Proxies were held by:

Faith-Anne Dohm for Sr. Julianna M. Poole
Katherine Schwab for Ronald Davidson
Mary Frances Malone for James Estrada
Mary Frances Malone for Orin Grossman
Steve Bayne for Dennis Keenan
Laura McSweeney for Matt Kubasik
Jen Goldberg for Wendy Kohli
Jen Goldberg for Patricia Calderwood
Paul Caster for Dawn Massey
Paul Caster for Lucy Katz
Robbin Crabtree for David Sapp
Ray Poincelot for Miriam Gogol
Cathy Miners for Dina Franceschi
David Zera for Dan Geller
James He for Chris Huntley
George Lang for Kathy Nantz
Susan Rakowitz for Rick DeWitt
Elizabeth Petrino for Sally O’Driscoll
Paula Gill-Lopez for Christine Siegel
Paula Gill-Lopez for Bogusia Molina

At 3:37 PM, the meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty, Professor Betsy Gardner.

1. **Announcements.**

Professor Elizabeth Petrino was granted the floor to announce and provide details for an upcoming conference to be held at Fairfield on October 27-29, 2006 on Jesuit and Feminist Education: Transformative Discourses for Teaching and Learning. Flyers with details were available. Contact Prof. Petrino or Professor Jocelyn Boryczka for further information.

Professor Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty, reminded faculty that a memo listing open committee positions had been circulated and that the deadline for volunteers/nominees is April 9. Prof. Mulvey reminded faculty of upcoming events:

- Wednesday, May 3, GF meeting for committee reports and elections
- Wednesday, May 10, GF meeting for the annual address by the President followed immediately by the reception for retiring faculty held in the Quick Center.

2. **Approval of Minutes from March 3, 2006.**

Prof. Gardner called for a motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

**MOTION [Greiner/Dohm], To approve the minutes of 3/3/2006 as circulated. The MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

3. **Informational Presentation by Jeanne DiMuzio, Office of Wellness and Prevention.**

This item will be rescheduled to a meeting next fall.
4. Changes to the Faculty Handbook on Sabbatical Leave Policy.

Professor Meredith Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Research Committee, presented this item to the faculty. New language is proposed for the Faculty Handbook so that tenured faculty members would be eligible for a first sabbatical after 10 semesters teaching at Fairfield (or 10 semesters after a Pre-Tenure Research Leave). Prof. Gardner called for a motion in order to proceed.

**MOTION [Wallace/Salafia]. To amend the Faculty Handbook (9th edition) section II.B.2.a by replacing the first paragraph under a. Sabbatical Leaves with the following paragraph.**

Sabbatical leaves are reserved for tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty members who have not been awarded a pre-tenure research leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after ten semesters of active service at Fairfield University. Tenured faculty members who have been awarded a pre-tenure research leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after ten semesters of active service at the University following their pre-tenure research leave. Tenured faculty members are eligible for any subsequent sabbatical after serving twelve semesters since their last sabbatical leave.

Professor Paula Gill-Lopez questioned the last sentence of the proposed new language in connection with faculty members who may put off an approved sabbatical in order to accommodate departmental needs and suggested that the wording should be amended.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE PENDING MOTION [Gill-Lopez/LoMonaco]. To insert in the last sentence the words “the awarding of” between the words “since” and “their”.

Professor Robbin Crabtree spoke against the motion to amend saying this should not be an invitation or policy to take a sabbatical whenever you want.

Professor Dennis Hodgson said that the current language in the Handbook is the minimum time requirement and that the administration can always make exceptions that the Research Committee would, presumably, not overrule.

Professor George Lang read from the current handbook (page 29), “Faculty members who, at the request of the Dean, postpone an approved sabbatical leave in order to accommodate the needs of their curriculum area may begin counting the 12-semester time period of eligibility for their next sabbatical in the first semester after the semester for which they applied and were approved for sabbatical leave, or, in the case of an approved two-semester sabbatical leave at half salary, in the second semester of the sabbatical leave for which they applied and were approved. The time of the postponed sabbatical leave will be counted in the 12-semester time period of eligibility for the faculty member’s next sabbatical leave.”

