General Faculty Meeting

Wednesday, May 6, 2015

Gonzaga Auditorium, 3:30-5 pm

Agenda

1. Announcements

2. Approval of the minutes of April 17, 2015 (attachment)

3. Pre-presentation of the CT State Conference-AAUP George E. Lang, Jr. Award

4. Presentation of FWC Service Awards

5. Update from the Faculty Salary Committee (materials will follow if available)

6. Address by President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J.

7. Adjournment

The meeting will be followed by the reception for retiring faculty in the Quick Center Lobby, 5:30-7:30
These minutes have not yet been approved by the General Faculty.

Proxies were held by:

- Sergio Adrada Rafael
- Chris Bernhardt
- Ryan Colwell
- David McFadden
- David McFadden
- Shawn Rafalski
- Susan Rakowitiz
- Aaron Van Dyke
- Jackie Vernarelli
- Jackie Vernarelli

for:

- Mary Ann Carolan
- Irene Mulvey
- Pat Calderwood
- Cecelia Bucki
- Elizabeth Hohl
- Nels Pearson
- Cheryl Tromley
- Matthew Kubasik
- Shannon Gerry
- Olivia Harriott

Prof. Terry-Ann Jones, Chair of the General Faculty, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

Announcements

Prof. Christine Earls offered the following remembrance of Prof. Frank Rice:

Dr. Frank J. Rice passed away on October 31, 2014.

I was honored when Brian Walker asked me to remember Dr. Frank Rice whom I had known for a long time. He came to the Biology Dept. in the 1960’s and many years later, I was a student in two of his classes here at Fairfield U. - Genetics and Embryology (I won’t give the years.....). He held his classes to a high standard and grades were not given – you earned them! – 3 tests, 10 questions each, all right or all wrong, no partial credit. The final exam was worth 50% of the course grade and consisted of 30 questions, all right or all wrong.....Needless to say, you dotted your I’s and crossed your T’s and double-checked your arithmetic. My famous error was going through a complex genetics problem and doing all the crosses correctly, but making an arithmetic error in reporting one percentage – minus 10 points! I was angry at the time, but it taught me to be exacting in all my work, all the time. For that I will always be grateful to Frank. A simple arithmetic error could kill someone if you are a health care worker, or, in my case, get me killed by a student if that arithmetic error results in a lower grade!

Frank was soft-spoken and steady-as-she-goes. When he spoke, you listened. I don’t think I ever saw him angry and certainly never heard him raise his voice. But he was an active participant in life! He served in the U.S. Army Air Corps during WW II, earned his Bachelor’s degree from Colorado A&M, Master’s degree from the University of Wyoming and Doctorate in Animal Breeding from the University of Missouri. In addition to teaching at Fairfield University for 35 years, he was very active in the community. He served on the Fairfield RTM, the Board of Directors of the greater Bridgeport Transit District, the State of CT 4-H Development Fund, was a scoutmaster, a 4th degree member of the Knights of Columbus, a member of the Fairfield Conservation and Inland Wetlands Commission, and was the author of a guide to Fairfield’s walking and hiking trails. He was honored with the Fairfielder of the Year award in 2009 and the 2009 Strong Community Builder Award from the Fairfield YMCA. In 2014, he was honored as Educator of the Year by the Centesimus Annus Pro Pontifice. A salt marsh trail in Fairfield was named in his honor in recognition for his work in achieving a wheelchair accessible trail in Fairfield. He and his wife Kathleen were also pretty darn good square dancers!!

In recent years, it seemed that at almost every event I attended in the area, I would see Frank. Well into his eighties, he was still very active and involved in the community. He would come to campus to attend the monthly biology lectures in memory of my Dad and when he couldn’t drive anymore, Brian Walker
or I would pick him up and he was the same mild-mannered yet energetic man I remember from my student days. I will miss seeing him on campus, at cultural events, or around town. And I will continue to double-check my arithmetic.

And now, let us remember Dr. Frank Rice with a moment of silence.

Prof. Laura McSweeney, on behalf of the President's Institutional Diversity Council, reminded faculty that they have received an invitation to take the campus climate survey. This survey is given every four years to faculty, students, and staff, and the input is valuable. If you haven't yet completed the survey, please do so by the end of the month.

Prof. Susan Rakowitz said that the Faculty Salary Committee asked her to remind those faculty enrolled in the HSA to complete the online health risk assessment and get a biometric screening or physical by 5/31 in order to get the University’s July contribution to their accounts. Human Resources will be sending out a reminder as well. She also noted the upcoming election meeting on 5/1 and final scheduled meeting of the year on 5/6, which will be followed by a reception in honor of the members of the faculty who are retiring this year.

Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka, on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said that it's that time of year again. The FWC is organizing in support of the Faculty Salary Committee. She urged faculty to stay for the gala reception after the meeting to discuss next steps.

Approval of minutes

Motion [Caster/McSweeney]: to approve the minutes of 11/21/14 as circulated. The motion passed unanimously.

Proposed Handbook amendment creating a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Presenting on behalf of the Academic Council, GFS Rakowitz explained that, based on the recommendation of a prior subcommittee considering non-tenure track (NTT) faculty issues, another subcommittee developed this proposal. It provides a role for NTT faculty in governance and a structure for considering formal policies regarding NTT faculty. As indicated in the packet, the Academic Council accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation, but the President disagreed with some of the wording. After several back and forths, the Council approved an amended version of the proposal, which the President agreed to support. She noted that the President does not have veto power over Handbook amendments as the Handbook is an agreement between the General Faculty and the Board of Trustees, but he is asked to express his agreement or disagreement with amendments approved by the Academic Council.

The floor was then opened for questions. Prof. Beth Boquet asked about the decision to include the SVPAA or designee on the committee. Prof. Rakowitz explained that the original proposal did not include an administrator. In the Council's initial discussion, someone, possibly the then SVPAA, suggested adding the position. As most, if not all, Handbook committees have an least one member from the administration, the Council thought the suggestion made sense.

Motion [McFadden/LeClair] 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 issues regarding non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties

i. To draft or review policies on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
ii. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
iii. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.
iv. To promote professional development of non-tenure track faculty.

Prof. Betsy Bowen spoke in favor of the motion. She said it was needed, would be welcomed, was useful, and was overdue.

Prof. Kathy Nantz made some comments on behalf of Prof. Liz Hohl who couldn't be at the meeting. They were both in favor of the motion. It is one of at least four initiatives since 1999 regarding non-tenure track faculty. It's designed to address faculty needs through the governance structure. Our current Faculty Handbook doesn't reflect the changed composition of the faculty. As non-tenure track faculty increase proportionately across the country, it's increasingly important to provide access to the governance structures.

Prof. Ron Salafia said that he was in favor of the motion but wondered if there were enough people present to vote. GFS Rakowitz said that only 65 were needed so we seemed to be fine.

The motion passed unanimously.

Proposed Handbook amendment deleting the University College Committee

Again presenting on behalf of the Academic Council, Prof. Rakowitz explained that when we closed University College three years ago, the Council charged the Committee on Committees to see what other changes needed to be made in the Handbook and Journal of Record in light of the closure. Some Handbook changes have already been made, and the Council just approved a set of changes to the Journal of Record. Eliminating this committee (which hasn't been staffed in three years) is the final step.

The floor was opened for questions. Prof. Ron Davidson said that he had heard rumors of reviving University College in light of which he wondered about delaying the elimination of this committee. Prof. Rakowitz said that University College was closed and couldn't just be reopened. If a proposal for a new school came forward, it would have to go through the entire governance process. As part of that process, faculty could consider whether a new Handbook committee made sense and what its structure and charge should be.

Motion [Boquet/Salafia]: amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by deleting the following entry and renumbering the committee that follows:

University College Committee

Membership

Six members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms as follows: three from the College of Arts and Sciences to include one each from the areas of Humanities, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering, Behavioral and Social Sciences; one from the School of Business; one from the School of Nursing; and one from the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions. The Dean of University College or the Dean's delegate shall be a voting member.

General Purpose

To act as a formal communications link between the faculty and the undergraduate and graduate components of University College on matters of educational and administrative policies.
Specific Duties

v. to study and make recommendations on academic policies for the undergraduate and graduate programs.

vi. to maintain liaison with the standing committees on Undergraduate Curriculum, Educational Planning and Student Life.

vii. to advise the Administration on policies.

The motion passed unanimously.

Informational presentation from the Associate Vice President of Marketing and Communications

Associate Vice President Jennifer Anderson noted that she has been in this office for seven months, happily back at Fairfield after her 1997 undergraduate English degree and her 2002 graduate degree from DSB. She then began going through the attached powerpoint presentation.

Part of her focus since arriving has been on personnel. The marketing team was established eight years ago but changes in digital marketing since then require new skill sets. She's made some changes in organizational structure and personnel to meet the new demands.

