General Faculty Meeting

Friday September 18, 2015

Gonzaga Auditorium, 3:30-5 pm

Agenda

1. Announcements

2. Approval of the minutes of
   a. 5/1/15 (attachment, pages 2-4)
   b. 5/6/14 (attachment, pages 5-17)
   c. 5/27/15 (attachment, pages 18-32)
   d. 9/2/15 (attachment, pages 33-38)

3. Introduction of New Faculty

4. Remarks by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

5. Adjournment

   The meeting will be followed by a lovely reception

   in the Kelley Center

   hosted by Provost and SVPAA Babington

   to welcome our new colleagues and toast the new academic year
Fairfield University
General Faculty Meeting
May 1, 2015
Draft Minutes of Meeting

These minutes have not yet been approved by the General Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxies were held by:</th>
<th>for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Abbott</td>
<td>Giovanni Ruffini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Adair</td>
<td>Liz Hohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Adair</td>
<td>Gavriel Rosenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Adrada Rafael</td>
<td>Eileen Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Adrada Rafael</td>
<td>Javier Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ania Aksan</td>
<td>Tom Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sila Alan</td>
<td>Greg Koutmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covadonga Arango-Martín</td>
<td>Imara Liz Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covadonga Arango-Martín</td>
<td>Laurie Lomask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Babington</td>
<td>Christine Siegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Babington</td>
<td>Mary Frances Malone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bloch</td>
<td>Michael Coyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Boryczka</td>
<td>Emily Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Boryczka</td>
<td>David Downie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Campbell</td>
<td>Belinha De Abreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Campbell</td>
<td>David Zera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Carolan</td>
<td>Zoe Erotopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Caster</td>
<td>Ahmed Ebrahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Ben Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Gerard</td>
<td>Carole Pomarico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Gerry</td>
<td>Shelley Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Gill Lopez</td>
<td>Emily Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Grossman</td>
<td>Nancy Manister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Grossman</td>
<td>Eileen O'Shea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keenan</td>
<td>Nancy Dallavalle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Klug</td>
<td>Tod Osier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kris</td>
<td>Suzanne Chaplik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Lane</td>
<td>William Vasquez Mazariegos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Lee</td>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lerner</td>
<td>Lydia Willsky-Ciolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ligas</td>
<td>Lisa Mainiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McDonald</td>
<td>Rajasree Rajamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McDonald</td>
<td>Michael Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McFadden</td>
<td>Cecelia Bucki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miecznikowski</td>
<td>Matt Kubasik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miecznikowski</td>
<td>Eileen Reilly-Wiedow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Peduti, S.J.</td>
<td>Frank Hannafey, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>Faith-Anne Dohm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>Erica Hartwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Rafalski</td>
<td>Nels Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Don Greenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Robert</td>
<td>Diana Hulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Robert</td>
<td>Paul Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Simon</td>
<td>Michael White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Simon</td>
<td>Gita Rajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Staecker</td>
<td>Janet Striuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thiel</td>
<td>Ellen Umansky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prof. Terry-Ann Jones, Chair of the General Faculty, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

1. **Announcements**

Prof. Susan Rakowitz thanked the FWC for the gala breakfast that preceded the meeting. She then explained the procedures—each election would be open to nominations from the floor in addition to the nominees on the distributed ballot. Following each election, the outgoing chair would offer a brief summary of the committee's annual report and be open to taking a few questions.

2. **Committee annual reports and elections**

Annual reports and committee minutes are posted at the General Faculty website: [http://faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/](http://faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/)

Election results are as follows:

**Academic Council**
- CAS/SOE: Patricia Behre, Beth Boquet, David Downie, Jen Klug, Phil Lane, Kraig Steffen, Joan Weiss
- SON: Alison Kris
- DSB: John McDermott

**Secretary of the General Faculty:** Susan Rakowitz

**Committee on Committees:** Cathy Giapponi, Marcie Patton

**Rank and Tenure:** Kathy Nantz, Joan Weiss

**Research Committee:** Mike Andreychik, Gisela Gil-Egui

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
- CAS/SOE: Johanna Garvey, David Lerner, Kraig Steffen
- DSB: Michael McDonald, Vishnu Vinekar

**Admissions and Scholarships Committee:** Rachelle Brunn

**Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees:** Carl Scheraga, Stephanie Storms

**Student Life Committee:** Jennifer Adair, Rachelle Brunn

**Library Committee**
- Natural Science/Math/SOE: Catherine Andersen
- GSEAP: Alyson Martin

**Public Lectures and Events Committee:** Jennifer Adair, Sergio Adrada Rafael

**Athletics Committee:** Sila Alan, Scott Hiller
Faculty Committee on Sustainability
    Math/Natural Science/SOE: Shanon Reckinger
    Behavioral and Social Sciences/DSB: Sila Alan

University Advancement Committee
    DSB: Rebecca Bloch
    GSEAP/SOE/SON: Paula Gill Lopez

Educational Planning Committee
    GSEAP: Anne Campbell
    Behavioral and Social Sciences: Phil Lane
    At large: Lucrecia Garcia-Iommi

Faculty Salary Committee: Bryan Crandall, Mark Demers

Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee: Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Kris Sealey

Educational Technologies Committee
    DSB: Rebecca Bloch
    Natural Science/Math/SOE: Angela Biselli

Budget Committee: Gary Weddle

University Merit Appeals Committee: David Schmidt, Kate Wheeler

3.  Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:13

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
These minutes have not yet been approved by the General Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxies were held by:</th>
<th>Proxies were held for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keenan</td>
<td>Paul Lakeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Patton</td>
<td>Lucrecia Garcia-Iommi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Patton</td>
<td>Kevin Cassidy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prof. Terry-Ann Jones, Chair of the General Faculty, called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

**Announcements**

GFS Susan Rakowitz made several announcements. 1) She reminded the faculty of the reception for retiring faculty taking place at the Quick Center at 5:30. 2) She said that the Salary Committee, as would be explained more fully later in the agenda, had asked for a General Faculty meeting on May 27. Faculty should save the date and keep an eye out for an email with further details. 3) She said that Prof. Jones was going to be away on the 27th, so this would be her last meeting as chair. Prof. Rakowitz thanked Prof. Jones for her service this year and the faculty joined in an appreciative round of applause. 4) Finally Prof. Rakowitz said she had received some questions about her reordering of the agenda in response to President von Arx’s request. She explained that her objection had been purely procedural; had the President contacted her prior to the publication of the agenda with his request to speak early, she would have acceded in deference to the presidency. Her objection was to changing the agenda after it had been distributed, but she ultimately made the judgment that it was most important for the faculty to have an opportunity to listen to and question the President. She hoped that the faculty would move forward, rather than getting caught up in a Talmudic debate over this procedural issue.

Motion[Patton/Boryczka]: to return to the agenda as originally published.

Prof. John Thiel spoke against the motion. He said he supported the Faculty Secretary’s judgment. Prof. Irene Mulvey urged the body not to discuss the motion but rather to move quickly to a vote. Prof. David McFadden said he supported Profs. Thiel and Rakowitz. He said that the President deserves this courtesy and we need to ask him questions. Prof. Marcie Patton spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the President would still have the opportunity to speak if we returned to the original agenda.

The motion failed.

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

Prof. Jones introduced President von Arx, who offered the following remarks:

Good afternoon and thank you all for being here today.

I’d like to start this afternoon by offering my thanks and congratulations to those faculty who will be retiring at the end of the semester — Professors Peter Spoerri, Donald Greenberg, John McCarthy, Jim Long and Wendy Kohli.

On behalf of the entire Fairfield University community I want to offer our thanks for your contribution to the success of this institution, and for all of the students that you have inspired by your work and example. We thank you for your contribution to your disciplines, and for your membership in our community. Please join me in honoring our colleagues.

As we come to the end of another academic year I’d like to offer my thanks to all of our Faculty members for your excellent work.
We pride ourselves on being an institution that seeks and retains highly skilled scholars who love to teach. The result is that we continue to excel as an institution where our faculty make significant contributions to their disciplines, while promoting an environment that supports transformative relationships between our students and their teachers.

You know better than I how influential you are in the lives of your students — not only through your teaching, but also through your example. Our graduates are confident men and women who feel prepared for the future — largely thanks to the formation they have received from all of you while they have been with us.

As much as we all know that college rankings are a mixed blessing we also know that they are a reality and that they have an influence on our students, families and peers. So we can be grateful that Fairfield continues to be highly ranked and well regarded.

Once again this year that we are highly ranked — third — in the list of master’s degree granting colleges in the Northeast by U.S. News and World Report, and we were particularly singled out for our commitment to undergraduate teaching and for our high freshmen retention rate.

The graduate programs of Fairfield University’s School of Nursing was also ranked among the best in the nation by U.S. News & World Report, while Meredith Wallace Kazer, dean of the School of Nursing, was recently named her one of the most influential deans of nursing in the United States by Mometrix, a testing agency.

Fairfield University's Charles F. Dolan School of Business was recognized as among the best undergraduate business schools in the United States, according to Bloomberg Businessweek, and LinkedIn in named The Dolan School of Business one of the country’s best schools for accounting professionals — these among a number of other high national rankings for Dolan.

Fairfield University student-athletes achieved one of the highest graduation rates in the nation this year. We achieved a 96 percent graduation rate among student-athletes who began their freshman year in 2007 according to the NCCA. Fairfield was one of 24 Division I schools to score that high — which is a great tribute to the commitment of our faculty and the integrity of our University as a whole.

We also continue to excel as a center for research and scholarship — and in the myriad ways that we contribute to the quality of life, and the promotion of justice, in the broader community as well as within our University community.

Faculty and students in the School of Engineering have opened up a new chapter of Engineers Without Borders, which will offer students in any area of engineering to put their shoulder to the wheel in areas that need fresh water and other vital improvements to their communities, and it is the start of a significant new chapter in the growth and orientation of our engineering programs.

Fairfield University was selected by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for its prestigious 2015 Community Engagement Classification, recognizing exemplary institutions for exceeding in student volunteerism, academic service-learning, and faculty community engaged research. Fairfield is one of 157 colleges and universities nationwide reclassified for the honor after being originally awarded it seven years ago.

Due to the growing interest among writers of all ages to present the nature of health and healing through writing, the MFA in Creative Writing program introduced a new focus within its program this year, “Literary Health and Healing.”

While the College of Arts and Sciences added new 5-year master’s programs — English major to MFA, Communication and Mathematics leading to an MA, with a major in politics and economics leading to a Master’s in Public Administration.
Our faculty also continue to contribute at a significant level to scholarship and to the service of our community through their work — I’m sure you appreciate that I can only take note of a few of these accomplishments.

Dr. John Thiel won the Alpha Sigma Nu Book Award for his latest work, *Icons of Hope: The ‘Last Things’ in Catholic Imagination*, a thoughtful and probing look at the Christian belief in resurrected life.

Jen Klug was selected by CT Campus Compact to receive its 2014 Faculty Engaged Scholarship Award for her community-engaged research with Friends of the Lake. For nearly a decade, Dr. Klug has overseen a water-quality monitoring program on Lake Lillinonah.

Our Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions has taken a leadership position in the debate over standardized testing in the public schools, holding a panel discussion featuring our faculty here on March 31, while our Connecticut Writing Project received $350,000 in state, federal and corporate funding to promote literacy in our local schools.

