I. Salary Increases - Bryna Sanger and Tim Marshall

Bryna shared information about the preparation for salary increases in January.

A salary study done five years ago by Towers Watson and has been used as touchstone but it needed to be updated. Faculty were distributed by what they are teaching, not by their degree. Only seven faculty at the university fell below the reference point.

From hand-out regard salary banding research:
Market Pricing Methodology
- Engaged the firm of Towers Watson who worked with us to design and carry out the faculty salary study
- Collected competitive compensation data from the College and University Professional Associate (CUPA) Four-Year Faculty Survey
- Chose data from Private Universities and increased 10% to account for doctoral institution’s premium
- Aged data by an annual factor of 2.1% to July 1, 2015 to reflect market movement in academic institutions
- Applied geographic adjustment to market data of 20% to account for New York City labor market

Analytic Methodology
- Grouped New School Disciplines by related cognate areas
- Identified median market salaries for each discipline in a cognate grouping
- Averaged the medians of the disciplines within each grouping to arrive at a reference point for each group
- Chose a spread of 60% around the reference point within which TNS salaries by rank should fall (appropriate min and max), 20% below for min, 40% above for the max
- Used current New School salary data to see the distribution of where individual faculty fall within this range by grouping and rank
- Identified cost of bringing everyone up to the min

Discussion:
There was a question about the pool of faculty who are still only assistant professors (mostly RTA) and should likely be associate professors. Bryan answered that they are looking for time in rank for faculty also, since it’s true that a lot of faculty weren’t historically on good review cycles. It was suggested that the PO ask faculty what they are teaching since the faculty might inadvertently be in the wrong band. Elaine A asked if the groups were alphabetical or if it was organized by salary. Tim said it was organized by salary. It was asked if there was a variation in salaries by employment type and the answer is no. Salaries do not vary from tenure to RTA. Bryna said that they only received a clean version of all this data recently and they are still unable to answer a lot of questions, especially about the comparison between men’s and women’s salaries. A thorough study with Towers Watson will happen again soon and then the banding information will be distributed after the salary increases are put in place. It was suggested that the information be broken up by employment categories. Sven suggested that the more important categorization is “merit.” Carlos brought up a question about if everyone was doing the same workload since that has a lot to do with the equity of salary. Tim noted that most of the increases are pulling people up. A question was asked about retention deals and if they could be standardized across the university. Tim answered that all the deals eventually come to the PO for approval so it’s not all the deans’ decisions. Almost all the retention deals require a letter of a job offer.
II. Call Full Senate to Order - New Business

Barry called meeting to order. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made and then approved.

III. USS Representatives / Student Unionization Presentation/Discussion

Representatives from the Student Senate, co-chairs. Simon Henschel and Kadin Herring

The USS representative talked about getting representation on the BoT, one undergraduate student and one graduate student. This is still under consideration by the BoT. Elaine S. asked what the criteria was for them to accept. The USS representative said that they cannot share information with the student body, even with USS, and they would have to sign a contract. But either way it is important because it gives a voice in the room even though they won’t be voting members. The BoT has the right to exclude. Barry asked if they were seeking voting membership. The students want to change things so that they are always in the room. Sven shared that the co-chairs of the UFS have been invited to attend the BoT meetings. But it’s under similar constraints. Charles said he would try to track down numbers of voting privileges for students or faculty on BoT.

Barry asked about student unionization.

The USS is very determined to further stance of unionization. Would be an important recognition.

Jurgen wondered what they were being told that is delaying the process. The students responded that the university is asking the union representatives to meet with department heads to “clear” requests for unionization. Before it is recognized by the school needs to be recognized by department.

Majority of students are for unionization.

Sven requested further information. He felt it was important it was the UFSs duty to support the students if that is appropriate. The UFS will invite students who are coordinating the unionization effort to a future UFS meeting.

Simon asked how the student senate and the faculty senate could work together more. Perhaps have joint meetings. The UFS co-chairs will follow up.

Charles asked for the USS co-chairs to share presentation they gave at the Town Hall.

IV. Faculty Lounge Discussion with Lisa Servon, David Lewis, and Bryna Sanger

Bryna, David and Lisa came to discuss the faculty lounge in the new building and how the space could be better utilized.
Sven said that faculty want to maintain the space. David and Lisa came up with three proposals.

1. new furniture
2. reconstructive work
3. make it a big expense project

There is concern about the space being under-utilized. But the PO doesn’t want to lose the faculty space. There is an issue of sound, a concern of whether it is private, that it is outfitted like a cafeteria and that the entry way is institutional.

The UFS should have a say in the decision of what to do with the same.

There was a suggestion to expand the faculty resource center on the 3rd floor but that doesn’t seem to be a good idea.

The money for this project will come out of the budget so it’s important that it is successful.

The question is are we as a faculty looking for spaces like this. Bryna thinks this is a big discussion. Elaine S. it takes time to develop central culture.

One suggestion was to put money on faculty IDs to get them to attend the first time and buy coffee or wine.

There is also a need for more clarification on if the space is bookable. Bryna said she has been trying to protect the space. Jennifer suggested a naming contest. Events need to have faculty related purpose. And need to be marketed better.

Recommendations

- establish a budget
- establish a schedule
- hire the right design firm

Co-chairs will re-visit. No doubt it should be retained for faculty and staff.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and then approved.