UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
APRIL 17, 2018

Members present:

Members absent:

Ex officio **Members present:**

I.   WELCOME FROM THE SENATE CHAIR

McFarland: We have a lengthy agenda and some time constraints so we'll go ahead and get started. We'll start with a report from the co-chairs; we have one item for a vote that's going to require a quorum. Libby, where are we on the quorum? Can you let me know in a little bit? Great!

We've talked about this before, there's been some progress in planning this; there are plans for an administrative faculty summit – this is a plan that the provost, the senate co-chairs and the president have been putting together. The idea is to have a day-long meeting to develop and tee up some issues we'd like to work on in relation to shared governance.

This will be a group that is roughly 50-50 faculty and administrators, meaning the school level or central level. There will be representatives from the senate, there are some faculty who are department chairs or program leaders; we have representatives of various schools and administrative units. There's also an attempt to pull in a member of the presidential search committee so we have that representation as well.

There's a list of 6 topics that we have and they address issues of governance and also the vision for the university. They are on centralization and decentralization, a topic on visionary projects that would affect social issues in the community, a topic on internationalization, a topic on some of the long-term financial pressures on the university, the explicit topic of shared governance and how we strength that going forward, and finally, priorities for the presidential search.

The idea is to do a one-day meeting of the minds and develop some topics that we would explore in the senate and the administration would explore in parallel and we would have common efforts for next year.

A short report from the sustainable transportation committee – the goal of this committee is to work with parking and transportation to develop a series of short-term and long-term initiatives around transportation. Short-term meaning things that can be done with relatively minor budget impact in the immediate future; long-term meaning things that would require more planning, either because infrastructure would have to be built or because they're expensive in some way.

The current activity of that committee, they will be sending out a survey to faculty – or has it already gone out? Soon; hopefully this week it will go out. I encourage all of you who are interested in the topic to take time to participate in that.

Another short committee report, university committee – there is a committee that has been formed, Tony Kinslow is leading the effort to put this together and this is the committee that's meant to address revisions to Policy 106, the policy at the university regarding harassment of protected classes. This is obviously broader than faculty – this concerns faculty and staff and has implications throughout the university. There are several faculty on the committee; one is explicitly a senate representative and Ann Nofziger has agreed to take on that role.

I will say that this omitted has a somewhat broader mandate than MJ and I originally understood when we first saw that it was being proposed. We originally thought it was just to work on Policy 106 revisions themselves, but it turns out issues regarding confidentiality in Policy 106 investigations are also being discussed in this committee. So it has a rather broad charge.

I don't think we know enough about timeframe for this committee – Ann, unless you want to say a couple words?

Nofziger: What's expected is at least 6 two-hour meetings.

McFarland: So it should be extensive. If members of the senate have thoughts on Policy 106 or associated investigative or confidentiality issues, Ann would be an excellent person to share those with. We've gotten some responses from faculty over the past few months after the White report and I think we've forwarded all those on to Ann. So if you've already sent something to the chairs, it's probably come to Ann but it doesn't hurt to check.   Amy, are there also representatives from the commission?

Lerner: It seems like it's going to be a process.

McFarland: I think with most of these policy revisions, they are going to take some time. It's probably more important to do it right than fast; I don't think this is a bad thing.

Okay, we have 2 items we'd like to discuss related to charter and faculty handbook revisions. We would actually like to hold a vote today on a charter revision that nobody has seen but is not terribly substantive – well, you've seen it if you read your email today and saw it. It was developed very recently in response to a question that came up with regard to terms – when they start and when they end. I'll explain more as we get to that.

MJ and I also want to bring forward, just for first discussion today – I'm sorry; this says 'charter revisions' and it should say 'handbook revisions' – a revision to the faculty handbook regarding the criteria for promotion and tenure. The specific issue is around acknowledging work that faculty do in the

community. We'll have some discussion about that when we get to that point.

Here is the Senate schedule; we have one more meeting after this one, which would be May 8th. We'll have a report from chairs on ongoing issues, no committee reports planned, if we have charter and handbook work – we'll surely have charter work and we'll do it then. We'll get a report from the provost on the faculty salary study that he's preparing and which will be circulated in advance. He gave us a target date of April 25 for that. Then President Feldman will give an address.

Libby, how are we doing on a quorum? So we're short of a quorum. Okay.   In that case, we will continue to ask for a quorum and I will move on to a chair's report item that I'd hope to intersperse, but we are where we are.

This is a topic that the Senate Executive Committee hasn't previously discussed with the faculty senate, but it's something that's been going on in the background. It concerns the growth of executive compensation at the University of Rochester.

As most of you are ware, salary information is generally not public at this university; however, all non-profits under federal tax law have to file what's called a 990 form. As part of the content of that 990 form they have to list the compensation of all senior executives, so that is trustees who are unpaid, but it's also anybody at the vice president or senior vice president level, CEO of the medical center, provost, president, etcetera, so it's actually quite easy to find that data because there are organizations that get that data from the IRS and then post it online.

With something like 3 person-hours of work we put together an initial analysis of what we found looking at 16 years of past I-990 forms from the University of Rochester, which is easily available online. I should say this is only senior executives, so it does not apply – it doesn't tell us very much about issues of compensation at the unit level.

The other thing is that it doesn't tell us about the growth of administration, broadly. It tells us about the growth of senior executives, but it doesn't speak to how much growth there is in the central administration or unit administration; these are things we would have to find in some cooperative data-gathering venture with the administration.

I think there are some relevant question you can get at from this data; one question you could ask is, are salary increases as a senior executive commensurate with salary increases of faculty? Another question is, how has the administration grown and can we understand that growth in terms of new initiatives that we believe as faculty benefit the institution? Certainly we can all point to examples where some of that is going on.

So here are some findings from the study; I'm a physical scientist so I assure you, there will be graphs later. The compensations for the president, provost and senior vice

president for institutional resources, those are individuals who have positions that have been instant throughout this entire time, have increased significantly faster than inflation during the period. Interestingly, however, that's not true for the CEO of the medical center, which is the biggest growth area of our institution.

The president's salary, it turns out, has grown 6 percent per year over inflation over this 16-year period. The senior vice president for institutional resources, that's grown 5 percent; that you have to ignore what appears to be a large bonus paid out in 2015 to come to that conclusion, and the provost salary has grown by 4 percent. These are all inflation-adjusted numbers. Inflation has grown on the order of 2 percent, if you're curious.

The reason that the president's salary has grown so much faster than anybody else's is that during Joel's, the mid part of Joel's tenure, 2011 through the last year we have data for which is 2015, his compensation grew nearly 10 percent above the rate of inflation year over year.

Another finding is that the number of senior administrators has increased dramatically at the institution. So between 2001 and 2004, it was 4 individuals; that grew to 17 in 2015. I should say that 17 some years it includes people who are receiving payouts for past service if they were senior executives.

So it might be that in any one year the active number of senior VPs is somewhat different; we didn't take that into account in this analysis. I believe, for example, that year in reporting of 17, there's one person being paid a delayed payout and therefore has to appear on the IRS form.

[question in background]

So I didn't read the IRS regulations; it's not tied to salary I believe, it's tied to title and function. But I did not go back and read what the IRS says. Interestingly, it's very constant over the years by title was reported except for one year, which is 2007, where a very large number of people's salaries were reported.

The other thing that has to be reported on Form 990 are the highest paid non-executive individuals at the institution. But there's no analysis of that here.

The number of senior administrators has grown rapidly; total compensation for that group - again, inflation adjusted – has gone from $3.7 million to $20 million over this 15-year period. That was correct.

Okay, so here's a graph of the growth of executive compensation and one thing that struck me as very interesting – the gray is the number of such positions; that is on the right axis. The red is the total compensation is on the left axis. One thing that's really interesting is that there's surprisingly good tracking between those two numbers and that was not what I was expecting to find when I started looking at this.