Carol Ann Davis was named a finalist for the 2015 National Magazine Award in the Essays and Criticism category for “The One I get and Other Artifacts,” an intimate meditation on the Sandy Hook Elementary School massacre. Michael White won the 2014 Tuscany Prize for Catholic Fiction for his book *Resting Places*.

Sheila Grossman was named one of the top 25 Nurse Practitioner Program Professors by Nurse Practitioner Schools.

Dina Franceschi, professor of economics, and about a dozen students in her 2013 “Environmental Economics” course did a comprehensive study of the value of parkland for the City of Bridgeport. The report well help the city to continue to expand and enhance its parkland and open spaces.

Shelley Phelan is an honoree for the 2015 Women of Innovation award in the category of Academic Innovation and Leadership. This award is part of a unique program that honors Connecticut’s outstanding women innovators, role models and leaders in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM).

These are just a few representative examples of the kind of work that we are doing as a University — advancing scholarship, engaging with our neighbors to improve their world, guiding our students through a significant period of their maturation. This is our mission and we continue to do it well.

As I know you are all aware, the quality of the education that we provide requires extensive resources — and we are at a time in higher education when those resources are harder to come by than they have ever been. Families and students are under financial pressure. State and federal governments are continuing to constrict their contributions to higher education — and at the same time, the rapid evolution of technology means that if we are to remain relevant we have to continually update our infrastructure.

We continue to do what we can to ensure — as always — that we have a balanced budget; that we are operating efficiently, while remaining as affordable as possible for our students.

I believe we are in a good position to meet and exceed our budgeted enrollment of 975 undergraduates this fall, down from the 1,056 freshmen that enrolled last fall. Currently, the quality of the class as measured by standardized test scores and class rank is higher than last year, and the admit rate is 5% lower than last year and the discount rate is 4% lower. Minority enrollment has increased. We have more Magis scholars than last year, which was already a bumper crop, and we have seen significant increases in the number of confirmed engineering students.

And based on our numbers to date, it looks like we will make our target number for our graduate programs as well.
But our undergraduate tuition and fees, which represent 85% of revenue in our operating budget, will only rise by 2.5%, and this places significant financial limitations on our ability to let any other element of our cost structure increase beyond that number.

As of March 31st, our endowment market value was $316 million, which is also providing an increasing contribution to our operating budget, although, of course, most of the endowment is restricted and cannot be used to support the general operating budget.

At the same time, we will continue to try and keep our costs and discount rate down.

I often say that an institution like ours is one bad enrollment cycle away from financial crisis, but I think Fairfield is showing that it can successfully recruit students in an increasingly competitive market, and that it has the financial discipline to balance its budget and set something aside for deferred maintenance and for our plant fund. But many of our competitors are doing the same, and, indeed, at a higher rate of investment than Fairfield. We will need to continue, and, indeed, increase our financial discipline and our ability to invest in our future in order to retain the agency ratings that will enable us to reenter the bond market while interest rates are as low as they are.

We are still 45 days away from the end of the current fiscal year, and the books are not yet closed. However if projections hold, we expect to end the year slightly favorable to plan (1/10 of 1%).

However we will still have a considerable disconnect between our deferred maintenance backlog of over $65 million and our liquidity reserve, which is used to fund such expenses.

This year, as part of capital projects, we plan on paving roads damaged by the harsh winter, updating another group of classrooms, improving internet bandwidth on the campus, replacing dated or broken furniture in classrooms, dorms and offices, and performing necessary maintenance on major utilities.

As you know, since January of last year when I kicked off our Fairfield 2020 strategic planning process, over 200 members of faculty, staff, students and alumni have been working hard on our future.

This process was one of the most open and participative processes I have been part of, with 11 task forces opening their meetings and presenting their findings to the entire Fairfield community. We created a dedicated web site where task force progress could be tracked. We videotaped and posted committee reports and brought to campus a wide array of thought leaders to stimulate dialogue and debate.

I am grateful to those of you who dedicated so much time and energy to this process. The report is now in the hands of a team of editors lead by Dr. Christine Siegel and Alistair Highet; I expect that a draft will be shared with the steering team next week and a final report will be shared with the entire community shortly.

I can’t emphasize enough how essential this plan is to the future viability of our University. The forces that are compelling us to make changes are converging — declining demographics in our recruitment areas, rising costs, alternative educational models, a decline in real income for our families, increased competition from our peers, and so on.

As I’ve said on many occasions — the business model on which institutions like ours have operated in the past is no longer viable, and so we have to act.

There are also great opportunities before us that we have to embrace — the need for higher education is greater than ever; the need for ongoing qualification and credentials for those already in the workplace is going to increase; we know that the healthcare industry is going to be a major driver of the economy of the future, and we are well positioned to take a leadership in this area — bringing business, engineering, education and the sciences into greater synergy with the health sciences will be an area of growth for us.
So the new Strategic Plan will show us the way forward. It is a time of change — change is never easy — but as Fr. Adolfo Nicolas, the Superior of the Society of Jesus, said to all of us in Jesuit higher education in 2010, we mustn’t be afraid to “recreate” the institutions so that they engage with our world as it evolves.

That has always been part of the DNA of Jesuit education from the beginning, and that is why it has remained a vital and renewable pedagogical approach for as long as it has.

Also critical to our future and now underway is our comprehensive campaign, which is coming to the end of its “quiet” phase, and will be publicly launched in the fall. I am happy to be able to report that we have raised over $97 million since we began, and we have an excellent chance of reaching $100 million by the end of the fiscal year.

For strategic reasons, the first phase of the campaign has focused on Rafferty Stadium and the renovation of the RecPlex — these are important facilities, and the support we have received for those projects have generated energy among our donors and alumni and met critical student needs. Both these projects are substantially funded through donations.

From now own, the focus the campaign will be shifting toward increasing our endowment so that we can provide more financial aid to students, increasing our endowed professorships and other programmatic support, and gathering financial support for our Integrated Nursing and Health Sciences Initiative — which includes both money to renovate and expand our Nursing School and provide additional state of the art classrooms and collaboration spaces, and also money to build and enhance our programs in these areas.

Our Advancement team has been meeting with the Deans to develop the best strategies for raising support for specific school-related priorities — and they will continue to be working more closely with faculty so that our fundraising is more acutely targeted at our research and pedagogical priorities.

The Advancement team — including major gifts, planned gifts, foundation and corporate relations, and annual giving, will all be presenting opportunities to our donors to support the academic priorities of our University — including opportunities to endow deanships, professorships, and to give money to support specific academic programs and academic centers.

I’d like to conclude then by saying thank you to all of you for your dedication and commitment. We do have a very special University here at Fairfield. We are in a time of dramatic change. We all want what is best for our students — that they have the best education possible, that they are guided and assisted as they mature, and that they succeed in the future. We also all want what is best for Fairfield University — that it grow and thrive, that its reputation for excellence continues, that we continue to expand our name recognition in the public sphere as a first class University.

We all want to see new life, and fresh energy and enthusiasm. I am confident that our new Strategic Plan is the first step toward a future that is infused with new life and fresh energy — and I want to thank all of you for your participation in the formation of the Strategic Plan and for your willingness to work together in Collaboration to build our future together.

This year, as you know, we ushered in a bumper-crop of fourteen new tenure-track faculty and 8 non-tenure track faculty for a total of 265 full-time faculty (the highest number ever). I had the pleasure of meeting with them over a series of dinners at which they each spoke about their research interests — from nutrition to the restoration of democracy in Argentina to film noir to the bond market. Their intellectual energy, and their focus on effective teaching, demonstrate that you, the faculty, are serious about securing the future of Fairfield. It’s an extraordinary group, you have hired well.

I particularly appreciate this because I am charged, by the Board, to be a good custodian of Fairfield’s future. But one thing that is a problem for us, going forward as a community, is the breakdown in civility that characterizes some of our conversations. This is a problem that is particularly true of interactions between faculty and administrators. Faculty seem to feel perfectly entitled to be rude and
condescending to administrators — and, indeed, to administrative staff -- often directly to their faces. Administrators are painted by faculty as faceless and mindless bureaucrats, and never are seen as the seasoned professionals they are. Members of this administration are not always right but they, like the faculty we so value here, deserve to be treated with the same respect that you, the faculty, treat one another. Nothing less.

Civility is not a given, it must be something we practice, together. We can have strong disagreements without a loss of civility, we can question one another closely without losing sight of the strengths we have together, we can argue about programs and curriculum and the details of the academic calendar without in any way denying the grace we find in the work we do and the delight we take in our students, particularly at this time of year, when all they have accomplished comes to fruition.

I will insist, going forward, that our conversations are marked by civility and respect for one another. I will ask this of myself and my administration and I will ask it of you as well. Without that mutual respect, we have no basis for dialogue and none for community.

Thank you

At this point, the floor was opened for questions.

Prof. Dennis Keenan said that the number of new tenure track faculty entering the College has been fairly steady over the last few years. But in 2015-2016 that number is going down while the number of new non-tenure track (NTT) faculty is rising. He asked whether this shift is indicative of a strategy to reduce tenure track lines in the College. President von Arx suggested that SVPAA Babington might be able to comment as well, but said that no, there’s no such strategy. Lines are allocated according to the student population, so there’s some movement of lines from one school to another. They’re interested in getting the right mix between term appointments and adjunct faculty. They would like to reduce the dependence on adjunct faculty by increasing the number of term appointments. That means more full time faculty and better employment opportunities for people currently serving as adjunct faculty. We need to consider the best mix of tenure track lines, term appointments, and adjunct positions, especially as we revise the core curriculum. SVPAA Babington added that we continue to increase the number of faculty overall, though she didn’t have the information broken down by school. This year we have the biggest increase in Fairfield’s history with 14 new tenure track and 8 NTT faculty. Next year we’re bringing in 17 new faculty. The searches for the following year aren’t yet finalized. She would be happy to provide information broken down by schools.

Prof. Beth Boquet returned to the President’s point regarding civility. She noted that as someone who studies rhetoric, she is interested in moments when we perceive civil discourse to be breaking down. It’s almost always people in power calling for civil discourse; there’s an opportunity to ask why we see these calls. Perhaps the reason for the perceived incivility is that the mechanisms of persuasion by logic and argumentation are failing. President von Arx said that he was as interested in reasoned discourse as civil discourse and that often both are lacking.

Prof. Paula Gill Lopez said that as a member of the Advancement Committee, she was concerned about the potential negative impact on the capital campaign of not reaching agreement on a new MOU. She wondered whether the President had told the administrative team to consider this impact. President von Arx said that we’re all aware of how difficult this is. There are difficult issues to deal with. The university income is severely constrained by our commitment to maintain tuition at a relatively low rate. No one would love to have a three-year contract more than I would. We probably could agree with regard to salary, but the issue of benefits, especially healthcare, is neuralgic. We have to reduce spending every single year. Without a comprehensive plan to reduce healthcare spending, we will struggle every year. Fairfield has a full and rich health care plan. Our consultants tell us we’ll be facing the Obamacare excise tax of 1.5 to 1.8 million in 3-4 years if we don’t bring our costs down. That annual expense will fall on all of us. We have a fiduciary responsibility to get under the excise limit; we owe that to the institution. If we can’t bring down the costs of health care on a regular and gradual basis, we will need to make draconian cuts. We cannot kick the can down the road.
Prof. Mulvey said that she had two questions. She didn’t want to give the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) report now, but they are well aware of the excise tax and the President’s description doesn’t match what has been discussed. It’s unknown what the tax will amount to or even whether it will be put in place. She was pleased to hear that we will need to work together to address the high cost of healthcare. She couldn’t agree more. Last May the faculty and administration worked together to set up a committee to do exactly that, yet the administration hasn’t used that committee at all. She doesn’t understand today’s rhetoric in light of the administration’s actions this year. The President noted that the healthcare committee has significant faculty representation. The administration presented a proposal to the FSC and the FSC has always had the opportunity to present alternate proposals, but that hasn’t happened. He added that if the administration has failed in adequate consultation, we’ll take part of the blame, but the faculty have to share in the blame for not coming up with alternative proposals. Prof. Mulvey said that the FSC would be happy to come up with alternate proposals if you would fund a healthcare consultant for us. The President said that we have a healthcare consultant for the university.

