

Drew University Faculty Meeting  
Minutes  
May 1, 2008  
4:15 p.m., Craig Chapel, Seminary Hall

Voting members present: E. Anderson, M. Beach, S. Bonn, V. Burrus, A. Candiotti, J. Cassady, L. Connors, G. Cousens, P. Cucchi, L. Culmer-Nier, M. David, P. Dolan, L. Edwards, D. Fewell, J. Fox, J. Golden, P. Gunter-Smith (presiding), S. Jamieson, M. Johnson-DeBaufre, C. Killian, W. Kolmar, E. Lawler, D. Lawson, J. Lenz, L. Lesniak, D. Liebowitz, M. Masucci, C. McKittrick, K. Moore, S. Moore, J. Muccigrosso, J. Olmsted, K. Pechilis, W. Rogers, A. Saltzman, V. Samuel, A. Scrimgeour, M. Sloan, A. Son, C. Taylor, R. Timmons, L. Van Blerkom, C. Van Wyk, T. Windfelder, A. Yardley, C. Yordan

Guests: H. Buxbaum

Preliminaries:

The meeting was called to order by Provost Gunter-Smith at 4:25. In her welcome she noted the attempt to schedule University Faculty (hereafter UFac) meetings in various locations. She also noted there would be some items of new business for the fall. She sent good wishes to all who are leaving Drew, retiring, or going on leave. The minutes of the meeting of Nov. 27, 2007, were approved.

Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance/PCC:

Deb Liebowitz reviewed the reasons for the formation of the committee, notably that procedures are unclear and often not followed. The committee plans to re-write procedures. There has been extensive discussion particularly in relation to jurisdiction. The committee prefers the procedures as written rather than as followed recently. Reasons for a grievance will be specified. Committee progress has been slowed because of a case this spring.

Discussion:

- Cases are often colleague vs. colleague whereas historically they were individual vs. policy or administration.
- Q: Is the committee planning to include administrative structure in the procedures? Issues can often be resolved at a dean's office level or via ad hoc committee. A: First stop should generally be the relevant dean.
- Q: What is the time line and what is the process for engaging faculty discussion? A: Some time next year. The sequence will be draft, then conversation on issues of jurisdiction (*e.g.* relation to human rights and sexual harassment policies), then to all faculties for approval.
- It is appropriate for a lawyer to look at this

Compensation (reports from University Faculty Committee on Faculty and the Compensation Monitoring Committee):

Part I. Virginia Burrus, co-chair of the University Faculty Committee on Faculty (hereafter UFacCoF), reported that the first job this semester was to revive the committee and clarify its staffing and functioning. Regarding compensation, historically the Committee on Faculty

produced an annual report comparing faculty salaries to comparison schools. More recently the Compensation Monitoring Committee (hereafter CompMon) monitored salary comparisons. This semester UFacCoF and CompMon held discussions about their roles and agree there should not be two independent and parallel assessments of salaries. The UFacCoF does not view its job as gathering and analyzing data. However, it does believe such information should be disseminated. It sees its own role as advocacy rather than monitoring. UFacCoF proposes that annually the CompMon should give either the UFac or the UFacCoF a report on university faculty salaries and compensation so that the UFacCoF can advocate if necessary. CompMon has indicated that a full report could be available for a fall UFac meeting. CompMon is charged to report to the Senate.

Part II. Jennifer Olmsted, chair of CompMon, reported that: the committee had gone moribund; it represents the whole university, not only faculty; committee members were finally identified; Jennifer had been on maternity leave; and CompMon doesn't really do the data collection and analysis itself. The Committee's agenda includes:

- Maintaining a list of comparison schools and evaluating them periodically. Chris Van Wyk could provide whatever information is desired. Comparison groups vary for different categories of employee. CLA, the Theological School, and the Library, for example, use different comparison data.
- Working on the charge from the President to develop plans to reduce the rate of health care cost increases. A related request has been to look into funding health benefits for retirees.
- Studying other benefits such as tuition and maternity leave

The committee supports communication but it has been unclear who provides input and who should be reported to. Discussion:

- Q: Does the committee ever verify that policies are met or adhered to and/or recommend adjustments. Compensation levels for adjunct faculty would be an example. A: There is monitoring of peer groups individually and dialog with administration
- Q: Who determines the peer school list? A: The policy was written in 2000 and things change, e.g. changes in grad programs, dropping the SAT.
- Family leave benefits are on the list but this issue has been tabled
- The Provost applauded the rejuvenation of governing bodies.

#### University Faculty Handbook:

Sandra Jamieson, co-chair of the UFacCoF, outlined work on the UFac handbook. The committee had first resolved its charge and process. It selected co-chairs as a symbolic gesture. It chose to work first on the salary and compensation question (see earlier reports) and then turned to the handbook issue.

The UFacCoF read all four faculty handbooks with attention to nuances and variation. It envisions a section of framing language to introduce issues of teaching, scholarship, service, and integrity, followed by separate sections and languages for the four faculties where they differ. In checking handbooks of other schools the committee finds that a typical arrangement is a common section followed by separate sections. Useful samples from other schools are welcome. When a draft is completed it will go to individual committees on faculty, then deans, then to individual faculties for full discussion. Discussion:

- Q: What is the time frame? A: Depends on definition of the scope, i.e. review only or entire handbook? Want to finish quickly but without rush.
- It is nice to have excellent examples and not have to re-create wheel, but it is necessary to get permission to borrow from others.
- Q: How will the university faculty handbook interrelate to school specific handbooks? A: The university faculty handbook will be an umbrella with commonalities which tries to increase coherence and similarities. Individual school handbooks will dwindle. (Provost). There will likely be one book with sub-chapters. (Sandra). Differences are not so great. It is possible to have a robust general section with sparser individual sections on criteria or process variations. (Virginia)

Budget:

Howard Buxbaum reviewed the status of the fiscal year '09 budget. This year the single representative budget committee received submissions in the fall. By December, the '08 budget was found to have a gap due to lower enrollment and changing discount rates. The gap was closed by reducing non-salary areas and leaving positions vacant. This gap will recur for '09 and units were asked to reduce up to a further 10% in "discretionary" areas. Current forecasts of unrestricted revenue also show a shortfall. The slow economy will likely affect enrollment because of lower home equity and increased difficulty getting loans. Several revenue initiatives are being explored. Discussion:

- Q: Might there be mortgage assistance? A: Assistance in the past was when interest rates were high. Need to know current issues. Specific ideas or concerns can be sent to Howard. Also, CompMon could be involved since this would be a benefit.
- Q: Can Drew give loans? A: This would be unwise.

Old business:

None

New business:

The Provost announced that the draft of the human rights policy has gone to the Senate. It will then go to faculty, staff, and students for comments. She thanked all who worked on it.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 and was followed by a reception.

Respectfully submitted,

Lessie Culmer-Nier  
Secretary, Agenda Committee