Professor Ron Salafia spoke against the motion to amend saying that the wording in the motion to amend will confuse the issue. The issue is addressed by what Prof. Lang read.

Prof. Beth Boquet spoke against the motion to amend and clarified the rationale behind the language Prof. Lang had read. A vote was taken on the motion to amend.

**MOTION TO AMEND FAILED** with only one voting in favor.

**MAIN MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**
5. **Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees.**

Professor Paul Lakeland, Chair of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees, reported to the faculty, saying that the General Faculty and Academic Council had asked the Conference Committee to take 2 motions passed by the General Faculty to the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board and this was done on March 23 in a two-hour meeting.

Prof. Lakeland reported on this meeting as follows. Present at the meeting were Professors DeWitt, Lang, Patton, Tromley and Lakeland of the Conference Committee, Professors Hlawitschka and LeClair of the Faculty Salary Committee, Board members Ed Glynn, Thomas Loughlin, John Baldovin and Paul Huston, and for the administration AVP Grossman and President von Arx. After some preliminary items, Mr. Huston read a prepared statement, the major points of which were reiterated in an email to the faculty of 3/26 from AVP Grossman which was a faithful and accurate summary of Mr. Huston’s statement. The four main points in the statement are (1) The Board is firmly committed to the AAUP’s 95th percentile in total compensation, (2) Competitive salaries are essential to continue to attract good faculty, (3) The benefits portion of the compensation package is unsustainably high with an inequity in the distribution between medical and other benefits, (4) Medical costs can be lowered with minimal decrease in benefits. A lengthy and lively discussion ensued. The faculty focused on their mandated agenda to discuss how the 3% salary increase this year should be allocated. The faculty gave the Board of Trustees the document, *Guiding Principles and Procedural Guidelines for Faculty Compensation at Fairfield (GP)*, which had been created jointly by a faculty/administration committee that included AVP Grossman, Dean Deignan and Dean Snyder and was unanimously approved by the faculty. The jointly-approved GP clearly state that when the salary increase is below the increase in CPI, serious attention should be given to judging only for sustained merit. The faculty attempted to show that the position was not simply heated rhetoric, but an argument for a principle in the GP and they made this point over and over.

Prof. Lakeland feels that some progress has been made. In particular, (1) although the faculty’s objective of having the 3% go to only sustained was not met, the 2.5/0.5 split is a step in the right direction (2) Misconceptions were corrected: trustees were surprised but glad to hear that the fight against merit pay was over; trustees are glad that the faculty realize that health care costs must be addressed. (3) While John Baldovin deplored the tone of faculty comments in the GF minutes, he was persuaded that the salary increase should go to sustained merit only.

Prof. Lakeland noted that problems remain. In particular, (1) the trustees were not persuaded by our argument of principle that no additional merit can be funded when the salary pool is below cost-of-living. (2) The Board’s actions seem to place in doubt the value of our jointly-approved *Guiding Principles*. (3) With regard to the Board’s continuing insistence that our increase in total compensation be compared with the increase in the CPI, there appears to be a gap in understanding that we do not know how to bridge.

Prof. Lakeland offered his own comments. Given the commitment to the 95th percentile, it seems that any decline in health care benefits would be compensated by an increase in salary but that the sickest among us would see the greatest decrease in total compensation. The trustees fail to see our principled faculty position that “some should not receive more if all do not have enough” and are not persuaded that the faculty as a whole would not prefer to see salaries increased on the backs of those among us who have chronic or critical health care issues.

There were no questions. The report was followed by applause from the faculty.
6. **Report from the Faculty Salary Committee and consideration of a 2006-07 MOU.**

Professor Beth Boquet, Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee, made the first part of the report to the faculty. Two copies of the 2006-2007 Memo of Understanding (MOU) had been distributed by email – one showing the changes from last year’s MOU and one a clean copy. Prof. Boquet went through the changes. In section C.2, on distribution of further merit: the goal is to have language mandating transparency and consistency so that once a faculty member knows their evaluation, they should know their salary increase. The FSC has no role in evaluating faculty but the FSC has a crucial role in seeing that the plans are clear with respect to how money gets distributed. The new language in C.2 mandates at least 2 meetings/year of the deans and AVP for the express purpose of working toward consistency and transparency in the disbursement of merit funds across schools. The FSC expects it will hear back after these meetings. In C.3, language that wasn’t clear last year has been clarified. Date and numbers have been updated, but there is very little change to the text this year.