Prof. Mulvey said that her second question was a hypothetical. If the Fairfield faculty chose to unionize, would the administration voluntarily recognize the union, or would we have to go to the National Labor Relations Board? President von Arx said that he hadn’t thought about this question, but he would have to ask about the implications of unionization for the longstanding agreements between the faculty and administration in the Journal of Record and the Handbook. Many of these longstanding agreements are dear to faculty. His understanding is that with collective bargaining, everything is on the table. Faculty might want to ask the recently unionized workers on campus whether they think their deal was worth their union dues. As an old school Catholic, he believes in unions, but they might not be in the best interest of faculty given the great deals you have with the administration over so many issues.

Prof. Walter Hlawitschka, a member of the Health Care Review Committee (HCRC) disputed the President’s claim that the faculty bears part of the responsibility for the administration’s proposal not going to the HCRC. He said that the faculty on the HCRC have asked to meet and gotten no response; they’ve asked for weekly meetings and been offered monthly meetings. We’re ready to discuss, but the administration hasn’t brought us their proposals. He asked whether the President would direct the administrative team to meet with us weekly going forward. The President responded that he would ask his team about the status of the discussions. Prof. Hlawitschka then asked whether the President would affirm his commitment to compensation at the 95th percentile. President von Arx said that we have met the 95th percentile this year and he was pleased that that was the case. When prodded about the commitment going forward, he said that we would maintain it in so far as we can given financial constraints. Prof. Hlawitschka continued by noting that in various walks of life, if people are overcharged, they are then repaid. He asked, if we are overcharged for healthcare, will we get the excess back? The President responded by asking, if you are undercharged, will you make it up the next year? Prof. Mulvey jumped in to say that we would be willing to consider such a system, but we aren’t meeting.

Prof. Dawn Massey said that she has never been part of our health insurance because her husband’s is far superior, but his W-2 shows a cost well below the “Cadillac tax” threshold. She also noted that there is currently legislation pending to repeal the Cadillac tax, and asked whether the administration was aware of that. President von Arx said that they are, but they have to plan for the laws currently on the books. Prof. Massey said she was not sure that our numbers would meet the threshold for the tax. The President said that our figures are from our consultants and it would be irresponsible to ignore them.

Prof. Don Greenberg asked whether the President was seriously making an equivalency between what the university does to faculty when we overpay and what happens when the institution comes up short. The President said that he thought the issue was over versus under, and his question had been rhetorical.

Prof. Bob Epstein asked, if we budget more than we spend, where does the excess go? President von Arx said that sometimes we spend more or less than we’ve collected; it all evens out. Prof. Epstein noted that the excess stays in the operating budget. The President responded by asking about years when we’re short.

Prof. Cecelia Bucki began by thanking the President for his contributions to and support of the History department this year. She then expressed concern about the administration’s healthcare proposals. Last year’s
changes left her with some providers out of network, now there’s a proposal for a bigger deductible. What about the staff; it doesn’t seem fair that lower paid staff members would have to pay so much up front in deductibles. President von Arx said that he doesn’t know enough about the plan to comment. He knows there are different positions on the relative benefits of different plans. He added that this year there was a modest increase in salary for staff earning less than $50,000.

Prof. Shawn Rafalski asked about the recently announced reorganization. SVPAA Babington now has Provost in her title and there are some other title changes. Does the term “Provost” reflect the primacy of the academic sector? The President said that it does and that her new responsibilities make the position “Academic Vice President plus”. He said that he was very happy with her functioning this year and was happy to offer her the new title.

Returning to healthcare, Prof. Sonya Huber noted that HSAs are confusing and can have different impacts on different families. Given that different health plans affect different families differently, wouldn’t it make sense to preserve choice? President von Arx said that the administration has heard that concern and has requested a meeting with the FSC next week to discuss some new ideas. The issue is less about choice than cost; we still need to find a way to begin to reduce the cost of healthcare.

Prof. Steve Bayne said that in the President’s address, he had mentioned the possibility of endowed deanships- are any particular deanships under consideration? The President responded that any deanships someone would be willing to give money to could be under consideration. It would get the dean’s salary off the operating budget and into endowment.

Prof. Michael Coyne said that he understood the pressure not to raise tuition. He wondered whether there was anything in the 2020 report that could be a paradigm shift to raise revenues or reduce costs not through cutting benefits. President von Arx said that relative to our peers we’re still in reasonably good shape. We’ve got a balanced budget and we’ve set some money aside for deferred maintenance. We’ve had three solid years of enrollments. But with 85% of our revenue coming from undergraduate tuition and fees, we need to look for new revenue streams. He mentioned online courses, non-traditional learners, continuing education, use of facilities for conferences, but said there was no silver bullet.

Prof. Epstein said that there has been much talk about healthcare costs, but the term has been used in a number of ways. There’s how much healthcare costs and how much the administration is spending on healthcare. When you say we have to address healthcare costs every year, it sounds like the university is going to spend less on healthcare every year. But does that just mean shifting the burden to employees? The administration’s proposal this year was presented late and never presented to the HCRC. If it just shifts the burden, we shouldn’t accept it. The President said that healthcare costs affect us all. We’re in this together; it is in both of our interests to find a way to reduce healthcare costs. Prof. Epstein said that we should be looking for ways to reduce spending, not just shift costs.

Prof. Kathy Nantz said that she has heard frustration from a lot of people here in the last half hour. One of the reasons she came to Fairfield and stayed for 30 years is that she has treasured the collegiality here and she sees that drifting away. Ten years ago, the NEASC accreditation report also expressed concern about faculty/administrative relationships. It’s not at all clear that we have a story of improved relationships since 2008. President von Arx said that was an excellent question that he ponders a lot. He likes to think he has good relations with many faculty here, he tries to be effective in helping different programs and departments, he treasures relationships with faculty and our culture of devotion to students. But, he continued, there’s a dimension of campus culture that I find myself participating in that’s almost an alternative universe, a perduing alternate universe of faculty/administration relationships that precedes me and just seems to continue. I’ve tried to address it on a personal dimension but sometimes it just seems that we’re down the rabbit hole. I’m not blaming anyone in particular, it seems to be part of Fairfield. There are many lights, but also some shadows, and it’s hard to understand.

As we still had some remaining agenda items, Prof. Jones called on Prof. Joe Dennin for a final question. Prof. Dennin said that one of his concerns about the healthcare proposal was that the administrative team may not understand what they’re suggesting. The initial proposal called for moving everyone to the HSA; the administrative team did not know that that was not legal. So the proposers don’t understand basic facts about
their proposal. HSAs are very tricky. He’s concerned that the administration hasn’t done their homework completely or hasn’t shared what they know with the faculty. Now they’re offering an HRA for those ineligible for an HSA. That’s probably also very complicated- do they really know what they’re offering? The President said that the administrative team has spent a lot of time trying to understand and answer questions from the FSC. The administration is listening and he would like to think that his team knows what they’re advocating for and why they think it’s best for most people at Fairfield.

Approval of minutes

Motion [Castor/Miecznikowski]: to approve the minutes of 4/17/15 as circulated.

The motion passed unanimously.

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

Prof. Mulvey explained that this award is given by the Connecticut State Conference but the recipient is chosen by our chapter. George Lang was on the faculty from 1970 until his death after a brief illness in 2007. He was a Professor of Mathematics and was very active at the local, state and national AAUP level. The award is for a member of the Fairfield faculty who, early in her or her career, has shown support for AAUP principles. This award recognizes younger faculty and strengthens our chapter. The award will be given officially at the State Conference meeting next week, but it’s announced here for recognition by the recipient’s colleagues. Previous recipients are: Jocelyn Boryczka, Dave Crawford, Bob Epstein, Sonya Huber, Matt Kubasik, John Miecznikowski, and Deb Strauss.

FWC President Rona Preli then introduced the recipient:

The recipient of the George Lang award is Anna Lawrence. In the past few years she has assumed an active role in the FWC advocating for faculty and shared governance. She designed and created the FWC Banner during our “We are one Fairfield” campaign three years ago. She is a dedicated member of the FWC and a key supporter and organizer the past two years for the May Day rallies. Her commitment to faculty governance, a key principle of the AAUP, is also laudable, including her recent willingness to serve on the Core Advisory Steering Committee.

Presentation of FWC Service Awards

Prof. Preli then offered the following citations for Lifetime Achievement and Colleague of the Year:

The recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award is Michael Tucker, who has been at Fairfield since 1988, and has been a vital source of information and encouragement to the FWC since its founding. His knowledge, based upon his expertise in the field of Finance, was of particular value during the struggles over merit pay in 2001-2003, when he was one of the FWC’s most active and tireless speakers. He has served on numerous health care review committees over the course of 2 decades. He worked on reviewing retirement savings when Fidelity was added to TIAA/CREF as an option. He served as a consultant to the FSC and was helpful in the development of the “buyout package” for retiring faculty. He has become the go to expert on health insurance matters and has served on the Health Care Review Committee. He has organized book discussions and built community among faculty. We are grateful for his years of service and contribution and we honor him with this award.

The recipient of the “Colleague of the Year” award has demonstrated extraordinary leadership at Fairfield University in advancing shared governance, protecting academic freedom, negotiating with the Administration for faculty salary and compensation, and working tirelessly to represent Fairfield at the Connecticut state and national levels of the AAUP. For the past three years, Irene Mulvey has served on the FSC and has chaired it for the past two. This position puts her in the firing line of the Administration and under intense scrutiny by the faculty. Her extraordinary ability to navigate complex matters of health care insurance, the university budget in a way that always presents the best case for the faculty is unparalleled. Irene has served as the Secretary of the General Faculty, our highest position of leadership for nine years, which ex officio has made her a leader in our Academic Council. She currently serves as the Secretary of that body. These leadership roles have been pivotal in charting shared faculty
governance and have established her as a paramount figure of faculty leadership at our university. Irene began our FWC newsletter in Fall 2007 and it has been an award winning AAUP publication in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2012.

And most notably, Irene has been selected as the recipient of the Marilyn Sternberg Award – this prestigious award is given annually to the one person nationally who best demonstrates concern for human rights, courage, persistence, political foresight, imagination, and collective bargaining skills.

Update from the Faculty Salary Committee

In the wake of the standing ovation she received, Prof. Mulvey, FSC Chair, took the podium. She acknowledged the other members of the FSC: Profs. Chris Bernhardt, Bryan Crandall, Bob Epstein and Sonya Huber, as well as the administrative team: VP Mark Reed, Ms. Mary Magri, VP Tom Pellegrino, and Dean Jim Simon.

