

SUMMARY NOTES OF FAC MEETING ON MARCH 19, 2013

- 1. The Notes from the FAC meeting on March 12 were approved as revised.**
- 2. FAC has received a joint response from the President and the Provost to the FAC memo on EVMS. FAC will seek permission to post the letter on our website.**
- 3. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to the draft Report of the Merit Review Committee (MRC) appointed by the Dean. The co-chairs and other members of the committee attended. Some of the issues discussed or raised included:**
 - a. MRS noted the diversity of practices among departments on annual merit reviews.**
 - b. MRC recommends a sharp distinction be made among three drivers of annual pay raises: merit scores (\$\$), merit-related inequities (\$\$), and cost of living (% of base pay).**
 - c. MRC recommends the standardization of the mean score undertaken by the Dean be done in a manner that preserves the distribution (spread) of the raw merit scores.**
 - d. MRC recommends that departments take full account of faculty contributions to interdisciplinary programs and activities in merit evaluations.**
 - e. FAC members posed several questions and offered suggestions, most notably: that MCR seek a buy-in from chairs, directors, and especially untenured faculty; the procedure for standardizing merit scores and for converting them into merit raises be explained fully, preferably with illustrative examples; the mismatch in the timing of faculty productivity and the size of salary pool is well-captured by the long-term oriented equity adjustment proposal but the special cases of smaller departments may need to be accounted for; incorporating interdisciplinary contributions may call for guidelines from the Dean; and inequity based on non-merit grounds (market-driven compression, gender and race related, etc.) may need to be acknowledged in the Report.**
- 4. Candidates for open slots on the Committee on Nominations and Elections: FAC decided to ask its members to find the 8 nominees needed before the end of the semester, making sure that people are willing to run; Area I (2 candidates for one position), Area II (4 candidates for two positions), and Area III (2 candidates for one position). FAC will also distribute a survey asking faculty to volunteer to serve on appointed committees. Finally, FAC underscored the need to establish a searchable database of committee assignments.**
- 5. Members of FAC were asked to submit their comments on the preliminary draft of the draft Report of the Committee on Athletics Policy which will be taken up on March 26.**

Respectfully submitted,

Berhanu