

Faculty Senate Working Meeting  
November 4, 2010  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Bryant Hall Recruiting Room

## Minutes

Chair Gweneth West called the meeting to order and explained the discussion format of the meeting, focusing on topics under discussion by the Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Welfare Committee. She asked that notes taken during discussions be emailed to Ann Witkower, the Faculty Senate administrative assistant, who will forward them to Chris Holstege, the FRRW chair.

Gweneth commented on Cabinet meetings under President Sullivan. Gweneth sits at the table along with administrators, and those in attendance sit in different places each time. President Sullivan organizes the meeting by starting with a “weather report” from each person, two or three minutes long. Then each person talks about “jeopardizes” – concerns each person has that could become problems. Sometimes weather reports could become jeopardies. These are followed by a “dance card” – everyone gets up and can touch base with people they might need to talk to later. Gweneth says that it is good to have a voice in the Cabinet as chair of the Faculty Senate. At yesterday’s Cabinet meeting, Gweneth made it clear that the Faculty Senate is in jeopardy on the Dissertation Year Fellowships, and solutions came forward. We now may be getting regular funding each year.

**Day of Dialogue Debrief:** The Day of Dialogue planning group met to discuss possible improvements – maybe classes could be canceled in the future. These dialogues might be ongoing; planning for that is still in the gestation stage. The Arts Grounds is interested in having a theme that would inspire artwork throughout year. A Collab site has been created that anyone can add to. There will also be a website to house a lot of information; most goes through Pat Lampkin’s office now. Pat and Susan Carkeek are working on paid time off for work on Sustainability Dialogues to take place six times per year. The faculty are interested in involving students; there are links on website to encourage this.

**Search for the Next Provost:** Faculty senators should have received an email asking for input – if not, let Gweneth know. Bob Kemp has created a phone tree to gather information on what the faculty think is important in a provost. A document will be created based on these comments and presented to President Sullivan.

The President has requested that as we look at holiday celebrations – e.g. deans’ parties – we keep a watchful eye on cost that implies. Big fancy parties fly in the face of issues we face economically. If plans are already underway, the President urges that a toy or food drive be added. Holiday cards will come from the President’s office electronically.

Concerns have been expressed about the Governors’ Commission’s call for an increase in student numbers. Pres. Sullivan has made it clear that our productivity is not an issue. She urges us not to be too concerned with what the Governor’s Commission is saying.

Gweneth read the Faculty Senate her statement that she will read at the Board of Visitors' meeting.

Statement will request that we be kept in collaboration going forward on these issues.

**Inauguration Week – April 14-17:** There are two major initiatives – Research Posters (Brian Pusser is our rep); and Academic (Shayn Peirce-Cottler is our rep). Gweneth said that faculty need to hear about these initiatives before the holidays so that people have time to prepare. The intention is to acknowledge the wide variety of research that the University community is involved in.

Michael Puri and Ted Chang will be working with the Capstone Experience Committee. Gweneth asked that senators give feedback directly to them or to Carolyn Callahan, the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. The Committee has discussed this issue. We hope to have a report from Milton sometime early next year since the process is going so quickly. Gweneth said that if senators have a particular interest and would like to be involved in a committee, please let her know.

**Benefits Update:** Chris Holstege introduced Susan Carkeek, the Chief Human Resources Officer, to explain changes in health benefits. Susan said that she came last year with grim news: health costs were increasing at 17% per year. The University doesn't buy health insurance; we have a self-funded plan. We only collect in premiums what we need to pay claims. As utilization increased last year, we had to raise rates and reduce benefits for the sake of stability. Susan has better news this year:

At the website [Benefits@UVa](mailto:Benefits@UVa), all University employees can see their own benefits. Ms. Carkeek handed out a printout of the information she shared to the Senate. She said that on the website is a list of things that one can do online, including tax shelter your bonus. Starting January 1, the University will have two new claims administrators: Aetna for medical claims (and also our mental health provider) and Catalyst RX for prescriptions. There are major advantages to using those. Aetna is a national company with a national network; if you need services out of our area, Aetna will be much easier to work with. Aetna also provides many administrative services we're looking forward to, including enhanced reporting capabilities and a wellness program. Catalyst also has done innovative work in this area. Most of the changes you won't really notice, since these are just claims processing agencies for the University plan. The benefits themselves, with their co-pays and deductibles, will not change. Certain aspects of the plan will change to conform to new federal guidelines.

The University's low premium plan is collecting more in premiums than are being used. There will be no change this year on the low premium rates, with a modest increase of 3% on the high-premium side, which is price of federal healthcare initiatives. For a long time, 90% of faculty and staff chose the high premium plan, 10% the low premium. Last year Human Resources conducted a campaign to have people look at the low premium plan, and enrollment is now up to 15%. It's only a one-year decision; if you get on that plan and don't like it, you can switch back.

Susan was asked if there are any events that the high premium plan covers but the low premium doesn't. She said that it would be best to make an appointment with a benefits counselor to check out your situation. Hospitalization is one of main differences.

Susan will send information comparing the two programs to Ann Witkower. She will also send a longer slide deck with much more detail.

Presentations about health benefits are taking place around the Grounds.

The University has never collected dependent data in our system; providers have collected that. Now we have collected it and consolidated it at the University level, so you will only have to enter that once.

The University got reductions in our rates on life insurance. This affects employees in two ways: People over 55, with an optional retirement plan, formerly got a \$75K life insurance benefit paid for by UVA that reduced at age 60 and kept going down. Now it does not go down so steeply. Rates have been reduced, some by \$100 per month. There are also changes in supplemental life insurance. Human Resources is sending out an email separate from the open enrollment announcement to people in the optional life insurance program.