I think there are 2 things going if you look at the data; one is that the number of senior executives have compensation that is very similar to the compensation of our most senior executives, meaning the most senior leader of the academic enterprise, the provost, the president, the CEO of the medical center. There are a number of people who are also compensated at that level.

Some of it is also that there are a fraction of those salaries – and I documented the ones that were easiest to pull out – that have grown much faster than inflation over this period of time. It's a combination of these two factors that mean these numbers roughly track each other, which is not normally what you would expect; you would expect as you grow the executive, the salary would grow more slowly because new executives you're adding in subordinate positions are not getting compensated as highly as the senior executives.

[voice in background]

Here are some graphs of individual compensation – again, these are all inflation adjusted. The yellow on the left is the compensation for the CEO of the medical center. Of course, the med center is a very large enterprise and the CEO has been historically well compensated. This is a zero-suppressed graph but you see the growth in the president's salary. Again, everything here is inflation adjusted so this isn't an issue of inflation. The president's salary during this period rose by a factor of 2.4 – which is what the magic of compound interest will do for you.

On the right is a graph, again, showing the president's salary in the same color blue and then I apologize for the poor choice of colors – the provost is in an orange-y color that doesn't the spike and then the senior vice president for institutional resources, Doug (Phillips) who manages the endowment, his salary is showing in the red. They both increase at more or less the same rate.

There's something that is either a large bonus or a large deferred comp payout or something for Doug (Philips) in the last year; that wasn't factored into any of the growth numbers that you saw because I can't come up with a sensible linear trend based on a spike that goes up by a factor of whatever that is – 3.

So you might ask why it is we collected this data and what we might want to do with it. I gave you some questions we might want to ask at the beginning; in thinking about this, there's growth that I think is due to initiatives that a number of faculty, or maybe even a majority of faculty would find – would be something they would support at the institution, and an example of that, I would say, would be the advancement enterprise.

I think there's been a recognition there are reasons to grow the advancement enterprise at the university, and that was one of Joel's signature initiatives that involves adding a fairly well compensated senior administrator to the institution.

You know, I've often heard the response that compliance needs drive the growth of the senior executives and I think that's true to a certain extent. I think a question that one could ask – I think one could also reasonably say that's a choice, right? Put the compliance personnel in the senior administration and put the compliance person in the central administration at the executive level.

I think we don't know anything about these numbers, although some of us may have our private impressions, about whether similar growth has occurred in the administrative staff and also in the administrations of individual school units. I think these numbers are at a level where it is reasonable for us as faculty to be concerned that this growth is potentially not sustainable. This is becoming a significant fraction of the university enterprise.

For example, that central administration senior salary line that I showed you is not very far from 1 percent of the total expenditures of the university, including the entire medical center, so it's a significant number.

I think that some of this growth is at a level that cold potential harm the public image of the institution if they chose to dig into it, and I'll remind everybody that senate proceedings are meant to be confidential within the institution. I honestly think for the moment we should work within the institution to see how these numbers can best be interpreted before anyone might consider moving outside, although of course I have told you this is all publicly available.

Looking forward, this suggests to me that this is time for a serious self-study across the institution to get the data we need to understand the growth of the administrative staff and down at the level of the various units. I believe the issue of presidential compensation should be considered in the search for the next president.

MJ and I have had some discussions with the president and the provost on this issue and those are ongoing. I think we want to give them a little space to respond before coming back to you with that.

That's all I had to say on that topic. Are there any questions or comments? Colleen?

Unidentified speaker: How do we compare to other similar institutions and their rate of growth?

McFarland: I looked at the data I could find on presidential compensation; it's actually not so straightforward to find but about every 2 or 3 years there's an article in the Times bemoaning the average salary increase for presidents of private institutions. The typical number you see is 4 to 5 percent year over year, but that's not with respect to inflation – so it's 4 or 5 percent absolute. As far back as I could do with article searches, that's constant.   I don't have data of comparable fidelity, but my impression is that our increases are well beyond the norm, and for a sustained period of time.

I'm sorry, and yes, please identify yourself when you speak. Eldred, I think you were next?

Chimowitz: Eldred Chemowitz, Engineering.   Some of us have been waiting for this day for a long time. It seems this is a good audience but the best one would be the Board of Trustees.

McFarland: I agree.

Chimowitz: Especially the executive committee – what is the administration going to do? If you want to attract the best people, what are you going to do? Take the endowment, for example. I'm in the middle of a similar analysis to what you've done except that is widely available and it turns out that ( ) fundraising over the last 10, 15 years – unless I'm mistaken, and I'd love to be proven mistaken – it's no different than to what happened when (Tom Jackson) was here. The actual increase in the endowment from '95 to 2005 is exactly the same 2005 to today.

And not only that; if you put the money into the S&P 500 and withdraw your 5 percent every year, you basically end up in the same place without having to spend tens of millions on advancement. So I'm not poo-pooing is; we wall want it to be a successful institution. If the university raises billions of dollars, I'd be happy, everyone would be happy, but we've got to get away from this thought – both on this and the advancement side of the institution.   I really think next year this is something the SEC should take the reins on.

McFarland: This is an effort that needs hard data and I would encourage you to put it together in the same sort of format. I agree; this is an excellent topic for the senate to focus on and I'm also glad to hear you endorsing my retirement strategy, by the way. Yes?

Kingsley: Paul Kingsley, Pediatrics. Did you break down your analysis by gender?

McFarland: I didn't have to.

[laughter]

The only individuals I looked at – and I'm hesitating, because I want to make sure I don't say something wrong, but I believe this is exclusively men so I did break it down by gender but it required very little effort. But on a related note – not meaning to make light of your comment – that is actually one of the things we heard from the provost that will be included in the salary study presented to us, so we're really excited to see that data for faculty salaries.

[voice in background]

Amy?

Lerner: Amy Lerner, Biomedical Engineering. So it would be all – I'm still not clear who the 17 are though. Are you saying - ?

The 17 senior – you want examples of people? It's vice president or senior vice president, so for example, the head of the Office of Counsel is there, the head of Communications is there, head of Advancement is there –

Unidentified speaker: One woman. Head of legal counsel.

McFarland: I'm saying of the individual titles where I did the analysis it was all men. There are certainly women in that group – I'm sorry. I apologize if that wasn't clear.

Unidentified speaker: There's more than one.

McFarland: Let me be clear about what I meant to say. The only titles for whom I analyzed salary over the whole 15 years were the titles that have stayed constant and the only ones are senior VP for advancement, president, provost and CEO for the medical center. Everyone else is an addition, and many of them are women.

Unidentified speaker: Many of the new ones, you're saying?

McFarland: Yes.

Unidentified speaker: But they may have contributed to the diversity of our leadership team.

McFarland: Absolutely.   Sorry, Michael?

Scott: For what it's worth, when I heard you were looking at this, we also found – I guess you found an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education that gave comparative salaries for presidents in, if I remember, 2015. We were in the group of well compensated presidents – not way out of line with them, so for me this highlights the fact that this is a complicated situation with a national context.

There were universities that we think of as peers whose presidents were paid even higher than ours, others that we think of as better than Rochester whose presidents were paid somewhat less than ours, but it's possible that this meteoric 15-year rise moved us from being well below the pack into the pack and we have to feel how we figure about that.

McFarland: I think what I'm saying is that something one should address explicitly. For example, one question you might think to ask as part of the presidential search is where in among the list of private institutions – what is our range of targets? Do we want to be somewhere between 20th and 50th in terms of presidential compensation? For example. I think that's not an unreasonable question to ask.

Anything else? Yes, Randy?

