

GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING DECEMBER 9, 2003

PRESENT: Prue Thorner, Lynda White, Donal Day, Bill Keene, Lotta Lofgren, Jean Collier, George Hashisaki, Phil Gates, Nancy Gansneder, Elaine Attridge, Robin Kuzen, Mary Abouzeid, Robbie Greenlee, Chris Milner, Jennifer Bauerle, Derry Wade

Absent: Greg Strickland

Chair Lotta Lofgren called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m. She then introduced Associate Provost for Management and Budget Anda Webb, our guest for this meeting. She offered us answers to questions sent to her before the meeting.

Note: the comments below were supplied by Ms. Webb at the time of the meeting. Questions and discussions that ranged beyond the prepared remarks and explanatory bracketed notes have been added below.

We are very interested to hear about what your job entails -- how your work fits into the University structure and what your responsibilities are. How can we (you and the GFC) best work together on issues that concern us both?

The great thing about my job is that I get to be involved in lots of interesting things; the bad thing about my job is that I am involved in lots of different things – Jack of all trades, master of none.

I am frequently asked this question, and it is very hard for me to respond. The easiest thing might be for me to tell you of the kinds of issues that are on my desk at the moment:

- ✚ Student Health Insurance – the Provost's Office is involved because of the financial aid subsidy that is provided for qualifying graduate students. We are faced with a significant increase in premiums because of losses sustained by the student health care plan.
- ✚ Proposed tuition and fee structures for next year (specifically graduate) – we are engaged in preliminary discussions, and I am currently reviewing the McIntire School's proposal for their graduate programs, which are a bit different because of the executive, one-price nature of them.
- ✚ Fielding graduate financial aid issues – how to increase the amount available, what our philosophy should be – work closely with budget office, Provost, VPR on this.
- ✚ Faculty salaries – we are trying to finalize the faculty salary recommendations for the 2.25% merit increase and the 1.75% supplemental salary increase. (More documentation to follow, when we get to that question) All faculty salary increases are based on merit. We review the dean's proposal, I try to highlight issues for the Provost, we coordinate the submission with the President's Office (the president reviews salary recommendations for senior administrators, university professors, anyone who receives a 0% recommendation, and A&P faculty who receives $\geq 10\%$, and any T&R faculty member who receives $\geq 15\%$).
- ✚ Governor's Overhead – the Provost receives a % of the indirect costs, which is a reserve for capital outlay. We aggressively manage those funds, with the goal that, over time, each school will get out of Gov. O/H what they paid in. Gov. O/H has been used to fund such things as the decommissioning of the nuclear reactor, Clark Hall renovation, AAALAC improvements, Thornton Hall Clean Room, MSENT building, Gilmer Hall renovations, Chemistry Bldg debt service, etc.
- ✚ Various personnel issues, including consulting with EOP; working with Alan Cohn and others regarding faculty personnel issues; guidance on hiring practices, searches,

- etc.; fielding questions from departments, individual faculty, etc.; dealing with retention requests for faculty; approving (in close consultation with the Provost) salary actions and other faculty personnel actions; reviewing and approving requests to establish A&P faculty positions, etc.
- + Do some work with the International Studies Office, specifically providing advice on policies specific to study abroad programs – liability, cancellation, etc.
 - + Chaired the Student Systems Committee, which produced a report recommending the University's next steps in moving forward with phase 3 of the Integrated Systems Project. Working on constructing a job description for a project director, and pulling together a search committee.
 - + The University is beginning the process for SACS re-accreditation; serve on the Provost's internal planning team.
 - + Service on FOCUS, a group chaired by Colette Sheehy to look at cost savings measures that can be accomplished by the University – this in response to budget reductions;
 - + Still dealing with budget reduction planning, working with Budget Office to re-certify our planning in anticipation of the next legislative session;
 - + Oversight of the AFROTC, AROTC, and NROTC;
 - + Oversight of the Office of the University Registrar;
 - + Service on SESPOG, student enrollment services process owner's group;
 - + Chair the Women's Leadership Council, working with a group of University faculty and staff on issues the concern women – advisory to President.
 - + Review some language in endowment agreements, as requested.
 - + Finalizing the details of recovering funds for the Separation Incentive Retirement Plan for faculty.
 - + Gearing up for the 2004-05 budget process, including providing advice on requests for addenda;
 - + Working with various units which report to this office on financial issues, business planning, management advice, etc.
 - + Any other question or activity that comes my way.

