Professor Larry Miners, the Chair of the General Faculty, called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

1. **Announcements.**

   Prof. Miners announced the Faculty Recognition Reception immediately following this meeting in the DSB Dining Room and encouraged all faculty to attend.

   Professor Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty, announced upcoming meetings and events:
   - Friday, May 7, GF Meeting for Handbook Committee Reports and Elections in DSB 110AB from 10:00AM until noon,
   - Wednesday, May 12, GF Meeting for the annual address by the President in the SON auditorium from 4:30 to 5:30,
   - Wednesday, May 12, Faculty Reception for Retiring Faculty at 5:30 in the lobby of the Quick Center from 5:30 to 7:30.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on March 19, 2010**

   It was noted that the date on the draft minutes needed to be corrected to read March 19, 2010.

   **MOTION [Caster/Scheraga]:** to approve the minutes of the General Faculty meeting of 3/19/2010.

   **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

3. **Consideration of a 2010-2011 Memo of Understanding**

   Prof. Miners announced that we would have a report from the Faculty Salary Committee. Following the report, the floor would be opened up for informational questions and, after all informational questions had been asked, motions would be in order.

   Professor Susan Rakowitz, Chair of the Salary Committee, made the report, first providing these updates to the Salary Committee report from the last meeting.
   - Some dental coverage claims had been misadministered and if you think you overpaid for dental coverage, contact HR.
   - The administration would like to buy more faculty condos; the Board of Trustees wants more information before moving forward on this and discussions are ongoing.
Last meeting, the Salary Committee was asked how far an individual receiving only standard merit would have fallen below CPI since the inception of merit pay. In the eight years since merit pay started, the standard merit increase has been over CPI only once; the total increase has been over CPI only three times.

In the recent issue of Academe, containing the annual salary survey data, the data for Fairfield is not right. The error was due to the fact that we got a salary increase mid-year (in January) and Director of Institutional Research did not know about the increase since payroll records were coding the mid-year salary increase differently. As a result, the salary and compensation data we had sent to AAUP had to be adjusted. As soon as we caught the error, we sent a corrected report to AAUP. With the corrected data, Professors are just at the 95th percentile for 2009-2010, Associates are over the 95th percentile, and Assistant Professors will each receive $276 in order for the administration to keep its commitment to the 95th percentile for 2009-2010.

Regarding the 2010-2011 Memo of Understanding, included with the materials for today’s meeting, the key points are the 1.5% increase for standard merit and the increase of $750 for faculty who switched to health care cost-sharing in 2010. In item K., stipends for chairing a department have been added to the MOU.

The floor was opened up for questions.

Prof. Bill Abbott asked for clarification: if between 2002 and 2010, the increase for standard merit was above the increase in CPI only once, then is it true that an individual receiving standard merit would have lost buying power, in real paycheck dollars?

Prof. Rakowitz: Absolutely.

Dean Robbin Crabtree asked Prof. Rakowitz if she could contextualize her response to Prof. Abbott.

Prof. Rakowitz said that the administration reminds us that although the salary increase is below CPI, the total compensation increase is over CPI. The Salary Committee does not think either is a truly fair comparison.

Professor Joe Dennin, a member of the Salary Committee, also indicated that neither comparison is completely appropriate. In the five years preceding merit pay, the across-the-board salary increase was always over CPI. In the eight years since merit pay, standard merit has been over the CPI only once.

Professor Michael Tucker asked if, during the discussions, there was recognition of the debate we had over the imposition of merit pay. That merit pay was imposed on the faculty and the result has been very little merit pay over CPI. Was there recognition of that in your discussions?

Professor David Crawford, a member of the Salary Committee, said that they pointed that out and although the administration doesn’t say it was a total screw-up, we are living with it.

Professor Steve Bayne referred to the excerpt of the MOU on page 17 of the packet. Are you asking us to approve a contract without knowing in the contract how much we are going to be paying for health care?

Prof. Rakowitz: Yes. We know that we will pay less than 10% of the total cost and that the increase must be less than 6%. At this point, we do not know what the numbers in the table will be, but we know that they will be bounded.

Prof. Bayne followed up: If we approve this MOU, what incentive is there for the administration to raise the health care costs by anything less than 6%?

Prof. Rakowitz: We will be discussing this matter this summer.

Professor Joy Gordon said she is really uncomfortable approving a contract without all the numbers plugged in. Couldn’t we bifurcate this? Postpone agreement on parts of the MOU until
more information is available? She has concerns agreeing to a 6% ceiling, comparing it to signing a blank check.

Prof. Rakowitz said the 6% ceiling makes it not a blank check. The Salary Committee is insisting on a process to determine what the increase will be.