Stone: Randall Stone, Political Science. I just wondered if anyone happens to know what the figure is, for example, faculty salaries in the college, so we could get a sense of what share this represents. This is roughly $20 million, correct? So what share of that would be faculty compensation?

McFarland: We should be able to extract that from the salary study information. I guess I would encourage you to write directly to the provost and ask if his staff can extract that number as part of the study; it should be quite doable. And they have all the data – they can do it unit by unit.

Unidentified speaker: ( ) from Linguistics. I have a naïve question, if you don't mind. How are decisions made – who decides someone's salary?

McFarland: That's not a naïve question at all; I think few of us know the answer. I can tell you what I do know, which at least the president's compensation is set by a trustee committee. As far as I know, the president is involved in setting the salaries of all the other senior administrators, I don't know to what extent that compensation committee weighs in on that process. And I think the president and the provost have significant authority over the unit leaders and so on, down the line.

I think there's some parallel with the way my salary is set; for example, my salary is set because there's some raise pool that's given to my department by the dean, and then my department chair makes an allocation of that raise pool. Then if there's something exceptional or strange, perhaps, there's a conversation with the dean. I imagine the process is not dissimilar to that. I don't know specifically in all cases how it's set. And that is not an unreasonable thing for faculty to know at the institution, one might argue.

Libby, how are we on that quorum? Fantastic. There's more time for discussion for that in the unrecorded session if we want to come back to that topic.

II.   REVISION TO FACULTY SENATE CHARTER – KEVIN MCFARLAND

McFarland: So I advertised at the beginning a charter revision; this is yet another charter revision, so I'll remind you on April 10th we approved a revision to the charter which was to allow senators to serve as faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees committee and fix up some usage errors in the charter to add gender inclusive language.

Today's charter revision is a new one and something that just came up very recently in a discussion. The question is, when are the beginning and ending terms of the senate, the SEC, and the UCTP – whose elections are specified entirely in the charter? The senate committees are actually clear from the way it's written but unfortunately these 3 groups, believe it or not, are not.

Why is it unclear? It's clear that the new senate starts in the beginning of the academic year and continues through the end of the academic year – that is clear. What is not clear in any case is what happens over the summer, except – there's one exception – our bylaws say that the senate executive committee must meet over the summer – the new senate

executive committee – in order to set the schedule of senate meetings in July.

So the one thing we know from the collective wisdom of the charter and bylaws is that there must be a handoff at some point over the summer – can you see I wanted to be a detective as a child? There must be some handoff over the summer, right, that takes places at the SEC. The past precedent has been that handoff takes place the week of commencement.

So the senate executive committee has a meeting with the outgoing and incoming members, the senate chairs are chosen, and then the reins are turned over to the new SEC for their first meeting after commencement.

Since there is no specification, we had some discussion in the SEC and thought the most logical thing to do was essentially specify that all terms end and start at commencement week. And the idea is to re-write the charter in order to make that clear.

Why is that necessary? Well you can imagine a situation where there's some event that happens and the senate feels it needs to have a meeting over the summer, or the university committee on tenure and privilege is asked to investigate a case over the summer and it's not clear who is actually on the committee because it's not specific.

Both of those are clearly problems; there are many ways to solve this problem. We're proposing one.

The process of charter revision that I went through last week is the same senate has to vote twice on every charter revision with a period for comments in between the two votes from the faculty councils. If we approve it today and then vote again to approve it on May 8th, the charter can be revised during the Board of Trustees meeting commencement weekend and the Board of Trustees have to ratify any change to the senate charter. We do not own that document exclusively.

And clearly this is a process that's a little cumbersome and it was designed around the possibility that somebody would change the constitution if you like, in an under-handed and sneaky way, so we have a deliberative process. But it means that even for relatively straightforward changes, we have to follow that cumbersome process.

So there's the propose change to the charter; it occurs in three places.

Section 4.a, terms of membership to the senate. At the end it adds 'terms shall begin and end the day of commencement for the School of Arts, Sciences & Engineering' – and somebody pointed out to me that I should have probably said College because graduate commencement is a different day, which I know very well but apparently I was tired when I wrote this. So if we can consider it to be a friendly amendment to say 'day of commencement for the College at the Schools of Arts, Sciences & Engineering' then it will be unambiguous.

Then there has to be parallel language in the executive committee section, that's Section 6.f.1, again same language, and finally the committee on tenure and privileges, Section 7.e, again the same sentence is added to the end.

We had a discussion in the SEC, this is a committee motion from the SEC, so therefore it can be placed before the senate without a second. We've already had a friendly amendment to change the language to read 'for the College of the Schools of Arts, Sciences & Engineering' in each case. Is there any further discussion? Yes?

Lerner: Amy Lerner, Biomedical Engineering. You mentioned earlier a meeting where you do the handoff. Are you suggesting that meeting is before this, on that day - ?

McFarland: The old SEC runs that meeting; the new SEC attends.

Lerner: Well, it's a little – maybe like the student I ran into in the tunnels who didn't realize classes were almost over and there were only 10 days left. To me that's a really busy time of year and I wonder if we need to –

McFarland: The SEC has been doing it that way for a long time when everyone is still generally around.

Curry: Just to add to that, as you know, the announcement just went out that the elections to the SEC are happening now, so this is all tied – we have the senate elections, the SEC elections and then this handover. It's really more specifying for post-commencement weekend who's supposed to be on duty.

Lerner: Okay.

McFarland: Anything else?

[cross talk]

Unidentified speaker: To be fair, the PhDs are on Saturday and the undergrads are on Sunday so it's really two days.

Curry: Undergraduate commencement.

McFarland: If you'll trust us to get it right… Michael has asked to call the question. Is there any objection to Michael's suggestion to call the question? Then by unanimous consent, we're ready to vote. All those in favor?

Unidentified speaker: I have 20 in favor.

McFarland: Opposed? I see none. Abstentions? Okay. Great.

III. DISCUSSION ON CARNEGIE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION – KEVIN MCFARLAND

McFarland: The last thing I would like to cover before handing things over to MJ is at least the start of a discussion – and we'll pick this up again; we're not exactly sure what we want to do about this, but it is an issue of consequence for the institution and it involves the faculty handbook.

President Feldman suggested we seek the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification – this is a classification that is available to universities who satisfy certain standards for engagement with their community.

One of the criteria that is taken seriously involves faculty promotion criteria that reflect the value – sorry, that reflects the value the institution places on engagement with the community. We believe there are at least 2 fairly non-controversial places we could address that in the teaching and service criteria for promotion.

The suggestion is that we would add an expansion to the handbook to reflect these, and we have some suggested language. The other thing we noted is that the criteria also talk about acknowledgement of community-based methods and scholarship and we suspect that one is going to be a little more thorny. At the moment, we have some language for discussion but we're not writing down language we think is ready to be considered for the handbook.

So language we would propose to put in the handbook about this, here's the key section – it's the promotion to tenure section of the handbook, because all other promotions refer to the criteria for promotion to tenure. The first sentence there says 'The principle factors considered to teaching scholarly are artistic work and service to the department, school and university' – and we propose to simply add 'community' to that.

With regard to teaching, by the way the writing in this section is one of my least favorite parts of the faculty handbook – it is painful, I must say. I tried not to do any harm by cutting anything out. It says 'The first threshold that must be crossed on the path to tenure is excellence in teaching. Each school seeks its own approach to the difficult task of evaluating teaching with the one proviso that the evaluation be formal rather than anecdotal.'

We propose to add 'Teaching that takes place outside the university or the classroom in the community will be considered, again, with the proviso that it be formally evaluated'. Again, it keeps consistency with what's there, but explicitly acknowledges a community component in teaching.

