

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

April 22, 2008
3:30 p.m. – Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

AGENDA

1. 3:30 Approval of Minutes of the March 27, 2008
Faculty Senate meeting - attachment D. Matthiesen
2. 3:35 President's announcements B. Snyder
3. 3:45 Provost's announcements/update J. Goldberg
4. 3:55 Chair's announcements D. Matthiesen
5. 4:00 Report from the Secretary of the Corporation J. Arden Ornt
6. 4:05 Report from the Executive Committee G. Starkman
7. 4:10 Report from the University Undergraduate Faculty -
attachment G. Chottiner
8. 4:15 Report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Governance of
the Undergraduate Enterprise and motion to establish
an *ad hoc* committee - attachment G. Starkman
9. 4:20 Report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Pandemic Flu
and motion to approve the 'Academic Plan' as policy -
attachment J. Alexander
10. 4:25 Report from the Budget Committee - attachment K. Ledford
11. 4:35 Report from the Nominating Committee and motion
to approve the slate of candidates for membership on
2008-09 Faculty Senate standing committees - attachment M. Berger

12. 4:40 Year-end reports from Faculty Senate standing committees – attachments. Committee chairs will respond to questions.

Committee on Bylaws	C. Cano
Committee on Faculty Compensation	S. Case
Committee on Faculty Personnel	J. Lipton
Committee on Information Resources	J. Blackwell
Committee on Research	C. Musil
Committee on University Libraries	P. Salipante
Committee on Women Faculty	E. Kaufman

13. 5:00 Passing of the gavel to the 2008-09 Faculty Senate chair D. Matthiesen

Adjournment

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

Minutes of the Meeting of April 22, 2008

Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

Members present

Kathryn Adams
Jay Alexander
Jeffrey Alexander
Keith Armitage
Olivier Arnoult
John Blackwell
Christine Cano
Susan Case
John Clochesy
David Crampton
Steven Garverick
Jerold Goldberg
Julia Grant

Kathleen Kash
Elizabeth Kaufman
Kenneth Ledford
Charles Malemud
David Matthiesen, Chair
Kathryn Mercer
Shirley Moore
Diana Morris
Roland Moskowitz
Carol Musil
Eric Neilsen
David Poerschke
Joseph Prah

Alan Rocke
Sandra Russ
Paul Salipante
Benjamin Schechter
Barbara Snyder
Glenn Starkman
Philip Taylor
Whitney Tice
Susan Zull

Members absent

Cynthia Beall
Nabil Bissada
Robert Bonomo
Joseph Carter
Stanton Cort
Robert Davis
William Deal
Mark DeGuire
Dave Diles

Dominique Durand
Thomas Frank
Faye Gary
Marion Good
Christine Hudak
Lawrence Krauss
Uziel Landau
Wilbur Leatherberry
Jacqueline Lipton

Judith Lipton
Sana Loue
Vincent Monnier
Sena Narendran
Ronald Occhionero
Joram Sawady
Elizabeth Tracy
Rhonda Williams
Terry Wolpaw

Others present

Paula Baughn
Molly Berger
Glenn Bieler
Robert Brown

Lynette Cordaro
Joanne Eustis
Donald Feke
Lara Kalafatis

Virginia Leitch
Charles Rozek
Chris Sheridan
Jeff Wolcowitz

Call or order

Professor David Matthiesen, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of minutes

Upon motion, duly seconded, the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 27, 2008 were approved.

President's announcements

President Barbara Snyder announced that the Provost Search Committee is off to an aggressive start. Open forums are taking place with appropriate constituencies, and the Faculty Senate will be kept informed of progress.

The president announced that the university, the City of Cleveland and the Cleveland Clinic have “made a commitment to corporate responsibility towards the environment, human rights, labor rights, and anti-corruption.” Today, the three organizations became members of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC). The university and its center for Business as an Agent of World Benefit at the Weatherhead School have been designated secretariat of the UNGC in the United States.

The president announced that Hossein Sadid, Vice President for Finance and Administration, would retire effective September 30, 2008. For the present, Mr. Sadid’s position is being divided. John Wheeler, who has served as the university’s Vice President for Cleveland and Regional Affairs, will assume the position of Senior Vice President for Administration. Until a search has taken place, Mr. John Sideras, former President and CEO of the MetroHealth System, will serve as Interim Senior Vice President of Finance and Chief Financial Officer. The search process will determine whether the positions will be re-combined in the future. Professor Kenneth Ledford, chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, expressed gratitude to Mr. Sadid for his years of service and loyalty to the university, and for his recent work with that committee.

Provosts’ announcements

Interim Provost Jerold Goldberg called upon Professor Carol Musil, chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Research, to report on the April 7, 2008 meeting of the Provost’s Research Council. Professor Musil reported that the research component of the university’s strategic plan currently consists of three focus areas: energy, health, and design; sustainability will be a common theme throughout. Other areas may be identified over time. She also reported on the impending changes in graduate student overhead on tuition, and graduate student reporting effort. A search committee has identified candidates for the position of Associate Vice President for Research. Finally, Professor Musil reported that state funding of Ohio’s private research institutions may be threatened, as the state is turning to developing its public university system.

The provost stated that the strategic plan is nearing completion. The university’s mission, vision, goals are initiatives have been articulated, and action steps are being considered. Three “townhall” meetings are scheduled for the first week in May and, with feedback from those meetings, action steps and metrics will be added to the plan. Implementation will begin in June. He added that the Executive Committee had requested information as to how much of the Senate’s input had been incorporated in various drafts. Compiling and condensing this information was impractical, and the provost invited specific questions that could be addressed directly.

Chair’s announcements

Professor Dave Matthiesen, Senate chair, announced the election of Professor Carol Musil to the position of chair-elect of the Faculty Senate. She will assume this role after the May 18 commencement as Glenn Starkman becomes chair.

Professor Matthiesen reminded Senators of the annual Hudson Relays, which will take place on Saturday, April 26.

Report from the Secretary of the Corporation

Ms. Jeanine Arden Ornt, Vice President and General Counsel and Secretary of the Corporation, reported on the April 7 Board of Trustees Executive Committee meeting. The usual consent agenda establishing endowment funds and other routine matters was approved, and a financial report was presented by Mr. Hossein Sadid. Mr. Bruce Loessin provided the trustees with an update on development and fundraising issues. As is the recent practice, the meeting ended with a trustees' executive session.

Approval of the Five-year Academic Calendar

Professor Matthiesen read the resolution to approve the university's five-year academic calendar for 2008-2013. Upon motion, duly seconded, the resolution was approved by majority vote (one opposed, no abstentions). The calendar for the fall, spring and summer semesters 2008-2013 is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Executive Committee

Professor Glenn Starkman, Senate chair-elect, reported on the April 7 Executive Committee meeting. President Snyder brought two issues to that committee for discussion and endorsement. The first was the "American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment," which is an opportunity for the university to participate in a national initiative to address global warming. The second concerns the United Nations Global Compact, which the president had detailed in her remarks to the Senate. Upon motion, duly seconded, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to support these actions.

Professor Starkman announced that the Campus Parking Committee has been reconstituted. He also announced that a Faculty Senate Executive Committee retreat is being planned for August 21, 2008.

Report from the University Undergraduate Faculty (UUF) Executive Committee

Professor Gary Chottiner, chair of the UUF Executive Committee, presented a report of the activities undertaken by the UUF during the 2007-08 academic year. The complete text of that report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Governance of Undergraduate Affairs

Chair-elect Glenn Starkman reported on the discussions and recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committee on Governance of Undergraduate Affairs. That committee presented its findings to the Senate's Executive Committee on April 7. With the recommendation of the Executive Committee and motion, duly seconded, Senators voted unanimously to authorize the chair of the Faculty Senate to "appoint an *ad hoc* committee to work in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Committee on Bylaws to draft and propose to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by August 31, 2008 amendments to the Constitution and any other governing documents of the University Faculty or its units, to revise the faculty governance of matters directly connected with undergraduate education and life." The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Pandemic Flu Planning

Professor Jay Alexander, past chair of the Senate and chair of the *ad hoc* Committee on Pandemic Flu Planning, summarized the actions and recommendations of the committee in conjunction with the university-wide task force on pandemic planning. The *ad hoc* committee focused its deliberations on the university's overall academic plan in the event of a pandemic, and Professor Alexander advised each school to continue to develop its own policies as appropriate.

The *ad hoc* committee voted to forward the academic plan to the Senate for approval as policy governing scheduling and grading, with stated provisos. The motion was seconded, and Senators voted unanimously to approve the plan. Having fulfilled its charge, the *ad hoc* committee was dissolved. The complete text of the report, the formal motion, and the academic plan are appended to these minutes.

Report from the Budget Committee

Professor Kenneth Ledford presented excerpts from the written report distributed prior to this meeting, noting that he has reviewed the PricewaterhouseCoopers report on the School of Medicine's financial situation and found it consonant with the summary recently presented to the Board of Trustees. He responded to questions. Professor Matthiesen noted that the Senate's Budget has done an outstanding job throughout the 2007-08 academic year, and thanked Professor Ledford for his extraordinary efforts. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Nominating Committee

Professor Molly Berger, chair of the Nominating Committee, thanked committee members for their thoughtful contributions and intense efforts in recruiting faculty to participate on the Senate's standing committees for the 2008-09 academic year. A motion was made to accept the slate of candidates as presented for membership on and leadership of these committees for the coming year, and duly seconded. With one abstention, the motion passed. The "Slate of faculty candidates for membership on the 2008-09 Faculty Senate standing committees" is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Bylaws

Professor Christine Cano, chair of the Committee on Bylaws, submitted the committee's year-end report, which was distributed prior to the meeting. There were no questions. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Faculty Compensation

Professor Susan Case, chair of the Committee on Faculty Compensation, reported that the newly-formed President's Advisory Committee on Faculty Compensation has met twice in recent weeks, and hopes to have recommendations to present to the Board of Trustees at its June meeting. The text of the committee's year-end report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Faculty Personnel

The committee's year-end report, submitted by Professor Judith Lipton, chair, was distributed prior to this meeting. There were no questions. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Information Resources

The committee's year-end report, submitted by Professor John Blackwell, chair, was distributed prior to this meeting. There were no questions. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Research

The committee's year-end report, submitted by Professor Carol Musil, chair, was distributed prior to this meeting. There were no questions. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on University Libraries

The committee's year-end report, submitted by Professor Paul Salipante, chair, was distributed prior to this meeting. Discussion ensued regarding several challenges facing the Kelvin Smith Library, such as space for current collections as well as acquisitions. Also, different academic units expressed different needs regarding electronic/digital access as opposed to print materials. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Report from the Committee on Women Faculty

The committee's year-end report, submitted by Professors Faye Gary and Elizabeth Kaufman, co-chairs, was distributed prior to this meeting. There were no questions. The complete text of the report is appended to these minutes.

