MINUTES OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, February 3, 2016, 3:30pm || Suite 1600 Student Union

Minutes

1. Chair Caldwell called the meeting to order at 3:31pm.

2. Roll Call

Attendance
ASFC Present: John Kinder (HIST), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), Lloyd Caldwell (TH), Allen Finchum (GEOG), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Andy Fullerton (SOC), David Meinke (BOT), Kim Burnham (MICR), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Shelia Kennison (PSYC), Lan Zhu (STAT), Erik Ekman (FLL), Apple Igrek (PHIL), Eve Ringsmuth (POLS), Jan Marks (CDIS), Gil Summy (PHYS)

ASFC Absent: Jennifer Shaw (ZOOL), Barry Lavine (CHEM), Liz Roth (ART), Doug Heisterkamp (CS)

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Assistant Dean Lewis

3. Approval of the Minutes
   a. Motion to approve – Allen Finchum. Seconded by Jan Marks. Minutes approved pending grammatical corrections.

4. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve – Unanimously approved.

5. Standing Committee Reports
   a. College Policy and Planning – Barry Lavine
      i. Lavine: Report via Loeffert: We will submit a report to the Dean’s Office by the 9th of February.
   b. Curriculum, General Education and Extension – Leticia Barchini
      i. Barchini: No report.
   c. Rules and Procedures – Liz Roth
      i. No report.
   d. Scholarship – Jennifer Shaw
      i. No report.

6. Old Business
   a. Report on A&S Junior Faculty Awards Committee
      i. Caldwell: No report.
   b. Supplemental Pay relating to On-Line and Summer Courses
      i. Motion to vote on the two pay scales by Gregg. Seconded by Fullerton. Motion passes pending discussion.
      ii. Lewis: The English Department is overwhelmingly opposed to the three proposals.
      iii. Summy: The Physics faculty is opposed to the second proposal. Faculty from the Physics department would likely make 70% of what they are currently making and would likely not teach the course. That level of financial compensation is not sufficient to warrant teaching during the summer.
      iv. Finchum: There is a similar sentiment in my department.
      v. Assistant Dean Lewis: Associate Dean Crauder looked at the classes from last year and how it would affect classes for the current pay scale working under the assumption that if faculty were paid less than half of what they were paid last year that they would likely choose not to teach the course. The Dean’s Office is not saying that faculty cannot teach these courses but rather assumes that faculty would choose not to teach for this amount.
      vi. Igrek: Option one would pay more in almost every case. It is difficult for us to understand why people would teach fewer classes under this scenario when they would almost always be paid more.
      vii. Assistant Dean Lewis: I can tell you that probably most of those courses would fall under the category of 15-19 students. The proposed pay scale has a set per credit hour rate. The current pay scale we are using now is 80% of one’s salary. So the difference in pay would vary dramatically depending upon one’s pay rate.
viii. Kennison: The Psychology department feels that none of these options are acceptable. Why not approach the shortfall by trying to grow outreach and offer more classes to make more money rather than cutting pay?

ix. Assistant Dean Lewis: The first proposed revision to the current pay scale was to allow the opportunity to offer courses with lower enrollment. If we continue with the current pay scale to allow faculty to teach with low enrollment being paid 80% of their salary, we would lose a lot of money. We cannot continue to do this. I tried to stick with the same pay scale but also address the issue of allowing low enrollment courses to be taught without losing money to do so.

x. Kennison: I thought that when the outreach formula changed that the departments would receive the money and not the college. So wouldn’t the departments experience the shortfall and not the college?

xi. Dean Danilowicz: The way that the outreach budget works is complicated. Central administration takes a larger percentage than before. This, along with block tuition, was an unanticipated change. This means that we have about $400,000 less income than anticipated, which is not a small amount. Our goal is to grow the program, but we are in a time of budget reduction. Of the tuition dollars that we receive, I believe that there is a 75% college / 25% departments split between the college and the departments.