Then it has this sentence at the end that I will not read but I guess we all know this; it sounds a little preachy to me, but okay.

Then the handbook continues on the subject of service – service is the third issue of consideration… I can't even read this, its terrible prose, so I'm not going to read it. What I will say is that at the end we added 'Service to the community related to a faculty member's academic discipline should be positively weighed at promotion time just as service within the university would be.'   In other words, you don't have to do it, but if you do, it should be positively weighed at tenure evaluation time.

So, with that, maybe we'll open for discussion of the teaching and service language and any concerns, and we have a second section with how one might approach scholarship, and we'll get to that after this discussion. Any comments?

Rubin: could you try not to use the word 'positively' in the teaching section as a qualifier?

McFarland: Yeah, that was nothing conscious about that. If you think that belongs elsewhere –

Rubin: I think so.

McFarland: Okay. That's a good comment. We will try to add some sense that the faculty member should not be penalized for not teaching outside the university.   Yes?

Green: (Jason Green) from School of Medicine and Dentistry. Thank you. I'm so excited to see this; I chaired the bridges committee for community-engaged learning and we have been pushing for the classification application for about a year and a half now, so to see President Feldman suggest this is amazing.

McFarland: Yes, the president deserves all the credit to bringing the solution to the forefront.

Green: And he wrote the application the first time around.

McFarland: Yes. And that wasn't successful –

Green: But this time!

McFarland: Yes. Thank you.   Yes?

Scott: Michael Scott, Computer Science. As we work on improving the language here, one thing I think might be worth considering is how to avoid any ambiguity by what we mean by 'community'. For example, that word gets used by various scholarly communities and I would not want anyone in the parallel and distributed computing community to be confused with the intent here.

[voice in background]

Stone: I've got a similar question. I think my colleagues would be happy – Randy Stone, Political Science – would be happy with the idea that being program chair for an academic conference, which is service to the academic community, should be evaluated as positive in tenure case, but I think they

would be very skeptical of the idea that my Sunday school teaching should be evaluated as a positive in my – whether it's good or bad.

Curry: It's not what you do as a volunteer but how you take your academic expertise and scholarship into the community. For example, I'm in the School of Education so this might be more parallel to what might happen in the medical sense, so my concerns come more around research but I don't think it's there's a risk here that our activities as private citizens like teaching Sunday school or whatever are going to be counted in here.

I think it's really more related to the increasingly translational mission and the idea that there's merit in bringing our academic expertise and knowledge often derived from our research into the community in different ways. I think – maybe Teresa, you can help clarify this because I'm not as familiar with what they're looking for, but am I correct that they're really talking about the community as the geographical, physical community we live in, not our academic, intellectual communities?

Unidentified speaker: The point is well taken in that it might need to be defined because two people went there, so yes community-based participatory research or community-engaged intervention, but yes the idea of taking your work or your scholarship and engaging the community in that process is the intent. And community meaning City of Rochester, Monroe County…

Curry: Some colleagues are doing research with community members, so that would be an example, and I know there's a lot of work that comes out of the medical center that's not just bringing services but engaging them in other ways.

O'Neil Davis: Colleen O'Neil Davis, Emergency Medicine. In the Emergency Department, pediatric emergency, surgery and trauma reach out and do injury prevention of all kinds in the community and we have cited it and used it in letters for our faculty to be promoted throughout the time. You know it's bike helmets, drunk driving around proms, fire safety, safe water temperatures, using Narcan, and I'm very happy to see it because you often felt like you were trying to push a rock uphill and these are very worthwhile efforts I think.

Unidentified speaker: Rob ( ), ECS. I think it's great; why is the use restricted to the geographic community? Why is driving around in a bus preferred over producing videos or - ?

Curry: That was me off the cuff trying to distinguish between two comments. At Warner, our professional service is positively evaluated for promotion and tenure. If I coordinate a conference to handle all the proposal reviews that gets counted – it doesn't get counted as much as research or teaching, but it does get noted.   That kind of professional community, I think, is not what the Carnegie is looking for.

I think they're talking about – we might think of the real world community; it doesn't necessary have to be a physical

interaction, right? Some of this ER training could happen through other kinds of media. That's a good point.

Unidentified speaker: Maybe we could clarify it as an economic community?

Curry: I think that's a powerful suggestion. Anybody else?

Unidentified speaker: I was going to ask – there is no one from the prison project here, which is far beyond the local right now and many of us are involved in that. It's just not work that's weighted –

Curry: Please don't overdo the reactions to the comment I made. That is one possibly way but many of us are studying real-world situations. It's complicated.

Rubin: I think teaching and service are pretty uncontroversial; we do already weigh them to some extent.

Lerner: Amy Lerner, Biomedical Engineering. I was just going to comment on what you just said, which was in Warner, we do it this way – once again, it's one of those cases where the faculty handbook is useful and it's one of the documents, but in fact, a lot of these decisions are made a lot more locally so –

Curry: That's a good question. I think this is the first step.

Lerner: I think there's quite a bit of discrepancy around what these 3 things mean among departments and that is – you know, it is not governed by this body. Although I do think this handbook can be seen as –

Curry: And if this is recognized in the handbook, it makes it easier for changes to happen at the unit level. Kevin looked at the website for Carnegie; I haven't had time to look at it, so I don't know what the whole process it – I imagine it's somewhat complicated. Teresa, can you speak more about that?

Unidentified speaker: Yeah, one of the sticking points for us in getting Carnegie classification is the unification and centralization of community engagement across the institution and we're not good at that, speaking to your point. So how do we find some centralization? We're asking for that as well. How do we have a foothold in some body that covers all of the institution? This is a great first step in that.

The committee I referred to is starting to have those conversations between Arts Sciences & Engineering, Warner, the medical center, and so on, but that's a small group of 10.

Curry: Can you say again what the name of that committee is?

Unidentified speaker: Bridges.

Curry: Okay. Is that an acronym?

Unidentified speaker: It's 'Bridges to Engage the Community'. It's really about service learning that involves the community. It's recognition for community engagement that's a brainchild of that ( ).

Curry: Okay. Ann?

Nofziger: Ann Nofziger, Med Center. I was just going to say that one of the requests that has come and the Mary Jo White report recommended that it be implemented in 106 is some illustrative examples. I think that here that might also be helpful for the local units.

Bernstein: Zach Bernstein, Eastman. I wonder about the proviso of formal evaluations. It seems like there are many examples of community teaching that would be hard to have formal evaluation – maybe that could be clarified.

Curry: This came out of discussions that Kevin and I had also in the scholarship piece, which we're going to get to next, which is that you could envision a slippery slope where somebody said 'I went to 2 community meetings and talked about my research'. Is that what we mean by this? I think it might be useful to see if we can benchmark what other institutions that already have this classification, how they handle this.

I think if you don't have anything in here – there has to be some way – they may not need course evaluations but you could imagine a number of assessment mechanisms that would at least document that something that happened, what kind of response it got. It's not going to necessarily be testing.

Anything else, or should we go on to the next one which does talk about scholarship? Okay, as Joanie said, I think this is the less controversial piece – at Warner, we've certainly grappled with some of this in terms of the growth of our non-tenure track faculty and what they do and how they're evaluated.

This is service… okay, scholarship. Do we need to talk about service? This is fairly similar. I was surprised to see that service to the academic community is not recognized in the handbook because certainly at Warner, that's talked about a lot in terms of as you become better known in your field, you're rewarded for engaging in your field and all that kind of stuff. I thought this was interesting.

Scott: I think that service to the academic community should be explicitly mentioned.

Curry: That's what I was thinking- maybe this is a moment to think about while we're adding things here. I think it would be codifying something that's probably pretty standard across disciplines. Okay, let's go on and talk about scholarship.

