



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The March meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, March 1, 2004, beginning at 5PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the December, 2003 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### AGENDA

#### 1. Amendments to December 2003 minutes

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

##### Questions

a. (Ben Marsh). Our October minutes say "The final order of business was to vote on the entire [Faculty] Handbook update. ... The motion passed without dissent, accompanied by a joyful round of applause. President Rogers asked, in view of its importance, that the faculty action on the updated Handbook be presented to him in writing, to which he will respond in kind." What is the present status of those revisions?

b. (Anonymous). What criteria are used to determine campus openings and closings during hazardous snow and ice conditions? How long ago were the criteria established, and has thought been given to the possibility that the criteria might now need to be reevaluated?

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

Report on review of faculty governance

#### 4. Old Business

Handbook motion on procedures for selecting faculty representatives to trustee meetings: Janice Mann (first introduced in December, 2003. See that Agenda for text.)

#### 5. New Business

a. Reports from the Committee on Academic and Faculty Personnel: Allen Schweinsberg

##### **I. On addressing the CPI issue**

Last November the faculty requested that "In a timely fashion Personnel should bring to the faculty for its decision a set of options for how to address [the] CPI issue."

For many years merit increases have been awarded in fixed dollar amounts. Consequently, faculty receiving the same merit scores receive identical merit increases, with

the result that higher salaried faculty receive lower percentage increases. In the current year 38 faculty received raises lower than CPI, because the 2.5% increase in the salary pool for tenured faculty barely exceeded the CPI of 2.13%.

In response to the faculty directive the Personnel Committee offers two alternatives to the current system.

(Option A) Continue to distribute merit increases to tenured faculty in fixed dollar amounts, provided the percent increase in the salary pool is at least 50% greater than CPI. [For example, if CPI were 2% then the salary pool would need to have increased by at least 3%.] In years when the percent increase in the salary pool fails to exceed CPI by 50%, award merit increases as percentages of salaries.

(Option B) Each year, distribute half of the money available for merit increases to tenured faculty in fixed dollar amounts. Distribute the remaining half as percentages of salaries.

Option (A) adheres to the current system (equal merit pay for equal merit) in years when the increase in the salary pool is adequate to provide raises that exceed CPI. In lean years, merit pay would be distributed by percent of salary in order to limit the number of faculty with raises less than CPI.

This option provides relatively more dollars to lower salaried faculty. It restrains the salary gap between younger and older faculty and between faculty in non-market fields and those in market fields. However, as we have seen, after a period of years the resulting salary compression can result in salaries at senior ranks below those at comparable institutions. Over the course of one's career any individual would presumably receive slightly higher pay during early years at the expense of pay later in the career.

By distributing half of the merit dollars in fixed dollar amounts, Option (B) still honors, in part, the principle of equal pay for equal merit. But it also uses percentages to lower the risk of high salaried faculty falling below CPI. Option (B) also addresses the problem of salary compression at higher ranks. It has the simplicity of remaining the same each year, although in years in which CPI and salary increases are very close more faculty will receive raises below CPI than would occur with option (A).

Most members of the Personnel Committee prefer Option (A), although we believe both options provide considerable protection from the CPI problem that arose last spring.



**II. On distributing merit raises in this second year of transition**

This is the second and final transitional year in which part of the faculty will have the new performance evaluation ratings and part will have the older merit ratings. Because the ratings are not directly comparable, it is necessary to separate the tenured faculty into two groups for the purpose of distributing merit raises.

The Personnel Committee recommends

(1) that this spring the merit dollars for tenured faculty be divided into two amounts in proportion to the number of tenured faculty in two groups, those reviewed in 2003 and 2004 and those reviewed prior to 2003 under the previous system. "Merit dollars" is that portion

of the salary pool remaining after 1/2 of CPI has been applied and equity and promotion amounts have been removed from the salary pool

(2) that, for the purposes of salary computations this spring, CPI be the December-December 3-year weighted average (1.82%) that is being used to project the FY2004-05 operating budget.

Recommendation (1) is a modification of our original recommendation of a year ago. It represents wisdom (we hope) gained from hindsight. Last year we split the salary pool before removing promotional dollars and across-the-board pay (1/2 of CPI). Only later did we observe that one group had a disproportionate need for promotional raises, while the other group had a greater across-the-board need due to slightly higher salaries. These effects only partly offset each other, with the result that the merit portion of the pool was not equitably distributed. That oversight was later remedied by a small upward adjustment to the salaries of faculty in one of the two groups.

b. Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

The Committee on Planning and Budget has begun an intensive review of the university's general policy on benefits. It is clear to us and to the Trustees, that the present rate of cost increase -- over 12% -- is not endlessly sustainable. We hope to be well informed about the problem and our options before substantial changes become necessary. The "Campus Benefits Advisory Group", which has representation from the administrative and academic personnel committees, is doing most of the leg-work on this topic.

c. Report from the University Review Committee: Gary Steiner

**Reviews of DRC Statements on Procedure and Criteria for Retention and Tenure**

The URC, in consultation with CAFT and the Office of Academic Affairs, has found that changes are warranted in the guidelines governing periodic review of department/program statements of procedures governing the review of candidates for retention and tenure. These changes do not pertain to criteria for retention and tenure, but pertain exclusively to procedures governing the periodic review of each department/program's review guidelines. The impetus for these changes was first provided by CAFT during the 2002-2003 academic year, in the interest of streamlining the process by which each department's/program's guidelines are reviewed. The following changes have been developed in consultation with CAFT.

*University Review Committee's Reviews for Retention and Tenure*

(Accepted by the Faculty 3/3/87)

(Revised 4/98 to incorporate accepted recommendations of the Task Force on Retention, Tenure and Promotion)

Last paragraph on Page 1 now reads:

DRC statements of procedures and criteria must be reviewed every five years by the department/program, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. DRC procedures should be dated to indicate the most recent

revision date. The department chairperson or program director will provide each member of a department/program with a copy of the DRC statement currently in use.

Recommended revision (changes are underlined):

DRC statements of procedures and criteria must be reviewed every five years by the department/program, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in that order. The office of the Provost will notify departments and programs on September 1<sup>st</sup> of a given academic year their documents are scheduled for review. Once reviewed, department/program statements showing planned changes will be forwarded to CAFT no later than September 1<sup>st</sup> of the following academic year. Reviews by CAFT and the Provost, and responses by the department/program, if necessary, normally will be concluded prior to May 1<sup>st</sup> so that updated documents may be distributed on that date to faculty anticipating reviews for reappointment, tenure, or promotion during the subsequent academic year. A cover sheet will provide signatures and dates to document the actions of each of the three parties. Should either CAFT or the Provost ask the department/program for changes, the new text will next be forwarded to CAFT for approval before it is forwarded to the Provost. The above procedures will also apply when review of DRC/PRC statements is initiated by or motivated by purposes other than the five-year review cycle. DRC/PRC statements should display prominently the date on which they received final approval. The department chairperson or program director will provide each member of the department/program faculty with a copy of the current, approved DRC/PRC statement.