Adjournment

The traditional "passing of the gavel" from Senate Chair David Matthiesen to Chair-elect Glenn Starkman took place, and Professor Matthiesen thanked all faculty who participated in governance this year. Professor Starkman will assume the chair on May 19, following the annual Commencement.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Susan J. Zull
Secretary of the University Faculty

Five Year Academic Calendar (2008 – 2013)

FALL	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Registration (and Drop/Add) Begin (UG)	Apr 7	Apr 6	Apr 5	Apr 4	Apr 9
Classes Begin	Aug 25	Aug 24	Aug 23	Aug 29	Aug 27
Late Registration Fee (\$25) Begins	Aug 26	Aug 25	Aug 24	Aug 30	Aug 28
Last Day to Withdraw Without Financial Penalty	Aug 29	Aug 28	Aug 27	Sep 2	Aug 31
Labor Day Holiday	Sep 1	Sep 7	Sep 6	Sep 5	Sep 3
Late Registration and Drop/Add End	Sep 5	Sep 4	Sep 3	Sep 9	Sep 7
Deadline Credit/Audit (UG)	Sep 5	Sep 4	Sep 3	Sep 9	Sep 7
Fall Break	Oct 20/21	Oct 19/20	Oct 18/19	Oct 24/25	Oct 22/23
Mid-Term Grades Due (UG)	Oct 20	Oct 19	Oct 18	Oct 24	Oct 22
Deadline for removal of prev. term "I" grades (UG)	Nov 7	Nov 6	Nov 5	Nov 11	Nov 9
Deadline Credit/Audit (G)	Nov 7	Nov 6	Nov 5	Nov 11	Nov 9
Deadline For Class Withdrawal	Nov 7	Nov 6	Nov 5	Nov 11	Nov 9
Registration for Spring Begins (UG)	Nov 10	Nov 9	Nov 8	Nov 14	Nov 12
Thanksgiving Holidays	Nov 27/28	Nov 26/27	Nov 25/26	Nov 24/25	Nov 22/23
Deadline for removal of prev. term "I" grades (G)	Dec 5	Dec 4	Dec 3	Dec 9	Dec 7
Last Day of Class	Dec 5	Dec 4	Dec 3	Dec 9	Dec 7
Reading Days	Dec 8, 12	Dec 7, 11	Dec 6, 10	Dec 12, 16	Dec 10, 14
Final Exams Begin	Dec 9	Dec 8	Dec 7	Dec 13	Dec 11
Final Exams End	Dec 17	Dec 16	Dec 15	Dec 21	Dec 19
Final Grades Due by 11:00 am	Dec 19	Dec 18	Dec 17	Dec 23	Dec 21
Fall Awarding of Degrees	Jan 16 (2009)	Jan 15 (2010)	Jan 14 (2011)	Jan 13 (2012)	Jan 11 (2013)
SPRING	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Registration (and Drop/Add) Begin (UG)	Nov 10 (2008)	Nov 9 (2009)	Nov 8 (2010)	Nov 14 (2011)	Nov 12 (2012)
Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday	Jan 19	Jan 18	Jan 17	Jan 16	Jan 21
Classes Begin	Jan 12	Jan 11	Jan 10	Jan 17	Jan 14
Late Registration Fee (\$25) Begins	Jan 13	Jan 12	Jan 11	Jan 18	Jan 15
Last Day to Withdraw Without Financial Penalty	Jan 16	Jan 15	Jan 14	Jan 20	Jan 18
Late Registration and Drop/Add End	Jan 23	Jan 22	Jan 21	Jan 27	Jan 25
Deadline Credit/Audit (UG)	Jan 23	Jan 22	Jan 21	Jan 27	Jan 25
Mid-Term Grades Due (UG)	Mar 9	Mar 8	Mar 7	Mar 12	Mar 11
Spring Break	Mar 9-13	Mar 8-12	Mar 7-11	Mar 12-16	Mar 11-15
Deadline for removal of prev. term "I" grades(UG)	Mar 27	Mar 26	Mar 25	Mar 30	Mar 29
Deadline Credit/Audit (G)	Mar 27	Mar 26	Mar 25	Mar 30	Mar 29
Deadline for Class Withdrawal	Mar 27	Mar 26	Mar 25	Mar 30	Mar 29
Open registration for Summer Begins (UG)	Mar 30	Mar 29	Mar 28	Apr 2	Apr 1
Open registration for Fall Begins (UG)	Apr 6	Apr 5	Apr 4	Apr 9	Apr 8
Deadline for removal of prev. term "I" grades(G)	Apr 27	Apr 26	Apr 25	Apr 30	Apr 29
Last Day of Class	Apr 27	Apr 26	Apr 25	Apr 30	Apr 29
Reading Days	Apr 28/29	Apr 27/28	Apr 26/27	May 1/2	Apr 30/May 1
Final Exams Begin	Apr 30	Apr 29	Apr 28	May 3	May 2
Final Exams End	May 7	May 6	May 5	May 10	May 9
Final Grades Due by 11:00 am	May 9	May 8	May 7	May 12	May 11
University Commencement	May 17	May 16	May 15	May 20	May 19
SUMMER	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Classes Begin	Jun 1	Jun 1	Jun 6	Jun 4	Jun 3
Independence Day Holiday	Jul 3	Jul 5	Jul 4	Jul 4	Jul 4
Classes End	Jul 27	Jul 27	Aug 1	Jul 30	Jul 29
Final Grades Due 12:00 noon	Jul 29	Jul 29	Aug 3	Aug 1	Jul 31
Summer Awarding of Degrees	Aug 7	Aug 13	Aug 12	Aug 10	Aug 9

Report to the Faculty Senate from the University Undergraduate Faculty Executive Committee
April 22, 2008, composed by Gary Chottiner, chair of the UUFXC

The UUFXC met monthly during the academic year, generally on the third Thursday of each month during the Provost's Hour. The minutes of our meetings, as well as the membership of all UUF committees, can be found on the UUF web site, <http://www.case.edu/president/uuf/>.

Some of the more important issues that the Executive Committee addressed this year were:

- Formation of a SAGES Impact Committee. The full report from this committee should be available to the FS by the end of this semester.
- CSE proposal to make optional the SAGES University Seminars. This discussion occurred over a period of several months and required involvement of the Deans of CSE and CAS. The result is a tabling of the CSE plan for a limited period of time, with a commitment for the schools to work together to determine if a set of uniform changes can be agreed upon over the next year.
- An evaluation of the UUF's role in faculty governance of undergraduate education and life. A detailed plan to address the real and perceived short-comings of the UUF will be made available to the FS after the UUFXC has an opportunity to approve the document at our April 24 meeting and takes it to the full UUF at its May 1 General Meeting.
- The UUFXC devoted considerable effort to UUF staffing concerns; identifying strong members and leaders for all of the UUF committees for this year and into the future. The UUFXC's most pressing need is for staff support; we currently have none.

Some other issues that came to the UUFXC, or which the UUFXC itself initiated (a few of which are not yet resolved) include:

- UUFCC policies and procedures for course and program approvals. We have instituted a more efficient process which is less likely to impede progress on actions which lie completely within individual schools.
- the policy of requiring 30 extra credits for certain combinations of degrees
- SOURCE proposal for monitoring undergraduate research activity
- SOURCE proposal for a capstone fair
- course evaluation questions and improved student response rate
- forced course withdrawals
- The UUFXC was also instrumental in the formulation of the proposal (which was subsequently endorsed by the Senate) regarding the restructuring of the teaching grid to free up more classroom space.

The UUFXC continues to monitor the routine (but essential) business of the Committee on Curriculum, Committee on Academic Standing (e.g., evaluating students' records for academic actions, merit scholarship retention, etc.) and the Committee on Admissions (e.g., evaluating the credentials of borderline applications, awarding the highest (full tuition) scholarships).

Report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Governance of Undergraduate Affairs

The committee met to consider the options for faculty governance proposed by the University Undergraduate Faculty (UUF) Executive Committee. The *ad hoc* committee strongly favored a renewal of the structure of faculty governance of undergraduate education and life, and strongly considered bringing forward a motion to effectively replace the current model with a Faculty Senate committee on Undergraduate Education and Life plus associated subcommittees. However, the committee, in the end, decided that it would be best to have a more considered and consultative process for such an important decision. The committee, therefore, has drafted and approved, and respectfully submits the following motion:

Motion to Faculty Senate on Governance of Undergraduate Education and Life

Whereas the education of undergraduates is one of the principal activities of the University and its faculty; and

Whereas the governance and oversight of educational programs is the responsibility of the University Faculty and its representatives, the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate has currently delegated the responsibility for undergraduate educational programs to the University Undergraduate Faculty (UUF); and

Whereas a more streamlined faculty governance would better utilize the efforts of the faculty; and

Whereas the undergraduate programs would be better served by strengthening the connections between their governance and that of the other activities of the university and the faculty; and

Whereas the university would be better served by increasing connections between the undergraduate programs and the other activities of the university and the faculty; and

Whereas the process for establishing curriculum requirements must be clear and expeditious yet allow, where appropriate, for deliberation between or among constituent faculties and within the Faculty Senate and University Faculty;

Therefore:

The Faculty Senate directs its chair to appoint, in consultation with the chairs of the executive committees (or their equivalents) of the Case School of Engineering, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Francis Payne Bolton School of Nursing, and the Weatherhead School of Management (hereafter "the schools"), the chairs of the Departments of Nutrition and Biochemistry in the School of Medicine, and the chair of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics, an *ad hoc* committee to work in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Committee on Bylaws, to draft and propose to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by August 31, 2008, amendments to the Constitution and any other governing documents of the University Faculty or its units, to revise the faculty governance of matters directly connected with undergraduate education and life.

The goals of said revision should be to establish a system of governance that:
a) is effective;

- b) is essentially democratic, and otherwise upholds the principles of the university;
- c) is well connected with broader faculty governance, as embodied in the Faculty Senate and its committees and in the University Faculty.

The committee shall include:

- Two representatives selected by the Faculty Senate chair from among the regular faculty, one of whom shall chair the committee;
- the chair of the UUF Executive Committee or his designee from among the regular faculty;
- the chair of the executive committee (or his/her designee) of the faculty of each of the four schools;
- the Dean (or his/her designee) of each of the four schools;
- a designee of the President and a designee of the Interim Provost; and
- such other members as the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall deem appropriate, except that regular faculty without administrative appointments shall constitute a majority of the committee.

