

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 10, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Gary Cooper (GC)

Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JiL)

Shane Prine (SP)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

(JH note: the workload compensation policy draft (minus annotations) discussed herein is available at <http://dixie.edu/dscpolicies/File/3-10rev3.pdf>).

DW: (hands out Ed's document) – could you please get started on this – I have to go address some students and will be back in 10-12 minutes.

BB: Did we talk last time about why it would be bad to include the word “average” in the workload compensation document? It could create a greater disparity in salaries. Have we agreed that we'll reject that as a Faculty Senate?

SP: No, just that we would re-review and discuss them today based on Martha's comments. With regards to this, I was talking to PA yesterday – this idea of allowing us to make a percentage of our salaries is great, but the money doesn't exist. It doesn't hurt to try, though.

JC: Even if we could get that within five years...that'd probably be easier to get.

SP: That seems more reasonable, phasing it in.

BB: I think we need to ask for it immediately and see how they counter.

JC: Yes, then suggest a time – get a part of it in three years get part, another part in another three, etc.

BB: I'm still concerned about Donna's insistence on putting “average” in the wording – that will affect us in the Fall. Don't we need to communicate this to the Faculty at Large in the next week or so? (JH reads from annotated draft with Martha's comments.) Didn't Martha say this would get voted on in the first week of March? In my building, the faculty have heard of this and really want to hear something from Faculty Senate with more than a few days to discuss it before it goes to a vote!

DH: (calls Martha) – this will be voted on the first Tuesday of March in Academic Council.

BB: I request that either PA or DW put something together on this that we can send to the general faculty by Friday or Monday. (PA enters; BB fills him in on this). We agree with Martha that having “average” in there is bad, so something needs to come from this body very soon so faculty can talk about it and we can put out a statement before Academic Council votes on it. Do we want to go over Martha's reasons why it would be devastating?

DH: I think what JH just read from the minutes is good.

BB: If I understand it, it creates disparity in salaries among departments, and if I understand Martha's reasoning, there's been something in the school's policy previously preventing that...?

DH: Something President Caldwell did to create equity?

PA: So why are they wanting this “average”?

(Many): To save money, presumably.

DH: Someone mentioned last week that Donna is mostly a numbers person, so for her it's about the numbers – that'd be my guess, that this boils down to the budget.

PA: And that's her job.

DH: But *ours* is to advocate for the best things for faculty, and I agree that this isn't good for faculty at all.

BB: So could we get something out to faculty by Monday?

PA: I'd hope so – DW said he'd send out a survey on some other issues we've previously discussed, but I haven't seen anything come out yet.

DH: Has anyone else talked about this in their departments? Is there a consensus forming?

BB: Does the general faculty know about this policy?

DH: It did go out to all faculty...

JL: We've talked about it informally, but nothing serious.

SP: No, the draft was just sent to us.

JC: Martha's comments were sent only to us, yes, but our minutes went out to all faculty.

DH: The Library faculty agree that it's a huge mistake. And our librarians are hybrid faculty, so it doesn't even really affect them.

JH: No, our minutes have not yet been posted.

BB: Somehow, my chair received an e-mail from Martha detailing 4-5 reasons why this language would be devastating...

DH: Martha just sent out the policy, without annotations, to all faculty.

BB: Would Martha be comfortable in adopting her language in whatever letter we produce?

DH: She's happy to meet with us as individuals, as a group, or whatever.

BB: So let's say PA sends out something Monday – how do we get feedback from the faculty?

PA: Time for feedback is critical because once it gets to Academic Council, it's basically rubber-stamped. So the time to change things is *now*, when the e-mail hits our inboxes. My understanding is that *we* (FSEC members) are responsible for getting department feedback and bringing it to this committee.

GC: Here's what she said (calls up from e-mail & projects on screen what Martha sent on 1/30/11) – In part 3-10.II.C – this is the Word doc she sent us. She addresses two effects that having the word "average" in the language would have – she talks about the advantages we have now.

BB: This is the language that would be great to have in whatever we send out.

PA: So what do we want to say? What's the solution we propose?

BB: Would be as simple as saying we want to continue to use what has been in place for the last few years? What Pam is currently calculating? ER's interpretation of it was that in order for anyone to get a raise, the lowest-paid faculty would have to be within 90% of the CUPA average. I'm not sure if that lines up with what Martha is saying.

DW: (returns) My interpretation was that it's done on a faculty-by-faculty basis. What the "average" is is unclear.

SP: Supposedly CUPA.

PA: If it's CUPA, are we comfortable with that?

DW: What else would we go on?

PA: So why are we uncomfortable with the word "average" here?

DW: We don't know what defines it.

PA: So we just need words added to the policy defining it.

GC: Right now, we're guaranteed to be within 10%. So if they say "average," someone could be at 120% equity and someone else at 70% and yet they could still say "we're at average." It takes that range of equity and opens it up too much – it would allow some people to be highly underpaid. In the

Chronicle, they've talked about people adverse to negotiating salaries, and these are the people that would lose out in this model.

DW: Let's say you've got a friend in the Art department at Harvard that teaches one class/semester and does lots of gallery work, etc., and gets \$140K/yr. Then here, you say "I want to be within 90% equity of this guy."

PA: (pointing to document): This suggests that the basis for comparison is CUPA.

DW: Well, then, if we do a within institution "average," we're already the lowest in the state! If they use the national average, everyone stands to go up.

JC: I'm confused as to there's two averages we're talking about – the "average" used here is "within institution."

GC: But we need to define what "equity" is.

DH: We need it specified that "equity" comes from CUPA, or wherever it comes from.

GC: CUPA accumulates from many different kinds of institutions...

DW: When an institution goes from college to university, equity changes by definition. If we keep "average" internal, we won't be reflected properly.

PA: But this is talking about overload..? Or base salaries?

DW: This is one of the issues I had: right underneath where "average" is, it conflates two different concepts: yearly salary and overload.

JC: This doesn't talk about overload salary, just the *amount* of overload. Is overload mandatory?

PA: No, it's determined within departments on an individual basis.

BB: Correct, but there are many faculty members, especially those making the least, that would choose to do lots of overload just for the money. Wouldn't it be better to bump up their salaries to prevent that?

PA: I don't think that's addressed here.

DW: I don't think it's clear at all.

BB: It says that Donna is afraid that if "average" is there, then they can't negotiate more overload.

DW: I have another problem stemming from your comments: in a sense, this punishes junior faculty seeking more income – rather than bring them up to equity, you hang out the carrot of "work more," and then you're paid more from overload rather than rising salary. No: overload is a completely separate issue.

PA: Maybe DW and I just need to talk to Donna to clarify where this is coming from.

JC: What would happen if we took that whole clause (everything in 3-10.II.C except the last sentence) and just chucked it and didn't worry about benchmarks at all...?

PA: Without knowing the motivation behind the changes, we can't say.

DW: PA, I applaud your solution, but I'm not sure we'll get the whole reasoning from a discussion with Donna. OK, we're about done, time-wise...I apologize for missing the first part of the meeting, but let's suspend making any statement to Martha until PA & I have a chance to talk to Donna, then we'll call another meeting to discuss what we've learned.

PA: Or discuss it over e-mail...?

DW: Or just at the next regularly scheduled meeting, next week. I think this has been a fruitful, if frustrating, meeting.

PA: We also need to set constitution/by-laws changes – if we move to a six-year model, open up president candidacy, etc. – that needs to be reflected and that we're not up against that vote when we're trying to make other changes.

DW: Let's propose the constitution/by-laws changes in simple language, perhaps even get Martha to participate, then post it to the Faculty. If the response is positive, a simple majority, then it's just a matter of getting it posted. It's just a language shift, so I don't think it will take long, and it doesn't need other committee approval – it's internal just to us.