Our faculty handbook doesn't have anything about community-engaged scholarship in terms of – well, at all. Kevin found – he looked in a number of handbooks and he found this from Syracuse. We've added this in the bold at the

bottom. 'Supports faculty who choose to participate in publically-engaged scholarship. It may involve partnerships with the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship research, creative activity, public knowledge, teaching and learning, prepare citizens, strengthen democratic values'…etcetera. This activity counts as scholarship that may be considered in promotion decisions rather than as service or teaching, only when its tangible products make a contribution to knowledge in specific disciplines.

Such scholarship is to be evaluated with the same rigor as all other scholarship. That final line there is in the original Syracuse handbook but we're proposing that we articulate that there has to be some format, some way of accessing the scholarship. In the handbook it talks about not only publications but arts performances and other forms of art, so it doesn't mean it has to be a print publication to count as scholarship.

If you think about, how do you know when someone has created new knowledge? You general know that by evaluating it according to established criteria and metrics, so if we want to call something scholarship, we feel like it needs to be accessible in similar formats that you would access it for other non-community engaged scholarship. Joanie?

Rubin: It's ironic that you pulled it from the Syracuse handbook because this issue divided the faculty in a bitter struggle. Nancy (Kantor), the provost, tried to – made this push and it drove her out, ultimately.

Curry: She made the push to include this?

Rubin: Yes. She was all about community-engaged scholarship and the faulty went wild. I see lots of problems with this and I hope it won't divide us in the same bitter way, but first of all, peer – I'm speaking for the humanities, and peer review is essential and it's also not enough. You could design a museum exhibit which might be peer reviewed by other museum exhibit designers but wouldn't really be peer reviewed in the same way a monograph is reviewed. It would be appropriately reviewed, but it isn't the same thing as writing a book.

The same rigor as all other scholarship? There are different forms of scholarship and they're all evaluated differently.

Curry: That's the point; is this so vague that it allows each discipline to decide the type of evaluation? I have no idea how you evaluate an art exhibition or something like that, but presumably my colleagues and Art and Art History do. We don't tell different disciplines how to evaluate themselves, right? So I think that's what they're trying to achieve with this final line here in the Syracuse handbook – that this isn't to establish new criteria to evaluate the scholarship; it's talking about what is the format of the scholarship.

Rubin: It's what counts as scholarship. Another part is what you said – are you creating new knowledge?

The idea here is a tangible product – that you don't just say I had a conversation with a group of teachers and I wrote a paper about it. If it's community based it still needs to be evaluated. For example, my colleague Joanne Larson co-authored a book about work in the city that got published by Rutledge. It's co-authored with citizens but it's published by an academic publisher.

Rubin: That's a case of something that would count.

Curry: Exactly.

Rubin: But a museum exhibit is a good example, a classic example of that gray area.

Curry: But isn't that already handled by the university in terms of faculty who work in those areas?

Rubin: No, a historian – I'm talking about a historical exhibit. For us, a book is the gold standard. If you design a museum exhibit, that's good but it's not the same.

Curry: So if you design a museum exhibit and you wrote the catalog for that exhibit, does that count as scholarship?

Rubin: It's not quite the same thing. It counts as scholarship but it's not the same thing. For us, writing a textbook – but I'm taking a very antiquated position, I want to make that clear.

Curry: I think it's important to take the most traditional position and then think about how we articulate it so it encompasses what we think of as scholarship but doesn't exclude things we don't think of. Teresa?

Unidentified speaker: (audio issue) if that art exhibit is community engaged or not is not the issue; I would make a friendly suggestion to stick with the same words because it's already confusing. If we're going to say 'community engaged scholarship' and not 'publicly engaged scholarship'… as we move forward.

Lerner: Again, I'll speak to the point but as you said, locally the departments would make decisions, experts in that field would make decisions. If there are local rules, they should also be written down because some of the junior faculty don't know what the rules are and they're not written down but suddenly they're being applied in ways that aren't clear.

I think if we're moving in this direction, then I'm not sure the handbook – again, needs to be that detailed; the challenge becomes deeper in.

Curry: I think you're absolutely right. I thought there was a movement a few years ago that all units had articulated tenure and promotion criteria and then now recently, there's a move to get all units to articulate promotion to full criteria. I know that at Warner we didn't have it, but now we have it and the UCTP is going to be asking all units to articulate.

Rubin: I don't know if that's true. I tried to gather governance documents for our unit and they don't seem to exist but when I did receive a few things from departments, sometimes they were specifically related to tenure and promotion and what counts for tenure and promotion at the local level. But not every department had them.

Curry: My understanding was that the tenure and promotion material operate at the college or unit level, not the department level. That's probably something we should continue to work on. Ann and then Tom…

Nofziger: I just have one line from Nancy Ayers. From the end of that one sentence could we add 'fields', so it says 'specific disciplines and fields'?

Curry: Okay. Tom?

Unidentified speaker: I'm trying to think about how we would put this into practice and how we would give advice to junior faculty about how they spend their time their first 6 years. So teaching is evaluated in my department usually by department members who have access to that, and scholarship is evaluated by outside letters. You send the stuff out to them and they evaluate it on what's there.

Unless the community-engaged scholarship has a tangible product that you can send to the outside reviewer, it seems to introduce a local element to the evaluation of the research part.

Curry: I think that's one reason we wanted to make sure that a tangible product is included in this, because – this is something at Warner where we have 40 percent of our faculty as non-tenure track and they are full-time, they're contracted, they're eligible for promotion. When we review promotion cases for non-tenure track faculty at Warner, we're looking at what we call clinical scholarship but it's not – they write articles, they're writing book chapters, but what they're writing about is their community-engaged scholarship.

Unidentified speaker: This covers both promotion to tenure and promotion to non-tenure track?

Curry: Listen, this is the first foray into this; this is cut from Syracuse's handbook so if we want, this is something that – all I'm saying is this is not final; this is for discussion.

Unidentified speaker: We've got outside letters for promotions to non-tenure track positions, yes?

Curry: Yes. We do send out their work. I mean, when I saw this my reaction was very similar to Joanie's, particularly because I am very concerned about the growth of non-tenure track faculty in our unit and at the university, that if we are going to increasingly have non-tenure track faculty I don't think we should just assume they're not going to be doing any kind of research.

I think we should be thinking more expansively about what research is, how knowledge is introduced, with whom and in

what formats. At the same time, trying to balance that out with having some kind of rigor and some kind of evaluation criteria that can be applied across cases. What we're doing here is initiating this conversation - this whole topic came up pretty recently from Rich – I've never heard of this but people at the university have been thinking about it, so I think the question is really how can we, can we and hopefully we can find some common ground here where we can have some language that will feel that it's rigorous enough and clear enough to say what kinds of products, but not limited to – it would have to have some kind of bounds, right? Randy?

Stone: Randy Stone. This seems from the narrow perspective of political science, it seems harmless because from our perspective it's completely negated by the last sentence. There's no way there could be something that fulfills the first part that's not negated by the last part just because of the terms of our discipline.

But it might be really useful in other parts of the university so it makes sense to me to try to go ahead and do this, but I don't think it's going to cause any harm in academic disciplines like mine where it just isn't going to be relevant. It's not that we don't do things that are community engaged but none of them are in peer-reviewed journals so they just wouldn't count.

Curry: It's hard to know where it would do harm but – Joanie?

Rubin: It's the phrase about partnerships with public and private sectors, that's the key phrase. You've got to have that partnership as opposed to strengthening democratic values and solving social problems in your work – you've got to have that part.

Curry: You could be aiming to do some of these things in your academic work as some of us are without being engaged with community members per se.

Rubin: Right.

[cross talk]

Randy, I would say that you do produce work that fits that first part up to a certain point. You are addressing critical social problems in political science.

