculty member who served on the Board of Trustees at the University of Virginia, where he attended, and he wondered whether there should be one faculty member who sits on our Board of Trustees. Then, we would be getting a copy of the Red Book and be more aware of these issues, especially if a person from FWC were to serve.

SVPAA Fitzgerald clarified that the Deans and SVPAA make decisions about hiring, and Vice President Lawlor has no input about academic decisions. On the other hand, he can authorize whether or not a position is filled. It’s important that we have a strong advocate for academic affairs in the SVPAA. SVPAA Fitzgerald explained that he used every meeting with the Committee on Conference to introduce and familiarize the Board with our quality faculty. Despite an adversarial relationship, faculty and administrators need a transparent process and mutual respect.

Motion (Mulvey/Greenberg): That the AC directs the Committee on Conference to:

1. Receive from the FSC a memo articulating their concerns about misrepresentation and present the matter to the Board.
2. Articulate to the Board that now is the time to have a faculty member on the Board.
3. Articulate to the Board that the EVP should not be having input into academic decisions (re having to sign off on the authorization to hire forms)

Prof. Dennin asked what would happen if Vice President Lawlor did not sign off on the authorization to hire. Doesn’t he ultimately have inappropriate influence on the academic division?

Prof. Mulvey said EVP Lawlor should not have undue influence in academic decisions.

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the motion, since there are larger institutions that have faculty members on the Board and the motion addresses the disconnect between faculty and the Board of Trustees. He noted that Fairfield’s existence depends on its academic reputation, but it is not clear that the Board of Trustees understands the essential importance of our academic reputation, nor do the business people on Board understand the problems inherent in single-year contracts.

Prof. Dennin noted that the University has witnessed a morale issue, and this motion may represent a way to move forward. Why not support our pedagogy and research more than previously?

MOTION PASSED 16 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstaining.

Prof. Dennin asked how many employees go to the Board of Trustee meetings, to which SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that Vice Presidents attend, followed by an Executive session without them.

Prof. Downie offered that there should be a common set of talking points among committees, where the central concern is the academic mission.

Chair Rafalski asked if there were further suggestion about ideas for the Conference Committee.

Prof. LoMonaco thanked the Council and added that she had a clear directive to bring to the full Conference Committee. Plans are to meet with the Board of Trustees on Thursday, June 5, 2014. Prof. LoMonaco asked SVPAA Fitzgerald if he had agenda items for that meeting, as the Committee on Conference would need the entire time.
SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the Executive Committee would be meeting to discuss budget, enhancement of revenues, and growing the graduate programs.

Chair Rafalski thanked Prof. LoMonaco for her report.

7.g. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA Form forms and re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations:

Chair welcomes Ms. Tracy Immerso, Prof. James Simon, and Prof. Mike Andreychik.

Prof. Andreychik discussed the conclusions that the FDEC came to about what to do with different forms. As Chair of FDEC, he supported moving to online evaluation forms as the most reasonable move. Since the major problem is response rates, the committee researched the issue and concluded that paper evaluations tend to have higher response rates. The committee also determined that where the forms are completed is more important than whether the evaluation is paper or online. Students write more if they are completing the forms in class. Since faculty members tend to be more comfortable with the paper form, the Committee felt people need to be educated about how to get higher response rates using electronic methods.

Ms. Immerso explained that there are significant costs associated with paper evaluation forms—namely, $19,000 for each round. Hiring a part time worker to prepare packets and distribute them costs $6,100, plus shipping and envelopes. One concern about online evaluation forms was whether the University computer network had appropriate bandwidth to allow students to respond at the same time. CIO Paige Francis contends we now have the technical ability. In addition, faculty can access results from online evaluations from my.fairfield and retrieve course objectives. Ms. Immerso added that the Committee has plans to discuss a URL for online evaluations that each faculty member could distribute on a single day. Online evaluations would reduce the costs associated with the labor, estimated at 670 work hours, required to process paper forms and result in easier administration and fewer mistakes.

Prof. Simon explained that he felt the need to have faculty benefit from the evaluation forms and analyze aggregate data for all departments. After attending an IDEA conference, he came to the same conclusion as his colleagues: online evaluation forms eliminate a delay of the response rate and guarantee faculty will receive results before the beginning of the term. There is currently a student who is under judicial review for tampering with the results, but these problems would be impossible if there were no yellow forms. In addition, the Dean’s Office has occasionally never received paper forms. Rather, he contended that the current method of omitting the yellow form in use for online courses should be applied for both online and traditional courses. According to IDEA studies, students will write more if narrative questions appear at end of the online form. He added that Prof. Bill Abbott has also endorsed the idea of online evaluations.

Chair Rafalski asked for questions.

Prof. Greenberg asked if all students would be required to have a laptop.

