

Northwestern University
Minutes of the University Senate Meeting
of
June 3, 2010

The University Senate held its third meeting of the 2009–10 year on June 3 in the Pancoe Auditorium on the Evanston campus, with an audio/video connection to Wieboldt 421 on the Chicago Campus. The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM by General Faculty Committee Chair Stephen F. Eisenman.

1. The minutes of the January 28 meeting were approved as received.
2. President Morton Schapiro noted that on May 3, the date originally scheduled for the present meeting, he was in Qatar for a meeting of the six presidents of the Education City universities in Doha.
3. By way of introducing the next agenda item, Eisenman announced that at its most recent meeting the General Faculty Committee approved a resolution in support of the principle that Northwestern pay its employees a living wage. On behalf of the Northwestern Living Wage Campaign, a student organization, students Matthew Fischler and Hayley Altabef presented an illustrated statement of their position. They argued that 90% of workers on campus do not receive a living wage. The Living Wage Campaign has adopted the Heartland Alliance's Self-Sufficiency Standard for a definition of basic needs. These include health care, food, transportation, and child care. Currently on campus, they said, only one out of ten workers can afford these basic needs. The Federal poverty level is calculated by the price of food multiplied by three. While this was effective in 1960 when Americans spent about a third of their money on food, current American budgets do not allocate 33% of their funds on food. The average family in Cook County currently spends about 12% of its money on food. Applied to Cook County, the Federal poverty level calculation therefore accounts for only about 36% of what a family actually needs to survive. The Federal poverty level also fails to take into account the regional specificity of Chicago, which bears especially on housing and child care costs, which are higher here than in more rural areas of the U.S. Depending on family size, most campus workers are making less than the Federal poverty level, which is 36% below actual needs. The original poverty calculation is based on a food plan that was developed by the Department of Agriculture in 1968. It has been indexed to the Consumer Price Index for inflation over time, but it does not reflect all the costs of living. Peer institutions like Harvard, Emory, Stanford, Georgetown, and Yale have implemented living wage standards for their own employees. Georgetown University's Just Employment Policy may be applicable to Northwestern. Among other provisions, it calls upon contract employers to pay living wages. Northwestern's Living Wage Campaign is engaged in conversations that will set a wage standard that meets the basic needs of employees working at Northwestern.

President Schapiro responded that Northwestern employs 6000 staff members, all of whom earn more than the living wage determined by the student campaign. There are an additional 600 who are subcontracted through Aramark and Sodexo, many of whom do not receive a living wage. Fewer than one out of ten of the total who work at Northwestern — not nine out of ten as claimed — fall short of a living wage. Fischler replied that his campaign had focused on subcontracted employees. Schapiro asked that the campaign put a clearer context on its claim, and say that 90% of Northwestern's *subcontracted* employees do not receive a living wage. Eisenman asked how many employees fall in that category. Schapiro repeated that the number is about 600 working at Northwestern for Sodexo and Aramark. Provost Linzer added that only 10% of that number are receiving less than a living wage. Of the 6000 who work directly for Northwestern, said Schapiro, a very small number are on probationary pay for a limited period, but all make more than the minimum \$27,500 living wage. Eisenman remarked that the

GFC had only expressed its support of the principle that all employees should be receiving a living wage. The margin between a substandard wage and a living wage would be relatively short. If the underpaid employees represent a small percentage of the 600 subcontracted workers, it would be no great matter to correct. Schapiro responded that it is not a small percentage. Vice President Eugene Sunshine added that the shortfall for those subcontracted workers is not a small dollar amount. A third contract employer, LDR, is also involved in the group of companies who supply campus workers. Schapiro emphasized that notwithstanding his disagreements about facts, he appreciates the efforts of the Northwestern Living Wage Campaign. He added that Northwestern is one of the few institutions that laid off no one in the Great Recession, while many that pay every worker a living wage laid off many employees. Carol Simpson Stern asked if the GFC is endorsing the Living Wage movement with a false understanding of the numbers involved. Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi replied that the GFC was aware they were discussing only the subcontracted workers. Eisenman added that their vote was on the principle. They were agnostic on the specifics regarding the numbers who are underpaid and the minimum dollar amount. No one of the GFC did research on the specifics; they voted on the principle.

4. Andrew Koppelman, Chair of the GFC Childcare Subcommittee, presented a report on the progress of campus childcare. This matter topped the list of faculty concerns in a survey taken some years back. A majority thought that childcare was somewhat important; more than a third thought it very important. With the forthcoming vacating of the Roycemore School near campus, the subcommittee wished to inquire whether its premises might be available for use as a childcare facility. The building turns out to be in poor condition and there are other grounds of uncertainty. The Administration reports that Facilities Management is continuing to review the physical condition of the space. To put it in condition suited to use for childcare would be more expensive than razing it and putting up a new building. This option is impossible because the existing structure is landmarked. The Childcare Subcommittee feels it should be a participant in the ongoing review of this matter. Provost Linzer remarked that the Administration has had no discussion of the subject and made no decision because it does not have an analysis of the building's condition. Koppelman reported that other childcare options are being explored, but there is no serious possibility at present that a childcare program is being developed. This remains a matter of great importance to the faculty, and whenever it is reviewed there should be a member of the Senate at the table. Cristina Traina asked what the calendar is for evaluating the Roycemore option and other childcare options. Is there a plan to report by a fixed date? Provost Linzer replied that the primary concern is not a budget matter or a renovation plan; zoning does not allow a childcare facility at that site or at any other east of Sheridan Road. Nor does zoning allow it at any University site west of Sheridan Road except the parking lot behind the Hilton Garden Inn, which most would not consider on-site childcare. It is therefore difficult to imagine where to have on-site childcare within the City's zoning rules. As we go forward, we want to know if the currently available options should be developed or whether we should work with the City to develop an on-site location that they would approve and the University could provide. A first-year member of the faculty asked if it is too difficult to create an on-campus childcare site, would it be possible to create a subsidy enabling parents to send their children to local daycare facilities? Eugene Sunshine replied that Human Resources staff would like to discuss various subsidies which have been funded. These are keyed in most instances to the applicant's income and can be applied to a number of facilities in Evanston and Chicago, and even in outside communities where individuals might live and want to place their child.