Stone: Well, sure.

Rubin: But it's the partnership thing, right, that's kind of a sticking point.

Stone: The point is that nothing that we produce that isn't in a peer-reviewed journal or major university press is going to count for tenure. So the things we do because we're trying to publicly engage are irrelevant.

Curry: Let's also remember the handbook does not apply to non-tenure track faculty members and in fact, the whole grievance policy we just revised specifically expands to cover

a grievance policy for non-tenure track faculty, which I have to say is a huge victory that we haven't really celebrated.

I think we need to recognize that although we may bemoan in more traditional disciplines the growth of non-tenure track faculty that we also need to be thinking carefully about how to protect and recognize them. Ann?

Nofziger: I'm going to read a comment from Nancy Ayers, who says, is the community engaged scholarship definition one that we could review? Currently it defines community engagement as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities – local, regional, state, national, global – for the mutually beneficial exchange of resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity.

Curry: That's good. Somebody else have a hand up? Chunkit?

Chunkit: I feel like at the medical school we are already doing this for evaluation for tenure. Correct me if I'm wrong. I feel like they look at community engagement, also national prominence and international prominence based on the work you're doing in the community, but ( ) really following the handbook right now.

Curry: Right. I don't think there's much controversy, if any, if we think about this in terms of teaching and service. The issue is, you know, what counts as scholarship in a community-engaged context. Maybe that's something that needs to be devolved to the department or unit level but I think that's also risky.

Unidentified speaker: Dan ( ), ( ) Science. So I can't think of an example of something that would count under this and not count currently. It seems like it still has to be evaluated in terms of some kind of peer review within your discipline.

Curry: Certainly in education, as in many fields, there's obviously hierarchies of journals, but it's maybe more analogous to medicine where we have really research journals and then more practitioner-applied journals and then more kind of gray literature, newsletter-y kinds of things. And certainly that mid-tier and below is not evaluated as highly – because those pieces are practice-based rather than pure research-based. (Dinah), do you have an opinion?

Unidentified speaker: It has been maintained that ( ) based scholarship wasn't scholarship, so one had to make a case for that work to be counted as scholarship. In some disciplines, it may happen but in quite a few it was not. We've had some who have really had to fight for their work, this community-engaged research to be really considered at a level where those who were doing classic experimental designs for example, would be not questioned.

Curry: In my 18 years in academia, I would say that has been a big shift in the broad field of vetting, including education – moving from a very quantitative experimental design orientation to much more open and including who you're

working with. I think it is complicated. And maybe that the fields like education and medicine who are already working in this area have already solved this problem, but I don't think it's definitive. Teresa?

Unidentified speaker: Even in medicine, the latest version of the handbook for promotion at the medical center has intentionally added community engagement throughout, but that was only in the latest revision, which was 2 years ago, and those that are working on building those partnerships and building those relationships before scholarship were not recognized for the work and time that goes into that relationship building.

Unidentified speaker: I would echo that; calling this out is important but it's also really important to call out the fact that it does take more work to do a lot of these things. I've been involved in community engagement in the college for the last few years and one of the things – I'm glad to see this, because for many tenure-track faculty in the college, they don't want to bother with this. We don't generally have the infrastructure in place to handle this; we're working on that but we have a ways to go. But maybe the Carnegie classification would motivate that. Right now, it would be nice to call it out so people would be more motivated, but if we say 'may count' –

Curry: I think these are really good points and one of the reasons – getting back to Tom's question about what would you advise junior faculty, certainly in education, people – I wrote a book on getting published that's a practice book based on research but I published that after tenure. That's not something I would have written before tenure. There may still be strategic pieces of advice you want to give junior faculty like 'If you spend all your time doing community-engaged research at the University of Rochester and get products published out of it, those still may not considered to be high quality enough to get you tenure.' That's the kind of local decision that would need to be made in each context.

Unidentified speaker: Each discipline is a global discipline and so when you send this stuff out, it doesn't matter necessarily what University of Rochester policy is on recognizing on this. If you're relying on outside vetters, then you have to know that your discipline generally does that, not just –

Curry: Okay, let's take one more.

Unidentified speaker: If we're going to do this, I've reviewed tenure and when I did, I got a detailed list of 'This is what tenure is at our college and you do it this way' – they're pretty explicit sometimes.

Curry: Absolutely. At Warner, we have to (fight) this within the university because the ad hoc committees for tenure at the university don't recognize, for example, most of us are hired to run teacher education programs. I mean, I've had 40 advisees as a graduate – 40 graduate student advisors and I've been interviewing applicants 4 times a year and managing student teaching placements – all of that while getting tenured.

That's recognized within Warner, but it's not necessarily recognized within the university, so that's a rhetorical task for whoever is managing the case.

If we have language in the handbook that can be used as evidence to say that this is actually a value that's shared in the university.

Okay, we're not anywhere near any kind of vote; this is really a first conversation, so thank you all very much for your input. If you have ongoing thoughts, I'm sure Teresa will want to talk to you about this. It will be really useful to have those.

So, we have some reports from committees. You want to come up here, Adrian? Adrian is co-chair of the benefits committee.

IV. REPORT FROM THE BENEFITS COMMITTEE – ADRIAN (BONHAM)

(Bonham): I'm Adrian (Bonham) and I'm from the medical center. My co-chair is Jeremy Jameson; he's from the River Campus – there's one of us from either side of the river. One of the projects the benefits committee has been working on for the past couple of years is to try to initiate a benefits survey – a comprehensive benefits survey to let us know where we are in relation to other institutions.

We haven't done one in 10 years; it's been a very, very long time. And as you can imagine, benefits have changed a lot since then and where we are in comparison with other institutions, we really have no idea.

I did just look at some data that was sent to me recently that shows how much we spend per dollar of salary and I don't know if you're aware of those numbers, but in comparison with almost every other institution I saw, we are dramatically below – like 27 percent as opposed to 33 percent, which seems to be the average, and 33 percent with those we would consider competitive schools or regionally applicable schools like Syracuse and RIT and things like that.

Clearly there are some questions in how we're doing and I just wanted to give you a bit of an update on where we are with that survey. It's been something Eldred has been pushing for a while – we've been working on it for a few years, actually before I started on the committee. This year, last August, we met with President Seligman and he actually agreed to this comprehensive benefits survey that we wanted to do.

Just to give you an idea what that entails, we actually have to send out an RFP to different vendors. They had identified 3 vendors they thought might be able to do this and we had one – I have reports from the one that was done about 10 years ago; it's really pretty comprehensive; they look at a lot of stuff.

The 3 vendors we were going to send them an RFP, give them an idea of what we wanted and then pick our vendor. What

we had agreed to with Dr. Seligman is that from the very creation of this survey we would be involved – the benefits committee would be involved. The problem is, if we don't have good data, it's hard to make comparisons and one of the really hard parts of making comparisons with the University of Rochester and almost every other institution we would consider comparable institutions is that we actually own our medical and we are one institution financially. We have to offer the same benefits to everyone at the medical center, so we're talking about thousands and thousands of people who work in the service industry at the university hospital.

The benefits from the people who are sweeping the floors to the president have to be the same, whereas other institutions don't. Harvard doesn't own its hospital; it has affiliations. It can give different benefits.

One of the places where this is really evident is in our tuition benefits because if you were to give tens of thousands of people where everybody gets free tuition at the school or half tuition or some things that some of the smaller, private colleges offer, we couldn't financially sustain that.

One of the problems in making comparisons with other institutions is we have to have enough of them that are comparable to us. One of the things we've run into when we try to compare our own benefits with other institutions is we're told that – that we can't compare our benefits to anybody else it's not applicable; they don't own their own hospital.