She then began with some of the background provided in the attached presentation. She presented the FSC’s purpose and duties, including a start date of October 1, from the Faculty Handbook. Then she explained our contractual documents. The Faculty Handbook has a section of policies related to employment. The Memo of Understanding (MOU) provides specific terms each year, as does the Benefits Plan Overview (BPO), which is an appendix to the MOU. Finally, individual contract letters reference the MOU/BPO and present the appropriate salary data for each individual.

The MOU says, “After collegial discussions, the Faculty Salary Committee and the Administration have agreed to recommend to the General Faculty for ratification and to the Budget Committee for inclusion in the budget that they submit to the President and the Board of Trustees the following compensation package…” Since the Board approves the budget in March, we should be voting on an MOU in February. The administration refers to our urgency regarding an MOU as a faculty timetable, but the timetable language in the MOU has been jointly agreed to by the faculty and administration.

Prof. Mulvey then reviewed the administration’s proposal of 4/16: a salary increase of 1.5%, all distributed as standard merit in exchange for working toward agreement on a “post-tenure review system;” an additional 1% increase because of the 1% cut in compensation we agreed to take previously that has since been made up for with other employees; elimination of PPO plans; increase in the HSA deductible with no increase in the university’s subsidy.

The FSC sent a counterproposal to the administration on 4/29, in advance of a 4/30 meeting which the administrators ultimately couldn’t make. The proposal was for a salary increase of 1.5%, all distributed as standard merit, an additional 1% increase in salary, and no changes to health insurance. The FSC would agree to work with the administration beginning immediately to study the advisability of eliminating PPO plans and continuing only with HSA options.

Prof. Mulvey explained the FSC’s problems with the administration’s proposal. First, we don’t know enough about it, and what we do know, we have serious problems with. The President and the administrative team say, “we’ve answered all of your questions,” but those are only the questions we’ve thought of. We need a document on the proposal that we can take to an attorney. As Prof. Dennin pointed out, when the proposal first arose, we asked about people ineligible for the HSA and the administrators didn’t know what we were talking about. The next week they came back with an HRA for those ineligible for the HSA, but no documents. We don’t know who is ineligible for an HSA and how imposing the HSA will affect people. If everyone had the same expenses as this year and moved to the HSA, how would they be affected? From our survey, it’s clear that many people are confused about the HSA. Some people might do better on it. It’s worth discussing, but it’s definitely not for everyone. We’re not prepared to present the administration’s proposal for consideration because we don’t know enough about it.

Regarding the excise tax, as Prof. Massey pointed out, it’s an unknown. Monitoring developments with that tax is a specific charge of the HCRC that the administration hasn’t engaged this year. We set up that committee to make smart, data-driven changes, but they’re not using it. Bypassing the HCRC is subverting governance, but the administration doesn’t see it that way.
Prof. Mulvey concluded by saying that yesterday the chair of the administrative team asked if we wanted to meet next week. We found an hour to do so. We really want to reach agreement and bring an MOU to the General Faculty. In 2012, when we did not have an MOU going into the summer, the GFS sent a memo to the President with the text shown on the last two slides. We’ve asked to have a General Faculty meeting on May 27. At that time we hope to have an MOU. If not, we hope to pass a motion comparable to what we did in 2012.

At this point, the floor was opened for question.

Prof. Kathy Nantz said that she appreciated the FSC wanting to spare us some details because this is very complicated. Some people have serious health issues, and HSAs are complicated even for a healthy family of four. She begged for a simple system that we don’t have to work so hard to use. She said that she tried the HSA but neither she nor her husband could figure it out. She wants a system we can all use without it turning into a part time job. Prof. Mulvey said that with regard to details, they would be happy to have conversations with faculty members, but it would be easier one on one.

Prof. Crandall, a member of the FSC, said that he was thrilled that the President had acknowledged the Connecticut Writing Project in his remarks because I’ve brought in more money through that than in my salary. Returning to the issue of civility, he said that he had “lost it” at the last meeting with the administrative team because negotiation requires reciprocation. Irene is on top of everything, while the administration’s responses take a while or come at meetings rather than in advance. The lack of transparency makes me question my future here; I’m not seeing actual talk between administrators and faculty. Prof. Mulvey clarified that Prof. Crandall didn’t “lose it;” he had been calm but angry.

Prof. Boquet, picking up on Prof. Nantz’s comments, said that the HSA is a modern day literacy test. We have a room full of PhDs who can’t figure out the details and need access to expensive layers of bureaucracy. Information is controlled by different people and we can’t figure out what questions to ask- that’s a literacy test. She went on to ask about incentives. There are employer incentives to provide certain benefits. Healthcare and retirement are governmentally incentivized; what are the conversations around incentives? Prof. Mulvey said that the administration’s conversation is all about cutting costs. Prof. Epstein, a member of the FSC, elaborated. He said that there’s a lot we don’t know about HSAs, but there are some things we do know. We know that not everyone is eligible and not everyone wants it for a variety of reasons. Many people find it onerous. Some would pay more under an HSA; he didn’t switch to an HSA because Human Resources told him, after looking at his expenses, that he would pay more. What the administration is proposing is to eliminate options and make the remaining option less attractive, with no explanation for why. The President said that they don’t want to shift the burden to employees, but that’s what this proposal does.

Prof. Bernhardt, a member of the FSC, said that we’re told we’ll save money by moving everyone from a PPO to an HSA. He then asked Prof. Hlawitschka, of the HCRC, whether the HSA is indeed a cheaper option. Prof. Hlawitschka said that last year and this year they cost exactly the same amount. Over a four-year period the HSA has been the plan with the fastest cost increase. When we asked for the economic reason for pushing the HSA, they said they didn’t know. They asked their consultant, who provided a report with some interesting information, but not a full answer to our question.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn [Dennin/Bucki] was uncontested at 5:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Know your Contractual Documents:

- Memo of Understanding
- Benefits Plan Overview (part of MOU)
- Individual Contract Letter
- Faculty Handbook

Faculty Salary Committee (from Faculty Handbook)

General Purpose
To engage annually in collegial discussions regarding faculty salary and benefits with an administrative team appointed by the President.

Specific Duties

1. To start collegial discussions with the administrative team by October 1 of each year with the shared goal of reaching agreement on a Memo of Understanding to present to the General Faculty for approval.

2. To review the Benefits Plan Overview for Full-Time Faculty, recommending changes to the General Faculty as appropriate.

3. To review the text of the annual contract letter before it is sent to faculty.

From the 2014-15 MOU:

After collegial discussions, the Faculty Salary Committee and the Administration have agreed to recommend to the General Faculty for ratification and to the Budget Committee for inclusions in the budget that they submit to the President and the Board of Trustees the following compensation package...

Administration’s proposal 4/16/2015:

- 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)

Health Care Review Committee

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 4/29/2015:
• Salary increase of 1.5%, distributed all as standard merit;
• Additional salary increase of 1% as described in [administration’s] memo of April 16, 2015;
• Health Insurance: no changes in health insurance for calendar year 2016 in exchange for an agreement to work with the administration beginning immediately (through the Health Care Committee and the Faculty Salary Committee) to study the advisability of eliminating PPO plans and continuing only the HSA plans.

We have been here before:
Memo GFS to President von Arx 6/1/2012:
As you know, a meeting of the General Faculty was held on Thursday, May 31, from 3:30-5:30 in Gonzaga Auditorium. As you also know, current faculty contracts run through June 1, 2012 and, traditionally, new faculty contracts, based on a new Memo of Understanding (MOU) are sent to faculty in June. Given that the parties have not yet reached agreement on a successor MOU, and based on the advice of our attorney, the General Faculty passed the following motion at the meeting on 5/31:

We have been here before:
Memo GFS to President von Arx 6/1/2012:
MOTION. Given that we have not reached agreement on a successor MOU, the General Faculty’s position is that current faculty contracts continue in force until superseded by a new mutually approved MOU and new faculty contracts for the 2012-13 academic year based on that MOU. The faculty will continue to perform their job duties under the terms of their 2011-2012 faculty contracts.

The motion passed unanimously 173 in favor, none opposed, and one abstaining.
These minutes have not yet been approved by the General Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxies were held</th>
<th>by:</th>
<th>for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bayne</td>
<td>Jim Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Biardi</td>
<td>Ashley Byun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bloch</td>
<td>Mousumi Bhattacharya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Boquet</td>
<td>Cinthia Gannett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Boquet</td>
<td>Gisela Gil-Egui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Boryczka</td>
<td>Bryan Crandall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mousumi Bose-Godbole</td>
<td>Camelia Micu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Carolan</td>
<td>Jiwei Xiao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Carolan</td>
<td>Michelle Farrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Davidson</td>
<td>Katherine Schwab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Mark Demers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Janet Striuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Epstein</td>
<td>Peter Bayers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Epstein</td>
<td>Dennis Keenan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Garvey</td>
<td>Betsy Bowen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Gill Lopez</td>
<td>Emily Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Gill Lopez</td>
<td>Evelyn Lolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Harding</td>
<td>Mike Andreychik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Hartwell</td>
<td>Patricia Calderwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Huber</td>
<td>Emily Orlando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Hulse</td>
<td>David Zera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Hulse</td>
<td>Gayle Bogel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerelyn Johnson</td>
<td>Nels Pearson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerelyn Johnson</td>
<td>Joel Goldfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Klug</td>
<td>Tod Osier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kris</td>
<td>Meredith Wallace Kazer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Labinski</td>
<td>Lydia Willisky-Ciollo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Labinski</td>
<td>Kris Sealey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Lane</td>
<td>Hugh Humphrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lyon</td>
<td>Uma Balaji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
<td>Milo Peck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
<td>Michael Coyne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McFadden</td>
<td>Jennifer Adair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McFadden</td>
<td>Cecelia Bucki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura McSweeney</td>
<td>Linda Henkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura McSweeney</td>
<td>Shawn Rafalski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Mettler</td>
<td>Joan Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey</td>
<td>Debra Strauss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey</td>
<td>Chris Bernhardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Murray</td>
<td>Anna-Maria Aksan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman Naderi</td>
<td>Arjun Chaudhuri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen O'Shea</td>
<td>Sheila Grossman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Planas</td>
<td>Mousumi Bose-Godbole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Planas</td>
<td>Nancy Manister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>William Abbott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>Faith-Anne Dohm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prof. David Schmidt called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. **Announcements**

GFS Susan Rakowitz thanked former Faculty Chair Schmidt for filling in for Prof. Terry-Ann Jones, who was unable to be at today’s meeting.

2. **Report from the Faculty Salary Committee**

Prof. Irene Mulvey, chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) began by thanking the faculty for coming to a meeting after Commencement. Her choice would not have been to meet today. She then expressed heartfelt thanks to: the other members of the FSC - Profs. Chris Bernhardt, Bryan Crandall, Bob Epstein and Sonya Huber; the other members of the Healthcare Committee (HCC) - Profs. Chris Bernhardt, Walt Hlawitschka, and Michael Tucker; the other members of the FWC Executive Committee - Profs. Rona Preli, Joceyln Boryczka, Bill Abbott, Betsy Bowen, Sonya Huber, Anna Lawrence, and Deb Strauss; and GFS Susan Rakowitz.

She apologized for the materials having been sent at the last minute. That shouldn’t be how things work. The FSC (though the GFS) sent a memo less than two hours ago with an update and electronic copies of a Memo of Understanding (MOU) and Benefits Plan Overview (BPO) with changes shown and changes incorporated. Those materials will be discussed today. She noted that she would explain all details carefully for those who had not had time to read the documents.

