1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Anne E. Fernald at 12:42 p.m. in the O’Hare Special Collections Room, Walsh Family Library, Rose Hill Campus.

2. Invocation

Senator William Baumgarth delivered the invocation.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of September 9, 2016

The Senate approved (15-0-0) the minutes from the September 9, 2016 meeting (Jackson/GoGwilt).

4. Matters Presented by Dr. Stephen Freedman, Provost

The Provost, Dr. Stephen Freedman, discussed his top three priorities for the academic year based on conversations with Faculty in town hall meetings and working with various schools on the strategic plan. The Provost said that he would continue to work with the Deans and Faculty to implement the three priorities.
The first priority is Research and Scholarship. The Provost would like to place greater emphasis on both expanding and intentionally shaping research and scholarship. Within this first priority, the Provost identified six general principles that will be finalized after he gathers feedback and is able to incorporate it into the planning processes. The Provost stated that collaboration between the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s office will be helpful for moving the research and scholarship priorities forward. The six priorities are: 1. Research focused on the student-faculty learning relationship. 2. Enhancing research in both the undergraduate and graduate and professional schools. This will include theoretical and practical research inside as well as outside of the classroom. 3. Supporting all areas of research including those areas, such as the Humanities and the Social Sciences, where Fordham is particularly strong, in addition to Science and Technology. 4. Establishing networks of scholarly activity with a focus on sponsored research to better support faculty. 5. Developing a greater sense of collaboration with faculty across departments and schools to enhance the relevance and impact of research. 6. Working across the silos in the University beyond the academic community. An example the Provost offered was Development and University Relations assisting faculty with accessing support from donors and government funding.

To assess the work and improve the value the University provides to students and faculty, the Provost stated that he has been meeting with Deans to ask them to share with him their plans for the year. He has also asked Deans to review his six foci and meet with faculty to illicit faculty feedback. The Provost submitted plans to the planning councils that can be assessed on a monthly and semester basis. He believes this model will enhance the student experience in a relatively short period of time.

The second priority is enhancing interdisciplinary programs at the Masters, Doctoral, and Undergraduate levels. The Provost acknowledged the Non-Profit Leadership, Health Management, and Social Innovation as examples of successful interdisciplinary programs that involve collaborations with the Gabelli School, Law School and faculty from the Social Sciences. The Provost stated that a significant obstacle to developing more interdisciplinary programs is the obstacles to joint appointments as well as tenure and promotion processes that favor a disciplinary approach to teaching and research. He indicated that recruiting faculty through cluster hire arrangements might be one possibility for addressing this challenge. Another significant challenge the Provost identified is budget processes that inhibit Deans from being creative in programming and, for example, trying programs for year and allowing for the possibility of the programs failure without faculty members incurring negative consequences in terms of their academic credentials or perceptions of their competency.

The third priority is to make a University-wide effort to enhance pedagogy, course content and faculty development through a reimagined initiative around teaching and learning that will allow faculty to think more creatively about teaching. This third priority will include a focus on faculty development in the areas of diversity and technology.

The Provost then turned the report from The Provost’s Office to Dr. Jonathan Crystal, Associate Chief Academic Officer and Associate Vice President. Dr. Crystal made three announcements. The first announcement is a reminder that the final Middle States report is posted on the Provost’s webpage. Dr. Crystal expressed the importance of reading, reviewing, and addressing the suggestions, particularly the ones related to governance and diversity. The second announcement is that travel and expense reporting will move from paper to online process. None of the substantive travel policies will be changed, but online reporting will make the process more efficient. There is no official start date for this transition but it will likely occur by the end of this academic year. Lastly, as many departments are in the process of conducting faculty searches, Dr. Crystal announced the authorization of at least three additional hires outside of the usual thirty in the hiring cycle through the Strategic Hiring Initiative. Thirty new faculty members were hired last year. These new faculty hires self identified as: 14 male; 16 female; 16 white; 6
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes # 428 October 21, 2016

Black or African American; 6 Asian; 2 Not identified. Faculty Senate President Fernald remarked that these hires represent a significant departure from the current racial demographics among the Fordham faculty.