xii. Gregg: I was lead to believe that if I taught a course in-load that I would not receive additional pay.

xiii. Dean Danilowicz: That is correct. You are already being paid by the state.

xiv. Lewis: English feels that the pay scale encourages certain disciplines, and we feel that this is a problem in A&S. We are also concerned with how quickly this is moving. Our department also has course caps.

xv. Loeffert: Since most of our faculty who teach outreach courses are adjunct faculty with lower base salaries, we feel that we are better off selecting an option with a higher rate of running courses (option two) and a base rate of $3,000.

xvi. Barchini: My department is against the three proposals. If we are strongly forced to select an option, we would go with a flat rate.

xvii. Meinke: We have very little outreach, but we feel like every model discourages teaching summer courses unless there is a high-enrollment course. A question raised by my department is how have other universities strapped for money dealt with this issue? The real issue from our department is why is there such a large differential in pay between large enrollment and small enrollment courses?

xviii. Assistant Dean Lewis: The current pay scale already rewards higher enrollment courses. These issues have already been addressed when creating the current pay scale.

xix. Marks: We usually have just one graduate course taught during the summer. We are neutral right now.

xx. Ekman: We haven’t offered summer courses since 2012, and I did not receive much response on the document.

xxi. Burnham: Our department does not teach much during the summer.

xxii. Fullerton: The consensus was that we did not see any of these three plans as being adequate. There is more inequality between salary levels in these proposals.

xxiii. Dean Danilowicz: Some departments have focused on the range of salary disparity. For this meeting, we need to decide whether or not the ASFC prefers a salary-based or flat rate pay model.

xxiv. Zhu: Faculty from my department were not happy with the options, but they voted on option one unanimously.

xxv. Kinder: History voted for option one. They asked when are these salaries locked in? When can faculty determine if they will teach the course?

xxvi. Assistant Dean Lewis: It is based on the add/drop rate.

xxvii. Dean Danilowicz: Ultimately, supplemental courses create their own budget. We are not in a position to pay all faculty one month of salary because the budget does not permit this. The model must balance. We are trying to create the most equitable solution possible for the college. There are constraints between class sizes, pay differences between the humanities and other departments, junior faculty versus senior faculty, etc. We are looking for the best compromise.

xxviii. Meinke: The question that I have along with faculty from my department is does this college value summer school? If the college values helping students get their degree and provide a diverse offering of courses, then we must provide sufficient pay to encourage faculty to teach these courses.

xxix. McKinnon: We are split between the first and second proposals. The preference is for a percentage-based model. One concern is that some of our summer courses are limited by the number of lab computers.

xxx. Kennison: Our faculty was not happy with these options, but option one was preferred over option two. We worry that we might drive the accomplished faculty out from teaching outreach.
xxxii. Assistant Dean Lewis: Keep in mind that option one is a slightly modified version of our current pay scale.

xxxii. Summy: Physics thought the first option was more fair.

xxxiii. Igrek: We unanimously voted for option one. About 85% of the categories pay more or the same for option one.

xxxiv. Gregg: We feel that option one is the best of the bad lot.

xxxv. Finchum: Option number one.

xxxvi. Caldwell: Theatre does not fit into this. All of our summer and outreach courses are taught by adjuncts. Our adjuncts would prefer option one.

xxxvii. Caldwell: Recap – there is a concern about the pay of outreach being tied directly to enrollment. One concern is that there is a disparity regarding pay on classes that have capped enrollment. There are concerns that smaller classes still take a lot of effort and scholarship. Ultimately, this comes down to whether or not we pay a flat or graded scale.

xxxviii. Vote for salary-based system versus a flat pay model: ASFC votes for option one by majority vote (a salary-based pay model for outreach). 12 votes for option one, 5 votes for option two, 1 abstain.

7. New Business
   a. None.

8. Dean’s Report
   a. Dean Danilowicz: No report.

9. Announcements
   a. No announcements.

10. Announcements