During the open enrollment period, faculty can sign up for the vision program, the tax-deferred savings plan, and other options.

A common request is for help to navigate the complexity of claims, reimbursements, planned surgery planning, etc. JoAnne Hayden is health care ombudsman; she will advocate for you in negotiating health claims.

### **Working Meeting Discussion:**

Chris Holstege introduced the format of the discussions. To understand why these topics were chosen, Chris pointed to the surveys the FRRW Committee has been looking at: the 2007 Faculty Senate survey, and two other surveys that Gertrude Fraser, the vice provost for faculty recruitment and retention, shared with us – the exiting faculty report 2002-2009; and the declination survey. The Committee also reviewed Leonard Sandridge's report on what is being done in response to the Faculty Senate survey. In addition, the FRRW tasked work study students to pull data from other universities, all of which are private.

There were many topics to choose from. Every school – maybe every department – has its own issues, but there are certain areas where they all cross over. One of topics that was highlighted on the survey results and reviewed by the committee was **transparency**, which fits into all the other topics. We need to understand what is going on. President Sullivan said there would be increased transparency to the level of the deans.

Transparency, though not clearly defined in the Faculty Senate survey, is listed as a prime goal.

Another issue is **diversity**; like transparency, it would be good to define what we mean by this term. The Committee hopes that today in small group discussions, we can find out

where this work is being done so we don't duplicate efforts. The Committee talked to Marcus Martin, the interim Vice President and Chief Officer for Diversity and Equity, and Gertrude Fraser. It was interesting to note that the declination report indicated an increase in diversity in certain areas over the last decade. Chris quoted from two emails sent by Faculty Senators as examples of some of the messages sent to him regarding these two topics. Gertrude intends to apply for an ADVANCE-IT award.

Faculty Senator Bill Keene introduced the topic of **general faculty**. The Faculty Senate survey showed that non-tenure track faculty – half of all faculty – feel marginalized at the University.

**Post-Discussion Summary – Chris Holstege:** Chris asked the tables to summarize their discussions, and the bullets below are what were stated to the group. Written notes from each of the tables can be found in an additional document.

- Transparency is linked to the idea of accountability – these are twin ideas. It seems most important to stress the question of transparency at the departmental level: more management training is needed; resource allocation and decision making are important issues; and these need to be enforced somehow from above.
- The Grievance Committee said that promotion & tenure policies are not adequately provided to new hires.
- Is the policy of rotating chairs every three years or so the most efficient way to do it? That depends on the chair.
- Transparency: a working definition might be “sufficient information” - especially information on finances passing from the president to the schools to the chairs, etc. There currently seem to be many miscommunications along way. Too many faculty and staff don't pay attention.
- Survey: does it need to be done again? Maybe it is too soon now, but what about on a regular schedule – e.g., every five years? In between, reports could be issued about what has been addressed. Accountability could be built into the survey – maybe a provost's office report? When we do the next survey, we will have an idea of what has been addressed. Raw data should be digested more before given to faculty. That is a real challenge. It could be a good goal for the committee – to come up with a clear structure. Next time, we could look at other surveys to get guidance.
- Transparency – we think of it as good when you want an efficient market, but you may not want an efficient market – for instance, we wouldn't want everyone in a department to know how much everyone is making. Do departments have budget committees that advise the chairs? Or do the chairs just do it?
- Salaries are a delicate issue. They are on the public record, but one has to dig them out. In some departments, the chair has difficulty deciding who gets merit pay when everyone is working overtime and collaborating. But if you never know what the salaries are, you don't know if there are trends having to do with diversity issues.

- Defining transparency is crucial. It is such a buzz word today. One attribute of transparency is timeliness of information – not only what you know but when you know.
- Transparency and service – this is also related to diversity in a way. Clearer guidelines should exist about how much service is expected of each member, and how the chair decides how to assign service to each member. Often the one woman in a department has to do a lot more service; the department wants to make her visible. Then her research or teaching may suffer. Clearer guidelines would help. Maybe a subcommittee could be created to try to decide what the guidelines should be. We could have a think tank of senators who would poll our constituents.
- Diversity: UVA is really succeeding in a lot of ways – e.g., undergrad admission; but Asian Americans are underrepresented on the faculty, and African American grad students are underrepresented. We are 56th out of 62 in women tenure track faculty compared to other AAU universities. It is good to have this information publicly accessible.
- Chris asked Gertrude if there is anywhere for people to get the information. Gertrude said that there is no one place to find all the data related to the declination survey. The hardest task for FRRW is figuring out where to get data.
- Half of the non-tenure-track faculty are female. We must be careful about whether we're talking about tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.
- Making all this information public would be great, but isn't the University concerned about public relations? Who would want to come here if UVA is ranked at the bottom of everything? Also – do we have salary information split out? The General Faculty Council generated that information some years ago.
- The Coordinating Council of University-Wide Groups: one of the reasons it existed was that groups all over university were doing research and putting their reports on the shelf, and groups didn't know what other groups were doing.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Submitted by Brie Gertler, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Present:

Jennifer Tsien  
David Green  
Bill Keene  
Rae Blumberg  
Ed Kitch  
Pam Norris  
Rasheed Balogun  
Bob Kemp  
Jay Brown  
Robert Bloodgood  
Blaine Norum  
Jack Brown  
Bob Conroy  
Nina Solenski  
Sophie Rosenfeld  
Mary Gibson  
Chris Holstege  
Alf Weaver  
Brandt Allen  
Carolyn Callahan  
Ann Hamric  
Steve Macko  
Adrienne Ward  
Brie Gertler  
Roger Chevalier  
Gweneth West