She said that this has been a terrible year from start to finish. She was not expressing a personal opinion- she was referring to the contractual documents and agreed upon processes that have been ignored and violated. That has made it a very difficult year for the elected representatives on the FSC.

Working through the attached slides, she provided an outline of today’s presentation, noting that Prof. Hlawitschka would talk about healthcare. They will be presenting an MOU/BPO, which the administration has not agreed to.

To provide context for an overview of this year’s timeline, she presented the charge to the FSC from the *Faculty Handbook*. In the Fall, the FSC’s work was taken up by exorbitant increases to our cost share premiums. The university’s share of the premiums was increased by 2.5%, while the employees’ share was increased by 14.9%. That activated the Trigger Committee, which ultimately determined that the increase for employees was not justified. Those issues delayed discussion of terms of compensation until the Spring.

The first proposal regarding terms of compensation was made by the FSC in early February, already much later than optimal. The administration responded on February 25. Prof. Mulvey reminded the faculty that we should reach agreement on an MOU before the meeting in early March when the Board of Trustees approves
the budget. The administration’s response was much too late for that timeline. The FSC met weekly with the administration, but saw no movement until April 16, ie, one day before the last scheduled General Faculty meeting at which an MOU could be presented.

There was then back and forth as outlined in the FSC memos to the General Faculty on May 20 and May 22. She said, I know what it feels like when people are engaging in collegial discussions trying to reach an agreement in good faith. Everything about this was wrong. We had no idea what the administration's objectives are. We have no idea what they are trying to achieve. They gave us proposals with vague language on "sustainability" but never clearly saying what they mean by that. We had absolutely no satisfaction in trying to engage the administration is meaningful discussions.

She went on, as we wrote in a memo, when their proposal continued to include items that had the potential to cause individuals serious financial hardship, we drafted questions in order to find out what the effects would be. As far as we can tell, the administration was basing their decisions solely on how much money would be saved for the University. They had no idea how this might affect actual employees. We asked for information from their consultant, Mercer, (whose fee we pay 20% of). We don’t have direct access to their consultant even though, when I asked the President about this at his address to the Faculty, he said the FSC didn’t need our own consultant because the university has a consultant. When we asked EVP Lawlor for the data that their proposal had have been based on, we didn't get any kind of a useful response. VP Reed said that they asked Mercer to run some scenarios, but then he didn’t answer the question of what guidelines Mercer was given for scenarios. We feel that faculty are being deliberately and systematically left in the dark.

At this point, Prof. Hlawitschka, member of the HCC and Trigger Committee, took over with a report for the HCC. His slides are also attached. He said that the administration was very helpful in supplying some data, but seems to have screened out other data. He noted that the national talk of a healthcare crisis is also part of the conversation at the university. Then he presented some data regarding the “crisis” at Fairfield. In the 12-month period ending in March 2015, over $15 million was budgeted for healthcare while the actual costs were under $14 million. In fact, over those 12 months, the amount budgeted for healthcare increased while the healthcare costs decreased. In the first 3 months of 2015 (the most recent period for which we have data), the actual costs were lower than in the first 3 months of 2014 by $436,704- that’s the “crisis”. For those same 3 months, we’ve over-budgeted for healthcare by $1.2 million. If that trend continues, that would be an annualized over-budgeted amount of $4.8 million. He speculated that this might be a better source of income than the endowment going forward.

In the Fall, the Trigger Committee was informed that employees’ contributions to healthcare premiums would be increasing by 14.9% while the university’s contribution would be increasing by 2.5%. We objected, asked for an explanation, and were told that the Mercer model said that costs would go up. The administration didn’t share Mercer’s report or model with us. They imposed the increases over our objections.

Last year we set up the HCC with terms carefully crafted with the administration. The FSC immediately staffed it, but the administration made it difficult to schedule meetings. And they didn’t bring a single proposal for healthcare changes to this committee, even though they proposed very significant changes to the FSC. Those changes still haven’t been explained. The premiums indicate that the PPO and HSA cost exactly the same amount, down to the penny. There’s no explanation of how those costs are determined and, if they’re accurate, if they truly cost the same, there has been no explanation of why the administration wanted to eliminate the PPO and push everyone on to the HSA. There was some talk, however, of "behavioral changes" that will help in the future, but that doesn’t make sense to us. Most behavioral changes happen in the first year after a switch. From that point on, they’re insignificant.

With regard to information sharing, the administration provided information about plan costs and budgets. But when we asked specific questions for Mercer, we got the administration’s interpretation of Mercer’s responses. We should be getting unfiltered, contemporaneous sharing of information.
He also noted that one of the faculty’s guiding principles is that if a change creates hardship for a single individual, that individual should be given reasonable time to change their behavior in order to avoid that hardship. The administration’s proposal could cost an additional $4600 out of pocket for some individuals. Yet the FSC and HCC haven’t been able to get information about how many people might be affected by the proposed changes and to what extent.

Prof. Hlawitschka noted that he may have been the most optimistic of the faculty on the FSC and HCC. He feels that we’re very close, in economic terms, to an agreement. Yesterday the FSC proposed a two-year contract, agreeing to most of the administration’s proposed changes to healthcare, and a salary increase of only 1.5% in year two. The administration rejected this proposal and stated that they may want to increase the cost share over 20% in the coming year.

For years we’ve accepted salary increases below inflation because our healthcare benefits were rising faster than inflation. Now the administration wants us to accept a decrease in healthcare benefits with no offset in salary. The FSC’s principle is that any decrease in benefits must be offset by an increase in compensation. The administration disagrees with that principle.

He concluded by summarizing some key points of the MOU being presented today. We’re agreeing to increase deductibles in all plans by $500 for individuals and $1000 for families. This is a very significant change and we don’t favor it, but we see it as a compromise. In addition to a 1.5% salary increase, the proposed MOU has a 1% across the board increase to base salary. The administration says it’s to make up for the 1% cut in retirement we agreed to several years ago. We see it as an offset for healthcare. Unfortunately some people will face much higher increases than others because of their use of out of network services. We’re recommending that the FWC set up a hardship fund to help people during the transition year.

Prof. Tucker, another member of the HCC, offered the point of clarification that our 20% cost share of premiums is 20% of the over-budgeted amount that Mercer sets as the premium.

Prof. Beth Boquet asked whether there had been any conversation about the point at which it no longer makes sense for us to be self-insured. Prof. Mulvey said that we ask about that every year and the administration’s response is that the consultant says it makes sense to be self-insured.

Prof. John McDermott asked what happens to funds that are budgeted for healthcare and not spent on healthcare. Prof. Mulvey said that they go back into the operating budget.

With no further questions at this point, Prof. Mulvey returned to her presentation. She reiterated the FSC and HCC's principles that 1) any decrease in benefits must be offset by an increase in salary and 2) that no individual should suffer an undue hardship due to a decrease in benefits. She said that it's unclear what the administration's principles are other than a focus on the bottom line.

Reviewing recent proposals, she reminded the faculty that initially the administration wanted to move everyone on to the HSA. The FSC has been fighting that and she appreciated the faculty making it clear to the President during his address how much they valued choice in health insurance options. After that meeting, the administration put the PPO back on the table, but now with a deductible.

Yesterday the FSC proposed a two-year contract. In the first year, the salary increase would be 1.5%, all distributed as standard merit, and 1% added to base salary as an offset for the healthcare changes. The salary increase in year 2 would be 1.5%. She noted that for that year, the unionized workers on campus in Local 30 have a contract calling for the higher of a 1.5% increase or whatever increase the faculty get.

The FSC's proposal also agreed to a variety of healthcare changes. Currently there are two PPO options, the second of which has unlimited pharmacy coverage and covers adult hearing aids. Caps on pharmacy coverage are no longer allowed under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), so the current PPO options will be combined. The FSC proposal clarifies that PPO 2 will form the framework of the new single PPO option.
This option will add a deductible of $500 for individuals and $1000 for families of two or more. In-network out of pocket maximums will be lowered as required by the ACA. The administration wanted large increases to out-of-network out of pocket limits; the FSC’s proposal agreed to increases of $500 (individuals) and $1000 (families). Likewise, all deductibles and out of pockets maximums for the HSA would increase by $500/$1000. Furthermore, the proposal specified that the HCC would continue to meet and seek mutually advantageous changes to plan design.

Finally, the proposal said that Paragraph F in the MOU would revert to the text of the 2011-2012 MOU. She explained that this paragraph lays out the institution's commitment to compensation at least at the 95th percentile of AAUP IIA institutions, and how that commitment is implemented. For several years, we have been fighting attempts to eliminate or change this commitment. The administration did reaffirm the commitment but then wanted to talk about the true-up system. Paragraph F in the current MOU says we would conclude talks about the true-up system this year, but we haven't done so. We want to eliminate that language about discussing a new system for implementing the commitment.

We met yesterday, presented and discussed our proposal, both groups caucused, and then the administration came back with an oral proposal. Their proposal was for a 1-year contract. They reduced the salary increase from 2.5% to 2% (on conditions that had been included all along- to agree to talk about post-tenure review and that all claims to retirement catch-up will have been met), agreed to the healthcare changes in the FSC's proposal, agreed to returning Paragraph F to the 2011-2012 text, and agreed to re-engage the HCC. They said they would send the terms in writing within the hour. When the FSC asked whether we should make plans to reconvene the groups after the FSC had received the administration's offer in writing, EVP Lawlor said, "no, absolutely not, we're done".

Surprisingly, the written terms differed in several ways from what the administration had presented orally. The proposal was still for a 1-year contract with a 2% salary increase all distributed as standard merit. Their written terms fully spelled out that this increase distributed as standard merit was conditioned on two things. The faculty had to agree to discuss a post-tenure review system to potentially replace the current merit system. Prof. Mulvey noted that the language around this process was much weaker than the administration had proposed earlier in the year. The other condition was that the faculty had to drop all claims regarding reinstatement for the reduction in retirement benefits we agreed to several years ago. Prof. Mulvey explained that the FSC has been arguing that faculty are owed a 1% increase in compensation because we took a 1% cut when we agreed to no raise and a decrease in the university's retirement contribution from 10% to 9%. At the same time, the other employees of the university received a 1% raise and saw their retirement contribution go from 10% to 8% (i.e., a net 1% reduction in benefits, like the faculty). This year, the retirement contribution for staff was returned to 9%, but faculty have not seen a restoration of the 1% we're owed. In other words, earlier this year the administration took actions that paid the 1% back to everyone except the faculty.

The most significant change in terms concerned the out-of-network out of pocket maximums for the PPO. The FSC proposal (to which the administration had orally agreed) was for an increase from $1200/$2400 to $1700/$3400. The administration's written proposal changed the increase to $2500/$5000. The administration's proposal also included details for the other HSA option (currently option 5), but Prof. Mulvey explained that the FSC had no position on that option because no faculty have opted for that plan. Finally, although the FSC was under the impression that the administration had orally agreed to changing Paragraph F as proposed by the FSC, their written proposal was to maintain the language in the current MOU.

