

Council for Faculty Affairs Minutes
April 10, 2018
4C Kelly Commons

Attendance: Shawn Ladda (chair), John Wasacz, Kimberly Fairchild, Sarah Scott, Quentin Machingo, Ira Gerhardt, Rebecca Kern-Stone, Nevzut Ozturk, Lauren Trabold, Jeff Horn, Br. Robert Berger, Bernadette Lopez-Fitzsimmons, Natalia Boliari, Corine Fitzpatrick, Scott Lowe, Patrick Abulencia, Kashifuddin Qazi, Tricia Sheridan, Meg Toth and Parisa Saboori.

- I. Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved as submitted.
- II. Approval of March 20, 2018 Minutes: The minutes were approved as amended to reflect attendance and the correct spelling of Ira Gerhardt.

III. Compensation Proposal – A very honest and polite discussion was held regarding the proposed Faculty Handbook Language discussion for the new compensation package proposed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Comments on the subject are organized below by School and are accompanied by any explanations provided by J. Horn or K. Weld, Co-Chairs of FWC, who also provided clarification throughout the conversation:

Salaries over the past 5 years are on average 14% higher than they were before that period and the college needs a policy to address this inversion. The proposed policy includes a review of salary data after 3 years and the policy can be updated after 5 years of implementation.

There are significant examples of recruitment and salary issues but there most likely isn't a report detailing the specifics of these concerns.

The Faculty Handbook sets a minimum salary at each rank but the Provost has the authority to hire new faculty at "Market" value. This value can be above the minimum and is often set through consultation with the Dean of the school in question.

The Fairfield plan, which has been governing faculty salaries for the past 15+ years needs to be continued and will be explicitly stated in an update of the compensation policy presented to the council in May.

Finally, the proposed policy will not be able to address unique aspects of each school; overload, Arches courses, chairs etc. but addressing all school specific idiosyncrasies would be impossible at a Handbook level policy. This policy was designed to help deal with some salary related concerns and serve as the starting point for continued compensation conversations in the near future.

School of Business: Faculty in the School of Business are enthusiastically in support of the proposed policy as they are most affected by inversion. They also expressed concern that under the current policies they have had difficulty recruiting and retaining faculty and anticipate an improvement under the proposed policy.

School of Education: Faculty in the School of Education expressed a desire to see all faculty on campus paid equal salaries but also recognized that was not a practical possibility. They also felt that they should see an increase in pay, although more moderate than some, and were generally in favor of the new policy.

School of Engineering: The overall sentiment from representatives of the School of Engineering is that faculty in the school will have much to gain if the policy is adopted. Currently faculty are paid wages below market value in the public sector and feel that this is contributing to the difficulty in hiring new Assistant Professors.

School of Liberal Arts: Many faculty from the School of Liberal Arts expressed concerns with the proposed compensation policy. One common point of concern was the perceived lack of communication. The faculty felt they needed to see data relating to two key areas; the overall issues of compression/inversion within the School of Business and issues related to gender equality. Beyond the communication concerns, faculty were concerned that the proposed policy will generate inequalities between the schools as well as inequalities between departments of the same school. They question what effect this will have on faculty morale. Some faculty, not just in the School of Liberal Arts, wanted to see all faculty receive equal pay for equal work.

School of Science: Science faculty agreed that most faculty in the School of Science would benefit from the implementation of the policy. Furthermore, there was a belief that faculty in the school will never earn as much as faculty in the Schools of Business or Engineering and are content earning a little more than they are currently. Some faculty are concerned of unintended consequences of implementing the policy such as faculty from lower paid disciplines limiting their service work. J. Horn indicated that this concern was already raised with the Provost and was informed that this was not an issue and everyone will continue to conduct service.

Following the discussion J. Horn and K. Weld noted they would be meeting with the Provost the next day. If any School or Department would like to introduce new language or principle to the proposed compensation proposal, the Faculty Welfare Committee would appreciate receiving that information within two weeks. CFA anticipates holding a vote on the new Faculty Handbook language during the May 8th CFA meeting.

