

**ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
Vice President for Academic Affairs Conference Room  
May 9, 2000**

**Present:** A. Merrifield (presiding), S. Heft, V. Garlin, S. McKillop, P. McGough, S. Moulton, T. Ormond, B. Poe, S. Winter, B. Goldstein (by phone)

**Guest:** Doug Martin

- **MSP Approval of the Agenda**
- **MSP Approval of the Minutes, April 20, 2000**

**Correspondence Received:** None

**BUSINESS**

**Setting the Academic Senate Agenda for 5/9/00**

**1. FMI Policy Data (D. Martin)**

D. Martin was asked a month ago to do a statistical analysis of the FMI process and he has spent quite a bit of time on it. He has discovered that no Dean moved money from one department to another; the Deans moved money up and down between people a bit; the Deans statistically moved money from lecturers to tenured faculty at an average of about \$7000 per year; the departments made out well or poorly depending on their FTEF and tenure track faculty. The lowest amounts went to Chemistry with 9 FTEF and 8 tenure/track faculty (ca. \$1000 per person per year) versus Anthropology with 6 FTEF and 3 tenure/track faculty at about \$1800 per person per year); departments in the second year that were "flush" in the first remained flush in the second and the President's augmentations went to Departments that were already rich departments. He noted there was systemic inequity and the money did not seem to be based solely on merit. The main variable seemed to be the department a faculty was housed in.

Prof. Martin developed graphs to explain the conclusions. Chemistry and Geography had the lowest average moneys with one individual high of \$8000 in another department. This leads to very large salary discrepancies. The mode is just under \$3000. One could make an argument that there was a departmental disparity that could lead to significant salary differentials if it were to continue in the same direction.

V. Garlin noted in the Education Department one out of 5 received awards while only 2 of the 63 lecturers got FMIs. of 31 FTEF and 19 tenure/track faculty, 6 got raises. This reveals an enormous inequity.

A. Merrifield noted moneys were distributed on the basis of many things, but not merit.

V. Garlin: the benchmark may have been based on merit, but the department was what really mattered.

B. Poe: Departments are too small a unit for determining the distribution if only 2 adjuncts in Education got raises.

S. Heft confirmed that the CFA wanted the departments to determine merit.

B. Poe noted there needs to be budgetary control at a higher level.

V. Garlin: The President insisted there be variation within departments even if departments recommended everyone the same. That would be an enormous disparity.

D. Martin: The Deans didn't move money but could have rectified inequities if they had. There is a strong correlation between the money received in the first and second years.

A. Merrifield: this will be placed on the agenda as a report and he will keep the questions focused on the findings of the report. This shows merit is not the primary consideration in the awarding of FMIs.

S. Moulton suggested the charts be included with the report to Senators.

V. Garlin asked about integrating D. Martin's report with the Resolution about FMI.

A. Merrifield clarified that reports go at the top of the agenda. Phil McGough will chair the meeting when the resolution comes up for its Second Reading.

P. McGough suggested that D. Martin present the report briefly here and that it be presented at the first meeting in the Fall for fuller discussion.

•(B. Goldstein connected by phone 3:25).

B. Goldstein reported he had just talked with Business Administration and Economics staff and faculty as well as other individuals as he considers his choice for interim Dean. He wants to move slowly and carefully.

V. Garlin asked if off campus candidates were being considered and if so, from whom did they hear about the position?

B. Goldstein noted one was interviewed. He doesn't know who recommended the candidate.

V. Garlin was concerned that since this had not been advertised and if it were to go off campus there is a question about it becoming a different process.

B. Goldstein acknowledged that was a possibility. He needs to clarify the process and consult with faculty. He also had a meeting with the Deans this morning. The have hired Computer Science faculty and because of the technology in the local area, these salaries are out of sight, making it hard for us to compete. Next year's assessments on the schools are heavy and he wants to work with the Deans to prevent and reduce the deficits to the schools. He has been putting together a document called "Taking Stock" which assesses what Academic Affairs has been able to do this year. A lot has been done. He is worried about ORSP since it cannot be expected to be self-supporting in one year. It has increased the volume of grants it receives by 80%. Subject matter programs (especially for Hutchins) is something we need to discuss to take care of indirect costs. K-12 programs are important. We need to make sure ORSP is in place.

S. Heft asked if it was in danger?

B. Goldstein noted having it be self-support means it has to generate more money to cover indirect costs.

A. Merrifield suggested we need an audit. It is incomprehensible that indirect costs are not covered under grant funding. There may be some alteration in the calculation of the overhead so that A & F can run the programs.

V. Garlin asked if L. Furukawa-Schlereth has alleged there have been hidden costs not properly accounted for and when it is done properly we will have what we do now? Were there previous costs that were not accounted for?

A. Merrifield noted L. Furukawa-Schlereth is claiming we weren't counting real costs in the overhead and he has recalculated what it costs to run those programs.

- Return to Agenda discussion

A. Merrifield noted we would allocate 15 minutes for Doug Martin. He wanted to get the information out before summer as an initial report. Issues raised in the report can come back later.

V. Garlin knows there may be people who will argue it is an inadequate amount of information to discuss the Resolution. He hoped there would be as much information as possible available before we got to the Resolution.

A. Merrifield has dropped the quote from C. Reed in the Resolution, but he did not include specific citations in the final draft and will keep the Whereas. There will be about 10 minutes to debate the FMI Resolution.

P. McGough reported that Suzanne Martin, chair of one of the FMI appeals committees wants to make a report.

A. Merrifield suggested she be part of S. Heft's report about what happened with the appeals process.

V. Garlin asked who would handle the appeals process, FSAC or Structure and Functions? This is a faculty matter.

A. Merrifield noted we shouldn't have extended debate in the senate on this. The FMIs are working out to be even worse than we thought. There is an update on the Academic Council of International Programs. Since we appointed the representative to do this, it is appropriate to receive her report.

Discussion on the amount of time for discussion of the FMI Resolution in order to complete the process. Whether to limit the amount of time any one individual could speak, to have several speakers on each side of an issue on the speaker's list, to work with Time Certains for all the issues, or to continue into an additional meeting on the 18th of May.

P. McGough reported that Structure and Functions has recommendations for faculty to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean of the School of Extended Education (C. Merrill, D. Dove). Heather Smith will replace Sue Parker on the Space Committee. Sam Seward and Jim Christman will serve on the Classroom Renovation Space Committee. They need nominees to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean of the Library.

Meeting adjourned 4:15 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted, Susan Moulton