Prof. Simon responded that 98% of students have them, and others can borrow one. He suggested giving out evaluations on the second to last class, and shared his own method for discussing the development of the evaluation form at Kansas State University and reminding students about the need to have a voice in their own education.

Prof. Yarrington contended that some courses and areas are quite different – how can one customize the form? Also, what is the process by which adjunct forms are evaluated?

Prof. Andreychik explained that, although ownership of data is still under discussion, online forms would provide information needed for hiring more quickly.

Ms. Immerso noted that, while the IDEA form has standard questions that cannot be changed, faculty members can add questions to the end of standard form, an easier task using the online method.

Prof. Yarrington explained that students are advised not to answer questions if they do not pertain to the discipline.

Prof. Storms expressed concern about support for students, since not all students have a laptop. Although we have increased bandwidth, will we have necessary technical support?

Prof. Simon offered a suggestion of a trial period for two years.
Prof. Andreychik contended that although the Committee was in favor of online evaluations, they realized the need to work out the specifics next year.

Prof. Storms asked when they were considering beginning online evaluations.

Prof. Andreychik responded at the beginning of next year.

Prof. Downie asked if online evaluations would be done only in class or at other times.

Ms. Immerso explained that a URL could be given to students for a class period, or they could decide to complete the evaluation outside of class.

SVPAA Fitzgerald added that ITS has an office in the library with evening hours.

Prof. Dennin wondered if additional questions would need to be added every year.

Ms. Immerso responded that special questions needed to be added from a drop-down menu every year. Questions you add this year will be on the drop-down menu in case you want to add them again next year.

Prof. Downie asked how the cost for paper evaluation was arrived at, since the estimate seems low.

Ms. Immerso responded that there were administrative costs for each set of evaluations.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that their argument was compelling, but it appears to be based only on the URL method. There are other issues to consider.

Prof. Andreychik commented that we need specific implementation for the details, but we believe that the online option is preferential.

Chair Rafalski thanked the visitors for their report.

Prof. Mulvey asked if the Council should take action, or should simply think about contingency issues, since the decision would impact all faculty members.

Prof. Kelly was concerned about how to move forward on the issue.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Mulvey):** The Academic Council receives positively the report and awaits a further report for implementation.

Prof. Downie contended we should go farther and endorse the idea of moving online with the report.

**MOTION PASSED** 14 in favor, none opposed, three abstaining.

**MOTION (Mulvey/Storms):** To continue the use of qualitative evaluations.

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

4 d. Subcommittee on maternity leave policy (AC 5/8/13).

**MOTION (Mulvey/Kris):** The Council recommends that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [page 29] as shown [deletions in strikethrough and additions in bold and underlined]:

“Faculty members who take Fairfield University’s maternity leave whose maternity disability leave occurs at a time during the semester that would interfere significantly with their teaching (normally considered to be a period of absence of three or more weeks) shall be released by the appropriate Dean from teaching and service responsibilities for the semester. During that time, full pay and benefits will be continued. Faculty will be expected to work on projects and to fulfill other responsibilities congruent with their role at the expiration of their maternity leave.”

Prof. Rakowitz suggests that the maternity leave is described in BPO and we add service, since the proposal describes the leave in a way that was no longer accurate.
Prof. Mulvey also recommended adding a reference in the BPO to the page in the Faculty Handbook where the policy appears.

Dean Crabtree asks why there is a maternity leave in the fall semester if child is born in May, June, or July.

Prof. Downie wonders why we would try to have people plan their maternity leaves planned for fall semester.

Prof. Mulvey explains that the intention when the plan was put into place in 1990 was to give any new parent a semester off from teaching.

Prof. Dennin asks if release from service is mandatory or whether a person may opt to continue to serve. It is optional.

Prof. Kelly wondered about how administrative responsibilities might impact those faculty members on maternity leave under this proposal.

SVPAA Fitzgerald explained that a person with faculty status should be governed by the faculty benefits policy; therefore, administration would be considered service.

Prof. Harding asked if there is anything in the language that prevents a faculty member from seeking outside employment.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that the leave already exists, so we are only adding information on service.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reminded the Council that faculty must seek permission to apply to consult outside the University.

MOTION PASSED 16 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.

MOTION (Mulvey/Steffen): The Council recommends the FSC work with the administration to revise the language in the Benefits Plan Overview as follows:

Fairfield University complies with all Federal and Connecticut State laws relating to pregnancy and leaves of absence for childbirth and adoption. In lieu of unpaid time off for pregnancy and childbirth outlined in the Family and Medical Leave Acts (FMLA), a faculty member may elect to take one semester of paid maternity leave from teaching and service responsibilities.

The specific semester of teaching and service release must be determined in consultation with the faculty member’s department chair and dean. In accordance with the Pregnancy Disability Leave Act, the normal recovery period following vaginal childbirth is presumed to be six weeks; following a caesarean section the normal recovery period is presumed to be eight weeks. Outside of the recovery period, faculty on maternity leave will be expected to fulfill their other academic responsibilities, again as determined in consultation with the faculty member’s chair and dean.