Prof. Carl Scheraga asked to give some context to Prof. Rakowitz’s response. In the Budget Committee, the amount they are using for the health care cost increase is 9% and so the administration picks up the 3%.

Dean Beth Boquet said that co-pays holding steady is another important piece of health care costs to keep in mind. Prof. Rakowitz said that co-pays cannot increase without discussion.

Professor Christine Siegel said that based on Prof. Scheraga’s comments, it is clearly safe to assume that the increase will be the maximum allowable of 6%.

Professor Walter Hlawitschka asked the following: Is it the case that we don’t know what our cost-share will be because those figures are determined by our usage this year?

Prof. Rakowitz: Yes.

Prof. Hlawitschka: If we don’t know what the costs were this year, how did we report it to AAUP? If we find our costs are higher or lower, will we send a revised report to AAUP?

Prof. Rakowitz: We know what the premiums are and that is the data that goes to AAUP.

Prof. Michael Tucker asked if the terms of the Health Savings Account would carry forward for the next three years. Prof. Rakowitz: Yes.

Prof. Rakowitz said that one of the administration’s items for next year is to look at ways we can reduce costs without impairing coverage; money saved by reducing costs in this way would go back into salaries.

Prof. David Crawford said that HR Director Mark Guglielmoni informs the Salary Committee that other places force your spouse to take other health care coverage if they have it. We are self-insured and we need a hard conversation about what we want to cover. Any money we take off our health care costs presumably can come back in terms of other compensation.

Professor Phil Greiner pointed out that the bigger the pool, the bigger the spread of risk and so kicking people off of our plan may be a bad idea.

Professor Dawn Massy asked two questions. (1) Could next year’s committee consider a menu approach? This could be cost effective for the University. (2) Re MOU Item K, will chair stipends currently over $5500 be reduced?

Prof. Rakowitz: The Senior VP for Academic Affairs will maintain DSB stipends at their current level. The intent is to eventually bring all stipends to the higher amount.

**MOTION [Scheraga/Greiner]:** to accept the 2010-2011 Memo of Understanding as presented.

Prof. Mulvey expressed reluctance to accept a contract without all the numbers filled in, as Prof. Bayne had pointed re page 17 of the packet. While she did not want to speak against the motion, she suggested that following the vote on this motion, the General Faculty might consider another motion to say that, in the future, the General Faculty will not approve a contract unless all the numbers are filled in.

**MOTION PASSED:** 83 in favor, 6 opposed, 10 abstaining (83-6-10).
MOTION [Bucki/McFadden]: the General Faculty recommends that in future years, MOUs are not voted on until all numbers are in place.

Prof. Rona Preli, a member of the Salary Committee, spoke in favor of the motion. She said that, since it’s the voice of the faculty speaking, it strengthens the Salary Committee’s position to get a mechanism in place to deal with this issue in the future.

Prof. Tucker said it would seem to be a simple thing to extrapolate from the data. Surely Anthem has someone who can do this.

Prof. Betsy Bowen expressed reservations about the motion. There would be no incentive for the administration to predict anything less than 6% and we would lock ourselves into that higher estimate. Here, there is a chance we might get less than a 6% increase.

Prof. Massey pointed out that medical expenses are based on the calendar year. How is it that we don’t know medical costs until the summer? Prof. Dennin said the estimate is based on expenditures through July. Prof. Rakowitz added that to set the premiums for 2011, they use numbers based on January 2010 through July 2010.

Professor Mousumi Bhattacharya said that health care increases have almost always been more than 6%. It is extremely unlikely that health care cost increases will be less than 6%. How valid is the concern that we are locking ourselves into a higher increase?

Prof. Crawford pointed out that the real fear is what happens when the 6% cap is gone? Then the increase is wide open and that is a very serious issue. We have next year to resolve this and it is the major thing on the Salary Committee’s agenda to resolve this.

Senior VP for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald said that the national average for health care cost increases this year is 12%. Fairfield is using the figure of 9% and being prudent. Everything should be on the table next year. We need to get a handle on health care – spend less but not deny anyone the care they need.

MOTION [Bucki/McFadden]: the General Faculty recommends that in future years, MOUs are not voted on until all numbers are in place.

MOTION FAILED: 29 in favor, 41 opposed, 12 abstaining (29-41-12).

Professor Kathy Nantz expressed thanks, on behalf of the General Faculty, to the Salary Committee for many, many meetings under difficult circumstances. Her comments were followed by applause.

4. Adjournment.

A MOTION to adjourn was made, seconded and PASSED without objection.

The meeting adjourned and was followed by a reception hosted by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for the presentation of SVPAA Faculty Recognition Awards in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty