



The March meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, March 4, 2002, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the February, 2002 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### **AGENDA**

#### **1. Amendments to February 2002 minutes**

#### **2. Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff**

Question 1. What is the charge to the task force the faculty was asked to elect (by ballot) at the end of February?

Question 2. Some courses were without scheduled classrooms into the second week of this semester, and many more were in strange and difficult rooms. The chronic shortage of suitable spaces makes teaching harder and saps the energy of those who must deal with it continually: department chairs, associate deans, the scheduling office. How is the university responding to this significant constraint on our effectiveness? Is a dedicated classroom building under consideration?

Question 3. a) Since the Personnel Committee was not given the chance to evaluate the 2002 salary structure, it is important that information necessary for determining the actual significance of the numbers categorized as "averages" be made available. The administration's presentation did not include data that would promote a more comprehensive understanding of the current allocation of salary increases.

More specifically, WHY was the following information not provided?

- i) The population of faculty occupying any one particular rank expressed together with the distribution of salary ranges in that rank
- ii) The methodology for generating averages (these values need to be normalized to years in service)
- iii) The methods used to normalize the "averages" used from other schools
- iv) the reason for including salaries adjusted for "market value" in the data set (including them in the same data set disturbs the weighting)

b. Why was the personnel committee bypassed during this salary restructuring. Although it may be said that the faculty was "informed", no actual numbers or distribution strategies were provided to the faculty before the decision was actually deemed acceptable by the administrators and faculty representatives who met with the Board.

c. On V-forum, Genie Gerdes stated that the appropriate avenues for formulating salary structure were "confused" this year. It could also be argued that there may have been discrepancies in the recommendations presented to the Board since the methodology used by Planning and Budget for strategic planning (ie. analysis involving the separation of ranks) is quite different from an analysis that ultimately provided only "an overall figure" to the Board.

Could it be that the recent salary restructuring prevented a fair allocation of funds for salary adjustments since the use of an "overall figure" for recommending a compensation plan feeds a different set of information into the decision-making process. How will the administration attempt to correct these decisions that will have wide-ranging effects both now and in the years to come?

**3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

Report on the planning process

**4. Old Business**

- a. The motion from Ben Marsh on Athletics has been withdrawn.
- b. Report from the Committee on Instruction: George Exner (see February, 2002 agenda for their report)