So one of the things about this survey was to pick 5 or 6 and there aren't that many in the country. There are really very few where the institution owns their own medical center. The other thing we wanted to do is design the questions from the very beginning to make sure we got the right data, and we'd let them know what we were looking for so we didn't have to delve into a notebook this thick to find what we were looking for.

The last survey gave us a kind of a scale like a dial, with a half-empty to full thing on your gas tank but there was no subdivision – we couldn't see if we were really great with the 5 or 6 schools we were compared to. So we were saying that when we design this we have to let them know that sub-analysis that we wanted them to do, and have that information available to us from the onset.

Dr. Seligman agreed that this was something we needed to do and then lots of stuff happened with the EERC case and the administration got busy doing other things and this was never commissioned. We waited 6 or 7 months and asked 'Where are we with this? We haven't seen an RFP, we haven't heard anything….'

What we were told at that time was in the meantime, sort of unbeknownst to the president – whoever it was at that time – and the CFO, the benefits people had agreed to participate in a study by a different entity, WTW, who was actually qualified to be one of those vendors. It's not like it's a slipshod place;

this is actually a legitimate vendor and they're doing the survey, but the problem is we don't know why.

We don't know who commissioned it, the benefits committee and Holly Crawford also did not know who commissioned it – nobody who was at the meeting knew who commissioned the survey. It's much less expensive at least 10 to 100 times – it's only costing us $4,000 to participate in this survey and it looks at a lot of things.

It doesn't fit with what we originally intended in that it we don't get to pick the comparison schools or start with the design in the beginning. There's been a little bit of 'What do we do now?' We've started down this path, we agreed to be in the survey, and it may give survey fatigue to other schools to say 'We know you just agreed to be in this other survey but we also want you to fill out a different survey of our own'.

When you do those kinds of commission surveys, you don't fill out a bubble sheet. What they do is they – you give them access to your HR; if you and I were to go into the HR thing, we could look up all the details – if you worked here for this many years and worked this many hours, you get this much tuition benefit and so on. You can look all that stuff up, so most of the stuff when these are commissioned, they basically go to the Internet and look at the information that's available, so it's not really a survey fatigue.

But, we are also – the timeline to design a survey like this is going to take a great deal of time. The other survey that we're in will be done some time in the fall, so the argument that was presented to us was 'Why don't we wait until that survey comes out and see if the data is useful for us or not?' Will it give us what we want, or do we really need to commission this survey?

That's where we are right now. To give you an idea of some of the schools that are included in it, the original one – Eldred, you can correct me if I'm wrong; there were something like 100 schools in the original on – at least more than 50 schools. There are 23 that have committed to doing them – there are some schools that I would think would be comparable: Boston University, Duke, Emory, George Washington University, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Miami, MIT, Northwestern, Notre Dame, NYU, Princeton, Rice, Tufts, us, USC, University of Chicago, U Penn, Yale – those have committed to it or are close to committing.

The likely ones that might be in it next year that might be in the survey next year are: Georgetown, Washington University in St. Louis, Vanderbilt, Tulane, Syracuse and Stanford, and then the ones who had declined were Brown, CMU and Dartmouth, and they're still pursuing Case Western and Cal Tech.   Of that list, the only one I believe owns their medical center is Emory so we have a very small number to compare ourselves to, basically.

The other problem is figuring out the financial structure of these schools is a little beyond my bandwidth right now; the vendor would have taken care of that for us and given us the

information on comparable schools, so that's something we can look into.

The things they agreed to look into, to give you a list of what the survey, the WTW survey will include right now is:

- General information about the university
- Disability and pension information
- 403(b) information
- Life insurance and AD&D, including referrals for optional coverage
- Vacation, holiday and other leave
- Sick leave
- Short-term and long-term disability
- Active medical and retiree medical
- Vision and dental
- Employee and dependent tuition
- Lifestyle benefits including family and personal life benefits
- Adoption, childcare, elder care
- Work environment benefits like flex time, job sharing, on-site fitness center, etcetera
- Financial planning benefits like pre-paid legal, auto and homeowners insurance and those sorts of things
- How these are funded, whether it is voluntary or full benefits

And they would also separate it out into staff benefits and faculty benefits which I think would be interesting because maybe we can extrapolate a little on what they give to their staff as opposed to faculty; we would have to match – that would have to be the common denominator.

That's what we're looking at right now; we're in a position where we don't think the data is exactly what we're looking for. It might be a little okay, we can try to make this work, but not really what the agreed upon or the spirit of a comprehensive benefits survey is. We're just going to take what was part of another survey we agreed to participate in and make it work.

But it'll be ready in a few months and it will give us information. We don't really know right now whether it's good information or not; looking at the list, it looks good but we don't know about the depth of it and the questions they're going to ask.

The next step is for Jeremy, my co-chair, and I to go meet with Michelle Hill, who is the one who's been interacting with this company and try and get an idea of exactly what questions they are asking. They said we could actually go deeper if we wanted to afterwards, if there was more information that we wanted – I'm not really sure how they would do that unless they went back to all 23 schools and said 'Oh, University of Rochester has a question; what do you do for this, this and this?'

I'm not really sure – that's one of the questions I want to ask; how do we go about getting more information? Is it something we have to specifically ask? Are they going to be

able to give us comparison groups? Are they going to be able to break it out into the sub-analyses we wanted or is it just going to be 'These are the kinds of benefits other people have, and this is what you have'? Is there going to be data we can use? The answer is we don't know.

We're going to try tomorrow to figure out what is going on. I know Dr. Feldman had said why don't we see – the initial thing was why don't we see what the survey gives us and then we'll see if we need to commission a survey; I think right now we've left it at 'Why don't you go meet with Michelle Hill and see if you can see some glaring deficiencies now? If it becomes clear this just isn't going to work, we don't have to wait another 6 months to find out it's not going to work and then another year to get the survey results. We can start designing a survey at the same time, maybe complementary pieces of information, but…' That's where we stand right now. Any questions?

Unidentified speaker: Two questions. Great work that you guys are doing. What is the ultimate goal of the survey? When you have the survey, when you have the data, what are you going to do with it and what kind of authority do you have to implement changes?

Unidentified speaker: Great questions. It is one that actually is – it's one that struggle with a little bit too because I have to say that 2 big benefit changes in the past few years went through without the benefits committee or the senate being aware of it – the vote on the Paid Family Leave Act and the vote on the tuition benefits.

And I think there were actually more; I think – things I find like a 32 hour a week (ultra sonographer) who is paid hourly went on maternity leave and nobody in our department realized she was ( ); she has no disability benefits because she's part time and she's hourly, and she thought she would. She's 32 hours a week and she's been there a long time.

And the person who does my benefits was like, when did this change? I wrote to the HR person at the med center and they asked me and I said 'I don't know'. Nobody really knows when that happened so these things slide under the radar. That's one of the things.

Some things have changed many times; since the last one we had free tuition, then we didn't have free tuition, and it's changed a great deal. But what we want to do with this, basically, is go to the administration and say 'This is what we need to do to be competitive'. Some of the things I think are really our assessment – and I'd like your opinion too.

I'm in the medical center so I'm more familiar with the medical side; I understand the health benefits really well because that's what I work with on a daily basis and I would say our health benefits are pretty good. There are some things we would like to tweak, things we've identified – there are some discriminatory things I've run across, and some other things which I call 'high optic' things. IVF coverage, for example. IVF coverage is $6,500 and I think tubes in ears are

that much when you talk about the cost of the OR and things like that – it's not that expensive but it's a high visibility thing because not that many places offer it. If you think about the population who uses that, that's frequently women who have gone into professions and now they're older and full professors and want to have children. That would be a benefit that whether they wanted to use that or not, the option that that's available looks very good. Those are high optic things that we've pointed out.