Please give us an update and let us have your thoughts on the draft of the general faculty policy document.

- + The Policy on the General Faculty has been submitted to the President for review before submission to the Policy Review Committee. The PRC will review the Policy, and any issues that individual members might have will be addressed. Once approved by the PRC, the Policy will be presented to the Cabinet and the President for final approval.

What advice can you give us about how to proceed with our goals to provide health care benefits for all part time employees working .5 FTE and above? We know that the state has just begun offering benefits to all employees working .8 FTE and above. That suggests to us that it's possible to change the way the system works. What can you tell us about how this change happened? What can we learn from it?

- + As you know, the issue of benefits for part-time employees has been around for a long time. It is my understanding from HR that, at the time the University became self-insured, the University signed an MOU with the State that stipulated that we

would use the same health insurance eligibility rules as those used by the State. Until this year, the State defined full-time employment as 40-hours per week, and any employee who was part-time was not eligible to participate in the health care plan. One suggestion that the University made to DHRM [Department of Human Resources Management] during the recent budget cuts was to allow employees to reduce to less than a 40-hour work week schedule (or less than 1 FTE) and retain their health insurance benefits. The state modified the University's proposal and implemented a policy that permitted the reduction in an employee's work schedule of up to 960 hours in a year and retain health benefits. This was implemented as the Temporary Workforce Reduction Policy. The budget crisis raised awareness at the state level of the need to provide state agencies greater flexibility in managing their workforce. Although the suggestion to permanently change the state eligibility rules for health insurance was rejected at the time, the state recently adopted a 32-hour per week rule for health insurance eligibility for salaried employees. The University has promptly followed suit, and this new rule will be implemented effective January 1, 2004. This change was state-mandated for classified employees, but left up to the discretion of state higher ed agencies to include their faculties. UHR tells me that the majority of higher ed agencies have not included their faculties in this new change and that UVa is the exception thus far. **[It is our understanding that 22 individuals are affected by this change.]** I suspect that this decision had something to do with budget reductions and the requirement for agencies to absorb the employer portion of the health insurance premium, but I cannot say for sure.

However, one issue which may be impacting the State's decision to extend health insurance to employees who work less than .8 FTE is the concern by the State and the University on how to address the issue of a large number of wage (hourly) employees who routinely work 20 or more hours per week over a period of time. I am told by UHR that one of the reasons for the recent change in the State's eligibility rule was based on the 1500-hour policy governing the limit on hours work by a classified wage employee. This policy was the result of a Virginia Supreme Court case some years back. This may explain why the eligibility rule was set to .8 FTE, but it is a real concern in terms of fairness and equity. Tom Gausvik has had numerous conversations with people in Richmond about the positive aspects of extending eligibility to employees who work at least .5 FTE, but I do not know the outcome of those discussions.

One of the difficulties in dealing with the State on these types of issues (and this is solely my perception) is that we, as a University, want to emulate our peers in many areas. On the other hand, the State views us as a state agency, and what Harvard and Columbia are doing is immaterial to them -- they view us in the same light as VDOT. It is a struggle in that our goals and objectives are, at times, very different. I'm not sure we had any impact at all in "changing the way the system works." I don't believe that DHRM made the recommendation about coverage for part-time employees who work at least 80% based on the University's desire to move in that direction -- I suspect that the decision had a much different motivation, although I am told by Tom that the majority of chief HR officers in state agencies over the years pressed this as a need to retain and recruit in today's economy.