Returning to process concerns, Prof. Mulvey said that despite all of the focus on changes in health insurance, the HCC was underused, bypassed, and ignored, in a deliberate violation of an agreed upon process. When pushed about sending proposals to the HCC, VP Reed said that it was not required. Now we're in a situation where faculty are about to go off contract. The FSC won't ask for a General Faculty meeting in June, July, or August, so this is our last chance to approve an MOU before September. The administration knows this.
They told us a proposal yesterday, and then refused to meet with us to discuss it after we were able to review the written terms. And the FSC hasn't been able to get the data from Mercer that would allow us to evaluate the proposal in a conscientious way.

In the absence of the necessary data, the FSC put together an MOU that's very close to the administration's proposal. Prof. Mulvey made it clear that the administration has not said that they will accept these terms of compensation. The FSC's MOU includes a 1.5% salary increase, all distributed as standard merit, and a 1% across the board salary increase. The per course pay for adjuncts and full-time faculty teaching overloads is increased by 1.5%. Changes to health insurance match the administration's final written proposal, i.e., everything goes up by $500/$1000 except for the out-of-network out of pocket maximums which go up by more. Paragraph F wording remains unchanged, as the administration wanted.

Prof. Mulvey said, I am deeply concerned about the lack of understanding on the part of some of our senior administrators about the enterprise of higher education we are engaged in. I am concerned they see only customers to be satisfied and employees to be managed and a bottom line as the be all and end all of our reason for being. The faculty are not employees of the University. We are the university. We are not satisfying customers, we are making deep and life-long connections with our students. They see us on a glide path to some undefined notion of sustainability. I see us on a glide path to mediocrity. Of course, we must live within our budget in a responsible way, but if we don't do it in the context of academic excellence and all that requires to maintain the reputation we've all worked so hard to achieve, we may as well close up shop.

She continued, from what I see, everything is under attack. Healthcare is under attack. Tenure is under attack. The 95th percentile is under attack. This year, I asked the FWC to stand down and at Commencement only to wear buttons. Perhaps that was a mistake. I don't know. But we all know the enormous amount of faculty time and energy and volunteerism that went into Fairfield 2020, core revision, and the deep discussions within departments to promote academic excellence in a new framework. But, everything that is important to our core academic mission is under attack. And, while I will be on sabbatical in the fall, my message to the FWC at this point is - everything that is important to our academic mission is under attack and we need to begin fighting back on day one next year- job actions, protests, work stoppages. My tactic of quietly working as hard as we can to reach agreement with the administration this year didn't work. We got a bad deal. They reject our principles. And, apparently it's also important to the administrators we are working with that the FSC carries this message to you: post-tenure review is on the horizon, the 95th percentile is still not entirely secure, benefits are under attack. They plan to attack everything that is important to our academic mission.

She then reviewed the motions they would present today. Motion 1 accepts the MOU/BPO as put together by the FSC. The FSC has decided to withdraw what's listed on the slide as Motion 2. Motion 3 is based on advice from the FWC attorney about what happens if we don't have an agreed upon MOU. The contracts continue, and faculty expect a 1.5% salary increase as that was in the budget approved by the Board of Trustees.

At this point the floor was again opened to questions.

Prof. Dawn Massey said that she had two questions. She heard SVPAA Babington say in a meeting that the university expected to be facing a "Cadillac tax" (ACA excise tax) of $2.5 million. She asked whether the administration had provided data to support that expectation. Prof. Mulvey noted that we're aware of the tax and of the fact that it's unclear how or whether it will take effect. One of the charges to the HCC is to monitor the tax. Prof. Tucker said that the tax is based on the value of the benefits and they have given us some data about the value of our benefits, but not the full picture. Our response to concerns about this tax is to match any reduction in benefits (which would reduce tax liability) with an offset in salary. Prof. Massey continued with a question about the description of the second HSA option on page 5 of the BPO and why it doesn't exactly match the description of HSA 1. Prof. Mulvey explained that the BPO didn't have any text about HSA 2 so she added the pieces from the administration's proposal.
Prof. Boquet said she was most surprised by the language of post-tenure review. She served on the FSC when a lot of the work around merit was going on. That was clearly connected to compensation. Without any sense of the purpose of post-tenure review, it's not clear how it's connected to the charge of the FSC. Why would it be appropriate for language about post-tenure review to be in documents that govern our compensation? Prof. Mulvey explained that language about post-tenure review was not in the MOU. She also noted that it's simply too late to review for additional merit this year. In response to Prof. Boquet's central question, she said that when the administration first raised this issue, the FSC asked VP Reed whether post-tenure review would be tied to money. VP Reed said that that was a good question, he didn't know, but probably yes.

The FSC will agree to the language of talking about the feasibility of post-tenure review; they're not asking the General Faculty to formally do so. Prof. Hlawitschka added that the FSC tried to make it clear to the administration what a hot button issue this is. Given that the FSC always stands ready to discuss anything, it would be in the administration's best interest to put this issue on next year's agenda instead of making it part of this year's documents. The administration insisted on acknowledgement of their desire to discuss this issue. The FSC is acknowledging it and will not object to the administration putting it on the agenda in the Fall.

Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka thanked the FSC and HCC for their hard work and for modeling collegial and civil engagement when confronted with incivility and sidestepping of processes. She asked about the implications for governance of accepting an MOU that the administration has not agreed to. She wondered whether this could open a window for the administration to further disregard the processes for reaching agreement. Prof. Mulvey said she did not know.

Prof. Phil Lane asked whether it was time to put a motion on the floor for a vote of no confidence in our president. Prof. Mulvey said that was up to the faculty. When pushed for her opinion she said, I have very little confidence in the president's leadership at this time. She added that the FSC had contacted President von Arx this morning asking if they could meet with him. He replied that he was unavailable but urged the FSC to continue working with the administration and to present an MOU to the General Faculty for a vote.

Prof. Patricia Behre said that the process seems to represent adversarial brinksmanship at best and the continuing presumption that faculty time isn't meaningful, that we're always available. Noting that she was a historian rather than a finance person, she thanked all the people with financial expertise for contributing their expertise. She added that sometimes a historian's view is important and said that she was hired right after a contentious standoff that entailed significant job actions and resulted in a major settlement. Since then our annual salary has rarely kept up with inflation or our tuition increases. She wondered what happened in 1989-1990, what actions were taken and what settlement occurred. Prof. Mulvey said this might be a good question for the FWC to explore further.

Prof. Joe Dennin said that he has been here for a long time and has been struck over the last 5-10 years by the tremendous hypocrisy from the administration. For example, they speak about controlling healthcare costs but they just mean shifting costs to employees. They say the pool of potential students is shrinking, but we're increasing the size of our student body. They often talk of financial crisis, but we regularly run a surplus. So why are we trying to appease them? Do they really think they can run the institution efficiently and maintain quality without us? He applauded the FSC for putting up with all they have this year. It seems like we're making constant compromises and getting nothing in return.

Prof. Tucker, picking up on points made in previous questions, said we've been told that it is the Board of Trustees that wants post-tenure review. He thinks it's the latest fad, as merit was 10 years ago. He also said that the staff salary pool is going up by 3% next year while the faculty pool is going down slightly. We've asked for an actuarial approximation of various costs, for example, how many people would have exceeded the PPO deductible if it had been in place this year. We've gotten no response.
Prof. Ron Salafia said he didn't want to put anybody on the spot or make life more difficult for the FSC, but he wondered what would happen if we voted against these motions and sent a message to the administration that it's time for them to bend a bit to the needs of the faculty. Prof. Mulvey said that we don't know, we can't control what the administration will do. The current MOU has language about what happens in the absence of an agreement. She's not sure voting down an MOU helps us. The FSC is presenting an MOU we're willing to recommend you accept and a motion about what happens if the administration rejects the MOU. There could be a nuclear response from the administration and Board of Trustees; they could try to impose all of the changes they want. Prof. Bob Epstein, from the FSC, pointed out that the MOU we're bringing forward includes a 2.5% increase, whereas without an MOU we're entitled to the budgeted 1.5% increase. Despite the frustrations around the process and some remarkable bad faith, we're still very close. We thought we had an agreement yesterday, we were just waiting for it in writing. We're still remarkably close. Prof. Mulvey added that the only difference between what they sent and what we're proposing is that we bumped the salary back to 2.5% (vs. 2%).

Prof. Kathy Nantz said, it's 3:30 on May 27th and I don't understand why we're sitting here any longer, having this conversation. It needs to stop and the faculty need to step up. I'm not sure what we need to step up to, but having our FSC continuing this way next year isn't an option for me. Each year we're warned that something bad will happen next year, but something bad happens every year no matter what we do. We could vote for this MOU but not send our colleagues to the table next year. Each person could bargain individually with the administration even though that's not efficient for anyone. Or we could form a union so our people don't have to spend all their time doing this. It's offensive to me that you're having to do this right now. Whatever we want to do, I'm ready to do it. If we want to move no confidence in the President, I'll make that motion. If we want to move that we won't do this next year without guarantees of collegiality and transparency, I'll make that motion. Let's figure out what we want to do and let's vote.

Prof. John McDermott, considering the administration's motives, said they're usually trying to take our money and/or disempower us. We ought to resist attempts to further disempower us. He continued, I've been in the military for over 20 years, I know about bullying, and we're being bullied. My question is, when you say we're so close, so close to what? What are we anchoring to? Is it where we would have liked to have been at the beginning of the year? Prof. Mulvey responded that we're close to an agreement that adheres to the FSC's principles that any decrease in benefits has to be offset by an increase in salary. She said she has been here for 30 years and served on the FSC for seven. This is the worst year yet. The people running the show have no understanding of our core academic mission. With regard to Prof. Nantz's comments, she said that she would like to approve the two motions from the FSC and then would welcome some motion condemning this year's process.

Motion [Preli/Salafia]: The General Faculty accepts the MOU/BPO that was attached to the email from the General Faculty Secretary at 12:14 PM on May 27, 2015.

Prof. Dennin pointed out that the MOU doesn't meet the FSC's stated principle of salary offsets to compensate for a loss in benefits. Initially the 1% over the 1.5% salary increase was to make up for the cut in the retirement contribution. Now it's being presented as an offset for the changes in healthcare. We should be getting 1% to make up for the retirement cut and another $1000 for the healthcare changes. Prof. Mulvey said that they had considered putting precisely those terms in the MOU, but the majority decision was to remove them in order to be more reasonable.

Prof. Paul Lakeland spoke in favor of the motion on the longstanding tradition that even in the darkest of days we support our committees.

Prof. David McFadden agreed with Prof. Lakeland. He said that no matter what we think about what the FSC should do next year, they've worked like hell this year and we should support them. He emphasized the importance of unity going into the summer.
Motion [Hohl/Bayne]: to amend the MOU by adding an additional salary increase of $1000 as item C.3 in the proposed MOU.

Prof. Rona Preli spoke against the motion because it's a point of contention that could stop agreement; we're trying to force an agreement.

Prof. Tucker concurred with Prof. Preli.

Motion [Lane/Davidson]: to call the question on the amendment. Motion to call the question passed.

Motion to amend failed.

Motion [Davidson/McFadden]: to call the question on the main motion. Motion to call the question passed.

Main motion passed 93-19

Motion [Nantz/Lane]: that the General Faculty has no confidence in the administration's ability to engage in collegial conversations leading to satisfactory terms of compensation.

Prof. David Downie suggested that we amend the motion to a vote of no confidence writ large. He said that's a better headline as opposed to a discussion that looks like we only care about money. His informal conversations with members of the Board of Trustees suggest that they think we're all about money rather than the long term viability of the institution.