The Provost opened the floor to questions from the Faculty Senate. In response to a senator who asked where the Diversity Officer would be housed when he or she is hired, the Provost stated that the issue has not yet been resolved.

One senator raised the concern that individual junior faculty are negotiating with Deans for course reductions without the knowledge of their chairs. This senator indicated that these individual negotiations minimize the importance of teaching, create a lack of equity in the faculty negotiation process, and devalue the role of Department Chairs. The Provost stated that the Board has asked for a comprehensive examination of course reductions, and that he has informed the Deans to institute more transparency and equity in negotiating course reductions. Dr. Crystal added that Chairs should be aware of course reductions in their departments. New faculty members are often provided with a course reduction for their first year. The Provost mentioned the need to create a balance between equity and hiring excellent scholars. The Senator who brought up the course reduction concerns stated that it would be unfortunate if these issues are brought forward during the tenure process.

In response to a Senator’s question regarding how the Provost defined success within the graduate programs he mentioned as model examples of interdisciplinary collaborations, the Provost said that he assessed success based on academic quality and student interest as determined by applications submitted to the programs and retention rates. The Senator noted that placement rates for students after graduation should also be a measure of success. The Provost agreed, and noted that placement rates for all of the programs he mentioned are excellent.

The conversation continued with another Senator reflecting that two of the Provost’s prioritized foci involve undergraduate students. It will be hard, this Senator noted, to provide the opportunities the Provost put forward when the percentage of full-time faculty is shrinking. The Provost acknowledged the important role of full-time faculty and agreed that this area would require more thought and attention.

5. Report from the Faculty Committee on Salary and Benefits

In the absence of Senator Andrew Clark, Senator Berish Rubin read the Report from the Faculty Committee on Salary and Benefits prepared by Senator Clark [See attachment]. After reading the report, Senator Rubin emphasized his commitment to advocating with the Senate for Senator Clark to be justly compensated by the Administration. In the role of Chair of the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee, Senator Clark has provided a tremendous amount of time and labor for the betterment of the entire Fordham community.

Senator Rubin completed his report and discussion ensued. One Senator inquired about the status of the four grievances the Faculty Senate filed against the Administration. Faculty Senate President Fernald stated that the grievances are undergoing confidential proceedings in the Faculty Hearing Committee and that the outcome cannot be predicted. Discussion continued with several Senators questioning the Administration’s refusal to comply with requests by the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee to provide documentation to support the data on budget figures verbally cited in their meetings with the Faculty Salary and Benefits committee. Senators also raised concerns regarding how the Administrations’ lack of transparency in current salary negotiations may impact future salary and
benefits negotiations. A Senator asked if the data from the report presented by AAUP Representative, Howard Bunsis, was shared with the Board of Trustees. Other Senators suggested that Bunsis’ report be made more widely available.

The Senate approved (15-0-0; Jackson/Klotz) the following motion:

That the Senate post AAUP Representative, Howard Bunsis’ report, “Analysis of the Financial Condition of Fordham University,” on the Fordham Faculty Senate website.

6. Electronic Voting

Shawn Hill, Instructional Technologist for Digital Scholarship, gave a presentation to the Faculty Senate on electronic voting. Shawn Hill provided various hands-on examples that demonstrated how electronic voting works across several relevant voting scenarios. Conversation following Mr. Hill’s presentation focused on how electronic voting for both Faculty Senate Committees and for Senators to serve on the full Faculty Senate could increase participation, particularly among junior Faculty, and decrease the untenable clerical tasks associated with the current paper voting system. The electronic system will also send out reminders a few days or even hours in advance of the vote to those who have not responded. Senators raised questions regarding the security of electronic voting and the possibility of an individual voting more than once or sharing the voting link with someone ineligible to vote. Mr. Hill explained how these potential security breaches would be prevented and how electronic voting would allow for voting irregularities (such as people inadvertently left off of the ballot) to be more easily caught and rectified.

The Senate approved (15-0-0; Keller/Chase) the following motion:

That the Senate implement electronic voting for Faculty Senate Committees to commence this academic year, and electronic voting for the full Faculty Senate to commence in academic year 2017-18.

7. Fellowship Banking Proposal

The Senate reviewed the Fellowship Banking Proposal put forward by the University Research Council. The proposal is intended to increase flexibility and clarify the guidelines by which a Faculty member may take a fellowship. Discussion on the proposal included clarifying language in the proposal to more accurately convey the number of credits that would be accrued or removed from a faculty member’s bank in any given semester or year. Senators also asked for clarifying language to indicate if the removal of credits would commence at the time at which a fellowship was awarded or when the fellowship was taken. Senate President Fernald stated that the goal of the Fellowship Banking Proposal is to allow for maximum flexibility for faculty members who have been awarded fellowships.

The Senate approved (13-0-0; Cox/Saharia) the following motion:

To accept the Fellowship Banking Proposal put forward by the University Research Council with minor amendments.
8. Senate President’s Report: Contingent Faculty

Senate President Fernald reported that she has contacted department Chairs with more than one adjunct instructor to convene an ad hoc group to review and revise the Lecturer Statutes. This committee is charged with making recommendations for revision to the Statutes that clarify the distinction between the rights and duties of lecturers and tenure-track faculty. Although the ratio of contingent and full-time faculty will vary by schools and departments, Senate President Fernald stated that a University-wide target for achieving balance in this ratio is needed.

Senate President Fernald noted that Fordham Faculty Forward is working towards unionizing contingent faculty (this includes graduate students and adjuncts) with the expectation that the union will be constituted within the year. Fordham Faculty Forward is asking the Faculty Senate to endorse their bid for unionization and offer support for contingent faculty.

In the discussion that followed Senate President Fernald’s report, Senators reflected on the challenge of determining the appropriate ratio of contingent to full-time faculty. A Senator noted that this is especially difficult given the fact that many of the full-time faculty members are lecturers. Another Senator asked the Senate to additionally reflect on the ratio of teaching to administrative duties and how we might consider this in productive terms. Senators mentioned that there are part-time faculty members with administrative duties who are not considered administrators. Thus, there is a need to review how administrative responsibilities are defined and counted across contingent and full-time faculty. Senate President Fernald stated that another significant ratio in need of review is the ratio of faculty to students, particularly as student enrollments increase. A Senator noted that there is a tendency to measure ratios from the faculty point of view rather than the student perspective. Students should be asked how many of their professors in any given semester are full-time faculty members since there are different ways of productively measuring the ratio of contingent to full-time faculty.

The Senators expressed agreement in supporting the unionization of contingent faculty, and for continuing to identify ways to measure and analyze the ratio of contingent to full-time faculty.

9. New Business

Senator Vernon reported that the Faculty Life Committee has drafted a survey on the quality of Faculty life at Fordham that will go out soon. Issues included in the ongoing work of the Committee include securing office space for faculty sharing or without office space and establishing common space for Faculty. Senator Vernon asked Senators to contact her if they know of other topics that impinge on the quality of life for faculty that the Faculty Life Committee should address.

Senator Baumgarth requested that the Senate take the initiative to officially reinstate the role of the ombudsmen. Other Senators echoed this request and Senate President Fernald agreed.

Senator Jackson asked for an update on the release of the Diversity Task Force report. Senate President Fernald stated that she has requested that Father McShane release the report numerous times but will continue to request that the report be released.

There were no announcements.

By unanimous consent, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Aimee Meredith Cox, Secretary
Faculty Salary and Benefits Report

October 21, 2016

Andrew H. Clark, Chair of Faculty Salary and Benefits.

Since our last Senate meeting, we have had three important meetings (a numerous meetings preparing and digesting those meetings).

The first was on September 22, 2016 with the CFO and her team, which include Tom Dunne, Elaine Crosson, Nick Milowski, Rebecca Ancheta (who takes notes for them) and their external legal counsel Doug Catalano. Our team includes our legal counsel, Beth Margolis, an expert labor rights lawyer, Bruce Berg, Andrew H. Clark, John Drummond, Anne Fernald, Micki McGee, and Berish Rubin.

The CFO opened the meeting underlining the fact that neither side was happy with the way negotiations had gone next year and the bi-weekly meetings would be scheduled so that a decision could be made before the April 20, 2017 Board meeting. She then spent time on recent figures underlining a point she makes frequently, that 92% of our revenue comes from student enrollment, that there were ongoing concerns about enrollment, that the University’s budget was currently down by 2 million, and that more pressure was being placed on the deans to make cuts, as we have all seen in 0% increase in departmental budgets for AY 2017 and AY 2018. She underlined her desire to reduce volatility, that the University had hired an enrollment consultant, Lipman, to make better projections on graduate enrollment, and to reduce various other costs and liabilities. She then focused on the cost of salaries to the institution and benefits. She said she was mindful of a multiyear agreement and that we should continue to speak of such an agreement and that health care and all other benefits needed to be on the table.

Clark then laid out a series of points and issues.

1) follow-up on the updating of the ID form, and a formal transparent process, so that spouses and LDAs could get an id card. This was something Salary and Benefits had been attempting to get for 8 years. The CFO began working on this in the fall of 2016. Senator Clark asked why this was still taking so long. Various things were cited including the recent terrorist attacks in New Jersey and New York. The CFO finally noted that it would be finalized by the end of the month. Although this did not happen by October 1, we are very happy to say that an official email was sent out to faculty on October 14 with the new policy, which is copied below and should be included in the minutes. This is another important step forward:

Full time faculty, administrators, and staff may now sponsor their spouse or domestic partner to obtain ID cards for access to public areas of all Fordham campuses and libraries via the following process:
• Complete a Request with the Spouse or Partner Guest Access form.
• Submit the completed form to Augusta Iacovetta in Human Resources Information Systems (HRIS), Faculty Memorial Hall, Room 538, either in person, by e-mail: aiacovetta@fordham.edu, fax: (718) 817-0779, or campus mail.
• The validated form will be processed within 24 hours of receipt.
• Have your spouse/domestic partner visit a campus Duplicating Center to be photographed and receive their ID card:
  o First floor of Faculty Memorial Hall at Rose Hill
  o Room SL128-A in Lowenstein Center at Lincoln Center
  o Room G-13 at Fordham Westchester

You may notify Public Safety at any time to discontinue your sponsorship of your spouse/domestic partner. All ID cards expire annually on May 31; HRIS will notify sponsors and guests regarding renewal via email annually in April or May. Please report lost or stolen ID cards to Public Safety so that the missing card can be deactivated.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John Carroll, Associate Vice President
Department of Public Safety

2) The Chair of Salary and Benefits then underlined the positions of Salary and Benefits, the strong position of the faculty that because of the 2014 historic agreement, which updated the Statutes with respect to health care with major concessions from faculty and stipulates an increase in cost sharing through 2019 (or even 2021 depending on the rate of salary raises), health benefits and contributions would be in place for the foreseeable future and could not be changed. There was disagreement on this with the CFO and she suggested the Board wanted changes made. The CFO underlined again that everything was on the table and that health costs were rising too quickly, with her estimates that the increases would be 15-20%.

3) As this was our first meeting, we attempted to set the framework by which other future meetings would be conduced. We agreed that all future meetings needed clear agendas, documents had to be shared at least 48-hours in advance, and any proposal and agreement had to be submitted in writing to prevent confusion.

4) Our lawyer asked questions on the 92% number, whether that was correct, about the 15-20% increase in health costs which also seemed too high, about the extent to which the Board and University were trying to lower that dependence through better fundraising, greater returns on investment, research monies, and other strategies. She articulated that the norm is much closer to 73% for four-year privates.

5) We then articulated a series of documents we would like for the next meeting, which was then sent formally in an email on September 27. These requests included
   a. 1) FY16 audited financial statements from KPMG (these should be being presented to the Board next week if they have not presented already)
   b. 2) FY16 990s
c. 3) Health care costs for tenured and tenure-track faculty for the last 5 years as well as health care costs for contingent faculty, staff, and administration, including in each: breakdown of how many on each plan (and whether they are single or family), and cost by plan to faculty, to the administration, and total cost
d. 4) List of each facet of total compensation for both tenure-track/tenured faculty and for faculty, staff, and administration with cost to faculty, cost to university, and total cost
e. 5) All budget documents being provided to the Board
f. 6) Updated information on enrollments and gifts
g. 7) List of investments (hedge funds, bonds, etc.) currently being used by the university in their endowment with fees/fee structure for the fund managers
h. 8) A multi-year proposal from the administration
i. 9) Child-care planning investigation timeline
j. 10) Written time line of salary negotiation with December 1, 2016 deadline articulated for formal salary proposal by the administration
k. 11) Scheduled meeting with UHC for November

II. BUNSIS. On September 23, 2016, Howard Bunsis, as you all know, came. We will not reiterate what you all heard at this powerful meeting but Bunsis’ presentation gave us important information both in the workshop he conducted with the executive committees and the presentation with the full faculty with over 250 faculty members present. The data Bunsis has provided was shared with the faculty and is being scoured by the data sub-committee. We will continue to be in conversations with Bunsis on a regular basis.

Bunsis’ presentation underlined in particular the fact

1) that it is unclear whether health care costs have increased for the University. Additional data from our laywer and Bunsis has shown that the anticipated increase for health care costs nationally for institutions such as ours is 6%, far lower than the 15-20% the CFO is claiming.

2) The University’s investments have become increasingly riskier, with higher costs hedge and private equity funds, but have produced lower returns, and returns significantly below the major indexes.

3) The 92% tuition dependence number is not correct.

4) Contingent faculty have sky rocketed while tenured and tenure-track faculty have decreased significantly.

III. On October 5, 2016 we met again with the CFO and her group. Unfortunately, no documents were shared or available before this meeting despite our request. The main objective of this meeting was to speak of a multiyear proposal. The CFO had requested our multiyear proposal from the previous year and this document was shared with her before the meeting. This meeting came after the Bunsis presentation and after the first Board meeting of the fall semester at which the Senate President informed the Board of the grievances. This is noted because there was a significant change at this meeting. The meeting was no longer led by the CFO but by the external counsel. The tone was significantly less confrontational and the external counsel began by noting his great respect for our attorney and his desire to
work together. There was also no longer mention of making cuts in health care benefits. The conversation turned to ways in which we could potentially work together to reduce costs without cutting programs. Ideas such as buy outs for those who have spouses or LDAs with insurance programs. Incentives for faculty and staff to move to less rich programs that might better fit their needs. And other ideas. We underlined our willingness to have this discussion but also the need to be extremely careful that any incentivized program didn’t increase costs for the sick. We said we would need our health consultant to partake in these conversations to assure that the best choices were being made. We also suggested there might be other places to produce cost savings like self-insurance, better phased retirement, better efficiencies, stronger investment options, etc. Although the meeting was more positive in tone, without any of the documentation we requested, it was still difficult to make any significant progress.

On the multiyear process, the external counsel did think that a model like the purchasing power model we proposed would be possible provided there were certain protections with respect to tuition revenues and CPI. We said that a discussion of such protections was possible.

We were not able to meet yesterday because Clark and Drummond were away at conferences and because the rescheduled date for the meeting next week was on a Jewish holiday. We will be meeting next on November 3 and our health consultant will be present in addition to our lawyer. It should be noted that we still have not received the documents we have requested. The Budget Planning Committee has met, however, and the documents from the Board meeting have been shared by the Senate President with members of the Executive Committees and Salary and Benefits.

We had demanded that a formal proposal be submitted by the CFO by mid-December so that we would have ample time to negotiate.

Other things that Salary and Benefits is working on.

We have reworked our subcommittees. We have a new communications subcommittee co-chaired by Ginny Strand and Micki McGee and a new Special Ops subcommittee. They have been very active. We have a much more robust and larger data committee. They are working at scouring all the data we keep getting. They have been tasked as well with establishing a true list of peers. The administration frequently uses peers as way of stating our salaries and benefits are just fine, just as they said in the Middle States official report. We would like to make sure the peers and aspirants that are established are actually are peers. We have written to Peter Stace and received information on where students who turn down Fordham go to and we are looking at various studies and rankings such as the recent WSJ ranking that ranked Fordham at 197 well below Boston College (62), Northeastern (71) Drexel (81) Bentley (94) Villanova (116).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Amount of tuition</th>
<th>Academic Spending</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>#197</td>
<td>#78</td>
<td>#291</td>
<td>#246 – 262(tied)</td>
<td>#299 – 307(tied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The *WSJ* points out that Fordham’s tuition is nearly 60K and its academic spending 16k so only about 27% of tuition dollars are spent on academics. This is a disservice to both faculty and students.

**UHC**
We are scheduling a meeting in November with UHC to discuss ongoing abuses for out-of-network, in-network referrals, harassment letters, reimbursement problems, and a variety of other things. Andrew will most likely begin participating in the weekly phone calls to Mercer.

**HR**
We have asked faculty to contact HR with their problems, they are welcome to cc Andrew H. Clark, but we would like to see if HR can resolve problems without Andrew having to work with Tom Dunne to resolve them independently. Larry Dipillo seems to have taken more initiative here and appears to be responding quickly. If there are issues, please contact Andrew.

**Phased retirement**
We are exploring a better phased retirement plan for the future with the CFO who has asked for ideas, but we are still trying to figure out why the Board has not approved the 3-year extension of the current phased retirement plan that expired in the spring. It was not on the agenda of the most recent Board meeting and it is unclear as to whether it will be on the agenda this December. This is of concern to us.

**Child Care**
We have also asked the CFO for the child care study. We have shared our own study with her and would like a formalized study to be done soon.

**Wellness**
Andrew has met with the new Wellness coordinator Jeanne Molloy. He asked that she really work on the communication side and that she set up a website. He expressed frustration with the absence of any communication between July when she was hired and October. For the moment she created a dedicated wellness email.
She organized the Benefits fair and flu shots and she is first trying to bring together all the wellness initiatives we currently have through our providers but might not know about or have. The Wellness committee met for the first time on Wednesday.

**Benefits fair:**
RH Oct 18th & Nov 7th  
WC Oct 19th & Nov 2nd  
LC Oct 20th & 31st

**Flu Shots:**
RH - Monday, Nov 14th - McGinley Commons Room 236  
LC - Tuesday, Nov 15th LL Plaza Level Room 100

**AAUP**
Membership has more than doubled but we need to continue to encourage people to join.

I’m sure there are other things that I’ve forgotten here, but Micki, Berish and the others can piece in anything else.

Thank you.
Faculty Salary and Benefits Report

October 21, 2016

Andrew H. Clark, Chair of Faculty Salary and Benefits.

Since our last Senate meeting, we have had three important meetings (a numerous meetings preparing and digesting those meetings).

The first was on September 22, 2016 with the CFO and her team, which include Tom Dunne, Elaine Crosson, Nick Milowski, Rebecca Ancheta (who takes notes for them) and their external legal counsel Doug Catalano. Our team includes our legal counsel, Beth Margolis, an expert labor rights lawyer, Bruce Berg, Andrew H. Clark, John Drummond, Anne Fernald, Micki McGee, and Berish Rubin.

The CFO opened the meeting underlining the fact that neither side was happy with the way negotiations had gone next year and the bi-weekly meetings would be scheduled so that a decision could be made before the April 20, 2017 Board meeting. She then spent time on recent figures underlining a point she makes frequently, that 92% of our revenue comes from student enrollment, that there were ongoing concerns about enrollment, that the University’s budget was currently down by 2 million, and that more pressure was being placed on the deans to make cuts, as we have all seen in 0% increase in departmental budgets for AY 2017 and AY 2018. She underlined her desire to reduce volatility, that the University had hired an enrollment consultant, Lipman, to make better projections on graduate enrollment, and to reduce various other costs and liabilities. She then focused on the cost of salaries to the institution and benefits. She said she was mindful of a multiyear agreement and that we should continue to speak of such an agreement and that health care and all other benefits needed to be on the table.

Clark then laid out a series of points and issues.

1) follow-up on the updating of the ID form, and a formal transparent process, so that spouses and LDAs could get an id card. This was something Salary and Benefits had been attempting to get for 8 years. The CFO began working on this in the fall of 2016. Senator Clark asked why this was still taking so long. Various things were cited including the recent terrorist attacks in New Jersey and New York. The CFO finally noted that it would be finalized by the end of the month. Although this did not happen by October 1, we are very happy to say that an official email was sent out to faculty on October 14 with the new policy, which is copied below and should be included in the minutes. This is another important step forward:

Full time faculty, administrators, and staff may now sponsor their spouse or domestic partner to obtain ID cards for access to public areas of all Fordham campuses and libraries via the following process:
• Complete a Request with the Spouse or Partner Guest Access form.
• Submit the completed form to Augusta Iacovetta in Human Resources Information Systems (HRIS), Faculty Memorial Hall, Room 538, either in person, by e-mail: aiacovetta@fordham.edu, fax: (718) 817-0779, or campus mail.
• The validated form will be processed within 24 hours of receipt.
• Have your spouse/domestic partner visit a campus Duplicating Center to be photographed and receive their ID card:
  o First floor of Faculty Memorial Hall at Rose Hill
  o Room SL128-A in Lowenstein Center at Lincoln Center
  o Room G-13 at Fordham Westchester

You may notify Public Safety at any time to discontinue your sponsorship of your spouse/domestic partner. All ID cards expire annually on May 31; HRIS will notify sponsors and guests regarding renewal via email annually in April or May. Please report lost or stolen ID cards to Public Safety so that the missing card can be deactivated.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John Carroll, Associate Vice President
Department of Public Safety

2) The Chair of Salary and Benefits then underlined the positions of Salary and Benefits, the strong position of the faculty that because of the 2014 historic agreement, which updated the Statutes with respect to health care with major concessions from faculty and stipulates an increase in cost sharing through 2019 (or even 2021 depending on the rate of salary raises), health benefits and contributions would be in place for the foreseeable future and could not be changed. There was disagreement on this with the CFO and she suggested the Board wanted changes made. The CFO underlined again that everything was on the table and that health costs were rising too quickly, with her estimates that the increases would be 15-20%.

3) As this was our first meeting, we attempted to set the framework by which other future meetings would be conducted. We agreed that all future meetings needed clear agendas, documents had to be shared at least 48-hours in advance, and any proposal and agreement had to be submitted in writing to prevent confusion.

4) Our lawyer asked questions on the 92% number, whether that was correct, about the 15-20% increase in health costs which also seemed too high, about the extent to which the Board and University were trying to lower that dependence through better fundraising, greater returns on investment, research monies, and other strategies. She articulated that the norm is much closer to 73% for four-year privates.

5) We then articulated a series of documents we would like for the next meeting, which was then sent formally in an email on September 27. These requests included
  a. 1) FY16 audited financial statements from KPMG (these should be being presented to the Board next week if they have not presented already)
  b. 2) FY16 990s
II. BUNSIS. On September 23, 2016, Howard Bunsis, as you all know, came. We will not reiterate what you all heard at this powerful meeting but Bunsis’ presentation gave us important information both in the workshop he conducted with the executive committees and the presentation with the full faculty with over 250 faculty members present. The data Bunsis has provided was shared with the faculty and is being scoured by the data sub-committee. We will continue to be in conversations with Bunsis on a regular basis.

Bunsis’ presentation underlined in particular the fact

1) that it is unclear whether health care costs have increased for the University. Additional data from our laywer and Bunsis has shown that the anticipated increase for health care costs nationally for institutions such as ours is 6%, far lower than the 15-20% the CFO is claiming.

2) The University’s investments have become increasingly riskier, with higher costs hedge and private equity funds, but have produced lower returns, and returns significantly below the major indexes.

3) The 92% tuition dependence number is not correct.

4) Contingent faculty have sky rocketed while tenured and tenure-track faculty have decreased significantly.

III. On October 5, 2016 we met again with the CFO and her group. Unfortunately, no documents were shared or available before this meeting despite our request. The main objective of this meeting was to speak of a multiyear proposal. The CFO had requested our multiyear proposal from the previous year and this document was shared with her before the meeting. This meeting came after the Bunsis presentation and after the first Board meeting of the fall semester at which the Senate President informed the Board of the grievances. This is noted because there was a significant change at this meeting. The meeting was no longer led by the CFO but by the external counsel. The tone was significantly less confrontational and the external counsel began by noting his great respect for our attorney and his desire to
work together. There was also no longer mention of making cuts in health care benefits. The conversation turned to ways in which we could potentially work together to reduce costs without cutting programs. Ideas such as buy outs for those who have spouses or LDAs with insurance programs. Incentives for faculty and staff to move to less rich programs that might better fit their needs. And other ideas. We underlined our willingness to have this discussion but also the need to be extremely careful that any incentivized program didn’t increase costs for the sick. We said we would need our health consultant to partake in these conversations to assure that the best choices were being made. We also suggested there might be other places to produce cost savings like self-insurance, better phased retirement, better efficiencies, stronger investment options, etc. Although the meeting was more positive in tone, without any of the documentation we requested, it was still difficult to make any significant progress.

On the multiyear process, the external counsel did think that a model like the purchasing power model we proposed would be possible provided there were certain protections with respect to tuition revenues and CPI. We said that a discussion of such protections was possible.

We were not able to meet yesterday because Clark and Drummond were away at conferences and because the rescheduled date for the meeting next week was on a Jewish holiday. We will be meeting next on November 3 and our health consultant will be present in addition to our lawyer. It should be noted that we still have not received the documents we have requested. The Budget Planning Committee has met, however, and the documents from the Board meeting have been shared by the Senate President with members of the Executive Committees and Salary and Benefits.

We had demanded that a formal proposal be submitted by the CFO by mid-December so that we would have ample time to negotiate.

*Other things that Salary and Benefits is working on.*

**We have reworked our subcommittees.** We have a new communications subcommittee co-chaired by Ginny Strand and Micki McGee and a new Special Ops subcommittee. They have been very active. We have a much more robust and larger data committee. They are working at scouring all the data we keep getting. They have been tasked as well with establishing a true list of peers. The administration frequently uses peers as way of stating our salaries and benefits are just fine, just as they said in the Middle States official report. We would like to make sure the peers and aspirants that are established are actually are peers. We have written to Peter Stace and received information on where students who turn down Fordham go to and we are looking at various studies and rankings such as the recent *WSJ* ranking that ranked Fordham at 197 well below Boston College (62), Northeastern (71) Drexel (81) Bentley (94) Villanova (116).
The *WSJ* points out that Fordham’s tuition is nearly 60K and its academic spending 16K so only about 27% of tuition dollars are spent on academics. This is a disservice to both faculty and students.

**UHC**
We are scheduling a meeting in November with UHC to discuss ongoing abuses for out-of-network, in-network referrals, harassment letters, reimbursement problems, and a variety of other things. Andrew will most likely begin participating in the weekly phone calls to Mercer.

**HR**
We have asked faculty to contact HR with their problems, they are welcome to cc Andrew H. Clark, but we would like to see if HR can resolve problems without Andrew having to work with Tom Dunne to resolve them independently. Larry Dipillo seems to have taken more initiative here and appears to be responding quickly. If there are issues, please contact Andrew.

**Phased retirement**
We are exploring a better phased retirement plan for the future with the CFO who has asked for ideas, but we are still trying to figure out why the Board has not approved the 3-year extension of the current phased retirement plan that expired in the spring. It was not on the agenda of the most recent Board meeting and it is unclear as to whether it will be on the agenda this December. This is of concern to us.

**Child Care**
We have also asked the CFO for the child care study. We have shared our own study with her and would like a formalized study to be done soon.

**Wellness**
Andrew has met with the new Wellness coordinator Jeanne Molloy. He asked that she really work on the communication side and that she set up a website. He expressed frustration with the absence of any communication between July when she was hired and October. For the moment she created a dedicated wellness email.
She organized the Benefits fair and flu shots and she is first trying to bring together all the wellness initiatives we currently have through our providers but might not know about or have. The Wellness committee met for the first time on Wednesday.

**Benefits fair:**
RH Oct 18th & Nov 7th  
WC Oct 19th & Nov 2nd  
LC Oct 20th & 31st

**Flu Shots:**
RH - Monday, Nov 14th - McGinley Commons Room 236  
LC - Tuesday, Nov 15th LL Plaza Level Room 100

**AAUP**
Membership has more than doubled but we need to continue to encourage people to join.

I’m sure there are other things that I’ve forgotten here, but Micki, Berish and the others can piece in anything else.

Thank you.