My suggestion to you is, if the quest for benefits for part-time employees is to succeed, it must have strong University backing and that you engage Yoke San Reynolds and Tom Gausvik in this conversation. We already know that the option of having a separate health care plan for part-time employees will not work -- the Commonwealth issued an RFP [request for funding proposal] for this some time back, and no bids were received. And, this issue cannot be proposed as a faculty

issue -- benefits pertain to all employees, and unless classified staff is included in the analysis, I cannot imagine that the University would move to secure benefits eligibility for part-time faculty alone. **[The GFC has consistently included classified staff in their advocacy for part-time health benefits; the survey that the GFC sent out concerning health care benefits for part-timers went to both faculty and classified staff.]**

And, finally, cost cannot be ignored as a factor. Increasing enrollment is one of the major cost-drivers in the health plan. According to HR, an increase in 100 employees in the plan will represent an increase of 200 in plan membership, once dependents are included. The current plan has approximately 12,500 employees in it; there are 24,000 total members. Currently, there are less than 300 part-time employees who work at least .50 FTE or more. Of those 300 employees, eleven of them are .8 FTE or above. I don't know whether or not the remaining 289 employees would have a financial impact on the Plan -- but, at a time of escalating healthcare costs, this is an important factor that must be considered.

QUESTION: "A consortium of UVA foundations, including Law and Darden have recently negotiated with Southern Health to offer part-time health care benefits, beginning in January 2004. Doesn't an inequity result for University employees?"

ANSWER: They are a privately funded group and received no money from the University.

QUESTION: Is it possible for a University Foundation to provide coverage to these part-time employees? ANSWER: We would have to untangle ourselves from the state's eligibility rules.

QUESTION: As part of budget reductions, could the University not pursue this as a way to cut costs? People might choose to work less if they could keep benefits. ANSWER: We as an institution are incredibly thin. A further 'thinning' would not be in the institution's best interests.

Another major concern of ours is the discrepancy in salaries between general and tenure-eligible faculty, and especially the discrepancy in salaries for administrative/ professional faculty and everyone else. This group of the general faculty regularly receives smaller raises than other members of the faculty. What thoughts do you have on what can be done about this?

✚ There have been years when the State has approved an average increase for A&P faculty that is less than that approved for T&R faculty. I know that you have raised these issues with Tom Gausvik in the past, and I am unsure of how to respond. I don't know what can be done about it. It is my sense that the University is an anomaly in higher education in terms of the large number of A&P faculty we have, especially compared to other institutions in the State. In addition, we have historically been asked to refrain from asking for salary increases in our biennial budget request, as the State prefers to handle such recommendations centrally. While there certainly seems to be a pattern in recent history of recommending lower average increases for A&P faculty, over the past 15 years or so there have been more years where the increases have been the same. I also believe that the practice in the College and the other schools is to treat all faculty the same, i.e. they don't single out A&P faculty to receive the smaller increase. In fact, the process in the College is this: the College pools all of its faculty salary funds (instructional and A&P increases) into one pool; then makes adjustments for funds to be held centrally by the Dean to address special increases, such as promotions; and then allocates a pool of faculty salary funds to each department, drawing no distinction between tenure-eligible and non-track faculty -- all increases are based on merit, regardless of tenure status. Smaller units that have mostly A&P faculty may not (and probably do not) have this flexibility.

- ✚ As far as what can be done, I am happy to raise these issues with the Provost, VP for Finance and others who might know better how to effect change. But, while this pattern may continue, it just as easily may not, so it is important to take a consistent, institutional approach to this issue.

More specifically, could you explain to us how the BOV's 1.75% raise was distributed to faculty? We are particularly concerned about the allocation between tenure-eligible and general faculty. Was there an equitable distribution as was suggested in *Inside UVA*?

- ✚ I have brought copies of two documents for distribution: the first is the original policy document that provided the basis of the Board's discussion. The second is the Provost's communication with the deans and heads of units, providing guidance on how the 1.75% should be allocated. As you can see, the allocation was based on merit, and was not distributed based on the numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty. I will tell you that the Provost's philosophy was that as much of the funding as possible should be preserved for the academic areas of the University, which includes the 10 schools of the University and the University Library. Funds were not allocated proportionally, but were allocated based on each school's proposal on how the funds should be used. Higher priority was given to those at the assistant and associate professor rank, which I believe is in accordance with the wishes of the Board. But, non-track faculty, whether they were T&R or A&P, were not excluded from this process.

I am not sure how to evaluate the term "equitable." There was never, nor has there ever been, any intent to distribute faculty salary increases (whether tenured/tenure-track or non-track) across the board. All faculty salary increases are based on merit. Indeed, with the 2.25%, some folks received more, some received less – but the average, on state funds, did not exceed 2.25%. Similarly, the intent of the 1.75% was not to provide a combined merit increase of 4%, and it was not allocated across the board. I feel that the funds were equitably distributed to the schools, but of course the increases proposed varied based on merit, market, and other factors.

Please give us an update on SCHEV: what is its current focus and mode of operation? How does SCHEV affect the daily lives of all of us?

- ✚ SCHEV's stated mission is "to promote the development and operation of an educationally and economically sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education." The actual SCHEV Council has 11 members, who are appointed by the Governor for four-year terms. The Executive Director of SCHEV, who is appointed by the Council, manages the day-to-day operations of the agency and its staff, of which there are currently approximately 45. The following URL describes the statutory role of SCHEV and how its role plays out on a regular basis.
<http://www.schev.edu/SCHEVs/RoleResponsibilities.asp?from=schevs> .

As you will see, SCHEV's direct responsibilities relate to implementation of coordinated policies concerning academic programs, federal mandates, consistent governance practices, space management, and so on.

In recent months, SCHEV has been very focused on addressing policies and guidelines related to the approval (and discontinuance) of academic programs, organizational changes (such as creation of off-site centers), and degree program productivity. The staff is also very focused on strategic matters, such as planning for the educational needs of an increasing college-age population, and advancing the stature of research in the Commonwealth. Clo Phillips can speak to specifics about these items if there is ever an

interest. Members of the University's administration work on a daily basis with the Executive Director and the staff.

In carrying out its duties, SCHEV may have reason to study, analyze, and make recommendations on issues associated with faculty matters. As the website describes, Section 23-9.9 of the Code of Virginia directs SCHEV to analyze each institution's operating and capital budget request and provide recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly regarding the approval or modification of each request. And, Section 23-9.6:1 of the Code of Virginia assigns SCHEV (see #12) to "visit and study the operations of each of the public institutions of higher education at such times as the Council shall deem appropriate and to conduct such other studies in the field of higher education as the Council deems appropriate or as may be requested by the Governor or the General Assembly." In carrying out this duty, SCHEV has studied everything from tenure to the supply of nurses to research related to Homeland Security.

Every new Council, and many of our constituents, asks the question: who are the general faculty? We know the data is available to answer this. Some of the data we need is already on the Historical Data and Data Digest pages of the University's Institutional Assessment website. However, it is not configured in a manner that is useful to the General Faculty. How can we gain access to data about ourselves?

- ✚ The term, general faculty, in and of itself is a poor one. We use that term in such wide and varying ways that it is difficult to define. In its strictest sense, General Faculty (capitalized) means all the faculty of the University, collectively. In its loosest sense, general faculty (uncapitalized) refers to anyone at the University who is in a faculty classification and is non-track.
- ✚ As you know, the University could not honor the most recent request for data, and I forwarded a response to Lynda White, which I hope she has shared with you. The data requested is legally restricted, and while the GFC did not ask for specific names, individuals may be easily identifiable.
- ✚ I prefer not to use the term general faculty, because it is so vague;
- ✚ I tend to divide the general faculty into two camps: T&R and A&P;
- ✚ T&R general faculty are made up of faculty who hold rank but are not tenure track, such as Assistant Professor of Commerce, general faculty; Research Professor of Internal Medicine; etc.
- ✚ A&P general faculty are those folks, like myself, who are engaged in the academic support mission of the University. This is the most difficult group to define: it includes librarians, development officers, university administrators, and others who are involved in the day to day operations of the University.

Ms. Webb asked the Council what our goal is for identifying general faculty. Lynda, Bill and others responded that we have never had a constituency list. Even today we don't have a complete email list. In addition, we need certain demographic information in order to better understand who we are and what our needs are. Ms. Webb suggested that she would work with us to find what we need to know to help us in our quest for information.

Lotta thanked Ms. Webb for coming and for offering the GFC such a frank and sympathetic assessment of our concerns.

(I would suggest we put the URLs and the "hot links" for the documents here)

Chair's Report: Lotta asked for the following Committee reports to be done over email and asked that we attend to them.

- Report from Data Management Committee

- Bylaws committee update
- Communications committee update on the Forum

The last meeting of the year adjourned at 1:30.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Abouzeid