Prof. Epstein said that there already is a tabled motion about a vote of no confidence in the President. That could be untabled, but it seems to be a separate thing from Prof. Nantz's motion. Prof. Nantz said that she understood Prof. Downie's point and would be willing to withdraw her motion as long as we proceeded with some motion.

Chair Schmidt sought advice from his appointed parliamentarian, Prof. Mulvey. She explained that once a motion has been made and seconded, it belongs to the body, not to the maker.

Motion [Salafia/Davidson]: to withdraw Prof. Nantz's motion

Prof. Hlawitschka said that we (FSC and HCC) spent a lot of time over the last few days thinking about the best strategy. Their judgment is that if we reach agreement on an MOU now we're in a stronger position to fight in the Fall. He favors withdrawing the motion and maybe untabling the other motion in September.

Prof. McFadden suggested that proceeding with these kinds of motions undermines our approval of the MOU. We should return in the Fall when we're better organized.

Prof. Boryczka spoke in favor of Prof. Nantz's motion because we have been put on notice and we should put others on notice. We've been extremely collegial and should send a message about the administration's lack of collegiality. She referred to an FWC brown bag about the new legal environment for faculty unionization. The standards focus on the role of faculty in governance processes of the university. When we considered the issue in February, we didn't seem to be a good candidate for unionization. Now we seem to be moving from red lights to at least yellow lights.

Prof. Downie said he would not disagree with his department chair. This seems to be devolving into a strategy session. Maybe we should vote on Prof. Nantz's motion now and consider further motions in the Fall.
Prof. Lakeland spoke against withdrawing Prof. Nantz’s motion because it focuses on process and that makes perfectly good sense alongside our approve of the MOU.

Prof. Salafia said that he made the motion to withdraw on the assumption that we would replace Prof. Nantz's motion with a stronger motion.

As we moved to a vote, there was some debate over whether it was appropriate to have a motion to withdraw rather than simply voting on the motion under consideration for withdrawal. Chair Schmidt ruled that we should vote on the original motion.

Motion [Nantz/Lane]: that the General Faculty has no confidence in the administration's ability to engage in collegial conversations leading to satisfactory terms of compensation.

Motion passed 90-7.

Motion [Mulvey/McFadden]: The General Faculty’s position is that current faculty contracts continue in force until superseded by a new mutually approved MOU and new faculty contracts for the 2015-16 academic year based on that MOU. The faculty will continue to perform their job duties under the terms of their 2014-2015 faculty contracts. Furthermore, the faculty fully expect a 1.5% salary increase beginning 9/1/2015 based on the budget passed by the Board of Trustees and the fact that minimum salaries for new contracts issued for 2015-16 have included a 1.5% increase.

Motion passed, 114-0.

Motion [Dennin/Davidson] to adjourn.

Motion failed.

Motion [Boryczka/Behre]: that the General Faculty will fight, by any means necessary, to protect academic excellence at Fairfield University.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn [Massey/Carolan] passed without objection at 4:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Health Care Review Committee

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 contributions 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.

3. Principles

FSC principles:

• Any decrease in benefits must be offset by an increase to salary.
• No individual employee should suffer undue hardship due to a decrease in benefits.

Administration’s principles:

• None have been articulated to us.
• The administration’s sole concern appears to be the bottom line.

4. Most Recent Proposals

FSC Proposal for two-year contract (1/3):

Salary year 1: 1.5% standard merit
1% added to base
Salary year 2: 1.5%
4. Most Recent Proposals
PSC Proposal for two-year contract (3/3):

**HEALTH CARE CHANGES:**
- Current PPO 2 becomes framework for single PPO option.
- Introduce deductible to PPO: $500/$1,000
- Lower in-network OOP maximum to $2,500/$5,000
- PPO: OON deductible increase from $200/$400 to $700/$1,400
- PPO: OON OOP maximum increase $1,200 to $2,000/$3,400
- HSA: increase in-network deductible $1,500 to $2,000
- HSA: increase OON deductible $1,500 to $2,000
- HSA: Increase OOP maximum: from $3,000/$6,000 to $3,500/$7,000

4. Most Recent Proposals
Administration’s proposal (1/4) when we got it in writing:

**Terms:** One year contract

**Salary:** 2.5% increase distributed as standard merit conditioned on...[rest of text cut off]

4. Most Recent Proposals
Administration’s proposal (2/4) when we got it in writing:

- HCC continues to meet and seek mutually advantageous changes to plan design.
- Paragraph F: back to 2011-12 language

4. Most Recent Proposals
Administration’s proposal following caucuses (orally):

- Term: one-year
- Salary: 2% standard merit in exchange for agreeing this resolves claims on retirement and to agree to discuss post-tenure review.
- Agree to health care changes that were acceptable to FSC.
- Re-engage the Health Care Committee.
- Paragraph F as the FSC wanted.

4. Most Recent Proposals
Administration’s proposal (3/4) when we got it in writing:

- Health Care:
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the in-network deductible to $2,500/$3,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the in-network out of pocket maximum to $3,500/$7,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the out of network deductible to $3,000/$6,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the out of network OOP Max. to $3,500/$11,000

4. Most Recent Proposals
Administration’s proposal (4/4) when we got it in writing:

- Health Care:
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the in-network deductible to $2,500/$3,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the in-network out of pocket maximum to $3,500/$7,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the out of network deductible to $3,000/$6,000
  - HSA (current Option 5) increase the out of network OOP Max. to $3,500/$11,000
4. Most Recent Proposals
   • Administration’s proposal (4/4 when we get it in writing)
   • Health Care Committee continues to meet and seek mutually advantageous changes to plan design
   • Paragraph F Language. The administration proposes that the language of Paragraph F of the 2014-2015 MOU (i.e., the current MOU) remain in effect for 2015-2016

5. MOU/BPO

The terms of compensation in the 2015-16 MOU/BPO we have drafted are as follows:
   • 1.5% salary increase distributed as standard merit
   • 1% salary increase for each faculty member
   • Adjunct salary/overload pay increased by 1.5%
   • Changes to health insurance as in administration’s proposal (slides 12 & 13).
   • Language for Paragraph F as in administration’s proposal.

6. Motions

**Motion 2:** [Like good children] the GF acknowledge the administration’s position that distribution of the 1.5% salary increase as standard merit and the 1% salary increase to each individual is conditioned on (a) the acknowledgement that all claims regarding past retirement contribution reductions and/or other undocumented claims are resolved and that going forward, any materials commitments be reduced to writing, and (b) the agreement to form an appropriate group made up of faculty and administration to discuss in earnest the feasibility of a post-tenure review system that could replace the current merit system and be in place for FY17 (2016-2017). If no change is mutually recommended by this group, it is understood that the current system for distribution of merit remains in full force and effect.

**Background for Motion 3.**

Current faculty contracts run through June 1, 2015 and, traditionally, new faculty contracts, based on a new Memo of Understanding (MOU) are sent to faculty in June. Given that the parties have not yet reached agreement on a successor MOU, and based on the advice of our attorney:

**Motion 1:** The General Faculty accepts the MOU/BPO that was attached to the email from the General Faculty Secretary at 12:14 PM on May 27, 2015.

**Motion 3:** The General Faculty’s position is that current faculty contracts continue in force until superseded by a new mutually approved MOU and new faculty contracts for the 2015-16 academic year based on that MOU. The faculty will continue to perform their job duties under the terms of their 2014-2015 faculty contracts. Furthermore, the faculty fully expect a 1.5% salary increase beginning 9/1/2015 based on the budget passed by the Board of Trustees and the fact that minimum salaries for new contracts issued for 2015-16 have included a 1.5% increase.
Healthcare Review Committee

Report to General Faculty May 27, 2015

Financial Status of Current Healthcare Plan

Most Recent 3-month Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted amount first 3 months 2015</td>
<td>$3,855,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual costs first 3 months 2015</td>
<td>$2,643,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount over budgeted for 2015</td>
<td>$1,212,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budgeted amount is 46% over actual amount vid 2015
**Annualized amount over budgeted for 2015 $4,848,304

Healthcare Trigger Committee

In November the administration informed the Faculty Salary Committee that healthcare premiums for faculty would increase by 14.9% in 2015. Healthcare premiums for the university would increase by only 2.9%. This was the case even though the actual healthcare costs for 2014 were about 10% below the budgeted amount. The administration’s explanation for this increase was that their consultant, Mercer, told them it was necessary. They never shared Mercer’s report or an explanation of Mercer’s methods to the Trigger Committee or the Healthcare Review Committee and imposed the premium increases over the objections of the Trigger Committee.

Healthcare Review Committee

The launch year for the Healthcare Review Committee (HRC), which was established to allow for more concentrated efforts towards reason and data-driven changes to our healthcare plan, was a dud. The administration did not bring a single proposed change to this committee and made meeting difficult to schedule.
No Answers to Questions

The administration circumvented the Healthcare Review Committee and made multiple proposed changes to our healthcare benefits very late in the year. The proposals were significant including the proposed elimination of the PPO options.

The administration has not been able to answer some very simple questions about the proposed changes put forth by the FSC including, “How much money is saved?” and “How many people are affected by the change?”

Warning: more costs-sharing?

The FSC made a proposal for a 2-year contract with a year 2 salary increase of only 1.5% and all changes in healthcare to be mutually agreed to. In rejecting this proposal the administration clearly stated that they may seek to increase faculty cost share of the healthcare premium above 20%.

Limited Information Sharing

While the administration has been great in sharing information on plan costs and budgets, they have withheld some information. Specifically, responses from Mercer to questions posed by the FSC were not forwarded to the FSC. The FSC requests contemporaneous sharing of all information regarding our healthcare plans.

Disagreement of Principles

The administrative team vehemently rejected the FSC’s principle that whenever the administration seeks to cut a benefit, the FSC will seek receive offsetting compensation.

After years of accepting below inflation salary increases to offset above inflation healthcare costs, the administration is asking us to now take cuts in healthcare benefits with no offset in salary. This is a win-win for the administration and a lose-lose for the faculty.

Disregard for the Individual

Yesterday morning’s proposal by the administration would have some people’s out-of-pocket healthcare costs go up by over $4,600 next year. The FSC/HRC thought that even if this was a reasonable modification to the plan, the sudden change in costs to some individuals was too high. The administration did not have any idea how many people would fall into this category or whether these individuals had options to reduce these out-of-pocket costs. While costly to the individual, the administration could not quantify the savings to the university.

Today’s Proposal (highlights)

1. All plan participants will have an increased annual deductible of $500 per individual and $1,000 per family. Out-of-pocket maximums also will increase by this amount.
2. The proposed MOU has a 1% increase to base salary that should cover the additional costs of the increased deductible for most plan participants.
3. Unfortunately, a handful of people (specifically PPO participants using maximum out-of-network services) will see their costs increase by $1,300 for individuals and $3,600 for families. We regret this change and this hardship for these individuals. The FSC has asked the FWC to create a “hardship fund” to assist these people transition over the next year. Members of the FSC have already committed over $1,300 to this fund. We are sorry that a few are being asked to bear an unreasonable burden for the benefit of many. [Note: the administration had been insisting on an even greater burden for these individuals.]
1. Announcements

Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs, Lynn Babington, made the following announcement:

I recognize that during the first scheduled faculty meeting this year on 9/18, I will be introducing new faculty and kicking off the new year, but I wanted to take a few minutes this afternoon to share with you the progress we have made in identifying ways to reward and incentivize innovation.

