MINUTES OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, January 13, 2016, 3:30pm || 412 Student Union

Minutes

1. Chair Caldwell called the meeting to order at 3:40pm.

2. Roll Call

   Attendance
   ASFC Present: Liz Roth (ART), Laura Belmonte (HIST), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), Lloyd Caldwell (TH), Allen Finchum (GEOG), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Andy Fullerton (SOC), David Meinke (BOT), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Lan Zhu (STAT), Erik Igrek (PHIL), Barry Lavine (CHEM), Jan Marks (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (ZOOL), Gil Summy (PHYS)
   
   ASFC Absent: Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Kim Burnham (MICR)
   
   Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder, Assistant Dean Bobbi Kay Lewis

3. Approval of the Minutes
   a. Motion to approve – Barry Lavine. Seconded by Erik Ekman. Minutes approved.

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

5. Standing Committee Reports
   a. College Policy and Planning – Barry Lavine
      i. Lavine: We will submit this to the Dean’s Office by the end of January.
   b. Curriculum, General Education and Extension – Leticia Barchini
      i. Barchini: No report.
   c. Rules and Procedures – Liz Roth
      i. Roth: No report.
   d. Scholarship – Jennifer Shaw
      i. Shaw: The committee met with Dr. Martindale to discuss items such as eligibility and how scholarships are renewed. These guidelines have now been established.

6. Old Business
   a. Supplemental Pay relating to On-Line and Summer Courses
      i. Bobbikay Lewis and Bruce Crauder Q&A
      ii. Assistant Dean Lewis: The first option is essentially the previous proposal from the last meeting with one large change - the salary would be a minimum of $3000. This addresses the issue of the pay floor. The current pay scale is almost exactly the same as the new proposal except that the pay is 80% or 90% of salary depending upon enrollment. But once enrollment reaches 100% (33 students), this pay scale is exactly the same as the existing pay scale for lower division classes. This takes out the delineation between lower division and upper division classes. The second pay scale option became a lump sum based on enrollment. This option encourages higher enrollment, but the pay is more equitable across the board. It is not based on salary whatsoever. This is from my perspective a much more doable solution. We would know exactly how much it would cost for a course to run, and we would know exactly how much faculty would be paid. The third pay scale is based on the model used by the Spears School of Business. Faculty are paid $50 per student credit hour up to 75 student credit hours.
      iii. Associate Dean Crauder: I ran the figures from the three proposals using the enrollments numbers and salaries from last year. The assumption here was that if a specific faculty member would be paid half of what s/he was paid last year, the class would not run because that faculty member would not likely not teach the class. Based on this, from the first model, about half the classes taught last year would not run. The second model, about a quarter would not run. The third, only a handful would run.
iv. Barchini: What would be the total cost of running these three proposals yet still paying everyone 100%? How much does the college save using the three pay scales as proposed?

v. Crauder: I went course by course, so I knew exactly what the salaries were. All of these proposals are scenarios that would work with the current budget (not losing $400,000 like this past year).

vi. Barchini: In the math department, the majority of classes are taught by TAs in the summer. In this situation, would TAs be paid more than faculty?

vii. Associate Dean Crauder: The TA pay would come from a completely different scale.

viii. Assistant Dean Lewis: If they taught for outreach, they would not be paid more. There might be a different pay scale for TAs teaching during the summer out of summer money, but if they are teaching through outreach they would not be paid more.

ix. Associate Dean Crauder: These pay scales are not just for summer school. They are for all courses taught through outreach. This also includes online courses, travel courses, and short courses.

x. Fullerton: The second plan is more realistic. Is there a way to pay the instructors of the smaller classes more by having less of a salary disparity between the larger classes and the smaller classes? Is the large ratio 4:1 in the pay scale necessary to motivate someone to teach large enrollment courses? And if we change this disparity, would it then be possible to raise the floor?

xi. Lavine: There is an additional administrative burden when teaching a very large class (100+ students) that one does not have when teaching a small class of 10-14 students. There are some impediments when teaching the larger classes, and it is reasonable to take this into account when considering the pay scale in addition to the obvious reason that these classes are helping to finance the smaller classes.

xii. Igrek: With the second option, it seems that we save more courses, so this would be an advantage. Is it fair to assume that with the first option, since more classes are being cut faculty are therefore being paid more?

xiii. Associate Dean Crauder: They would overall, but they may not for summer school. Remember, summer school is just one piece of this.

xiv. Fullerton: I agree (that it is necessary to provide additional pay for faculty who are teaching large courses), but does that require four times as much money? How about twice as much?

xv. Lewis: The number of instructors teaching the large enrollment courses is very small, and those courses help subsidize the smaller enrollment courses.

xvi. Roth: One of the difficulties of option II is that some classes cannot be held at a large enrollment due to physical limitations, so classes just cannot run or the pay is very low. It seems unfortunate that we cannot create a system to concentrate on many of the departments that for excellent pedagogical reasons cannot run a course at high enrollment.

xvii. Caldwell: As I understand, any courses at an enrollment of 10 or below can be negotiated with the college. The instructor may be paid less, but the course may be able to run.

xviii. Fullerton: The revenue generated by a class is not the same as the value of a course. The pay scale does not reflect this sentiment.

xix. Caldwell: We will vote on this issue at the next meeting. Please report back to your departments. Be prepared to vote on percent based versus dollar based pay.

xx. Dean Danilowicz: The key issue will be to decide whether or not the pay is percent based or dollar based. Then, we can discuss the differentiation in pay.

7. New Business
   a. None.

8. Dean’s Report
   a. Dean Danilowicz: There have been budgetary changes. We were told early in the year that there would not be in-year budget cuts, however we received a 1.35% budget cut for this semester. Since colleges have already spent their budgets for the fall, this amounts to a 2.7% for this semester. It is very difficult to manage budget cuts in the middle of the year. The college had money for some positions that it was searching on, and we basically gave back this money. It does not impact the searches at this time, but we do not know how we will cover the costs next year yet. That is not a good signal for next year. We also received a memo on December 23 that the amount of startup budget that we requested has been cut in half for next year. We are in the process of discussing with departments that they will have a reduced start up. What is likely to occur is that if we have reduced startup budgets and we fill the positions that we are currently searching, then next year we will have a significantly lower number of searches. This is particularly difficult for the sciences.
   i. Gregg: Are upper administrators aware of how these cuts will affect tenure and our ability to bring in grants and contracts? These are some of our largest sources of income.
ii. Dean Danilowicz: This memo came from the Vice President for Research. The timing of receiving the memo in December is difficult from the perspective of the Dean’s Office because we have all of our data gathered in July. I intend to ask them to reset when they make those decisions.

iii. Roth: Does the start up fund also affect the Humanities?

iv. Dean Danilowicz: This does not affect Humanities. To cut this budget really does not correct the issue in a significant manner. Roughly speaking, faculty in the Humanities receive startup packages of $5,000. Faculty in the Social Sciences receive somewhere between $25,000-$50,000. Faculty in the Sciences receive between $200,000-$500,000. In the large scheme of things, cutting from the Humanities would not save much.

v. Shaw: The source of startup money comes from grants. Have the grants gone down in proportion to the cuts to the startup budgets, or is it because more money is being taken from these grants for other reasons?

vi. Dean Danilowicz: I cannot answer that exactly. The one change that I know is that the university was receiving about $195 million from grants three years ago, and this past year it was down to about $160 million. This is a large decrease, but it is not proportionate with the decrease that we have received.

vii. Meinke: Is the cut for startup packages that have yet to be awarded or startup packages for candidates who were recently hired?

viii. Dean Danilowicz: Faculty under contract will not lose their startup packages. This is for candidates who we are looking at now.

b. Dean Danilowicz: Some good news! - we have some great philanthropic gifts coming soon. We have also needed a core facility for Geology, and I think we will finish fundraising for this soon.

9. Announcements
   a. No announcements.

10. Announcements