The committee shall also afford to the deans and executive committees of the other constituent faculties; to the chairs of the Departments of Nutrition, Biochemistry, and Physical Education and Athletics; to the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Vice President for Student Affairs; and to the Undergraduate Student Government, the opportunity to consult with the *ad hoc* committee should they so desire.

Report to Executive Committee from the Ad Hoc Committee on Pandemic Flu planning

James Alexander, Chair

Summary. The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Pandemic Flu planning recently had some issues referred to it from the university-wide task force on the topic. This is to report on the ad hoc committee's actions and recommendations. In particular, it presents a motion, for possible referral to the Senate for action.

Report. The University set up a university-wide task force on pandemic flu planning a couple of years ago. Most of the issues it has considered do not impinge on academic or faculty personnel policy; however the Senate in fall 2006 set up an ad hoc committee to deal with issues that do so. The committee was renewed in fall 2007, and the task force asked the committee to comment and/or formulate policy on several matters. The members of the renewed committee are listed in the appendix below.

The task force has a web page containing its reports and documents:

<https://docshare.case.edu/jsl44/jsl44/PandemicPlan/>

The following items were referred to the ad hoc committee:

- #06: contingent academic calendar
- #11: ethical and legal issues concerning student resources
- #17: management of research facilities

Since there is a standing Senate Committee on Research, the ad hoc committee referred #17 to that committee. The Senate Committee on Research meeting April 19, and will consider the issue at that meeting. It may or may not develop a motion for the Senate—it is anticipated such a motion would require each researcher in charge of a laboratory to develop contingent plans.

It was determined that item #11 is not appropriate for Senate deliberation, at least at the present time. It is a matter for the units with students working in clinics to develop policies and procedures on these issues. Our understanding is that this process is underway. None the less, it was useful to bring this issue forward. Committee members had comments on the documents, and these have been forwarded to Lynn Singer, Colleen Treml and Dan Ornt.

The ad hoc committee met on Friday, March 7, to consider #06. That document is appended. Don Feke, who had developed the draft document along with Chuck Rozek, attended and described the rationale for the document. The committee voted to forward the following motion to the Senate.

Moved: The included document, "Avian Flu Pandemic Preparations, Academic Plan," excerpted from the draft version 2.3, 2/15/2008 version of the university task force, is approved as policy governing scheduling and grading, with the following provisos:

1. It is understood that implementation may vary among constitutive units.
 - a. In particular, the calendars may be different. References to weeks of a semester refer to calendars of each unit.
 - b. Grading emphases may differ among units or even among subunits. For example, grades in some courses may depend almost completely on work done in the last weeks or days of the class. Some grades may depend on

clinical practice, which could be disrupted by an event. The appropriate bodies of the various units are urged to develop clarification of this policy appropriate to the units, subject to the general principle that in so far as possible, students should be able to progress with as little disruption as possible in their program of study.

2. The following changes in wording are incorporated.
 - a. Item 2) changed from “The University closes in the eleventh (out of fourteen) week or thereafter” to “The University closes in the last three weeks of classes.”
 - b. Item 3) changed from “The University closes sometime between weeks four and ten of a semester” to “The University closes sometime between the first three and last three weeks of a semester.”
3. Although this policy was developed in consideration of a pandemic flu, it is applicable in the event of other disruptive events.

End of motion.

Appendix 1: Members of the Senate ad hoc committee on pandemic flu

James Alexander (Chair)

Jessica Berg, School of Law

Carol Kelley, School of Nursing

Carol Musil (ex officio, as Chair of Committee on Research)

Joesph Prah, Case School of Engineering

Robert Salata, School of Medicine

JB Silvers, Weatherhead School of Management

Aloen Townsend, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences

Stephen Wotman, School of Dentistry

Avian Flu Pandemic Preparations
Academic Plan

In the event that an Avian Flu (or other) pandemic requires Case to cease normal teaching operations, the following Academic Plan provides the algorithm for decisions related to coursework and academic credit. Depending on the onset of the disruption, different sets of procedures will be followed.

1) The University closes within the first three weeks of a semester or earlier

- That semester will be canceled, and no academic credit will be awarded.
- That particular semester will be restarted, from the beginning, at the first available opportunity.

2) The University closes in the eleventh (out of fourteen) week or thereafter

- That semester will be considered to have concluded.
- The course instructor will decide whether or not it is feasible to require additional work (e.g., a term paper, a final exam) that could be submitted remotely by students from off-site locations.
- The course instructor will have discretion over the awarding of academic credit for his/her particular course(s).
 - If the instructor feels that the full amount of academic credits could be awarded, he/she will submit a grade for the course that will appear on the student's transcript and be included in the student's Grade Point Average.
 - If the instructor feels that, on the basis of work completed, that only partial credit should be awarded (e.g., students should earn only two credits out of three), then he/she will submit a grade of "Credit" or "No Credit." These entries, and the amounts of credits earned, will appear on the student's transcript, but they will not be included in the calculation of the student's Grade Point Average. Also, departments must provide information on how students would be able to earn or replace the missing partial credits within their programs of study.
- The subsequent semester will be started at the first available opportunity.

3) The University closes sometime between weeks four and ten of a semester

- The semester will be considered to be paused.
- Instructors will be encouraged to remain in electronic contact with their students during the closure.
- If conditions permit, course readings, homework problems, lab reports based on analysis of virtual laboratory data, term papers, etc. can be assigned during this period.
- The semester will be resumed at the first available opportunity. The semester will then proceed to conclusion, with normal grading procedures and full academic credit awarded.

Unless quarantined on campus, students will be asked to return to their homes (if possible) until academic operations resume. Following the disruption of a semester, the academic calendar will be adjusted (e.g., breaks will be eliminated or shortened if feasible, the Spring semester will continue into June if necessary, etc.) in order to restore the University to a normal schedule (as governed by the official five-year calendar) as quickly as possible.

Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106

**Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee
to the Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate**
Tuesday, April 22, 2008, 2:00 p.m.

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee held its eleventh and twelfth regular meetings on Wednesday, April 2, and Wednesday, April 16, 2008, respectively.

At the April 2 meeting, the primary item on the agenda was a presentation by Dean of the School of Medicine Dr. Pamela Davis on the Report of the PricewaterhouseCoopers operational improvement assessment white paper report, commissioned in September 2007 and delivered to the Board of Trustees in February 2008. The Dean had previously made presentations to the Chairs of Departments in the School of Medicine and offered presentations to the faculty of the School of Medicine on several occasions. Prior to the April 2 meeting, the Dean had also provided a copy of the Briefing to the Board of Trustees, dated February 22, 2008, to the Chair of the FSBC, without appendices, and distributed in advance of the meeting a summary report called "Prescription for Financial Health" to all members of the FSBC. FSBC member Prof. Edith Lerner described the series of faculty forums in the School of Medicine, each of which consisted of a one-hour presentation followed by ample time for questions, as the greatest financial transparency involving the most faculty ever in her long experience in the School of Medicine.

Dean Davis's presentation focused on the PWC analysis of the SOM's fiscal situation relative to peer institutions and on recommended means to eliminate the SOM's structural budget deficit of \$14.4 million as of FY 2007, \$12.7 million as of FY 2008.

Important advice included: 1) all medical schools lose money if clinical revenues are not considered; 2) medical education breaks even on a fiscal basis; 3) *funded* research loses 20 percent; and 4) clinical activities make money most of the time if well-managed. Clinical income thus subsidizes the deficit, and philanthropy raises all boats.

The dilemma for the SOM at CWRU is that it is more highly dependent on the income stream from research revenue than peer schools and very low on clinical, low on philanthropy, and lowest on endowment. Long-term strategies, thus, depend on raising the annual level of philanthropy and augmenting the principal of the endowment so that annual draws will constitute a larger proportion of the SOM's total income. Short term strategies necessarily involve both fixing the calculation of the amount of clinical income and securing its actual timely payment and also cutting costs to eliminate the structural budget deficit.

Specifically: whereas the mean percentage of total income from clinical sources for our peer schools of medicine is 15 percent, at the SOM here it is 5 percent (Dean's Tax and contributions from hospital operating funds). At CWRU, endowment income is about 5 percent

and philanthropy is about 5 percent, also below the mean for our peer institutions.

Dean Davis that the SOM plans to implement a variety of the recommendations of the PWC report as follows:

Faculty Salary: Phasing in by 2010, faculty in Basic Science departments will be expected to fund 70 percent of their salaries from external sources, and those in Clinical departments will be expected to fund 90 percent of the CWRU portion of their salaries. Research staff will be expected to be 100 percent funded. These goals are in line with policies at peer schools of medicine, and 50 percent of faculty in Basic Science departments, and 67 percent of those in Clinical departments, already fund more than 50 percent of their salaries from external sources. However some 25 percent fund less than 20 percent of their salaries, so that there will be a challenge to Chairs to improve faculty productivity.

Improved Financial Management: PWC recommended, and the SOM advocates implementation, of changes in usage of the current PeopleSoft financial software to make financial management more timely and transparent. This will involve first implementing capabilities in current software which are not implemented, second purchase of the PeopleSoft grants management module, and ultimately an upgrade to PeopleSoft 9.0. All of these will require investment at the University level.

Recruitment: The SOM will honor real recruitment commitments.

Tuition return to departments: A portion of tuition revenue from M.S. and Ph. D. will be returned to Departments for use in their budgets.

Space: The SOM will face challenges in space when 34,000 square feet are lost in the Triangle, but reorganization of space will result in some budget savings. There is really very little dry space. The SOM is at the median of peer institutions on research dollars per square foot and indirect dollars per square foot. The Wolstein Research Building is very costly and therefore unattractive; that building alone is so energy inefficient that it consumes 10 percent of all electricity used on campus

University issues: Dean Davis indicated her conviction that the SOM is charged a disproportionately high percentage of indirect costs by the University and receives a disproportionately low share of undergraduate tuition revenues. Both of these issues will be up for discussion in the upcoming consideration of tuition allocation and indirect cost allocation formulae beginning in summer 2008.

Dean Davis indicated that the SOM proposes not to implement some PWC recommendations right away, such as consolidating departments, moving certain departments out of particular spaces to save money, or charging departments that underutilize space.

Dean Davis also reported that relations with UHHS regarding payments due under the affiliation agreement have been working better; specifically, on March 31, the SOM received a payment for the prior quarter's estimated Dean's Tax. Negotiations continue on an addendum to the affiliation agreement that will clarify some payment issues and increase the predictability of payment to permit more accurate budgeting.

Savings accrued from the PWC recommendations and measures already implemented in fall 2007 will permit the SOM to meet the targets in the October 2007 Financial Recovery Plan, return to the black, and begin to build reserves for targeted investment.