One of the things that we are really looking at a lot are the tuition benefits; I think that would be – I have my own problems with the tuition benefits, having had a child who could have gotten in here. Then, I have a son with ADD and he will never get into the University of Rochester. We want to look at those tuition benefits, very much so, to see if there's any creative ways we can come up with that aren't going to be financially devastating to the university.

Unidentified speaker: Are you collecting information about maternity and maternity leave and how is that tying into what Amy is doing with the commission?

[crosstalk]

Unidentified speaker: I think in a general sense the goal of gathering all this data similar to what Kevin was giving us with the compensation data or what the provost will be giving us with the salary data is without data, we can't try to push for any improvements. We know that our retirement contributions are low, for example. Eldred, did you want to make a final comment?

Chimowitz: I did. ( ) for a $4,000 survey, you're going to get exactly what you asked for - $4,000 worth of data. I think we need to get the other survey going; there's only one school that's comparable and that doesn't make sense. Then we get a commissioned report and that's going to take several months, the new president comes, and the first thing he's going to say is (audio issue). ( ) all schools and ( ) in the meantime.

The one thing about the 3 main legs of the benefit tripod – time, tuition and medical – the one that sells or that's really sensitive is the tuition benefit. The others should be a given. ().

[crosstalk]

Curry: I think with 20 minutes left of our meeting, we don't need to hear every step of our strategy. I think Adrian explained it really well. And that's why we invited Adrian and Jeremy to come and talk to everybody. Thank you very much.

V.   REPORT FROM IT POLICY COMMITTEE – ANDREW WHITE

Curry: We're now going to have Andrew White presenting on behalf of the IT Policy Committee.

White: Ron and I are basically charged with taking the recommendations from the working group, which was chaired by Harry Groenveldt, from the EEOC complaint about the searches of faculty emails and we're taking those recommendations to the IT Policy Committee.

We've met twice and we have a brief update on it. To make sure everybody's aware, the IT Policy Committee is sort of an umbrella committee made up of all the leaders in the university who work in compliance and IUT. It's chaired by the provost.

The key – what we've been focusing on one of the recommendations from the working group and the Mary Jo White report is about searches of faculty email. The working group report covered many other areas but we've focused in on what we think is the most important immediate concern.

To begin with, we wanted to get a benchmark of what are the other existing policies and practices and why would emails be searched and under what circumstances. We met and discussed the recommendations and then had another meeting where the IT gave us a summary of what are the circumstances of searching faculty emails. Broadly speaking, they're things to do with cybersecurity or user help incidents – and then the other category is things that originate in the Office of Legal Counsel.

These are things like preserving evidence or doing forensic reviews in response to a subpoena. Do we have the document, MJ? Ron, you sent it to Kevin. We have a PDF document with the list of categories – we have a document that was approved for release to the faculty senate that gives specific numbers per year of what these searches compose of.

Unidentified speaker: There are 70,000 email accounts and last year there were approximately 1.4 percent – 1.4 emails per 1,000 were subject to a subpoena. They're very infrequent.

Curry: You're talking about all email, not just faculty email.

White: IT doesn't have a breakdown of just faculty; it's been given to us for faculty, students and staff. Rather than try to – I can give you a brief summary but the document has the categories, the numbers and a brief justification. What we're interested in is there are many searches that are part of the day-to-day operation of the mail clients – things like making sure patient data wasn't shared or if there could be potential litigation, the need to preserve evidence.

Basically what we focused on is that most of these go through the Office of Legal Counsel and we're interested in the dissemination of them and not so much legal counsel accessing them. That's our strategy – to focus on the dissemination of them and why they would ever be shared outside of the Office of Legal Counsel.

We didn't want to put up a summary here of all of the categories. We have a PDF of that; is there a way to distribute it?

Curry: We have a Faculty Senate website but it's public.

We can share it with the Senate Executive Committee, I guess. And we can take any questions.

[voice in background]

Unidentified speaker: We wanted to have the data to begin the conversation and to understand what the major processes were. There's a big difference between the values and culture of respect we're attempting to inculcate and then the nitty-gritty of the rubber hitting the road. This is a very fine process that's going to take some time to work out, but it's underway. I must say that we're really encouraged by how this is proceeding.

Curry: The document you're referring to, is this a confidential document? Is that why you only want to send it to the executive committee?

Unidentified speaker: Well, it was circulated among the committee and people can make comments –

Curry: That's the listing? Have you been told that information should not be shared - ? I'm just wondering if there's a reason to restrict the distribution to the senate executive committee.

Unidentified speaker: No, I don't think there's a reason to restrict it only to the executive committee; I didn't know we could put it in the minutes –

Curry: The minutes you have to use an ID to get to, so that could be attached. Any faculty member who is eligible – it's about 2,500 people and I can guarantee you 2,500 people don't log on and read the senate minutes, but that's where they could get them. It doesn't have to be on the public senate website; it could be as an attachment to the minutes, so if you want to resend it.

Unidentified speaker: Yeah. I think people would find it very encouraging; we have a highly professional organization. We have an annual certification by all employees about the privacy policies at the university. They have to either read any updates or sign certifications before they conduct a search. Then the results of the research are forwarded to the Office of General Counsel. It's a highly structured procedure.

Curry: Forgive my cynicism, but I don't think there's any doubt about their ability to collect the information. The question has to do with how does it get distributed from the Office of Counsel?

Chunkit: The common theme is why they started searching?

White: I mean, if you look in the document there are different categories for why a search would go, but I would say broadly there are things to do with cybersecurity – like somebody's account has been compromised and it's sending out spam locally; another category is user help, where somebody requests help.
The other category is one that we have in the document which is like the Office of Counsel is wanting to preserve something or Public Safety is conducting an investigation of a crime or if someone is missing and they urgently need access to an email box.

Chunkit: Does the owner of the email account know about the searches?

Unidentified speaker: That depends. It depends on –

Chunkit: The reason I ask is because when we draw up these policies people want to understand why this is performed, what categories there are and we need to be careful with that.

Unidentified speaker: It's not necessarily a decision that can be made because many of these are legally initiated, court of law subpoenas that only people who are called would know about it.

Chunkit: Correct. Those are not ones we can change but I'm sure – I want to make sure we look through all these searches carefully and find ways that people –

Unidentified speaker: A lot of these actions really aren't searches in the case of people reading; they can be categorical, machine-based searches. They can also be a snapshot of a machine and then put it in a secure place to hold it for review of the Office of Counsel.

Curry: So it's really different than the events that triggered the faculty's interest in –

Unidentified speaker: I believe so, exactly. Of all the searches that have occurred – there are about 1.4 per 1,000 of all email accounts, there was only 1 very rare event. The problem is the way it was (illustrated) is aligned to faculty. It's not like this was an intentionally offense act –it was intended to be helpful and pursue a goal.

Curry: I think that's a matter of interpretation.

Unidentified speaker: Yes. Well, that's my reading of it.

Curry: Okay. LaRon?

Nelson: I know the focus is on how these are distributed, but I could've sworn when the previous incident occurred, that Joel said they'd never had an instance where they searched student emails.

Unidentified speaker: I don't think that would be accurate based on my review; I don't think that's correct.

Curry: It's not just employees who have email addresses – does this include students?

[cross talk]

Okay, we're going to have to wrap this up. Thank you. So we'll get that document and have it attached with the minutes. I think Kevin covered the Policy 106 committee. Amy, do you want to add anything to that?

We don't have that much time left, but our final chunk of time, which is now about 9 minutes, is designated as unrecorded session, which means we stop recording. I will take notes and basically it's open for conversation on topics of interest to anyone in the senate.

End of Recorded Session.

Respectfully submitted,

{name}
Secretary, Faculty Senate