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Call to Order
Senate President Eve Keller called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.

Invocation
Senator Flicker delivered the invocation.

Presentation from the President
Because Joseph M. McShane, S.J., was presiding at a funeral, he sent a written report to the Senate in his absence. In the report, Fr. McShane commented on the following topics:

- Development: Fr. McShane recently returned from a fundraising tour to Florida. Alumni/ae receptions throughout the country are doubling as admissions events. The current financial aid campaign stands at $165 million toward the $175 million goal, which Fr. McShane is confident of reaching by June 30.
- Admissions: The admissions staff is fine-tuning the offers that will be made next week, and the pool is strong in terms of racial, ethnic, and international diversity, as well as in test scores.
- Student Death: Fordham mourns the loss of Donika Celaj, FCRH ’19, who died suddenly on February 21. Fr. McShane has authorized the granting of her degree posthumously.
- New York State: Fr. McShane spent time last week in Albany, meeting with lawmakers and members of the Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities. He noted the recent closure of the College of New Rochelle. CICU members were invited by Governor Cuomo to join a letter to Amazon encouraging it to reconsider its decision regarding its planned headquarters in Queens.

Presentation from the Interim Provost
Dr. Jonathan Crystal addressed the Senate. He described a recent joint meeting of the University Research Council and the research deans, as well as a meeting of the CUSP Committee. Participants in the first meeting discussed the priorities of the Office of Research and challenges facing the faculty with regard to research productivity. CUSP is developing specific initiatives that, as of now, fall under three
overall themes: Fordham as an anchor institution for our communities, enhancing student experience and learning, and promoting research focused on particular areas (for example, the themes associated with the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals 2030).

In addition, Dr. Crystal provided an update on the University’s strategic initiatives fund, which Fr. McShane announced to the community in December 2018. Proposals from deans and vice presidents will be due later in March, and many schools and administrative areas have been collaborating with one another to produce their submissions. The fund, which represents $8.1 million in the current fiscal year, is supplementary to the work that CUSP is undertaking; a portion of it may be spent on specific projects consistent with the Strategic Framework.

Senators discussed with Dr. Crystal how the fund was generated and will be spent. Some Senators indicated concern about the perception that the fund had been generated out of a pool that might have been used for faculty salaries. Dr. Crystal responded that Fordham has a single budget and the funds did not come from any one particular area. The hope for the fund is to enable the University to increase its revenues and to invest in new projects, and that some of these projects would increase overall revenues. Several Senators also expressed concern that the statutory Budget Planning Committee has yet to meet this year. Senators asked Dr. Crystal to ensure that details about the strategic fund, and the proposals ultimately funded, are communicated to faculty transparently. One Senator observed that proposals need to be assessed in part for their impact on and feasibility in regard to facilities.

**Key Conversation: Faculty Compensation**

After outlining the meeting’s key conversation, Senate President Keller introduced Senator Rubin, who on behalf of the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee (“S&B”) delivered a presentation on the history of faculty salary increases. Senator Mozes, as chair of S&B, presented the committee’s recommendation concerning the allocation of the 2.7% increase in the faculty salary pool for academic year 2019–2020. By a vote of 14-0-1, the committee recommended that 2.3% be allocated to across-the-board increases and 0.4% to merit.

Senator Mozes moved that the Senate accept the recommendation of S&B, and Senator Rubin seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. Those supporting the motion argued that it is appropriate to provide all faculty members, whether or not they are receiving merit, with an across-the-board increase at least equivalent to inflation. Several expressed hesitation, indicating that larger merit increments serve as a reward to those faculty who are highly involved in research (and, in some units, university service). Merit increments are particularly important to junior faculty with lower salaries. Some Senators observed that within particular departments, some faculty members believe that the distribution of merit is not transparent or fair.

Proceeding to a vote, the Senate accepted S&B’s recommendation, 17-2-0 (1 Law non-voting).

Senate President Keller then introduced the second question: how the 2.3% across-the-board raise should be allocated among members of the faculty. Senator Mozes outlined the three proposals for allocating the across-the-board raise that S&B considered:

- All faculty in each rank receive an equal raise, calculated by multiplying the average non-Law salary for that rank by 2.3%.
- Each faculty member receives a raise equivalent to 2.3% of her or his salary.
- Some combination of the preceding two options.
Senator Mozes described the advantages and disadvantages of each these proposals, noting for the sake of context that some 70% of faculty earn below the average salary for their rank. Senator Rubin presented data with regard to the likely outcomes of each proposal. S&B cast several votes regarding these options. With regard to the flat 2.3% increase by rank, the vote was 9 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstained. With regard to the individualized raises, the vote was 4 in favor, 12 opposed, 2 abstained. The committee also considered a hybrid approach that would allocate 1% as a percentage of salary and 1.3% as a percentage of the average salary by rank. Between a flat 2.3% increase by rank and a hybrid approach, 7 favored the flat increase by rank, 8 favored the hybrid model, and 2 abstained.

Vigorous discussion ensued. Senators who favored equal raises by rank argued that this has been the Senate’s longstanding practice and that a change would benefit only a very small number of people. They noted that this practice has aided those at the lower end of the salary scale, for whom a raise of the same dollar amount may matter more. A change at this point, when there is only one year remaining in the current agreement between the Senate and the administration, might divide the faculty. In addition, colleagues have had little notice that S&B and the Senate are considering such a substantial change.

Senators who favored individualized raises argued that if the Senate is committed to providing every colleague with an increase in excess of inflation, raises indexed to individual salaries are necessary. Individualized raises would help to eliminate the unfairness to higher paid faculty of the historical practice: Faculty in schools with higher salaries have tended to feel marginalized by the flat raises. Concern was expressed that individualized raises would increase inequality. From an economic perspective, this is not in fact true, because these individualized raises would represent the same percentage of each faculty member’s base salary.

Many Senators expressed concern about the inevitability that, with such a small overall increase in the faculty salary pool, some segment of the faculty would be disadvantaged regardless of how the Senate chose to proceed.

Senator Mattson moved, seconded by Senator Grimm, that the Senate adopt the first mechanism proposed by S&B, namely, that all faculty in each rank receive an equal raise, calculated by multiplying the average non-Law salary for that rank by 2.3%. The motion was adopted, 16-3-0 (1 Law non-voting).

**Approval of Minutes**
The Senate approved the minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2019 (17-0-3).

**Announcements and Updates**
Senate President Keller reported on a variety of matters, including that the Faculty Life Committee and the Provost’s Office are now working together to assess the use of space for academic purposes. A subcommittee of S&B is planning to administer a survey on childcare benefits and will meet with Human Resources, which is also working on childcare. Along with the resurrection of the Faculty Development Committee, the approval of the Online and Hybrid Learning Committee, and the renewal of the faculty’s relationship with the Board of Trustees, these projects represent instances where different parts of the university community are working together for the common good.

**New Business**
One Senator expressed concern about how readily the University has been calling snow days, which has had detrimental effects on faculty members’ syllabi. Senators requested clarification on the decision-making process with regard to inclement weather. Dr. Crystal indicated that the Emergency Management Committee meets when there is a storm forecast. This year, the University has given greater attention to the differential impact of inclement weather by campus.
By acclamation, the Senate adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by J. Patrick Hornbeck II, Secretary