Real budgetary health will result only from a long-term strategy to decrease the overwhelming dependence upon research funding, increase the percentage of total income from philanthropy and endowment draw, and clarify and perhaps increase the revenue derived from clinical income. In order to approach or equal our peer institutions, income from gifts (as a percentage of income) must double; income from endowment must triple; and clinical income must triple, assuming our excellent history of income from research remains constant. Space remains very much constrained, compounded by acute shortages of dry space and the inefficiencies of the Wolstein building.

After Dean Davis answered an extensive number of questions from committee members, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

At the April 16 meeting, Vice President Chris Ash reported on the proposal and awards activity through the end of March and noted positive upward trends. Proposals were up notably in the School of Medicine, and both proposals and awards were up gratifyingly in the Case School of Engineering.

Vice President Ash and CFAO Sadid reported on plans to consult broadly with multiple constituencies and have the President charge an Allocation Rules Review Committee to work through the summer and into the 2008-07 academic year to review and if necessary propose changes to current rules and formulae for allocating income (largely undergraduate tuition) and indirect costs to the 8 management centers. The intention is to be consultative, transparent, and for any ultimate recommendation to be broadly seen as legitimate. The intention also is to complete the process in time for any resulting new rules to be used in formulating the FY 2010 budget. Vice President Ash announced her plan to consult with the Deans of the constituent faculties on May 8. Members of the committee posed a number of questions and urged that the review transcend accounting considerations and a goal of “fairness,” moving instead toward a system of allocation calculated to advance clear objectives of the University as outlined in the emergent University Plan.

Ms. Nicole Addington, Budget Director in the School of Medicine Finance Office, then made a presentation in her role as Chair of the Business Policy Task Force appointed by President Snyder. That Task Force is charged to review current business policies (*not* the business practices that implement those policies) and make a report to the President by mid-May, so that any resulting recommended changes can go to the Board of Trustees at its June meeting. The impetus for this review has been interest on the part of the Audit Committee of the Board. The Task Force consists of four faculty members and a number of administrators, and it is charged to review the following policies:

- General Purchasing
- P-Card Policy

Travel Policies
Spousal Trip and Club Membership Policy
Meals and Entertainment Policy
Policy on use of external consultants
Employee Recognition Policy
Catering Policy
Printing Policy
Policies on Cell Phones, PDAs, and Internet Connectivity
Policy on Personal Use of University Property
Policies on Use of University Facilities

The goal of the review is to examine the policies for internal consistency and cross-policy conflicts to eliminate redundancies and contradictions, to benchmark against peer Universities to ensure use of best practices, and to make the policies more comprehensive and concise to render them easier to use. Much discussion ensued with specific questions that helped distinguish between policies and practices, and with anecdotes about practices and change in practices that seem to make little sense. Emphasis emerged on the need for both policies and practices to contain reasons for their existence. The Committee asked Ms. Addington to share with it the Task Force's draft report in May, and she readily agreed to do so at the May 21 meeting of the FSBC.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

The FSBC reports further its plan to receive a report on the FY 2009 budget at its May 7 meeting and to receive a report on the FY 2008 Third Quarter Forecast at its May 21 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth F. Ledford
Associate Professor of History and Law
Chair, 2007-08 Faculty Senate Budget Committee

**Slate of faculty candidates for membership on the
2008-09 Faculty Senate standing committees**

Abbreviations: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CSE = Case School of Engineering;
SODM = School of Dental Medicine; MSASS = Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences;
SOM = School of Medicine; SON = Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing; LAW = School of
Law; WSOM = Weatherhead School of Management; PE&A = Physical Education and Athletics

Note: Members with terms expiring in '11 are new to the committee or beginning a second term;
those with terms expiring in '09 and '10 are returning.

Executive Committee – all for a term of one year

Cynthia Beall, CAS	Kathryn Mercer, LAW
William Deal, CAS	Shirley Moore, SON
Steven Garverick, CSE	Terry Wolpaw, SOM
Leonard Lynn, WSOM	

Budget Committee

<u>Elected Senators</u>	Shirley Moore, SON '10
Kenneth Ledford, CAS '10, Chair	Marsha Pyle, SODM '10
Julia Grant, WSOM '10	

Representatives from Constituent Faculties' Budget Committees

David Biegel, MSASS '10	Kenneth Loparo, CSE '10
Laura Chisolm, LAW '10	J.B. Silvers, WSOM '10
Elizabeth Click, SON '10	Lee Thompson, CAS '10
Jim Lalumandier, SODM '10	Nicholas Ziats, SOM '10

Committee on Bylaws

Christine Cano, CAS '10, Chair	Dorr Dearborn, SOM '10
Stan Cort, WSOM '11	Gerald Mahoney, MSASS '11
Kathleen Courtney, SON '10	Spencer Neth, LAW '09

Committee on Faculty Compensation

Susan Case, WSOM'09, Chair	Eva Kahana, CAS '11
Keith Armitage, SOM '10	Patrick Kennedy, PE&A '11
James Dennis, SOM '11	Charles Malemud, SOM '10
Donna Dowling, SON '09	Catherine Scallen, CAS '10
Kathleen Farkas, MSASS '09	

Committee on Faculty Personnel

Robert Greene, CAS '09, Chair
David Crampton, MSASS '11
Karen Farrell, PE&A '11
Eva Kahana, CAS '09
James Kazura, SOM '10

Marshall Lietman, CAS '10
Vincenzo Liberatore, CSE '10
Marsha Pyle, SODM '09
Scott Shane, WSOM '11

Committee on Graduate Studies

Alan Levine, SOM '09, Chair
Cynthia Bearer, SOM '09
Sami Chogle, SODM '10
Christopher Flint, CAS '10
Ellen Landau, CAS '11

Edith Lerner, SOM '11
Kathryn Mercer, LAW '10
Wyatt Newman, CSE '11
Martin Snider, SOM '11

Committee on Information Resources

John Blackwell, CSE '09 Chair?
Christopher Burant, SON '10
Catherine Demko, SODM '10
Christine Hudak, SON '11
Kalle Lyytinen, WSOM '11

Wyatt Newman, CSE '09
Charles Rosenblatt, CAS '09
Virginia Saha, SOM '11
Jiaynag Sun, CAS '09

Committee on Minority Affairs

Sana Loue, SOM '09, Chair
Linda Boseman, SON '11
Roma Jasinevicius, SODM '09

Marixa Lasso, CAS '11
Spencer Neth, LAW '09
Aura Perez, SOM '10

Nominating Committee

“ . . . the annual designation of members of the Nominating Committee for the following year shall be made not later than May 1. . . to be selected by the faculty senators representing that faculty.”

Committee on Research

Ray Muzic, SOM '09, Chair
Eben Alsberg, CSE '09
Yiping Han, SODM '11
Katherine Jones, SON '10
Leonard Lynn, WSOM '10
Janet McGrath, CAS '11

Cassandra Robertson, LAW '11
Lawrence Sayre, CAS '11
Aloen Townsend, MSASS '10 (on sabbatical 08-09; David Biegel will substitute for one year)

Committee on University Libraries

Peter Haas, CAS '10, Chair
Vernon Anderson, SOM '09
Erik Jensen, LAW '09
Frank Merat, CSE '11
G. Regina Nixon, MSASS '09

John Orlock, CAS '09
Rolfe Petschek, CAS '11
Paul Salipante, WSOM '10
Kristin Victoroff, SODM '09
Awaiting a representative, SON '11

Committee on Women Faculty

Elizabeth Kaufman, SOM '11, Chair
Sarah Andrews, MSASS '10
Sarah Augustine, SOM '11
Karen Farrell, PE&A '09
Beatrice Jessie Hill, LAW '09

Arthur Huckelbridge, CSE '10
Judith Maloni, SON '11
Roy Ritzmann, CAS '10
Kristin Williams, SODM '11

April 22, 2008

Faculty Senate Committee on By-Laws

Year-end report, 2007-2008

The Committee on Bylaws has had nine lively meetings this academic year. We continue to work concomitantly on two activities: the review of revised by-laws of constituent faculties as they are submitted, and the ongoing review of the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Senate Bylaws.

At the September 20, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Senate approved revisions to the charter and by-laws of the School of Dental Medicine. The approved changes included 1) written procedures providing for an appropriate review of each member of the School of Dental Medicine, as mandated by the faculty handbook; 2) the addition of a paragraph explaining the school's exemption from the FH rule that a majority of fulltime faculty appointments in any constituent faculty shall be tenured or tenure-track (the so-called "51% rule"); and (3) the clarification of sections pertaining to criteria for promotion and tenure. Also in September, the committee considered an addition to the by-laws of the Case School of Engineering relative to the creation of a budget committee (as mandated by the new Article VII, Sec. A, Par.5 of the Faculty Handbook). We returned it to the CSE with recommendations for minor changes.

In October, after reviewing the revised bylaws of the School of Law, the committee sent a set of interim recommendations to the School of Law. In November, having reviewed three appendices (Procedures for Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure; Policies and Procedures for Lawyering Skills Faculty; Policies and Procedures for Clinical Faculty), we sent further recommendations to the law school, the most substantive of which pertain to confidentiality in promotion and tenure procedures.

In January, the committee approved an amendment to the bylaws of MSASS regarding the creation of a Research and Training Subcommittee of the Steering Committee. We also reviewed revised bylaws from the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing and returned them with recommendations, mostly non-substantive. In March and April, we began our review of updated bylaws from MSASS and the Weatherhead School of Management. Once this process is complete, the committee will have seen updated bylaws from all constituent faculties of the University, which have been mandated to: provide for a standing budget committee; include written procedures for evaluation of all full-time faculty members; and conform to the Faculty Handbook in matters of faculty categories and corresponding duties.

Our review of Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook is nearly complete, but outstanding sections of the chapter continue to provoke debate. In particular, the committee has discussed at length the FH section on the initiation of formal consideration of promotion and/or tenure (Initiation of Recommendations), which ascribes to certain faculty members the right to "self-initiate" consideration of promotion and/or tenure, with a guarantee of full higher review. Our

recommendations on modifications to the Faculty Handbook should go before the Faculty Senate in 2008-2009.