Ongoing items are (1) contract language, (2) a mortgage assistance program for newer faculty, (3) a subcommittee of FSC and Academic Council to review health benefits will be proposed to the Academic Council. The floor was opened up for questions on this part of the report.

Prof. Paula Gill-Lopez questioned the use of the term further merit since the Guiding Principles Committees says additional merit. Prof. Boquet: The administration wants the term “further merit”.

Prof. Joe Dennin asked if the committee had considered having a member of the FSC at the newly mandated meetings between AVP and deans. Prof. Boquet: There was some discussion and the idea wasn’t rejected but ultimately the FSC agreed to the language in the proposed MOU.

Prof. Michael Tucker asked (1) for clarification on health benefits in that there is no change to health benefits for next year and (2) for next year, is the possibility of changing providers on the table? Prof. Boquet: (1) that is correct; no change to health benefits for 2006-07 and (2) Everything is potentially open for discussion: the provider, being self-insured, etc.

Prof. Don Greenberg asked if the administration is aware that health benefits are in the Faculty Handbook and cannot be unilaterally changed. Prof. Boquet: Yes.

Prof. Kathy Nantz, President of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said that the FWC had begun to pursue a health benefits review last year and that the FWC stands ready to support the FSC as needed.

Professor Walt Hlawitschka, a current member of the FSC, continued with the report from the committee. He began by trying to explain why the FSC has accepted the MOU given that it is a very bad MOU. First, the fact that we are not in compliance with the Guiding Principles, which say we should only be judging for sustained merit since the increase is below CPI, is very troubling to the FSC. Contributing faculty members have seen their purchasing power decrease in each of the last 4 years. And, although all parties negotiated in good faith this year, it seems that the Board of Trustees is now one of the parties. There is a disconnect here in that the Board looks at the MOU as one part of a budget while the faculty see the MOU as how we as individuals live. The Board leans on their commitment to the AAUP’s 95th percentile (for which the faculty are grateful) but in reality (1) 71% of the faculty are below the 95th percentile and only 29% are above. Prof. Hlawitschka went on to discuss the 95th percentile as a complete and meaningful measure:
(1) The AAUP data are not adjusted for local cost-of-living.

(2) In Connecticut, the average employer pays salary 38% higher than the average US employer (US census 2004) while the 95th percentile for salary and compensation is only 26.9% above the average US employer. As an analogy with teaching, Prof. Hlawitschka said 95th percentile for the state of Connecticut is not an A.

(3) Fairfield public schools reflect local costs and local teachers make more than Fairfield professors. If we compute the average number of years of service for current faculty, it is 13.6 years. A Fairfield public school teacher with a Ph.D. and 13.6 years experience would make $4356 more than the 95th percentile.

(4) Fairfield county is ranked either first, second or third in gas tax, housing, residential property tax, federal tax and state tax.

With regard to health care, we’re self-insured so every dollar spent on health care goes to actual health care expenditures. The problem is not allocation of health care benefits, but the problem is health care costs to us. If health care costs get shifted to employees, that doesn’t solve the problem. The government provides very large tax benefits for health care benefits, so it is smart to overweight this benefit relative to cash (it’s worth more to faculty than cash). Paying less money to employees while overpaying health care costs make everybody win. Last year, copays went up (e.g., $20 copay for doctor visit). If Fairfield covered that cost, it would cost Fairfield $20; when a faculty member pays that cost out-of-pocket, it costs the faculty member $37.04 (calculated using a conservative 25% marginal federal tax rate, 5% marginal tax rate and 16% FICA –total for both Fairfield and employee).

In summary, employer-provided health care makes good sense all around.

Mr. Huston’s concern is that without being aware of actual health care costs, faculty might be overusing the benefit and that with changes to our health care plan that would make the costs visible, total usage might decline, since awareness of actual costs might result in cost savings for everyone. The FSC agrees and is open to considering possibilities along these lines.

Prof, Kathy Nantz asked if the information in Prof. Hlawitschka’s report had been shared with the Board. Prof. Hlawitschka: As much as we could.

Dean Timothy Snyder asked for clarification on the statement that last year’s increase for sustained was below CPI. Prof. Hlawitschka provided the following data: for 2006-2007 increase 2.5% vs. CPI 3.3%; for 2005-2006 increase 3% vs. CPI 3.3%; for 2004-2005 increase 2.2% vs. CPI 3.3%; for 2003-2004 increase $500 (approximately 0.7%) vs. CPI 1.9%. Over the last four years, sustained faculty have seen their purchasing power decrease by 3.4%, which is pretty significant. Contributing faculty members are falling behind. Dean Snyder noted that Prof. Hlawitschka had not mentioned, in his earlier comments, that he was speaking of faculty who obtained only sustained merit and that the total salary increases generally exceed CPI.

**MOTION.** [Greiner/Nantz] To accept the 2006-2007 Memo of Understanding.

Professor Bill Abbott suggested that a unanimous positive vote on this motion might not make it clear how very upset we are that a raise below CPI is being split into sustained and additional merit.
Professor Mark LeClair, a member of the FCS, said we need better coordination between the FSC and the Budget Committee.

Prof. Dennin, following up on Prof. LeClair’s comment and paragraph 1 in the MOU noted that the process has changed in that we now wait for the Budget Committee to give us a number for salary which defeats the whole purpose of the discussions.

Prof. Ron Salafia, in favor of approving the MOU, will abstain and hopes others will as well to send a message to the Board.

Prof. Hodgson pointed out that we were united and vocal this year with regard to the further merit pool. We’ve heard that the Board’s focus is the 95th percentile in total compensation but we have jointly-approved Guiding Principles that indicate there should be no further merit when the salary increase is below CPI. We are getting mixed messages from the Board. It was the Board’s idea for further merit but for sensible further merit, there must be more or less the same increase from year to year. A system where one never knows whether or not there will be money for further merit in any given year doesn’t make sense. This is an on-going problem and there should be some place to address this in total context and consider other reasonable solutions.

Dean Snyder spoke in favor of the motion saying everything that has been done has been consistent with directives from the Board, the AVP, the Guiding Principles Document, the University President, and, at least in the College, the Dean. Each of these parties added criteria to what was possible, and the present plans have met them fully.

Prof. Don Greenberg spoke against the motion and will vote against the MOU. With regard to the 95th percentile, when we negotiated that about 15 years ago, all faculty were within the ranges. Over the last 15 years, we hear that market conditions make it necessary to pay some faculty much higher salaries, which artificially inflates the average salary and compensation. The Board and the administration are using the 95th percentile now as if it’s the same as it was then but it isn’t. The intent of the commitment to the 95th percentile was to pay everyone at the 95th percentile and that has been lost.

Prof. Larry Miners spoke against the motion and will vote against the MOU - not because of the 95 percentile issues, which are valid but because of the breakdown between sustained and additional merit. Some faculty will get an increase of 2.5% compared to an increase in CPI of 3.3% so that other faculty can get more. This breakdown between sustained and additional is unjust and a clear violation of our jointly-approved Guiding Principles.

Prof. Paula Gill-Lopez spoke in favor of the motion and will vote for the MOU because our FSC wants us to accept the MOU. The minutes of this meeting will show the context.

**MOTION PASSED: 47 in favor, 12 opposed and 12 abstaining (47-12-12).**

Prof. John Thiel expressed appreciation for the FSC on behalf of the faculty and this was followed by applause.

A **MOTION TO ADJOURN** was made, seconded and **PASSED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** The meeting adjourned at about 4:58 PM and was followed by a gala post-meeting reception sponsored by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty