

Minutes, Meeting of COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION  
September 20, 2007

Present: Carl Huffman (Chair), Jackie Roberts, Wayne Glausser, Ray Burgman, Bob Stark, Andrew Hayes, Marcia McKelligan, Neal Abraham

The meeting began at 12:40 P.M.

I. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

II. Gender related concerns about the UP awards

Meryl Altman has expressed a concern about the fact that only men are being considered for the UP this year and has asked the committee to consider whether women are being discouraged in some way from applying for the award. After a discussion of the issue, COA decided that based solely on the number of awards given to men and women, there is no obvious gender problem, but that there might be questions worth exploring further. The committee asked Neal to get more data, specifically on the number of women and men nominated relative to the number in each gender who decide to pursue the award.

III. Recommendation to be sent to COF regarding size of files. The committee agreed that personnel files tend to be too large, which is unnecessarily burdensome on everyone involved and might even compromise the quality of decision making. We unanimously decided to send this recommendation to the Committee on Faculty:

COA recommends that COF adopt policies that will reduce the size of personnel files.

Rationale: The faculty governance survey revealed widespread dissatisfaction with the laborious nature of the current personnel process. In particular, COF was identified as the one committee that many faculty would never serve on, because its procedures were viewed as very inefficient. Probationary faculty are also being required to spend excessive time developing ever larger personnel files. COA is willing, at COF's behest, to develop concrete proposals in this area. We decided not to send any recommendation to COF at this time about requirements in the service area for tenure candidates.

IV. Appointment of a benefits and retirement committee

COA believes there is a need for a committee to study and monitor policies relating to benefits and retirement. We agreed on this statement: The subcommittee on benefits will consist of three members appointed by COA for a three year term. Members can be current members of COA but need not be. Members should have expertise in the economics of benefits and retirement. The committee will conduct a yearly review of the effectiveness and fairness of the benefits package for all employees at DePauw and report to COA on that review. The committee will also address specific benefits related issues directed to it by COA. Jack Morrill is willing to serve on such a committee. Other persons suggested include Jeff Gropp, Tom Musser, and Gary Lemon.

V. Expansion of the tuition benefits program. As the time for adjournment was nearing, we were unable to take up the issue of expanding our tuition exchange program beyond the GLCA, as has been suggested by Susan Hahn. Neal did report, however, that VP for Finance Speller is in favor

of DePauw's joining the Tuition Exchange Program and that he will be glad to meet with COA to talk with us about it.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marcia McKelligan

#### COA Minutes October 11, 2007

Present:

Carl Huffman (Chair), Wayne Glausser, Raymonda Burgman, Jacqueline Roberts, Robert Stark, and Andrew Hayes.

Visiting: Jana Grimes (Human Resources)

#### I. Tuition Exchange Proposal

Jana Grimes presented information about Tuition Exchange, a tuition exchange program with over 500 participating colleges and universities. She shared that other schools similar to DePauw have analyzed the service and determined it was a reasonably priced benefit to offer to employees. The tuition exchange is a scholarship benefit (tuition only benefit). Ms. Grimes then reviewed some of the possibilities for qualifying for and participating in the benefit. A major consideration is how to balance the limited access to the benefit (maximum number of participants) and how we decide who gets to participate. The determination of who is eligible could be based on seniority, salary, lottery, etc.

Ms. Grimes made the suggestion that we also consult with Admissions and Financial Aide offices regarding their opinion on the proposal. Finally, Human Resources stated its willingness to administer the program if we elect to participate. Motion (Roberts) – Second (Glausser). We recommend to Dean Abraham to have the administration pursue joining Tuition Exchange. Motion carried unanimously.

II. The minutes of the September 20, 2007 meeting were reviewed and approved.

#### III. Personnel File Size.

COA has received official correspondence from COF providing us a charge to examine the issue of personnel file size. Comments from David Harvey were shared with the committee and the committee determined it would be very beneficial to invite David Harvey to visit with us at a future meeting. It was pointed out that our choice of an open file model tends to make for larger files. We also discussed that job descriptions influence file size. COA then discussed some of the ramifications on evaluations of the file that would be necessitated by a change in the file size. The committee then reviewed the Proposed Guidelines Draft submitted by the Chair. In essence the proposal advocates a primary file document with supplemental information to be included an appendix. The primary file document could perhaps include a statement addressing the required elements in the job description. The Proposed Guidelines expressly preserve the Department's right to request additional information. Other committee members offered observations on the issue including an outline and analysis of the items currently included in personnel files and a possible length and breakdown of items addressed in the proposed primary file document. The Committee finished the discussion of the personnel file size by considering where the burden to

“make a case” for a favorable tenure decision should reside. We discussed some possibilities for how a candidate might present evidence supporting a favorable decision.

#### IV. Subcommittee on Benefits

Concern was raised about the faculty perception of the composition and responsibilities of the Subcommittee on Benefits. A recommendation was made to provide some clarification about the specific charge made to the Subcommittee at the next faculty meeting. The Chair will make particular note that the Subcommittee will not implement policy; rather, they will make recommendations for actions to COA. The meeting time and date for the next meeting was noted and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew M. Hayes

### COA Minutes October 30, 2007

Present:

Carl Huffman (Chair), Wayne Glausser, Raymonda Burgman, Jacqueline Roberts, Robert Stark, Neal Abraham, Marcia McKelligan and Andrew Hayes.

Visiting: David Harvey (Current Chair of the Faculty).

#### I. Tuition Exchange Proposal

VP Abraham updated the committee on the considerations from the administration’s point of view regarding the adoption of the tuition exchange proposal. The administration is in agreement with the proposal and will seek to work out the details.

II. The minutes of the October 11, 2007 meeting were reviewed and approved.

#### III. Personnel File Size.

COA invited David Harvey, a recent chair of COF, to discuss issues of file size. The committee’s discussion first focused on the general philosophy behind the proposal. As part of that discussion the committee recognized several issues requiring careful examination:

Personnel file guidelines should prompt the candidate about what issues to address in the primary document.

Should reference be made to a teaching philosophy?

Should this be where candidates address student evaluations?

Should the candidate be encouraged/required to address problematic issues?

A handout of guidelines for what should be included could be distributed at the COF meetings with candidates.

Clarification or consensus is needed regarding the “highlighted courses” to be included in the personnel file appendix.

Should the department be consulted about the featured courses?

Should the courses be dictated by the Appendix B?

Should the highlighted courses be only from the major or department?

Should the candidate have complete freedom to select the highlighted courses?

An option would be to state the two course requirement as part of the “rule book”, then give COF the opportunity to offer advice on which type of courses have been found to be the most appropriate to include. Perhaps there is a philosophical difference of opinion about the size of

the teaching portion of the appendix file. Some members of the committee suggest that a limited record on teaching allows a candidate to “hide” or “ignore” poor performance. Some members feel the limited size encourages the candidates to “make their best case.” Should the personnel file appendix be allowed to include evidence from any or all courses? Should the personnel file appendix be limited so that the DPC’s and COF rely on other materials (peer reviews, course evaluations, and annual reports) to evaluate additional courses?

One possible model for the review of files: The primary personnel file document should be read and will be read by every member of the DPC and COF. It will be supplemented by course evaluations, annual reports, peer evaluations, and other materials which are normally retained as part of the personnel files. These committees will consult the appendix material as needed but the candidate is not guaranteed that those materials will be reviewed in full by each member of the committees.

Discussion about these issues will continue during the next committee meeting. The chair will strive to summarize the previous discussion and frame discussion points for the next meeting. The meeting time and date for the next meeting was noted and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew M. Hayes

#### Committee on Administration

November 8, 2007

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Ray Burgman, Wayne Glausser,  
Marcia McKelligan, Jackie Roberts, Robert Stark, Neal Abraham (EVP and VPAA)

**Previous Minutes** The minutes of the previous meeting were approved with one minor correction – David Harvey’s title is “chair of the faculty.”

**Tuition Exchange** Neal Abraham reported that the administration was investigating how quickly DePauw could join the Tuition Exchange program. Hope remains that this could be in place for dependent support beginning in Fall 2008-2009, but that is not certain. The administration will return to consult with COA when advice is needed on the priorities that should be used for determining which employee dependents should be supported within the limited export and import rules of the program. We currently anticipate that we might be able to import 610 new students under this program each year, and thus be eligible to export a similar number each year.

**Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Files.** The Committee resumed discussions of a draft of the guidelines based on materials distributed by Carl Huffman and suggestions and commentary from Neal Abraham.

**Highlighting courses** – After considerable discussion the Committee found consensus on the following recommendations:

That a candidate should provide the most recent syllabus for every course taught during the period under review. (This with student opinion surveys should provide adequate preliminary information about all courses mentioned in the Appendix B of the job description.)

That normally the candidate should feature two courses taught in the department’s curriculum, one lower level and one upper level (providing copies of all assignments, samples of graded student work, and additional commentary). Candidates would be encouraged to consult with

members of their department (or just the department chair?) about the choice of these courses. (COF could say in the briefing of candidates and DPC chairs that it is best to harmonize the submitted material with the expectations of the department; and that departments should not normally expect more than two courses to be featured. Candidates may wish to feature a third course of particular value or merit. Typically candidates should only feature courses which have been taught more than once.)

That candidates should respond to concerns raised in the student opinion surveys in either their summary statements or their annual reports, or both. Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion files (continued) Student opinion surveys All surveys are included in tenure files.

A Proposition not yet raised to a level of consensus included:

All surveys for the period under review should be included for promotion reviews for the rank of Associate Professor (this is presently required only for promotion reviews linked to tenure reviews).

What material should be included in the file?

Required material (grades, student opinion surveys, annual reports, peer observations, chair's responses to annual reports, letters from the community...)

Other material: Additional material should be provided by the candidate only if it is referenced in the candidate's statement.

COF advice: COF should delete the advice to "put everything in, because it can't hurt" and change that to advice to put in only those things that make an important evidentiary point.

Letters. Peer letters (from DePauw should be requested by the candidate only to provide evidence of the candidate's contribution in areas of service. Student letters can be solicited by the candidate.

Proposition, not yet reaching to the level of consensus – that student letters should not be solicited from a randomized list of those taught. The open call to the community for letters from peers and students should continue.

Discussion on this topic will continue at the next meeting. In advance of the next meeting, the chair will circulate a revised draft of the Guidelines with a list of suggestions for the remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Neal Abraham

Committee on Administration

November 29, 2007

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Wayne Glausser, Marcia McKelligan, Jackie Roberts, Robert Stark, Andrew Hayes, Neal Abraham (EVP and VPAA)

**Previous Minutes** The minutes of the previous meeting were approved with one minor correction – Fred Soster was removed from the list of members present.

### **Invitation to Join the Board of Trustees**

Committee members have been invited to join the Trustees for their January meeting. It is not anticipated that there will be any faculty presentations as part of the meetings.

Neal Abraham briefly outlined potential agenda items to be addressed at the meeting.

### **Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Files**

The Committee resumed discussions of the draft of the guidelines based on materials circulated since the last meeting.

There was clarification regarding the solicitation of letters for the file. It was determined that our consensus was that a candidate or the DPC may request that a randomized list of students be generated. Letters then would be solicited from students on that list. This solicitation is optional and not required of either the candidate or the DPC.

Another clarification was offered regarding letters from faculty colleagues. It was our consensus that candidates should not be encouraged to request letters from faculty colleagues regarding their teaching when that faculty colleague has submitted a peer observation.

Regarding the inclusion of course evaluations in review files, the following was determined: In the case of a term or interim reviews, all evaluations from all courses will be automatically included by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. In the case reviews for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, all evaluations from all courses will be automatically included by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

In the case of reviews for promotion to the rank of professor the following evaluations will automatically be included by the VPAA: the greater of a) all evaluations for all courses for the last four semesters in which the candidate has taught or b) all evaluations for the last eight courses that the candidate has taught. The committee then determined to recommend that a tenure review and promotion to the rank of associate professor review should be linked. The committee reasons that when you are granted tenure you should be promoted to rank of associate professor provided there are the sufficient number of years in rank of assistant professor. The uniform criteria for this linked review would be a finding of strong teaching and at least adequate performance in both scholarly/artistic work and service. In order to assist DPCs and other readers of the file it was decided that the recommendation should be for the candidate to submit three separate binders containing evidence in the three areas of teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and service. The committee will also recommend that in any promotion review, the VPAA will automatically include the most recent report from COF. The committee wants to make clear that the COF report is not included to invite any reevaluation of the previous period of review; rather, the report may indicate issues or areas of improvement the candidate should have addressed since the previous review. COF would be encouraged to take care with developmental suggestions which include recommendations for the next period of review.

The date for the next meeting was announced and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration

December 6, 2007

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Wayne Glausser, Marcia McKelligan, Raymonda Burgman, Jackie Roberts, Robert Stark, and Andrew Hayes.

**Previous Minutes** The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

### **Information to be Addressed at the January Board of Trustees Meeting**

Committee members were asked to review a preliminary list of future capital projects in connection with the upcoming meeting with the Board of Trustees. The list was reviewed and a short list of questions and suggestions will be forwarded to the Vice President.

The committee discussed other issues which might be of concern to the faculty which might be addressed at the meetings.

### **Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Files**

The Committee resumed discussions of the draft of the guidelines based on materials circulated since the last meeting. Evidence of Scholarly and Artistic Work Inclusion of Publication All publications should be required, but are not included in binder. It is desirable for them to be available for review, but there is no expectation that these materials will be reviewed in their entirety by the DPC or COF.

#### **Inclusion of Grant Proposals**

All full proposals which are substantial in size (equal to an extensive article or book) should not be included in the binders of supplemental information. It is sufficient to include confirmation of the grant, a review of the grant, and/or a summary of the grant in the binder materials. Full proposals should be made available for review in a manner similar to the published materials described above. Consultation of the Public Record The committee felt the issues of a DPC or COF accessing the "public record" regarding a candidates scholarly and artistic work was an important issue warranting further discussion, but that its impact on the size of the file was minimal. The decision was to set aside this issue for now. File Binder Recommendations In addition to the review materials automatically included by the VPAA and contained in a binder or folder, the candidate would submit the following:

**1 2-3 inch binder for teaching**

**1 1 inch binder for scholarship**

**1 1 inch binder for service**

#### **Inclusion of Teaching Philosophy**

The value of a separate statement teaching philosophy was discussed only briefly. It was suggested that no separate statement of teaching philosophy was needed and that the candidate's teaching philosophy should be integrated into the candidate's demonstration that they had met the criteria for teaching in the 1020 page statement. This issue will be discussed further at the next meeting. Number of Copies of the Primary Statement It will also be recommended that the candidate include several copies of the primary 1020 page statement to facilitate convenience of the review and that these copies be kept in a separate file from the teaching binder.

#### **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

In continuation of our discussion from the last meeting we plan to recommend the adoption of the following uniform standard for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: Strong teaching and adequate performance in both scholarly or artistic work and service.

This change increases the standard for tenure where unquestioned promise in scholarly and artistic work is the current standard but lowers the standard for promotion, where significant performance is required in either teaching or scholarship and adequate performance in the other area. The criteria for promotion to Full Professor would continue to be Strong teaching, adequate performance in both scholarly or artistic work and service, and significant performance in one of these two areas.

The date for the next meeting will be announced later and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration  
February 7, 2008

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Wayne Glausser, Marcia McKelligan, Raymonda Burgman, Jackie Roberts, Robert Stark, and Neal Abraham.

**I. Previous Minutes:**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**II. Salary Increase for Next Year:**

Committee members reviewed relevant information provided by the Vice President prior to the meeting. The committee was asked to offer advice on the distribution of funds from the increase in the faculty compensation pool. The Vice President addressed various questions about the materials provided. Based on our discussion, the committee made suggestions that will be utilized by Neal Abraham as allocation of the salary pool is finalized.

**III. Preliminary Information from Neal on Increases in Health Care Costs for Next Year.**

We were informed that there would be an increase in Health Care cost in the coming year. Members of the committee were asked to provide preliminary thoughts on how to deal with this increase. After our discussion, we provided the Vice President with a number of different scenarios. These will be given to Human Resources for analysis. It was announced that Jana Grimes and Felice Herrera-Kish, both from Human Resources, would like to attend our March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. They will provide us with relevant materials prior to the meeting in March.

**IV. Report from the COA Subcommittee on Benefits**

The committee discussed the report from the Subcommittee on Benefits (see attached). We talked further about the issue of documentation of policies concerning benefits with Neal Abraham.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jackie Roberts

Report of the COA Subcommittee on Benefits (Gary Lemon, Chair; Jack Morrill, Jeff Gropp)

I. There are no major problems with the DePauw benefits package. DePauw is in line with other similar institutions. We are a little more generous in life insurance (2.5 times salary) than many places but somewhat less generous in the institutional contribution to retirement (8%) than some places (a number pay 10%).

II. The subcommittee has two major recommendations:

1) The subcommittee should meet yearly. [COA has already taken this into account. Gary was appointed for a 3 year term, Jack for a 2 year term and Jeff for a 1 year term. We will need to replace Jeff at the end of the year.]

2) A number of policies concerning benefits need to be available in writing and on the web. In particular the policy regarding the funding of the Emeriti program needs to be written down somewhere as does the percentage of health care expenses that the University is committed to paying.

Committee on Administration

February 21, 2008

Members Present: Jackie Roberts (substitute chair), Wayne Glausser, Robert Stark, Andrew Hayes and Neal Abraham.

**I. Previous Minutes:**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**II. Recommendation to COF to make review criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor uniform.**

Minor revisions to the document to be submitted to COF were discussed and the document was approved by the committee. The consensus of the committee is that despite some possible difficulties this proposal might create for a few recent review cases and for other special circumstances, linking the review criteria is a desirable course of action. A revised document with the recommended revisions will be circulated prior to the next meeting.

**III. Recommendation to COF regarding personnel review file size.**

Committee members reviewed the document that has been circulated over the past several meetings. Both editorial and minor substantive issues were addressed based upon the set of question prompts provided by the committee chair. The committee also noted that COF's determination about how to proceed with the proposal above will have an impact on some of the specific language in this recommendation. However, we feel that our intent and advice is clear enough for COF to follow our line of thinking. A revised document with the recommended revisions will be circulated prior to the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration

March 6, 2008

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Robert Stark, Andrew Hayes, Raymonda Burgman, Marcia McKelligan, and Neal Abraham.

Guests: Gil Stanley, Jana Grimes, and Felice Herrera-Kish

**I. Previous Minutes:**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

## **II. Discussion of Health Care Insurance Costs**

The sole agenda item before the committee today was the issue of funding the Health Care Insurance for the next fiscal year. Overview of Current Benefit Plan (Felice) An explanation of the difference in the Open Access Plus plan and the POS plan was provided. Outside of network coverage is part of the POS plan in emergency situations. The differences include cost of the plans and deductible/co-pays. The mathematics of co-pay versus deductible was then explained. Charts of coverage and copays were reviewed and it was understood that the amount of co-pays was within the discretion of the committee to consider.

### **Current Claim Trends (Gil)**

The committee was provided a document outlining the university's cost history which includes a projected cost increase over the next two years. An explanation of the reasons for the increase was summarized in an executive summary cost analysis. In general, both pharmaceutical and catastrophic claims account for the most recent increase.

Still DePauw is very close to the industry norm and slightly higher than the overall norm.

### **Budget for Health Care Insurance (Jana)**

A Group Insurance Cost and Benefit Analysis document was distributed to the committee. The document indicated a substantial 24% increase in Total Health Care Costs. If funding were to remain the same as the previous year it would result in a budget shortfall of over one million dollars. The document also outlined two strategies for adjustments that would address the shortfall.

### **Possible Plan Changes**

Addressing these issues is always a balancing act. The option of a health reimbursement arrangement (HRA) as a cost savings plan was discussed. The committee was also presented a possible modification of the Prescription Benefit. It was noted that all the currently offered possible plan changes would still not account for the budget shortfall. The current philosophy is to spread the increased costs of health care insurance increases over an increased premium, cost savings in plan changes, and alternative coverage options. Additional items for future discussion are the current wellness initiatives and possible changes in the long-term disability coverage for hourly staff.

An additional meeting will be scheduled next week in order to deal with the complexity of the issues concerning the health care plan and develop COA recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration

March 20, 2008

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Robert Stark, Andrew Hayes, Raymonda Burgman, Marcia McKelligan, Wayne Glausser, Jackie Roberts and Neal Abraham.

## **I. Previous Minutes:**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

## **II. Discussion of Health Care Insurance Costs**

The VPAA reported on the projected amount of the shortfall upon which the committee was asked to make a recommendation. Considerations of the increase in premiums and increase of

co-pays and deductibles as cost reduction measures were discussed. A variety of additional cost saving measures including lower stop loss thresholds and an alternative Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA) plan we presented and discussed.

Additional considerations for ways to improve the health care plan were discussed.

The committee reached an agreement on a recommendation for adjustments in health care strategies to address the projected shortfall. Finally, the committee will later consider making a recommendation regarding future policy for covering health care costs.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration

April 17, 2008

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Robert Stark, Wayne Glausser, Jackie Roberts, Andrew Hayes, Marcia McKelligan, and Neal Abraham.

### **I. Previous Minutes**

The minutes of two previous meetings were reviewed and approved.

### **II. Discussion of a Recommendation about Future University Policy Regarding How to Cover Increases in Health Care Costs?**

The committee held a lengthy discussion about a proposal regarding the future of the employee compensation and health care costs. The committee formulated the following recommendation: Benefits (including benefits to current and future retirees) are an important part of total compensation. In principle, DePauw University should make it a goal to have a total compensation package that is competitive with our comparison group. We support the idea of having faculty representation on a university budget committee, which sets spending priorities. COA itself could play this role or some of its members could serve on such a committee.

### **III. Payments to the Emeriti Program**

The committee recommends that the Subcommittee on Benefits closely monitor contributions to the Emeriti program as well as the projected growth of those funds through investment to insure that retired employees will not lose "buying power."

### **IV. Membership of the Subcommittee on Benefits.**

The committee developed a list of desirable candidates for the subcommittee and the Chair will contact these individuals to determine their interest in serving on the committee. Particular attention was paid to gender representation on the committee. The individual agreeing to serve will be replacing Jeff Gropp on the committee.

### **V. Training Session for Incoming Chairs of Major Committees**

The training session held last year was very effective and was generally well received. Carl Huffman will serve as session coordinator for this year's event. A proposed session time would be between May 9 and May 16.

## **VI. Election of the Committee Chair for Next Year**

The elected members of next year's committee will be invited to the May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and the election of the new chair will take place at that time. Committee members rotating off the committee will not have a vote on the Chair for next year's committee.

## **VII. Reminder of File Size Recommendation at the Next Faculty Meeting**

The general feedback on the proposal to COF has been positive, but the committee members are encouraged to be part of the discussion at the time of the next faculty meeting. It is expected the many untenured faculty members and those preparing files in the next few years will have concerns about the new format.

## **VIII. Tuition Exchange Announcement**

The Chair will make an announcement about the university's plan to proceed with the Tuition Exchange Program at the next faculty meeting. The meeting concluded with a review of the major agenda items for the next meeting, and was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes

Committee on Administration  
May 8, 2008

Members Present: Carl Huffman (chair), Robert Stark, Wayne Glausser, Jackie Roberts, Andrew Hayes, Raymonda Burgman, Marcia McKelligan, and Neal Abraham. 08-09 Members Present: Vic Decarlo

## **I. Previous Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were circulated by e-mail and approved.

## **II. Election of a chair for next year. Only members of next year's committee vote.**

The only nominee for the Chair's position for next year was Marcia McKelligan. With no other nominations and Marcia McKelligan was willing to serve, she was appointed as Chair of COA for 20082009.

## **III. Review of the Business Completed this Year. (Note that minutes are posted on the COA web page for all meetings this year.)**

A. Recommendation that the University join the Tuition Exchange Dean Abraham updated the committee on the progress and the administration's desire to be able to offer a large number of exchanges rather than start by offering only 23 slots per year.

B. Recommendation to COF on Reduction in Size of Personnel Files This proposal was presented in a faculty meeting to gather responses to the concept. It is our hope that COF will implement these recommendations for future reviews.

C. Recommendation to COF on Making the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor the same apart from time in rank. This proposal seems to be more controversial to the faculty as a whole. Discussion about this recommendation is likely to continue. Ultimately this proposal would require a change in the faculty handbook and would necessitate a multiyear phase in.

- D. Recommendation to the administration on how to distribute the salary pool.
  - E. Recommendation to the administration on how to distribute the increased cost for health care between premium increases and plan changes.
- There will be an opportunity to review the health plan and make recommendations on it next year.
- F. Attended the Trustees' meeting in January.
  - G. Created a subcommittee on Benefits.
  - H. Meeting for incoming and outgoing chairs of committees.

#### **IV. Agenda Items for Next Year**

- A. Meet early with Brian Casey to determine how he wants to use the committee
- B. COA's role regarding advice to the administration on spending priorities
- C. Evaluate the Faculty Governance Steering Committee
- D. Determine what COA wants its Subcommittee on Benefits to study next year.
  - 1. Vision coverage?
  - 2. How to determine whether our total spending on compensation is competitive?
- E. Recommendation to the administration on how to distribute the salary pool
- F. Recommendation to the administration on health care issues
- G. Follow up on the recommendations to COF
- H. Review of the Distinguished Professor program
- I. Start of an eighteen month progression toward developing a 2010 Strategic Plan

#### **V. New Business**

AAVP Abraham announced an adjustment necessitated in the salary pool distribution. The salary pool remains the same at 5.5% but the percentage pay increase previously announced as a little below 5% is most likely to be closer to 4% because a larger amount of the salary pool was needed to pay for increases in salary due to promotions.

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Hayes