IV. IRB revised proposal

K. Fairchild expressed concerns from the Psychology department that the IRB was being put together like any other committee, but it is not a typical committee. In particular, the Chair of this committee would have a significant volume of work to deal with all IRB proposals. In the past, W. Matystik had been addressing a majority of the proposals and the IRB committee was only called on to review the infrequent complicated reviews. K. Fairchild would like to have meeting with R.Roy and any other administration/faculty to establish an appropriately functioning IRB committee.

In previous conversations regarding the IRB committee R. Roy has expressed she wants the IRB to be faculty driven to limit perceived conflicts of interest between the administration and possible grant applications.

V. Sabbatical application proposed edits.

K. Fairchild who has recently chaired the Sabbatical committee, along with other committee members has submitted proposed edits to the Sabbatical leave application. These edits arose as an attempt to minimize the great diversity of applications submitted and the changes are intended to clarify the instructions specified by the Faculty Handbook. J. Horn was concerned that the changes may prioritize support that directly impacts work in the classroom but he was assured that was not the case.

The changes were approved unanimously.

VI. Faculty Concerns brought forward to discuss at CFA

I. Gerhardt brought several points of concern to the council:

- a. South Campus parking. Though out the construction of the Higgins building and following its completion, the RLC parking lot will be the only lot near South Campus and is not large enough to support all of the faculty, much less the students that also park there. Ira proposed the following motion:

“The CFA requests that the administration consider paving and installing lighting in the parking lot at 240th street and reserve it for faculty. The CFA also requests that the parking restrictions are enforced.”

The motion was unanimously approved.

- b. Announcements regarding snow. Recent snow events resulted in multiple, and at times contradictory communications from the Provost’s office and Public Safety. To avoid confusion one coordinated message would be helpful. It was also questioned if there is enough parking in the Broadway garage for all faculty, staff and students when Public Safety closes all outdoor lots during inclement weather. This should be a consideration when developing a campus closure communication. Ira proposed the following motion:

“The CFA requests that the administration coordinate any closure related policy into a single communication to the campus community.”

The motion was unanimously approved.

- c. Locked doors in RLC & Leo. There are frequent irregularities regarding the access to RLC and Leo buildings though the key card system, although this appears to be a larger concern for RLC. South campus faculty asked that Public Safety be reminded of the policy regarding access to RLC and Leo and that Physical plant make timely repairs to facility doors. S. Ladda will discuss the faculties’ concerns with Provost.

- d. Common final exam schedule. There are a set of traditional and laboratory classes that always need a common exam and the Faculty would appreciate a scheduling notice earlier than 4-6 weeks prior to final exam week, possibly at the start of the semester for these courses which would be identified. Some classes will need common exams Ad Hoc but these should be able to process more quickly than they are already. Also the request for a common exam should be solicited at beginning of semester not during the summer or winter breaks. EAC has heard the concerns previously and Shawn will reiterate the faculties' concerns with the Provost.

VII. New Business

- a. It was reported that the new Faculty Handbook is still at the College's legal office although CFA was assured that the new handbook will be ready at some point in the future.
- b. The data regarding usage of the Faculty dining room was requested and the data still forthcoming.
- c. R. Kern and I. Gerhardt reminded everyone to complete the administration survey and asked everyone to encourage their constituents to do the same.
- d. Retired emeritus professor Dr. Leo Alvez contacted S. Ladda requesting the policy for emeritus professors regarding; access to email, office, library, etc. There doesn't appear to be any policy outlined in the Faculty Handbook and CFA should explore defining the Emeritus position more fully.
- e. S. Ladda encouraged CFA members to consider serving as Chair next year. It is an excellent opportunity for an Associate professor to earn valuable leadership experience.

Respectably submitted *Quentin Machingo* minute taker