

A NOTE ON THE SESSION

Parts of the session may be off the record due to a provision that allows the senate to go into “executive committee.” Please respect that when discussing this meeting with other faculty members. When something is off the record, please don’t repeat it.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SENATE AND TRUSTEES

Dr. Freeze wants to use this rift (in regards to faculty salary exposure) as an opportunity to open a line of communication with the trustees—a permanent line of communication. In other words, we need to alleviate the frustration and skepticism the faculty has toward the board and the board has toward the faculty.

WHAT HAS OXENDINE BEEN ASKED TO DO?

A consensus amongst the board is to see what each faculty’s salary and benefits are (it’s not a rogue group of trustees). It’s a board action. In addition, the board has checked the legality of their request. It’s been confirmed as legal by 1) not putting names in the data (doesn’t interfere with SACS), 2) a state law that allows trustees of any organization a five day request window to learn data about individuals within that organization, and 3) the bylaws make it possible for them to do this.

Dr. Freeze has been insured that the purpose is *not* to weed us out. There is no intent from their end to ever see a name associated with any of the data. What they want to know is why is there such variety in our job descriptions compounded with great variety in our salaries? It’s coming from the Interim Audit Committee (which is made up of multiple members of the trustees).

The Mona Lisa Wallace Angle: One rumor is that this was all her idea. It wasn’t. She’s just part of the Interim Audit Committee. She is part of this committee and she is the lawyer that checked the legality.

Interim Audit Committee: Is essentially trying to figure out what our student ratio is in relation to our salary to present to the new president. They want this data to be skillfully used as part of the strategic plan.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

One more clarification from Gary: This all comes down to the board’s frustration with previous administrations. There are certain faculty members who don’t teach full loads, and it’s loosey goosey on how it’s arranged. They want to bring this to the attention of the administration.

Q: Are they willing to consider other areas of our responsibilities (service, scholarship, etc.)

A: Right now, it's irrelevant. It won't factor into their weighting. Community involvement may be another story.

Q: If this results in greater fairness, than I'm all for it. I've heard, though, that benefits vary wildly including things like country club memberships.

A: The suspicion is that benefits aren't similar.

Q: When the numbers come out will there be any action?

A: Joe Oxendine and Rick Stephens have refused to do this... The board doesn't understand why Joe brought that to the faculty's attention. The board wants these numbers whether or not Joe cooperates. So, the opposition to it doesn't matter.

WHAT DOES THE FACULTY SENATE WANT ON THE REPORT?

As faculty senate, we'll be able to offer input into what categories go into the report to the board. The current form looks like this:

| | | | | Fall 2011 | | | | Average fall 2008-fall 2011 | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Years at Catawba | Salary | Benefits | Total Compensation | Lec/lab Hrs | Is/int/thesis students | Lec / lab hrs | Lec/lab Hrs | Is/int/thesis students | Lec/lab hrs | Lec/lab Hrs |

If we as the faculty senate can make input to what's assessed, then they are **asking for our endorsement to the plan.**

C: To me, the faculty senate is circumventing the administration. They're ignoring their responsibility to find the new president.

R: The board is doing this regardless...

C: It bothers me that what's required for tenure (ie scholarship) isn't being assessed.

R: They aren't looking at people individually. In other words, they aren't looking for individuals to weed out. They're looking for variation. They're trying to see what's fair. And they're trying to alert the new administration to inequity.

C: If there is a flaw in the way they're collecting data, it will potentially skew the vision of "fairness." In other words, labs are different in contact hours meaning that students get a 1 hour credit but the teacher spends 3 hours.

R: Okay, that's what they're looking for. In other words, how can we more objectively weigh the assessment of our work?

C: How we're evaluated as faculty members (FPAR) is different than the contract we sign...

C: What good is it going to do to put a number on the disparity of workload? It's a known problem.

R: All I can say is we can either help them or not help them... they are going to do it. We either welcome their initiative with our contributions or we say we're not helping.

C: So, the board is hopeful that we can improve our relationship with the board. The second thing I'm hearing is that they want us to open lines of communication... Are there components of this that we can support?

C: Perhaps, one of the reasons we have this inequity is that stuff like this isn't kept up with... So, this is a positive thing because we'll have a record.

R: You're right.

C: I would feel much better as a representative of a faculty that if this request is truly coming from the board then I would like to see it in writing. Because if they have other motives, then I don't want to sell the faculty down the river.

C: Also, the board is asking us to go on the record about this but they don't want to go on the record.

Q: What does the board want from us exactly?

R: An endorsement to open lines of communication... which will hopefully open a dialogue of mutual concerns down the line.

Q: Are we endorsing the actual form? Or, are we endorsing the process that we're undertaking?

A: We're endorsing the process of evaluation.

Q: Is it possible to take a middle-ground. As in, if the board behaves this way, then we'll respond this way.

THE MOTION

If the board of trustees pursues this data in an attempt to address inequality in faculty responsibility and workload, we can agree to it if we add criteria to the assessment process.

MOTION SECONDED

This allows us to make a statement that says we support this in terms of correcting inequity.

DISCUSSION

C: Committees like the FTPC have often been thinking about ways to address inequity. So, maybe this is positive and it should be under the guidance of the BOT. Because then, the fog of tenure can be made more transparent. It leads to more transparency and fairness.

C: There are also some inequities that we'll never have any control over... For example, a nursing program... Those faculty will make so much more than the rest of us. Business faculty get paid a lot more, too.

R: The BOT would respond to that that if they aren't teaching enough students then they're not worth it.

CALL THE QUESTION

ALL IN FAVOR

MOTION APPROVED

If the board of trustees pursues this data in an attempt to address inequality in faculty responsibility and workload, then we can support this data collection.

WHAT TO ADD TO THE LIST THAT WILL BE REPORTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Advising Hours

Contact Hours

Committee Service (admittedly, this might be tough to calculate).

Q: Would a point-value system be in order? It can be tricky because it could inadvertently identify faculty members.

C: We could add a point system for scholarship. Yet, that could be a reporting nightmare.

C: Also, think about internships and independent studies those value wildly by discipline. For example, teacher education supervises several student teaching internships... so it skews the data.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, December 8th at 6:30PM

NEXT ACTION ITEM

Gary will let Joe know that we plan to expand the data sheet, and that we're meeting next week.