University Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
Special Meeting: December 2, 2014  

Attending:  

Zed Adams, NSSR  
Elaine Abelson, Lang  
Anthony Anemone, NSPE  
Adria Benjamin, Mannes  
Erin Cho, Parsons  
Margaret Fiore, NSPE  
Josh Furst, Lang  
Peter Haratonik, NSPE  
Richard Harper, Jazz  
Rachel Heiman, NSPE  
Nicolas Langlitz, NSSR  
David Lopato, Jazz  
Frank Nemhauser, Mannes, Co-Chair  
Richard Salcer, Parsons  
Elaine Savory, Lang, Co-Chair  
Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons  
Carlos Teixeira, Parsons  
Sven Travis, Parsons, Co-Chair  
Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang  
Jennifer Wilson, Lang  

Not attending:  

Banu Bargu, NSSR  
Erica Fae, Drama  
Ragnar Freidank, Drama  
Danielle Goldman, Lang  
Candy Schulman, NSPE  
Earl Scott, Parsons  
Shane Selzer, Parsons  
Marcus Turner, NSPE  
Inessa Zaretsky, Mannes  

Frank called the meeting to order.  

The co-chairs received a draft of the revised salary memo that the administration drafted and they asked for UFS feedback.  

The co-chairs reported back to administration about the faculty unease in regard to the salary increase memo and that it was discussed at length at previous UFS meeting.
Frank read the new draft of memo to the group.

Discussion:

It was stated that a commitment to general wage increase policy and procedures should be clarified. Sven wondered if the UFS should ask that to include the UFS in all decisions like this moving forward. Peter pointed out that the new draft memo doesn’t really say anything. It just placated the situation. Sven said that the reason for focusing on a January raise is the result of a successful enrollment in the fall. Peter asked on the long term question where faculty salary came from. Peter pointed out that PTF and some senior administrator are contracted for their raises while the FTF do not have contracts. Peter also said that the faculty don’t know anything about salary equity at the university so there is no reference point. Anthony felt that the UFS should make clear how important it is that it should be consulted on these matters, but should also point out that there are no procedures of equity or merit to draw from. Elaine A. pointed out that the administration was talking about merit increases in a year where there were no full time faculty evaluations. It was also asked how many senior administrators were declining to take raises. Frank answered that it is only a small amount but that it was a gesture. Sven reported that the primary issues at Parsons FTF Faculty Assembly are transparency of faculty banding, what are the levels and the comparisons between divisions, and what constitutes the evaluative process of merit. It is understood that the deans were asked to determine the approach they would take to distribute the funds. The deans were told they could slice and dice the money however they wanted. The deans at Lang, Parsons, and NSPE presented this information to their faculty. Frank said that the decisions for distribution were likely already made before the memo was even sent out. Sven, catching up with this after the fact. Elaine S. reported that the administration was waiting to send out the new draft memo until the UFS special meeting convened. Frank urged the UFS to come up with a response before the end of the meeting. Jurgen felt that there should be a differentiation between the long term procedures and guidelines, and the short term steps needed to resolve this issue. He also felt that equity should be adjusted first. Sven reported that only 2.5% of the budget has been allocated for raises. He also reported that the UFS had already requested the faculty banding numbers but that they haven’t received any data. Jennifer wondered if this was the only communication that faculty were going to receive about this and if so it doesn’t really address any specific information. It was pointed out that if the deans have already made their decisions then the faculty aren’t going to learn anything more. Frank postured that maybe all the dean’s hasn’t made their decisions. Elaine A. felt bothered that this was already a done deal even though it didn’t sounds like it was at the time. It was pointed out that the UFS is more of just a sounding board for decisions instead of being a part of how decisions are made. Frank said that he didn’t want to sugarcoat things but that he also didn’t want to diminish the fact that they have reached out to UFS for input. Adria felt that the first memo was painted with too board of strokes and felt that the administration needed to provide a full account of what took place and what will happen moving forward. It was reminded that the UFS not only need to give feedback on this memo but that it should also send some sort of communication to the faculty. Adria thought that a list of items the UFS felt needed to be addressed would be better than a letter. Carlos said that it was
clear that faculty were unsatisfied. He wondered why is the faculty banding information exists why is hasn’t been disclosed. Peter said that the faculty were promised banding information in 2006. The UFS isn’t comfortable with merit increases until it knows the true nature of merit. Equity needed to be addressed before the next budget year begins. Sven wondered why the UFS’s communication to the administration all be the same to the faculty. Everyone agreed that it should be one document. Margaret wondered if there was an individual published pay grid and if not, what would stop the FTF from putting up their own grid. Sven said that the UFS can request this information or say that it will get it by itself, using anonymous means. Elaine A. said that a lot of this stuff is public knowledge anyway. Adria felt that the UFS needed to present what its expectations are and not just for this issue but all communications that go out. Jurgen felt that these issues need to be tied to these bigger issues like workload. Policy can’t be crafted without data. It was suggested that a task force be created to evaluate policy about wage increase immediately or the UFS would do it by itself. Sven wondered if the UFS really wanted to ask for task force or if it might be better for UFS Faculty Affairs Subcommittee to look into it. Jennifer asked if the group was accepting that the decisions have already been made. Sven said that the UFS could declare a cease and desist and go back to the beginning but pointed out that that would set up the UFS as being confrontational. In order to put raises into the system for January they would have likely already been processed. Josh thought this meeting was called to add input into this decision. Sven said that moving forward is just as important. He also said that last year the FTF got a memo about an across the board wage increase and no one said anything about that. He wondered why there wasn’t any questioning about that and noted that the only different is that this year a memo was sent out. David asked about FTF unionizing. Sven said that it is good to look at these issues to see what is happening at other universities. David shared that Jazz PTF didn’t get anything until they unionized. Carlos said that even if these things have been happening every year the memo disclosed the behind the scene stuff that has been happening without policy. Sven said that the UFS could strongly urge the administration to put forth the salary banding information. Elaine S. wondered if the school was a university or divided divisions.

Proposed Bullet Points Response:

-Transparency: the need for it
  1) salary bands and equity and how much money is in the game
  2) nature of merit evaluations
  3) results of this process
  4) how they did it this year, a report from individual divisions

Elaine S. reported that the co-chairs have asked a representative dean to attend the next UFS meeting on 12/9.

It was stated that it’s not really a large amount of money so why this is such a big thing and thus an across the board salary increase would make the most sense. Maybe in the future that could change. Nicolas said that even if it was too late for this round there should be no problem with revealing the process this time around. The bullet points
should refer to the present too. Nicolas also felt that the proposal should include something about the dean’s and how they should make their decisions transparent.

Elaine S. said that the co-chairs would like to have a rotational process of dean representatives at UFS meetings.

Other Proposed Bullets:

-Idea that there is no recourse for negotiations, individuals, what is the process for faculty to meet with the individual who made the decision, to understand the logic of how the decision was made, use the word procedure instead of recourse, procedure for follow up, clarification

Anthony didn’t feel like that was a great way to engage with administration. Jurgen suggested that each bullet point have a preamble, to separate the present and the future a little bit. Luciana felt that negotiations should be included since it is vague when the conversation will actually happen. Carlos wasn’t sure if it needed to be individual or collective.

Other Proposed Bullets:

-Procedures, policy, and planning moving forward, suggested UFS subcommittee be included in this process

It was suggested that we should ask for a deadline about this information instead of just keeping the request a general one. Perhaps there could be a possibility of requesting a green paper about this process. Sven wondered if the UFS really wanted to suggest a vetting of a green paper. Peter felt that the bullet points were sufficient for now. Luciana said she agreed with the need for a timeline for this information so faculty can understand the process before annual reviews happen. David pointed out that if people have gripes about their salary some clearly know where to inquire about it if some faculty are making upwards of a $100,000 a years. Richard recapped the bulleted list: how TNS defines merit from evaluations, how TNS defines equity. He felt that the UFS should keep the word “negotiations” in there in order to keep the administration honest. Anthony said again that the administration should consult with the UFS before decisions are made. Sven made clear that the UFS should ask for senate representation, not just faculty representation. Language that should be considered: “UFS is seeking action on the following bullet points.” Jennifer wondered what the timeline was for everything. The co-chairs planned to meet later in the day to discuss. Other language to be considered: “expectation.”

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