MOTION PASSED 16 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.

Chair Rafalski indicates no petitions for immediate hearing.

7.c. Dissolution of the 3/2 program in Engineering.

Dean Berdanier explained that the program allowed students to do some work at other institutions and then receive B.A. in engineering at Fairfield. He noted that Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute has no current record of our program and added that none of their faculty wish to continue this work. Although Fairfield University has developed a program with Columbia, we only have three students who are left in program, and they will graduate in 2015. Dean Berdanier noted that, while he does not advocate having a B.A. in Engineering, there is an advantage to having a combined five-year B.S. and M.A. program. Both Columbia and Fairfield offer these programs, which provide distinct advantages over the B.A. program.

Chair Rafalski asks for questions.

Prof. Huntley wonders whether, if is it possible to go to Columbia for the degree, we will promote only our 5-year program or another.
Dean Berdanier explained that he encourages good students to do a five-year conventional or research-based M.A.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Dennin): to dissolve the 3-2 program in Engineering**
**MOTION PASSED:** 15 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.

### 7.d. Proposal for B.A. in Environmental Studies:

Prof. Downie briefly explained the proposal (included with the materials for the meeting) for a B.A. in Environmental Studies, a rigorous, 13 course major; students will also be required to fulfill the requirements for a minor or major in another department or interdisciplinary program.

Prof. Dennin asked about how the anticipated increase in applications for environmental science and environmental studies was estimated.

Prof. Downie responded that developing a major is a “masthead issue,” since half the Jesuit schools have Environmental Studies. He estimates a new major will bring in 10-15 students at most, rather than 40-50 additional students.

Prof. Thiel noted he was concerned about the science requirements and the regularity of these courses being offered.

Prof. Downie explained there is a need to depend on courses that we cannot control, but he noted that Chairs indicate that they will continue to be offered with regularity.

Prof. Harding asked about the role of the Associate Director and the reason to have a course release and stipend.

Prof. Downie explained that, although this has not been defined yet, we anticipate a stipend and potential course release. We are concerned that advising may be “tricky,” since there are 40-50 minors. We have had eight interdisciplinary majors and we already have some interest in the major.

**MOTION (Steffen/Greenberg): to approve proposed B.A. in Environmental Studies**

Prof. Petrino thanked Prof. Downie for the report. She noted that many of the English courses required for the major have already been and continue to be taught, since there has been growing interest in the program.

Prof. Steffen noted that this program has been incrementally put together and will continue to strengthen.

Prof. Dennin offered that it might be helpful to remove estimates about numbers of potential majors from the final proposal.

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.

### 7.f. Discussion of AC three-year Review of Merit Appeals Policy.

Since this item originally was to be reviewed in Fall 2013, Prof. Rakowitz explained that the Executive Committee recommended changing the pending item to an AC full review of merit appeals policy *once one or more appeals have been adjudicated*. There were no questions.

### 7.h. JOR language from FSC regarding standard merit.

Although we have a JOR policy about how merit funds would be distributed, the writers of the merit review committee did not consider how the process would unfold. They did not anticipate that salaries would be flat for a number of years, followed by a year of extraordinary merit.

The proposed change in JOR language would ensure that standard merit increases keep pace with the actual cost of living (more than .7% above cost of living increase). Only in that case would distribution of extraordinary merit be considered.

Chair Rafalski asks for questions.

**MOTION (Mulvey/Greenberg): to recommend the AC make the following changes to the Journal of Record entry on Merit Pay:**
Current Language.

Distribution of Funds

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool. Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater.

Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

Proposed Language with changes shown.

Distribution of Funds

If, in any year, (1) if the percent increase in the salary pool is at or below the percent increase in the cost of living (CPI-U) plus 0.7, the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit, then the average over the last five years of the difference in the increase in salary pool over the increase in CPI-U is calculated. If the average is not more than 0.5, then the entire increase in the pool for that year will go to Standard Merit. If this average is more than 0.5, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. The pool for Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be the remaining funds in the pool. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

Prof. Thiel spoke in favor of the motion. The proposed change extends the spirit of the agreement on merit reached between the faculty and administration in the governance discussions several years ago.

Prof. Dennin asked if the SVPAA is in agreement with the proposed change.

Prof. Mulvey noted that he has already said he approved this idea.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.

Prof. Dennin noted that, given how “successful” merit has been, we should suggest that a subcommittee consider doing away with merit altogether or develop a more realistic system. Perhaps a bonus system might be appropriate, given that there has been no merit in many years.

Prof. Steffen offered an acclamation for Chair Rafalski’s work this semester! He made a motion to adjourn that was seconded and passed without objection.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth Petrino