The handouts that you hopefully picked up on your way in today [attached to these minutes] outline three general areas of innovation.

The first is pedagogical innovation and we have been offering faculty workshops and stipends through various centers to support new course development for some time. In addition to those opportunities, we launched the IPad distribution this week to all faculty. This has been very successful and as of this afternoon, we have distributed 182 IPads.

The second are that we have been able to procure money to support new on-line course development. Faculty can apply for a $2500 grant to support the development of an online course, either a new course or taking an...
existing course and moving it to online. Our goal is to have at least one online course offered next summer in all of the general areas of the Core. If we can achieve that, we will not allow our current students to take required courses at other institutions over the summer if they are offered online at Fairfield. The details of this application process will be available in the next week or so and will be sent out on faculty announcements and placed on the Academic Affairs (AA) website.

To support this initiative, we are hiring an educational technology specialist with expertise in online education. This person will be hired in the next few weeks and will be located in AA, but will work in collaboration with academic computing and the CAE. Their role will be specifically to work with faculty.

The final area is faculty research. There are two opportunities here.

a. Currently there are a number of faculty (particularly in the STEM fields) who are PIs on government sponsored grants (federal, state and local) where the University receives indirect cost allocations. In working over the summer with my colleagues from other AJCU schools, I have been able to get FU to agree to support a fund share with faculty/department/schools of 15%. This is actually higher than at other AJCU schools. What this means is that 15% of the administrative fees awarded to the University will go back to the PI/department and/or school. Schools and departments will determine the split between the PI and the general department or school fund. These monies can support student workers, research, travel to disseminate study results, money to fund pilot projects, etc. The policy supporting this initiative with all of the details will be posted on the AA website.

b. Finally, we have procured some funding to support the development of larger research grants at both the corporate, foundation and governmental levels. Details are on the handout and again, faculty announcements will include the application process (and it will be on the AA website).

Finally there will be 10 Presidential Innovation Awards ($5000) each to recognize faculty and staff who generate innovations that result in significant cost savings to the University or generate additional revenue. Details of this award will be forthcoming.

We hope that this is only the beginning of a University wide movement toward innovation in both the way we do business at the University and our educational programs.

You, our faculty, are not only experts in your own specific disciplines but possess the creativity and energy to identify and develop innovations that contribute to the education of our students and the success of the University.

I would be happy to take questions, however I know that we have a very short time today for this important agenda, so I suggest that if you have specific questions, you can speak with me after the meeting OR if you send me questions by email, then during the 9/18 first faculty meeting, I will attempt to answer them.

Thank you!

2. Consideration of a 2015-2016 Memo of Understanding/Benefits Plan Overview

Prof. Chris Bernhardt, Chair of the 2015-2016 Faculty Salary Committee (FSC), made the final presentation from the 2014-2015 FSC. The slides accompanying his presentation are attached.

He began with an overview of the official timeline, noting that if we approved the MOU/BPO under consideration today, then we could be back on track for receiving the new salary in September. He reminded the Faculty that we tried to finish the process at the end of last semester. The FSC was close to an agreement with the administration and on May 27 brought a proposal to the General Faculty that they hoped would be acceptable to the administration. That proposed MOU was accepted by the Faculty, and its terms were almost entirely acceptable to the administration, but the administration insisted on some additional language.

Prof. Bernhardt then reviewed the terms. There is a 1.5% salary increase, distributed as standard merit. There is an additional 1% salary give-back for all continuing faculty. Furthermore, the BPO contains changes, detailed on slide 5. Most significantly, a deductible has been added to the PPO, and the HSA deductibles are increasing. All of these terms were accepted by the Faculty and the administration in May. The changes in terms from the May 27 proposal concern adjunct/overload pay and salaries at the associate professor rank. [These changes are explained in the memo from the FSC accompanying the materials for today’s meeting.]
The new language requested by the administration consists of 3 paragraphs shown on slides 7-9. The first paragraph relates back to the 2011-2012 academic year when we had a shortfall in students. The administration asked for givebacks and the Faculty agreed to a 1% decrease in the university’s contribution to our retirement accounts. Last year, when the administration restored staff compensation cuts from that same period, the FSC asked for restoration as well for faculty. The administration agreed to 1%, but in salary, not retirement. They also insisted that the initial give-back was never formally described as temporary and that moving forward, all agreements need to be put in writing. That’s what paragraph a of the new language is about. In addition, paragraph c states that the 1% is not an offset for health care plan design changes in the 2015-2016 BPO.

Prof. Bernhardt went on to explain paragraph b. The Journal of Record describes our current merit pay system. Part of that system is that when salary increases are above cost of living, higher levels of merit pay should kick in. The FSC has argued that considering cost of living in only one year is problematic so that language should be tweaked. In the meantime, they asked to have all of this year’s increase distributed as sustained merit. The administration agreed but insisted on the language in paragraph b forming a committee to look into post tenure review. He thinks that this language is talking about merit because it explicitly says that if no agreement is reached then the current merit system remains in effect.

He concluded by stating that the 2014-2015 FSC, Profs. Crandall, Epstein, Huber, Mulvey (chair) and himself, are unanimously recommending acceptance of this MOU/BPO. He also acknowledged the help of the other faculty members from the Healthcare Committee, Profs. Hlawitschka and Tucker.

At this point, the floor was opened for questions. Prof. Gisela Gil-Egui asked whether the new language meant that there is no commitment from the administration that the 1% increase will be permanent. Prof. Bernhardt explained that the 1% is going into base salary.

Prof. Eric Mielants asked about the administration’s rationale for revisiting the merit system. Prof. Bernhardt said that he thought it was a response to the faculty’s concerns about the current distribution system. He doesn’t think there’s an ulterior motive. They want to talk about problems raised by faculty.

Prof. Cecelia Bucki began with her appreciation for the interminable hours put in by the members of the FSC. Returning to the 1%, she noted that restoration in salary is not equivalent to getting that amount in retirement contribution because salary is taxable. Prof. Bernhardt said that faculty members could choose to divert it into their retirement accounts tax-free. He acknowledged Prof. Bucki’s point that that is only true if the faculty member has not already maxed out his or her retirement contribution.

Prof. Bucki asked if we will ever see the retirement contribution back at 10%. Prof. Bernhardt said that we can’t talk about going to 10% as restoration for the change made in 2011-12, but we could argue for an increase. Prof. Bob Epstein, member of the FSC, reminded the Faculty that we weren’t forced to reduce the retirement contribution; we agreed to do so for the health of the institution in a moment of crisis. This language says that the discussion of what we’re owed is over. It doesn’t foreclose any future discussion of what the retirement contribution should be.

Prof. Bucki then noted the administration’s new emphasis on what’s written. She wondered whether there is a danger in committing in writing to a committee examining post-tenure review. Prof. Bernhardt said that if the MOU passes then the Academic Council will set up the faculty membership for the committee and give it a charge. Any recommendations will come back to the faculty, so he doesn’t see much danger.

There were no further questions.

**Motion [Bernhardt/Scheraga]:** that the General Faculty accept the MOU/BPO presented with the materials for the 9/2/2015 General Faculty meeting.

Motion passed with 15 opposed.

3. **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn [Bernhardt/Caster] was uncontested at 4:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
General Faculty Meeting
September 18, 2015
Faculty Incentives for Innovation

The fast-paced and globally interconnected world that unfolds before us is asking use to recreate and reimagine our institution if we are to remain true to our mission – to transform the world for the better through education.

We are introducing the following incentives in calendar year 2015-16.

**FACULTY INCENTIVES**

1. Pedagogical Innovation
   a. NEW ipads for all full time faculty and used ipads for part time faculty
   b. CAE Grants and Programs
      i. Pedagogical Innovation Mini-grants
      ii. Use of mobile devices in the classroom
      iii. The ins and outs of flipping a classroom
      iv. Teaching computer applications through the Cloud
      v. Meeting the needs of the 21st century learner though use of technology
      vi. Course Design Institutes
   c. Office of Service Learning Course Development Grants
   d. Applied Ethics Course Development Grants
   e. Humanities Institute Grants

2. On-line Course Development

   Faculty can apply for a grant to support the development of one of the Core courses (either the University Core or the core classes in the major) as an on-line course to be taught within the next calendar year (Spring 16, Summer 16, Fall 16). The deans will review applications and award $2500 grants on the following schedule: October 15, 2015, January 15, 2016 and May 15, 2016.

   Details on the application process will be forthcoming.

3. Faculty Research
   a. Faculty/Dept./Schools share in administrative overhead on extramural funding. To further support research, when a grant includes indirect costs for the University, a portion of those funds will be returned (to the school/dept/investigator) will be 15% of the monies allotted to the University. A detailed policy is forthcoming.
   b. Support for developing and submitting research and institutional grant proposals (competitive process)
      i. Budgets over $500,000 = $2000 incentive
      ii. Budgets between $100,000-$500,000 = $1000 incentive
      iii. Special circumstances for budgets less than $100,000 = $500.

   Details on the application process will be forthcoming.

**FACULTY AND STAFF INCENTIVES**

4. President’s Annual Innovation Award for Faculty and Staff: There will be 10 awards for $5000 each that recognize innovations that either generate additional revenue for the University or decrease expenses.

More details on the annual innovation award will be forthcoming.
Faculty Salary Committee 2014/2015
Presentation to the General Faculty
September 2, 2015

Official Timeline
• October  Faculty/administration discussions start
• February  Faculty approve MOU/BPO
• March    Trustees approve budget
• June     Contract letters sent to faculty
• September Faculty start receiving new salary
• January  New health insurance premiums start

Reminder
• Proposed MOU contained:
  o 1.5% salary increase distributed as standard merit
  o 1% salary give-back for each faculty member

Reminder – cont.
Proposed BPO changes:
Current PPO 2 becomes framework for single PPO option.
Introduce deductible to PPO: $500/$1,000
Lower in-network OOP maximum to $2,500/$5,000
PPO: OON deductible increase from $200/$400 to $700/$1,400
PPO: OON OOP maximum increase $1,200/$2,400 to $1,700/$3,400
HSA: increase in deductible $1,500/$3,000 to $2,000/$4,000
HSA: Increase OOP maximum: from $3,000/$6,000 to $3,500/$7,000

May 27 meeting of General Faculty
• FSC presented an MOU/BPO that had not been approved by the administration.
  • The motion to accept the MOU/BPO is passed by the General Faculty (93 – 19)

Subsequent events
• The Administration agreed to accept the MOU/BPO approved by the GF provided additional language was included in the MOU. The BPO was accepted without change.
  (Corrections were made to the max/min associate rank and to adjunct pay.)
The increase [of 1% of 2014-15 salary to each faculty member] is agreed to and conditioned on the following stipulations:

(a) all claims regarding past retirement contribution reductions and/or other undocumented claims are resolved and that going forward, any material commitments be reduced to writing, and

(b) the agreement to form an appropriate group made up of faculty and administration to discuss in earnest the feasibility of a post-tenure review system that could replace the current merit system and be in place for FY 17 (2016-2017). If no change is mutually recommended by this group, it is understood that the current system for distribution of merit remains in full force and effect.

(c) the faculty acknowledge that the increase does not constitute an offset to compensation for changes made to health care plan design as set forth in the BPO.

It is the unanimous recommendation of the FSC that the GF pass the following:

MOTION:
The General Faculty accept the MOU/BPO presented with the materials for the 9/2/2015 GF meeting.