We would like to thank Susan Zull for her invaluable administrative support.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Cano, Chair

Faculty Senate Compensation Committee Report

2007-2008

Priority Selection

The work of the Compensation Committee began in September. We decided to initially focus on the major recommendation of last year's committee: to address faculty salary competitiveness through correction of internal salary compression. Compression has occurred because of market competitive higher starting salaries about what Case Western Reserve University pays to remain competitive in the new hire market, and past salary practices in most schools with regard to promotions that have resulted in compression.¹

In deciding our priorities, we expanded the previous recommendation. Our top priority was to work on guidelines and recommendations to increase faculty salary at Case Western Reserve University to address inversion, compression, equity, and competitiveness with other top universities across ranks and Schools. Another priority that closely linked to the inversion, compression, equity focus, was to develop a policy and guidelines recognizing the wide range of faculty contributions to the University in determination of faculty raises. Both of these are important since institutional quality is related to faculty compensation.²

The committee felt strongly that our priority problem of making salaries more competitive by closing the inversion, compression, and inequity gap could not be addressed and corrected by the individual schools within their current operating budgets. Hence, the committee recommended, in its Wish list to the Faculty Senate, that the issue be a high priority for the University Central, and that it increase its salary pool of money, restricting some of these funds to begin correcting the problem. We anticipate that there will need to be a multi-year time frame and plan for correction.

¹ Salary compression is an internal problem initiated by external market conditions and exacerbated by other factors. Two points of comparison are typically used to measure salary compression: salaries of junior employees versus salaries of senior employees. When the salary differential between junior and senior employees is smaller than *it should be* (emphasis added), compression occurs. Further, because junior employees may be defined as those newly hired or newly promoted, salary compression can occur between ranks as well as within ranks. A related term, "salary inversion" occurs when salary compression, left unexamined or unadjusted, results in junior employee salaries greater than senior employee salaries. Like salary compression, salary inversion can occur between ranks as well as within ranks. Although the reverse is not necessarily true, whenever inversion exists, compression also must exist.

² Sutton and Bergerson, *Faculty Compensation Systems*, ASHRE-ERIC, Higher Education Report, Vol 28 #2.

Faculty Salary Analysis

It is customary for the Compensation Committee to do a comparative evaluation of faculty salaries at Case Western Reserve University. We began this process in October with a focus to try to understand the data as it related to compression, inversion, and inequity in salary, not just general competitiveness.

One part of our evaluation was based on the AAUDE (Association of American Universities Data Exchange) Survey for 2006-2007. The AAU consists of 62 public and private research universities across the United States and Canada (34 public and 26 private in the US, and two in Canada – Mc Gill and Toronto). Fifty-nine AAU institutions participated in the faculty salary survey. This data was made available to the committee from the Center for Institutional Research at Case Western Reserve University.

Also provided to the committee was a customized version of 2006-2007 ACES data for all full-time faculty from all University Departments at Case Western Reserve University with the exception of the Clinical Departments of the School of Medicine. All the School of Medicine data was included for basic scientists. Deans were also excluded. Salaries were adjusted to a nine-month equivalent appointment. This data provided the committee with information on salary by gender, race, rank and school. Additional information on mean salaries at Case Western Reserve University by department, rank, gender and race was also provided by the ACES Office at Case Western Reserve University. A final salary comparison document made available to the committee was the Faculty Salary Survey Summary Report of the American dental Education Association (2005-2006).

The Committee analyzed faculty salaries from the aforementioned documents.

ACES Report

Nahida Gordon presented information on ACES data from 2006-2007 concerning salary equity at CWRU. Some of the conclusions follow:

1. There are clear inequities throughout the University by gender and race, with more inequities due to gender, although both have different patterns in different schools. Noticeable gender inequities are evident in the humanities, sciences, dental medicine, engineering, law, applied social science, basic sciences, and management.
2. There is the least discrepancy for gender at the Assistant professor level where market forces make similar salaries more the norm for both male and female hires, with the gap for women just a little behind on the average, compared to much larger gaps at the Associate and Full Professor levels.

3. Female faculty are predominantly in the lower ranks while male faculty are in the higher ranks. The differential in tenure and rank status contribute further to disparities in salary.
4. Differences in salary between male and female faculty cannot be explained fully by differences in rank, discipline, tenure status, years since hire, years in rank, highest degree, and years since attaining the highest degree.

The committee wanted to know how to make sense of the inversion in the data. How do we stay competitive, pull in new people, and still take care of people who have been at their rank for a while? The committee requested that the issues of promotion and coming to and leaving CWRU be examined. Are more women than men leaving before coming up for tenure? Is it harder to get promoted as a woman? This data has not yet been made available to the committee, but is considered important to further our understanding of the data presented. These are also questions for the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee to consider.

The committee noted that the salary-data presented only includes nine-month salary figures. This is misleading in terms of total year salary obtained by individual faculty members for comparison. The committee agreed that we want future reports to the committee to also provide information on total salary earned in a year by all full-time faculty at the University to determine the degree of inversion, compression, and inequities that individual faculty are experiencing. There is much anecdotal information on inequities that are evidenced in compensation by some men getting more opportunities for summer ninths (not grant related) added to their nine-month salary for administrative responsibilities, curriculum development, or other compensated opportunities. These opportunities are not as readily available to women, who often do similar work to help the School and or the University without similar compensation.

How widespread this pattern is throughout the University needs to be determined. Without examining the twelve-month salary for all faculties, the picture of inequities by race and gender is not a true picture. The committee believes that the inequities are likely to be far greater than the data currently shows.

In future reports to the committee on salary inversion and compression, the committee would like to see the data computed with years since hire to the salary received. The longer a person has been at CWRU, the less money they make contrasted to newer hires. It is expected that there is a negative coefficient of years since hire and faculty salary. To determine the impact, it is clear that this information needs to be examined one faculty at a time. The committee would also like to have salary ranges for the information provided by School, rank, race, and gender.

It became clear to the committee that to examine patterns of inversion, that we needed to begin developing guidelines and recommendations for a process to review individual faculty compensation to examine and identify inversion and compression. This became a major task for the committee this year, and will be described in more detail in a later portion of the report.

Because of problems with the Dental School data in the SACES material (60% of the faculty who are part-time are considered full-time faculty for voting and administrative supplements make a significant contribution to faculty in the Dental School) the committee used faculty salary information from the American Dental Education Association Summary Report for 2005-2006 to see comparable norms for Dental School faculty.

A question arose from the data concerning inequities in teaching loads, and if this was relevant to the salary studies being conducted. For example, some faculty now have five courses as their regular load, whereas, other faculty in the same school receive an overload if they teach five courses, since their load is determined to be four courses. By taking away overload payment for faculty whose course load has now risen to five, faculty have increased their workload and lost additional compensation they had been receiving. There might be a gender and/or race pattern to this alteration in loads and compensation that need to be examined. As the financial situation has worsened, making faculty teach more courses than they had in the past, without additional compensation, has been a way that individual Schools have been able to save money. This not only further causes inequities, but it is part of the perception of unfairness and continued ability to “cut deals” that further erodes faculty morale. This appears to be another area to examine next year.

The ACES data is compelling and indicates issues at CWRU, especially issues of gender inequities and salary compression.

AAU Data

The AAU data exchange report includes the ratio of CWRU salary data. The report was constructed matching disciplines, field to field, with salary included for nine-months. Both tenured and non-tenured track faculty are included in the data, as well as administrative stipends. The data set for comparison includes our peer institutions from the top public and private universities. Data is provided as a box plot comparing CWRU averages to AAU averages by rank and disciplinary group. The box plot shows a range of salary at a particular rank. It is good for the median to be close to the end of the box plot. The data shows the relative rank of average salary by rank and discipline within groups of universities. Unlike past data surveys, this one was adjusted for cost of living.^{3,4}

³ The Runzheimer cost of living indexes used in the salary adjustments include (1) Taxation (federal, state, local, and social taxes), (2) Transportation – cost of owning and operating personal vehicles including gas, oil, maintenance, license, registration, financing, and

The overall picture from the data follows:

1. Overall average CWRU faculty salaries rose 1.3% in 2005-2006 and 2% in 2007-2008, falling behind the rate of inflation for the second two-year consecutive period.
2. Most of the ratios provided from the 06-07 AAU data for CWRU are either flat or went down. See Table 1.
3. CWRU is below average at most ranks in most schools compared with our peer institutions. The committee questioned if we should be looking at data split by all public schools and all private schools for comparison.
4. The cost of living adjustment pushes CWRU up a little, but not as much as was expected. Even after adjustment for a lower cost of living, CWRU salaries are still not competitive.
5. The group data presented cannot be used for individual conclusions concerning our issues of inversion, compression, and equity, but do help gauge our competitiveness in the market.

depreciation, (3) Housing – total expenses including home market price, mortgage payment, insurance, real estate taxes, and utilities, and (4) Goods and services – cost of ten major categories (food, tobacco, alcohol, clothing, domestic services, recreation, furnishings and household appliances, personal care, and medical care). The CWRU index used for Cleveland covers east side suburbs where most faculty live. Runzheimer has a number of community groupings for each metropolitan area.

⁴ In Cleveland, housing prices are lower than the peaks of the coasts. But many other costs of living are much higher. We pay the highest electric utility rates in the US and we have a very long winter season. Our burden of state and local income, property and sales taxes here is higher than areas known as “high tax” localities like Howard County, Maryland. We pay regressively bracketed Ohio State income tax and two local income taxes (Cleveland and RITA). Property taxes in the Heights areas (Shaker, University, and Cleveland) are much more than identically valued homes in other locals and are the highest in the state. Even food prices are higher compared to the east and west coasts. The committee doesn’t accept that the cost of living here is any significantly lower than elsewhere.

Table 1 – Average Faculty Salaries by Rank and Discipline
 Academic Years 2005, 2006, 2007
 Case Average Compared to AAU Average
 Not Adjusted for Regional Cost of Living

	Professor			Associate			Assistant		
	AY05	AY06	AY07	AY05	AY06	AY07	AY05	AY06	AY07
Humanities	0.77	0.78	0.74	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.97	1.01	0.92
Social Sciences	0.82	0.79	0.84	0.90	0.89	0.86	0.92	0.92	0.87
Visual and Performing Arts	0.90	0.91	0.89	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.11	1.13	0.99
Math and Natural Sciences	0.86	0.83	0.80	0.94	0.99	0.96	0.93	0.94	0.90
Engineering and Computer Science	0.92	0.92	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.92	0.98	0.97	0.95
Management	0.94	0.91	0.89	0.94	0.94	0.91	0.99	0.96	1.00
Nursing	1.05	1.17	1.08	1.13	1.15	1.05	0.97	0.93	0.93
Dental Medicine	0.74	0.78	0.90	0.88	0.95	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.79
Law	0.90	0.91	0.90	1.06	1.10	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.08
Social Work	1.10	1.13	1.08	1.14	1.11	1.07	1.13	0.97	1.01
Biomedical Sciences	1.02	1.04	1.07	0.95	0.96	0.91	0.85	0.86	0.90

A value of .75 means that the Case average salary is 75% of the AAU average for a given rank and disciplinary group.

Sources: AAU Data Exchange Survey of faculty Salaries by Discipline; Case faculty Database. All salaries have been converted to nine-month equivalents. AAU averages include non-tenure track faculty. Programs included in the average salary calculations for each discipline correspond as much as possible to the program mix in the College of Arts and Sciences and professional schools at Case. The AAU comparison group includes 36 public and 23 private institutions.

- The data in the report also clearly shows that inequities vary by school and department. The Humanities is very uncompetitive. Almost every department in the Humanities is under market and at or below the bottom 20%ile. Social Sciences are below the median, as is math and natural Sciences. The two schools with nationally competitive salaries are Nursing at the Professor and Associate levels, and the Mandel School. In the Law School, Associate and Assistant professor salaries are very close to each other indicating areas where inversion may be occurring.

7. In the Management School, Assistant and Associate Professor's salaries are also very close with the average Assistant Professor salaries higher than the average Associate Professor salaries. Inversion may be occurring in some departments since salaries fluctuate greatly depending on the field of management specialty.
8. Dental Medicine has some anomalies because they include faculty and students in the data and faculty money received through clinical practice is not included. The salary data presented is incomplete.
9. CWRU is more competitive with our new recruits who are offered market competitive packages. This leads to the issue of inversion that our committee is addressing.
10. Increasing disparities in compensation between faculty and other highly educated professionals are making it more difficult to secure the best students to academic careers.
11. Our peer institutions strive to be in the 70% bracket. We are not there in any of our schools. Only Mandel comes close to being competitive across ranks with their adjusted salaries. Where do we want to be in comparison with our peer institutions? 50 %? Just average? , 70 %? "Bragging rights"?

The University currently looks at the adjusted numbers when it examines salary competitiveness for its existing faculty. But in recruiting, CWRU uses the unadjusted national norms. These increase inversion for faculty. The CWRU cost of living adjustment is 1.023 (in comparison to Manhattan at 2.16, Boston at 1.36, and Buffalo at .996). The committee members do not believe that the administration should be looking at adjusted numbers. These do not represent real wealth accumulation by faculty here. For example, the principal item in Cleveland that is low is housing. But when faculty buys property here, the equity in the house doesn't increase like it does in some higher cost of living areas. In these higher cost areas faculty often get help from their institutions to enter the housing market through grants, low interest loans, or buying a part of the equity in the house. Thus, you can afford career moves. In those areas you grow more equity toward retirement as you build your career. In Cleveland, the housing market translates into lower equity generators.

Once at CWRU, you get stuck because you don't get raises that are competitive, and you fall further behind in what you are able to save for retirement. It is a myth that these unadjusted numbers don't matter. Once here, faculty get further behind financially.

The committee suggests some possibilities for future examination include using unindexed salaries, exclude the effects of housing from the index, or use a lifetime wealth index as ways to examine competitiveness.

The Deans of each school were provided with AAU adjusted and unadjusted comparisons for their own faculty, with dollar values, as part of this year's budget process. The provost indicated that this would help us identify and begin to address inequities within particular disciplines and ranks.

Wish List for Budget Priorities

Our top priority, to expand the faculty salary pool to begin the process of correcting for salary inversion, compression, and inequity was one of the top two vote getters in the Faculty Senate vote on priorities that CWRU should address immediately. President Barbara Snyder agreed to address the top two priorities as she moved forward at the University in its budget process and with its strategic plan. It is expected that significant financial resources will be necessary if faculty salaries are to be competitive with our peer institutions.

Also included in our wish list was paid family leave in the contexts of total benefits packages, cost of living or across the board raises to deal with the impact of inflation on salary, an examination of how raises are determined and development of a policy that recognizes a wide range of faculty contributions to the University.

The number one priority was the issue of increased faculty salary for University faculty members because of inversion, compression, equity issues, and lack of competitiveness with other top universities across the ranks. Last years salary pool for raises was 2-3%, with different pools given to different Schools. President Snyder has increased the pool for 2008-09 by 1% to 3-4%.

The committee formed two subcommittees to work on (1) developing a policy and guidelines related to faculty contributions to the University for the purpose of determining raises, and (2) developing guidelines for identifying and correcting inversion, compression, and inequity.

Recommendation and Process for Salary Inversion, Compression, and Inequity

This recommendation was one of the top priorities for the administration to address that was approved by the faculty Senate. As the committee discussed a policy and process for determining raises and dealing with a correction of faculty salaries because of inversion, compression, and inequity, our recommendation included three components: (1) a process where people are to self-identify, (2) a central role from the Provost's Office in similarly identifying where there are inequities, inversion, and compression for individual faculty members in their compensation, and (3) Deans' be charged with also identifying those faculty and be held accountable for correcting the problem. (See attached Recommendation and Guidelines for Salary Inversion, Compression, and Inequity). The first step in the process is identification of those who need adjustments. The second step is examining a justification for the adjustment on how "valuable" a faculty member has been and is to the CWRU mission of teaching, research, scholarship, and service.

For continuing faculty, starting salaries, both now and for at least the last 20 years, were set primarily by national market rates in each discipline. For many faculty, offers accepted were on the high end of the national range. Decades of 0-3% per year raises, and small increases upon promotion, depending on the annual budget, are the reasons so many faculty are so

underpaid. Regardless of cost of living, the annual increases since 1991 fail to keep pace with even Cleveland Fed's local inflation rate index.

The committee is aware that to correct the problem to some reasonable goal level (not yet determined) will take as much as five years. But the process needs to begin for all faculty who are affected so that they will see a salary correction beginning in this raise cycle.

Provost Jerry Goldberg asked Deans for 2007-2008 academic year to define instances where there are racial or gender issues in pay, as well as disparity due to inversion of salary. He asked them to identify those individuals and to come up with a plan to begin to fix these problems. The Provost indicated that his office would go over this list and look for outliers. A plan needs to be in place even with the budget constraints. The committee sees the plan for correcting inequities and addressing internal inversion and compression as the first step toward moving to overall competitive faculty salaries with our peer institutions.

The plan recommended by the Compensation Committee states that the implementation plan should strive to provide the most benefit to the most faculty and not to just a selected few. There is also strong sentiment that the decision as to how to identify those faculty who have been most affected by salary compression, inversion, and inequity must occur in an atmosphere of collaboration between the Administration (President and provost's Office), the Department Chairs and Deans of the various faculty constituencies. Further, there needs to be a University-wide process to review possible inequities and complaints about possible inequities and to award raises to those found behind disciplinary norms for their faculty rank. The provost already has the task of determining whether or not a fairness doctrine has been applied to promotion and tenure deliberations in various schools so we do not suggest another layer of bureaucratic involvement.

Description of Broadened Faculty Contributions to University and Guidelines for Faculty Review of Contributions

Members of the committee stated that there are strong perceptions by faculty members across Schools that there is little transparency related to issues of faculty load, work expectations, and pay. Transparency is an important goal from which to work. Based on examination of salary data and extensive discussions, the committee focused on finding an objective way to evaluate people annually for salary increases.

The committee prioritized the examination of how raises are determined and the development of a policy that recognizes a wide range of faculty contributions to the University in the determination of raises. It also recognizes that faculty have different talents and abilities that can enhance the entrepreneurial character of the University. It also recognized that faculty may best contribute in different ways at different life and career stages.

This is something that Deans of all schools need to work on with coordination from the provost's office. Salary raises reflect how people spend their time. Faculty need to be rewarded for what they are asked to do. This involves teaching, service to the Department, School, and University, research, and outreach in many forms that contribute to the mission of the University and the goals of the administration. The decision for raises and the way evaluations are used needs to be objective. The committee recognizes that there are many ways to contribute to the University and currently believes that many important contributions are not considered.

Many faculty leave the University between the Assistant and Associate Professor rank because there is little difference in salary. But faculty do not leave just for dollars. Many leave because they don't feel valued by the University, including in the way they are compensated for their work efforts. Broadening the criteria will also help in the correction of problems with inversion and compression. The committee will send forth resolutions for approval of the Faculty Senate next year based on recommendations in the attached guidelines (See Broadening Criteria for Faculty Raise determination).

These include:

1. The Faculty Senate Compensation Committee recommends adoption of broadened guidelines and criteria across all School's of the University for the yearly determination of raises for faculty. Broadened guidelines and criteria that apply across schools are needed in order to recognize that there are many ways to "add value" and bring stature to the University. All contributions are important to the health of the University. Demonstrated performance in any combination of excellence in teaching, research, and/or service to the University should be recognized and rewarded. Guidelines across schools should be determined through faculty and administrative dialogue that reflects the same "open spirit" that has been guiding the strategic planning process.
2. The Faculty Senate Compensation Committee recommends that the Provost establish a clear policy for faculty evaluation that matches rewards with agreed upon expectations. For example, if a faculty member is asked to teach more courses during an academic term to meet department and/or school needs, then his or her evaluation should be based on this altered expectation.
3. The committee also recommends the establishment of a mechanism for an independent review of faculty activity for raise determination at the University level in instances when a member of the faculty does not think that his or her contributions have been fairly evaluated at the School level. Prior to requesting an independent review, all School level discussions with one's Department Chair and Dean, to resolve the discrepancy, must have occurred, or the faculty member must have made a bona fide attempt at such resolution. This will provide a mechanism for review of faculty contributions in a broader context of "adding value" to the University. At this time, there is no such University level mechanism.

President's Committee for Identification and Development of Process for Salary Correction and Competitiveness

The President met with the Chair of the Compensation Committee, the President and President Elect of the Faculty Senate and the VP of Human Resources to discuss the Committee's recommendations and guidelines given the Faculty Senate priority for the issue of salary correction. After discussion, she established an implementation committee to be chaired by Carolyn Gregory, VP of Human Resources, whose task is to develop a multi-year process to address this issue. The seven-member committee includes five faculty and two administrators. The committee has had two meetings in April with intent to move rapidly with a plan for the Board of trustees by September.

The Compensation Committee has forwarded its recommendations and guidelines for implementation to the President's Committee as input to their deliberations. This committee has set priorities to focus on internal inequities of compression and inversion first, determining a process for internal inequity reviews and establishing the extent of the problem, followed by external competitiveness. It will establish our benchmarks for salary comparison, our reference point (market average, median, top quartile), review the need to adjust salaries for cost of living, look at continuing faculty average increases, determine criteria for faculty salary (based on Compensation Committee report that was also forwarded to them), and create a transparent process that needs to be built into School's five year plans.

The work has begun that will build on the Compensation Committee's work this year, and will continue with weekly meetings throughout the summer.

Benefits Analysis

Members of the committee worked closely with the benefits staff from Human Resources in three areas: (1) health care plan costs, (2) examination of CWRU paid family and parental leave policy and benchmarking with peer institutions, and (3) development of certification procedure for determining benefit eligibility. An extensive evaluation to assess external competitiveness of the various benefit programs at CWRU was undertaken by this committee last year. A review of retirement, health plans, and tuition assistance in comparison with peer institutions resulted in CWRU benefits exceeding their peer group significantly. The few weaknesses within the health and welfare area, like offering a vision plan, have been addressed.

(1) Health Care Plan Costs

Anthem replaced Qual Choice in January 2007 as one of our health carriers. Because of a 40% higher six-month claim experience, with more large claims than anticipated, and longer hospitalization days than with Qual Choice, the employees contribution increased by 15% for January 2008. Medical Mutual and Kaiser each had 6% increases. The Benefits Committee will continue to look at the structure of Anthem and other health care costs.

(2) Paid Family and Parental Leave

Carolyn Gregory facilitated a discussion of whether CWRU needed a paid family and parental leave policy at CWRU. Currently there is no one policy and practice for the University. Each School makes deals with faculty and the deals differ from one another creating issues of equity. All department policy needs to be in alignment across the University. There needs to be one policy that is in effect for everyone.

As a University, we have not been proactive on this issue. We are within federal regulations, but not much ahead. We let people use sick time when a physician says this is medically necessary for a faculty member, such as birth by cesarean section. With medical necessity, a faculty member receives up to six weeks paid leave.

For recruiting top faculty and retaining them in a competitive market, a policy on paid family and parental leave is important, especially given that several of our peer institutions (Vanderbilt, Carnegie Mellon, Duke, Washington University) have more

accommodating parental leave policies including 100% pay for one semester. ACES data has already pointed out that salaries for women are behind our peer institutions at CWRU. Young men who are being recruited are also asking about availability of such leave. Without a comprehensive parental/family leave policy the University fails to cultivate a supportive environment for parents.

There are male faculty who desire to be involved in rearing newborns and infants. They have fewer options than their counterparts under the current leave policy. They have no stated option to extend family obligations. Similarly, adoptive parents can take only unpaid leave through the Family and medical leave Act, and have no option to extend the tenure period.

The Committee examined practices at other comparable universities, with Carolyn Gregory charged with costing out a paid family leave policy of a minimum of 12 weeks at CWRU. Twelve weeks was suggested since not all schools are on the same 15-week semester system.

Certification System for Benefit Eligibility

Human Resources has initiated a new certification procedure for dependent children and spouses of employees in order to save the institution money. The initiative began in January and will move forward to January 1, 2009 when it will be fully implemented. Businesses find a 10 – 14% discrepancy in eligibility when they require certification. Marriage certificates, birth certificates, tax returns, divorce decrees that mandate custody, and proof of full-time student status all will be acceptable documents. Human Resources will provide a list to faculty and staff, who have until May 31, 2008 to submit proof for coverage.

In addition, the Benefits Fair will return to a two-day event next year, which was preferred by faculty and staff.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions:

The fringe benefits to CWRU faculty are competitive with our peer institutions in most cases, and the University should be commended for maintaining a strong fringe benefit package and for examining ways to create a more family friendly environment. However, the faculty compensation system is far from ideal. Overall, average faculty salaries by rank and discipline lag behind those of our peer institutions. Some Schools are more favorable overall, but most are not. We have considerable work to do to close the gap with our peers.

Add the internal inequities due to compression and inversion and the picture is even bleaker. There is extensive inversion and compression of salary across Schools where faculty who have been performing satisfactorily have not received a constant standard of living, yet alone appropriately increased compensation for performance above a satisfactory level. Tenured

long-term faculty have salaries that are no longer competitive, whereas new hires remain competitive in a national market. The higher starting salaries necessary to remain competitive and past salary practices in most schools with regard to promotion have resulted in salary compression. Furthermore, the criteria used for raises are not broad enough to match faculty behavior that is in alignment with the vision, mission, and goals of the University. Finally, faculty do not believe that the compensation system is administered objectively and without any subjective bias.

The committee feels strongly that this problem cannot be addressed and corrected by the individual Schools within their current operating budgets. Thus, the committee recommends that the University Central set aside funds for this purpose to Schools where the problem exists. We understand that this problem cannot be corrected quickly, but recognition of the problem and a strategy of how the problem will be corrected over a multi-year period will do a lot to improve faculty morale over this issue.

Recommendations:

1. Continue working on a multi-year, School by School plan for correction of inversion, compression, inequity, and salary competitiveness, charging deans with accountability for dealing with these inequities. While it costs money to provide raises for those behind disciplinary norms for their faculty rank, turnover is also expensive. The committee recommends looking to retain faculty, even if it means fewer (new) slots.
2. Salary issues of inequity, inversion, and compression should be addressed in the University Strategic Plan and the Strategic Plans of individual Schools. Getting all faculty to a competitive salary range needs to be put into the Strategic Plan. Next years committee will forward a resolution that recommends to the administration that for comparison purposes we use unadjusted salary numbers in our move to increase market competitiveness of salaries. We will also request an examination of total compensation over 12 months for inequities, and not continue adjusting all salary to a nine-month basis.
3. The Provost's Office should identify where there are inequities, inversion, and compression for individual faculty members in their compensation and share this with their Deans. There is a need for transparency at all levels of the evaluation and compensation system.
4. Develop a University compensation structure that is more varied in what is rewarded than the system currently in place. Compensation needs to value the many roles faculty play in the University that add value to its stature. The reward system needs to match what the University wants people to do. The Committee recommends defining what a valuable faculty member is, then creating incentives consistent with how we want people to behave.
5. Follow the Faculty Senate Committee charge to conduct an annual review of the guidelines and policies for faculty compensation for each school, considering issues of comparability in policies across all units. Also review the implementation of those guidelines and policies at each School.

6. Bring a resolution for a paid family/parental leave policy of at least 12 weeks full salary.
7. Recommend a review of the compensation system to include inflationary adjustments in salary for satisfactory performance with merit an incentive for performance greater than satisfactory.
8. Next year the Faculty Senate Compensation Committee will begin sending forward resolutions to the Faculty Senate that are drawn from recommendations in our two sets of guidelines as they evolve as we work with the president's Committee regarding inversion, inequity, and competitiveness of faculty salary.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan S. Case

Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior

Chair, 2007-2008 Faculty Senate Compensation Committee

Acknowledgements:

The committee acknowledges the cooperation of the Center for Institutional Research, the ACES program, and the office of Human Resources at Case Western Reserve University. Special thanks to Jean Gubbins and Tom Geaghan for meeting with the committee to discuss the AAU faculty salary study data; Nahida Gordon for presenting ACES data on salary inequities and providing mean numbers by departments, across schools, by rank to help the committee identify some of the many instances of individual inversion and salary compression; and Carolyn Gregory for meeting with the committee several times to discuss family and parental policies and benchmark data for comparison as part of a total benefit package.

Year-End Report of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, 2007-2008

During the academic year 2007-2008, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee addressed three primary issues. First, the committee discussed budget priorities. Second the committee discussed the grievance process. Finally, in the context of other issues that arose during the year the committee discussed the roles of the Office of the University Attorney and the Faculty Senate in amending or re-writing sections of the Faculty Handbook.

Budget:

The members of the committee focused narrowly on the budget priorities from the perspective of faculty members. This approach reflected the committee's view of its role. Therefore, the priorities articulated by the committee were:

1. Salaries:

Equity

Compression: The salaries of senior productive faculty have not grown as fast as those of newly hired junior faculty. While it is critical to recruit highly regarded new faculty the range of salaries from junior to senior has been narrowed. This is bad for senior morale and has an effect on recruiting new faculty.

Merit Raises: In general an underlying question was what percent of the university budget is spent on faculty and staff salaries and how has this changed over the past 5 years?

2. Benefits:

It was the sense of the committee present that benefits have already been cut in recent years and that no further cuts for staff or faculty should be made without intense consideration of other alternatives.

3. Retirement Incentives:

There have been retirement incentive packages but they have not been very attractive to most senior faculty. Within budget constraints new packages should be considered.

4. Environment for conducting funded research has deteriorated:

As central administrative staff has been cut. Researchers have less support for grant applications and administration. Examples include bookkeeping, purchasing, and independent consultant contracts.

5. Outsourcing:

The outsourcing of some administrative functions seems to be inefficient and perhaps even more costly to the individual school or department. Examples include Kelly Services for research consultants and interviewers.

6. Child Care

The committee believes that funding child care is among the best mechanisms for clearly and visibly demonstrating the University's commitment to diversity and family.

7. Set aside money for recruiting "partners".

In general, the committee concluded, though mindful of board pressures, that it was critical to ask whether it was valuable or necessary to balance the budget with such speed.

Grievance Process:

The committee discussed the procedures for grievances contained in the faculty handbook. The following issues were raised as meriting additional discussion by next year's committee and attention from the faculty senate.

- a) Role of the office of university counsel and lawyers for parties in grievance process. Should all lawyers be excluded or should lawyers be allowed? It was the sense of the committee that the policy of excluding lawyers should continue but that this required clarification of the role of university counsel.
- b) Electronic communication: It is the sense of the committee that, although cumbersome, confidentiality is best protected if electronic means of communication are not used to transmit documents for grievance hearings.
- c) The faculty handbook provides for training for members of the grievance committee panels. This training should take place.
- d) The faculty handbook provides for an end of the year meeting between the faculty grievance committee panel members and the president. This meeting should take place.
- e) Mediation: It is the sense of the committee that professional neutral mediation services be made available as a step prior to a formal grievance proceeding. Mediation should be voluntary and all parties to the grievance must agree to this alternative. The university should develop both "internal" university mediators and a list of "external" mediators. (In a related matter the committee notes that the chair of the Personnel Committee is asked to play the role of mediator in grievance matters but is not given any appropriate training.)
- f) Confidentiality: Further discussion is necessary to clarify the right of individual schools or departments to control whether letters of recommendation or review of a candidate for promotion or tenure should remain confidential.

Roles of University Counsel and Faculty Senate:

In the context of a request to review changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy the committee agreed that there was need for clarification of the role of the Office of the University Attorney in re-writing sections of the faculty handbook.

The committee hopes that next year's agenda for the Personnel Committee will include consideration of the role of the University Attorney and the issue of the Grievance procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lipton, Chair Personnel Committee
School of Law

**Faculty Senate Committee on Information Resources (FSCIR)
2007-08 Report**

Committee members:

John Blackwell (CSE, chair)
Mark Dunlap (SOM)
Catherine Demko (SODM)
Lev Gonick (ITS)
Alex Hutnik (Undergraduate Student)
Thomas Knab (CAS)
Wyatt Newman (CSE)
Alan Rocke (CAS)
Charles Rosenblatt (CAS)
Timothy Robson (KSL)
Kenneth Rys (Graduate Student)
Paul Salipante (WSOM, Libraries Committee)
Jiayang Sun (CAS)

FSCIR meetings (7) were held on October 8, November 12, December 3, January 14, February 11, March 5 (joint with FSBC) and April 14, and focused on the following issues:

Technology enhanced classrooms (TECs)

FSCIR is concerned that there is no line item in the ITS budget for maintaining and upgrading the TECs. These first of these facilities were installed in 2002-03, and there are now 154 of them. They were equipped largely through one-time special appropriations, and the first of them are in need of refresh. ITS has been spending \$500K/yr on regular day-to-day maintenance, garnered from elsewhere in its budget. An additional \$500K would be necessary to include 3-4 yr refresh and enhancement of the present 154 TECs.

The committee believes that the faculty places a high priority on the continued availability of the technology enhanced classrooms (TECs). The faculty has come to take these facilities for granted, and see them as essential to our teaching mission. Failing to maintain them adequately, and to keep up with incremental changes in the state of the art, would be seen as a major loss. Also we believe that our present and incoming students take them for granted.

This recommendation was brought to the January meeting of the Faculty Senate, and passed to FSCB. The committee held a joint meeting with FSBC in February, to discuss this and other issues. At that meeting it was agreed that FSCIR should look more deeply into the budget of ITS in order to understand ITS priorities, and keep FSBC informed of our discussions.

Conversion to gmail

The committee heard presentations from Lev Gonick on the advantages to CWRU of operating email through a tie-in with gmail (Google). We were supportive of the proposal because of the additional storage space for individual accounts, something that it would be difficult for CWRU to provide. The potential security risks appear to be minor. This transfer will be on an opt-in basis for faculty, and the CWRU email system will continue to operate as parallel option. Those opting for gmail will retain their @case.edu addresses. A complete conversion will result in budgetary savings, although email represents only about 1% of the ITS budget.

Security

The committee discussed the need for a policy to require regular changes in computer passwords. We viewed this as necessary because of the new student information system, which has resulted in faculty access to more confidential information. Faculty inconvenience also needs to be minimized, but a requirement for an annual change of password would seem reasonable.

ITS communication with Faculty

The committee expressed concern that ITSPAC was a less than effective means of communication with faculty on IT issues. FSCIR itself cannot fill this gap: there needs to be direct communication with the faculty at the school level.

2008-09 Budget

At the April meeting, Lev Gonick presented the 2008-09 budget for ITS, which showed an approximately 1% increase, consistent with the austerity elsewhere in the university. As a result, there would be no special funding for the technology enhanced classrooms, and hence no refresh and up-grade of the existing facilities. Likewise, expansion of MediaVision would be on hold. The committee expressed disappointment on hearing of these cuts, and concern for our competitive position among our peer institutions.

Graduate Student IT Fee

Ken Rys (Graduate Student member of FSCIR) reported on the continued dissatisfaction of graduate students over the separate IT fee, seeing it as more appropriate that their IT usage be funded as part of tuition. The committee indicated that the faculty also took that view when the fee was introduced, and accepted that this would mean increasing graduate tuition.

Faculty Senate Committee on Research
Report 2007-2008

The Committee met seven times during the academic year, with one additional meeting to discuss priorities with budget impact.

The Committee generated a “wish list” of items with budget implications for possible inclusion in the University budget; these items were forwarded to the Executive Committee in December, 2007 and, in April 2008, to R. Baznik of the Research Strategic Planning Group, in response to the Provost’s request for implementation suggestions.

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) has been a recurring theme in issues and concerns brought to or raised within the committee during this year and prior years. The Committee believes that most faculty and researchers try to maintain high ethical and practice standards. Some universities have comprehensive policies or white papers on RCR. The committee reviewed current status of RCR at CWRU; CWRU ORA has RCR policies/guidelines on some areas, but not on collaborative science, data management, mentorship and training, and peer review. Subcommittees examined mentoring and collaborative research.

Committee discussion emphasized a process of building awareness of responsible conduct, not drafting punitive measures, and that Research Committee efforts should not duplicate efforts of ORA or Graduate Studies. A mentoring handbook is under development by the Graduate Student Senate and will be reviewed by this committee. Collaboration remains a concern: some departments report that collaboration across departments/schools is difficult, but others do not. Given the considerable variability in many aspects of research across departments and disciplines and in light of the Strategic Planning Process, which includes Research Strategic Planning, the need for further attention to RCR and collaboration will be noted and reported, but no further action taken this year.

There was discussion on authorship and an example of a recent case. We remind the University community of the University Guidelines on Authorship (Faculty Handbook p. 52).

The committee has requested to meet with candidates for the Associate Vice President for Research Administration, given the current structure in which ORA works with Faculty Senate committees for policy changes.

The Conflict of Interest Policy was brought to the committee but was recalled.

The Committee was asked to review the CWRU Avian Flu Response Plan. The plan is an excellent starting point for planning other emergency preparations. Individual labs (wet and animal labs) will need to have a detailed plan as outlined in the Conditional Emergency Operational Plan currently under review. Other labs (including chemistry, engineering, labs with sensitive equipment, and high speed climate controlled computers (C. Rudick, grad student), as well as other research projects) also should plan for unanticipated (emergency) and/or anticipated (avian flu) closures.

Recommendations for committee activities next year:

1. Continue to work on:

- Avian Flu and general emergency preparedness plans, including Research Computing Security in planning
- Responsible Conduct of Research
- Fostering Collaborative Research across disciplines

2. Consider how to improve relationships/profiles of some CWRU departments with foundations

3. Review Mentoring Handbook for value to research at all levels and RCR

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Musil, Chair

Year-End Report to Faculty Senate of Faculty Senate Library Committee
April 17, 2008

The Library Committee met monthly during the 2007-2008 academic year, with the University Librarian and other key librarians participating in its discussions. The Committee focused primarily on issues involving strategic planning, materials budgets, space shortages, development, and scholarly communications/dissemination.

During the fall semester the Committee conferred with Prof. Jerry Floersch, serving as a Library Task Force to provide input into the University's strategic planning process. In the spring the Committee reviewed the University's draft strategic plan and suggested minor changes to its section on libraries, to read, "Address space constraints in campus libraries and issues of scholarly communication, including the acquisition of traditional holdings and digital publications, and dissemination of our scholars' products to enhance the University's visibility." This sentence in the strategic plan concisely captures several library issues of concern to the Committee.

The Committee proposed three budget priorities for the poll of Senate members conducted in January: Hire a development officer dedicated to library fundraising; increase the budget base allocation for library materials; and hire a scholarly communications specialist. Together, these three proposals received 23 votes, with strong faculty support for the first two proposals. Those two proposals reflect the libraries' needs for increased financial resources to maintain even basic levels of acquisitions of the traditional and electronic materials necessary for faculty research. The Committee reinforced its call for the University to continue its recent specification of a separate materials budget for the libraries. Increases in this budget have been minimal in recent years. Future budgets must reflect the reality of 5% annual increases in the costs of OhioLink electronic resources and yet greater increases in other materials costs.

At several of its meetings the Committee considered the possibilities for development efforts to provide sorely needed resources for materials and additional space to store traditional materials. As part of this process the Committee met in April with Kaye Ridolfi, Associate Vice President for Institutional Development, and discussed ways for the libraries to work with the development office and the academic units to prepare for a possible capital campaign.

In concert with the University's librarians, the Committee conducted a second annual library planning retreat. The January retreat brought together approximately fifty faculty members and librarians from all academic units on campus to generate priorities for the allocation of the libraries' scarce resources. The retreat brought to the surface important concerns of various units, including scholarly communications and increased acquisition and availability on campus of traditional materials.

The Committee had intended to bring to the Senate a resolution on Open Access, to extend the resolution passed by the Senate in spring, 2005. However, the dramatic decision by Harvard

University's Arts and Sciences faculty to mandate that its members retain the rights to open-post their published academic articles changed the landscape. The Committee reported on this development at the February meeting of the Faculty Senate, leading to an extended discussion of Open Access issues and the proper response of the University. The Committee subsequently met with legal counsel of the University to discuss methods for supporting our faculty in retaining their author's rights, including aid in using an addendum to publishers' copyright agreements and facilitating the disseminating of research through Digital Case, when so permitted by publishers' current policies. The Committee's agenda for 2008-2009 includes monitoring Open Access developments nationally and internationally, working with faculty leadership in selected academic units to facilitate more widespread dissemination of research through Open Access methods, and the likely presenting of an Open Access resolution to the Senate.

Other intentions for the coming academic year include conducting a faculty survey on the libraries, using the survey results in a 3rd annual faculty retreat, identifying development initiatives for the libraries, and continuing to advocate for a rational approach to the library materials budget. In addition, the Library Committee will work with the University's librarians to update the 5 year Plans and Priorities document produced in the 2006-2007 academic year by identifying library priorities that flow from the University's strategic plan.

Year-End Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty, 2007-2008

During the academic year 2007-2008, the Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty has focused attention on one issue, obtaining a commitment to go forward with the development of a child care center on campus.

The establishment of such a center has been discussed for many years and has consistently been a high priority on multiple faculty surveys. The President's Advisory Committee on Women researched this project extensively in the past and provided a financial analysis, recommendation for location, and architectural plans. At the Faculty Senate meeting on December 18, 2006, the Committee on Women Faculty presented a formal motion entitled "Endorsement of child care center" which was approved unanimously. However, the University has never made a commitment to proceed with development of the center.

Since the development of a child care center on campus is consonant with our Committee's charge to "participate in the formulation of university policies and procedures bearing on recruitment, retention, promotion, compensation, and quality of life" and with the Provost's charge to emphasize measures that would positively impact all the schools, creating opportunities for the faculty to flourish, we urged the Executive Committee to consider making development of the child care center a high priority for budgetary support and implementation. In a vote of the Senate (each Senator had three votes to spread among eight priorities recommended by the standing committees), development of a child care facility (50 votes) and increasing faculty compensation (49 votes) were identified as the two top financial priorities. President Snyder has expressed her support for the development of a child care facility and has agreed to convene a special committee to work out an implementation plan. She has requested that the Committee on Women Faculty be represented on this committee. Jonatha Gott, who is the chair of the President's Advisory Council on Women and an ad hoc member of the Committee on Women Faculty, has been asked to work with the President's and Provost's offices on a needs assessment on child care.

At the conclusion of the 2007-2008 academic year, the Committee on Women Faculty stands at the ready to support President Snyder and to supply a representative to serve on the special ad hoc committee on developing the child care center.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth S. Kaufman, MD, Co-Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty
Faye Gary, EdD, RN, FAAN, Co-Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty
April 15, 2008