At the same time, the old processes and technology were not very efficient. She's moving toward automating some things and updating technology. For example, emails have been made mobile friendly, and we now have the ability to analyze and learn from responses to our marketing efforts on a regular basis.

She pointed out that she arrived to a vibrant university with lots of things going on. But our communication strategy needs work. Internally we need to streamline messages and channels, consolidate information in simple, easy to find locations, and reduce duplication. Externally we need to aim for an integrated approach and stop relying on press releases. Last year the office sent over 300 press releases; that leaves media outlets unable to distinguish what's more or less important.

We also now benchmark against other universities' websites and upgrade ours accordingly. For example, our new home page includes a "donate" button as all others do. Things on the website become more or less prominent as their relevance changes, and social media are all grouped together. There are also new opportunities to showcase thought leadership, in other words, to get top tier press outlets looking to expertise among Fairfield faculty.

Finally, we're attending to a much greater extent to social media- linkedin, facebook, twitter, instagram and snapchat. We're being more strategic and relevant regarding what gets posted. For example, event listings may not attract much attention, but accompanied by pictures of last year's event, they become more relevant. We can now track social activity, studying what kind of content will generate more interest and making year over year comparisons. Our biggest social media hit so far was last week's Mad Men shout out to Fairfield University.

There were no questions.

Faculty Salary Committee (FSC): Current proposals for the 2015-2016 MOU/BPO

Prof. Chris Bernhardt said that they would have hoped to have a Memo of Understanding (MOU) to present by now, but they are far from that point. Today they are just telling us what's happening. Before going through the attached presentation, he identified the committee members: Bryan Crandall, Bob Epstein, Sonya Huber and Irene Mulvey (Chair).

He began by reminding us of the Health Care Review Committee (HCRC) that was set up last year to look at health care cost increases and the looming "Cadillac tax". This year, the administration should have sent their proposals for health care changes to this committee, but they didn't.

At the beginning of February, the FSC made the following proposal to the administration: an increase of 2.5%, all to be distributed as standard merit; restoration of the university's retirement contribution to 10%; equalize chairs' stipends by increasing non-DSB stipends by $1000 (as the FSC thought had been agreed to in previous years); no changes to health insurance.
On February 25, the administration responded with their proposal: 1.5% salary increase, distributed partly as standard merit and partly as further merit, as per the formula in the Journal of Record; maintain the retirement contribution at 9%; no change to chairs' stipends; change health insurance by eliminating PPO plans and continuing only with HSA plans while increasing the deductible in the HSA by $500 for individuals and $1000 for families, with no concomitant increase in the University's subsidy to HSAs. The FSC initially thought this health care proposal was a bargaining ploy but now it seems to be their real goal.

Yesterday the administration revised the salary terms of their proposal. They offered to distribute a 1.5% increase in salary all as standard merit "in exchange for the faculty agreeing to create an appropriate faculty/administration committee to determine if there is a mutually agreeable post-tenure review system to replace the current merit pay system, with the goal of having a new system (if agreement can be reached) in place for 2016-17." Furthermore, instead of restoring the retirement contribution to 10%, they offered an additional 1% added to the base across the board before the 1.5% merit increase.

The FSC doesn't know what to make of these offers. We're not in a position to judge the health insurance proposal; that's why it should have gone to the HCRC. Eliminating PPO options also seems to violate the Faculty Handbook. If the administration continues to push this point, we will need to consult the FWC attorney.

At this point, Prof. Sonya Huber spoke a bit about HSAs. She explained that an HSA is an account you manage. Money is pulled pre-tax from your paycheck to fund the account and then you pay health care expenses from the account. After you meet the deductible, in-network expenses are covered at 100%. She said there's an assumption that HSAs make people better health care consumers, but it's not clear whether there's support for that claim.

The FSC is particularly concerned because: this change would represent a major reduction in health care choice; it's unclear what the savings from this change would be; the increase in the deductible would mean this is a loss in benefits. And we don't know what the impact would be on faculty members currently on a PPO. It's not clear why the HSA hasn't been attractive to these faculty. It may be because the out-of-network deductible ($6000 for family) is much higher than the in-network deductible. The FSC will be sending a detailed survey to faculty covered by the MOU, asking especially about use of out-of-network services.

Prof. Mark LeClair asked what percent of the total University budget health care expenditures constitute. Prof. Bernhardt said he didn't know. Prof. LeClair suggested that they ask.

Prof. Barbara Welles-Nystrom expressed concern for those over 66 because her understanding is that they're no longer eligible for HSAs. Prof. Bernhardt said they're eligible as long as they don't take Medicare. For those unable to enroll, the administration has offered HRAs (health reimbursement accounts). They're new and we don't know much about them. Prof. Epstein added that this was one of the first questions the FSC asked the administration and the administration seemed surprised to learn that not everyone was eligible for HSAs. Then they returned with information about Medicare and HRAs, but the FSC can't evaluate this information; that's why it needs to go to the HCRC. We set up membership for that committee in the Fall but the HCRC has been "underutilized" by the administration. This proposal hasn't gone to them in any way.

Prof. Boryczka asked about the administration's rationale for not restoring retirement to 10%. Prof. Epstein reminded the faculty that the staff's retirement contribution had been lowered to 8% a few years ago in response to a moment of crisis. In the same context, the faculty voluntarily gave up 1% in retirement and took zero raise while the staff got a 1% raise. This year the staff was returned to 9% retirement so all employees are at the same level again. We feel we're owed a 1% restoration as the staff received.

Prof. Boquet followed up on this question, noting that retirement contributions are deductible for employers so there's an incentive for them to contribute there rather than in salary on which they pay payroll taxes. Prof. Bernhardt agreed that it costs them more to put money in salary rather than retirement. But their priority seems to be to have everyone at 9%.

Prof. Alyson Martin asked what the university's contribution to HSAs would be if the deductible is raised. Prof. Bernhardt said that it would remain the same ($1000 for individuals and $2000 for families). Prof. Epstein noted that on the face of it this is not a very attractive offer.
Prof. Rachelle Brunn said that there's currently an incentive to not take the university's health insurance. Does that remain and/or get better in this proposal? Prof. Bernhardt said that the administration is not proposing to increase the incentive and has talked about eliminating it sometime in the future; they have made no long term commitment to it. Prof. Epstein questioned the administration's understanding of incentives given that instead of incentivizing people to move to the HSA, they're making it less attractive.

Prof. Rose Rodrigues said that she's on the budget committee this year. She thinks that the most recent data show medical expenses going down. Others on the budget committee didn't remember the data.

Prof. Joan Lee asked about the administration's ability to change this without our agreement. Prof. Huber pointed out that the plan referenced in the Handbook as a benchmark for our health care benefits is a previous version of a PPO. Prof. Epstein said that we need to reach agreement on an MOU. It's frustrating that we've been meeting regularly since September in hopes of avoiding this chaos at the end of the semester, yet the administration's first offer came at the end of February and they haven't varied much since then. What they've offered is radically different from what we've had previously yet we've had no time to evaluate it. The option we see is not to do anything we're not prepared to do.

Prof. Walter Hlawitschka, a member of the HCRC, said that for the last two years the cost of the PPO (judging by the premium) has been exactly the same as the cost of the HSA, so why change? Prof. Bernhardt said that Mercer is telling them to do it. Prof. Hlalwitschka continued that we've heard that the PPO is subsidizing the HSA. In the Fall, projections were that the budgeted amount for the HSA was 21.9% over actual expenditures, though that wasn't through the end of the year. The proposal at that time was to increase the amount charged for the HSA even though it was overbudgeted. He speculated that they might want to switch because they're overcharging us and we have no recourse. He asked what happens to money budgeted for health care and not spent there. Prof. Bernhardt said that it goes back into the general budget.

**Motion [Davidson/McFadden]: The General Faculty direct the faculty members on the Health Care Committee to study the changes to health insurance proposed by the administration to the Faculty Salary Committee on April 16, 2015 and prepare a written report to be sent to the FSC and the GF on the pros and cons of these changes and on the financial implications of these changes for the University and for employees.**

Prof. McFadden spoke in favor of the motion. He said it's clear from the discussion and presentation that this is political for the administration. This is about governance. We need an MOU.

Prof. Boquet spoke in favor. She said she was a member of the FSC when we began working with consultants to look into HSAs. At that time we had a benefits subcommittee that was instrumental in helping all of us- faculty and administration- to understand the issues and gather relevant information.

Prof. Boryczka also spoke in favor. She noted that the NEASC reaccreditation process will begin soon. It would be in the interests of the administration to support getting the HCRC going and working well together since transparency and shared governance were key issues in the last NEASC review.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

There was a long round of applause for the FSC.

**Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn [Epstein/Miecznikowski] was uncontested at 4:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Marketing & Communications

Jenn Anderson

Communication Strategy

- Internal
  - Streamline messages and channels
  - Consolidate in simple, easy-to-find locations
  - Reduce duplication
  - Fix backend rogue processes

- External
  - Integrated approach
  - Benchmark
  - Relevant and topical
  - Response driven
  - Demonstrate innovative, pedagogy & thought-leadership

Enhancing the Backend – Email Example

Images may not always appear
- Specific to the viewer’s email program due to settings, firewalls or filters
- Single image email sends
- Important Text and CTA buttons set as images

Streamline process, CTA-Goal Driven, Simple-Clean Design
- Design and copy written around the CTA; images for design value only
- Important dates and CTA’s will no longer be hidden due to the viewer’s email settings

A Vibrant University!

New Home Page & Social Hub

INSET:
- Social layout responding well with 69% of viewers scroll to the bottom
- Implementing 15% mapping to Home Page
- Stay On Topic (14%) top three clicked areas
- 36,649 users in week 1 with 711 clicks, 1.96% CTR
New Opportunity to Showcase Thought Leadership

- Increase content marketing capabilities to elevate brand perception of Fairfield
- Increase relevancy and generate more tier-A media hits

Social Media In Review

- Engage students, prospective students, alumni, parents and faculty/staff in what life at Fairfield is like across a variety of points in time

LinkedIn: 33,398
Facebook: 10,241
Twitter: 6,948
Instagram: 4,451
Snapchat: 300

Social Stags

- New social dashboard reports traditional activity as well as content reach
- Social is more viral than what meets the eye
- "Campaigns" and "people stories" tend to perform the best
- Event promotion is weakest content when not surrounded by personal touch
- Content is KEY! Send it our way.
Faculty Salary Committee

Presentation to the General Faculty
April 17, 2015

Health Care Review Committee

Membership
Two members of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) and two members of the faculty appointed by the FSC and up to three administrators appointed by the President.

Purpose
The purpose of this committee is to address on an ongoing basis the growth in the total cost of health care, which is of concern to both the faculty and the administration. Using all relevant and reasonably available data, including data on projected as well as actual health care costs in the aggregate, changing demographics, employee usage patterns and changes in stop-loss insurance cost, and with the help of the University’s consultant and other consultants as mutually agreed to and needed, the Committee is charged to:

1. Consider and make recommendations to the FSC and administration on ways to make plan participants more economically efficient users of health care.
2. Consider and make recommendations to the FSC and the administration on ways to reduce the increases to the cost of health care, and to monitor developments regarding the health care excise tax and make any recommendations deemed necessary and appropriate.
3. In any year when cost-shares of health care premiums increase at any rate, consider and make recommendations to the FSC and the administration as to the appropriateness of said increases.

FSC’s proposal 2/5/2015:

- Salary increase 2.5%, all distributed as standard merit
- Restore University’s contribution to faculty retirement to 10%
- Equalize chair stipends by having non-DSB chair stipends increase by $1,000
- No changes to health insurance

Administration’s proposal 2/25/2015:

- 1.5% salary pool – 0.975% for standard merit and 0.525% for further merit per the Journal of Record
- Maintain University’s contribution to retirement at 9%
- No change to chair stipend
- Health insurance changes (on next slide):

Health insurance changes:

- Eliminate all PPO plans
- Continue only the HSA plans
- Increase the deductible on the HSA plans by $500/$1,000 to $2,000/$4,000
- No increase in subsidy for HSA provided by the University (remains $1,000/$2,000)
Administration’s proposal 4/16/2015:
(changes from 2/25/15 shown in red)

- 1.5% salary pool - all as standard merit in exchange for the faculty agreeing to create an appropriate faculty/administration committee to determine if there is a mutually agreeable post-tenure review system to replace the current merit pay system, with the goal of having a new system (if agreement can be reached) in place for 2016-17.
- An additional salary increase of 1% (before standard merit is awarded) across-the-board as a percent of salary (not the mean).
- Maintain University’s contribution to retirement at 9%
- No change to chair stipend
- Health insurance changes (on next slide):

Administration’s proposal 4/16/2015:

Health insurance changes (same as on 2/25):

- Eliminate all PPO plans
- Continue only the HSA plans
- Increase the deductible on the HSA plans by $500/$1,000 to $2,000/$4,000
- No increase in subsidy for HSA provided by the University (remains $1,000/$2,000)

MOTION: The General Faculty direct the faculty members on the Health Care Committee to study the changes to health insurance proposed by the administration to the Faculty Salary Committee on April 16, 2015 and prepare a written report to be sent to the FSC and the GF on the pros and cons of these changes and on the financial implications of these changes for the University and for employees.