5. Eisenman then reviewed the status of the Senate-approved governance documents and the planned transition to the new governance regime. This year marks the transition from the regime of the General Faculty Committee. The new governance system to be devised with the cooperation and support of President Schapiro and Provost Linzer will replace the present Senate with an Assembly of about the same size and a smaller Senate with representatives from every department on the campus and from the

non-tenure track faculty. Being a larger body than the GFC, the new Senate will be more representative and directly elected by the individual departments. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees were presented with the outlines of the new governing system at their meeting in early May. The next stage entails a similar presentation to the full Board of Trustees at their meeting next week. Subject to their vote of approval, the plan will go into effect.

Paul Arntson prefaced his remarks about the transition by noting that Daniel Garrison has served as Secretary of the Senate for over ten years. He thanked Dan for keeping the Senate minutes during this period of time. The mechanics of transition to shared governance will begin with a letter to department chairs explaining procedures early in the fall to elect a representative to the new Senate from their department. The representative should be elected by secret ballot. Each school or college of the University will be asked to elect one non-tenure track member of the faculty to serve on the new Senate. The number of non-tenure track is not thereby limited to six, as the departments are free to elect non-tenured members as their representative. It is intended that the Senate so constituted will be in place by the end of December, so that the new Senate will be able to convene in January 2011 and the present GFC will be completely dissolved. This being the plan, a motion is needed to extend the current GFC until that date. The current GFC Chair, Stephen Eisenman, will be the chair of the new Faculty Senate until it elects its own chair. GFC members from the several schools will assist the chairs of their respective departments with election procedures if so needed. The first meeting of the Faculty Assembly will take place some time in the winter quarter of 2011.

As attendance at the downtown extension of the meeting now stood at three, it was agreed to ratify the procedures just explained by a sense of the meeting vote. In response to a query by Charles Thompson, it was determined by a show of hands that eleven members of the GFC were present on both campuses at today's meeting.

6. Eisenman introduced the subject of faculty and staff salary issues by remarking that the GFC had spent considerable time on this matter. The straitened economic situation of recent years had made it more difficult for the salary pool to increase to the degree that faculty and staff would prefer. In a series of meetings between the GFC Budget Committee and the Central Administration, the budgetary process was laid out before the Committee, which sought to learn the degree to which the endowment and other incomes permit or prevent allocations sufficient to increase salary pools. Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi, chair of the GFC budget subcommittee, explained that his committee met with Vice President Eugene Sunshine. The previous July, the GFC Executive Committee had met with President Schapiro, Provost Dan Linzer, and others in the Administration. They agreed that the GFC would meet with administrators responsible for the budget. At the resultant meeting the Committee received valuable information about how the budget process works but did not reach the point where they could offer useful input. The Committee is hopeful that such meetings will develop into something more substantive. One specific subject Mussa-Ivaldi was asked to discuss is the bearing of faculty salaries on morale and institutional competitiveness. How receptive is the Administration to the suggestion of a 1% across-the-board increase in the salary line? This amounts to about .14% of the endowment. The GFC has not taken a position on whether this increment should be requested.

Carol Simpson Stern asked what salary pool has been apportioned in the budget for the next academic year. In past years, she remarked, the range of salaries by school and much additional budget information was made available. But more recently, information of this kind has been very scarce. Provost Linzer responded that there is a salary pool each year that Northwestern has continued to provide, which many state universities and private institutions have been unable to provide. The actual amount each school at Northwestern has been able to distribute depends both upon the centrally appropriated salary pool and amounts provided by endowed chairs and other sources each school can devote to salaries. Salary is also set differently by Northwestern's professional schools. The envelope calculation does not take into account that the endowment consists of thousands of separate accounts, many of which

are financial aid endowments that cannot be used for faculty salaries. Other accounts are for library support or for purchase of materials. Such endowments are not fungible and cannot be moved from one account to another. The small amount of money available for allocation is subject to various priorities, among them increase in financial aid for students. Meetings with the GFC Budget Committee help to illuminate the choices of funding allocation.

Eisenman commented that while the GFC appreciates being informed about aggregate numbers and basic breakdowns in funding, it has not felt itself sufficiently involved or knowledgeable about decisions that have been made to take a position regarding those Administrative decisions. He hopes that the new Senate Budget Subcommittee will be involved not just with macro organization of funding but with decisions in greater detail. It is understood that such involvement requires an investment of time, but in order to maintain a communication between Faculty and Administration about limiting faculty salaries in the way the Central Administration has stated, they would need to be a party to the discussions. There is no institutional impediment to the necessary transparency, and there seems to be support in the Administration for progress in the necessary direction.

Stern asked what is a reasonable expectation for what the staff is told about increases to their base pay for the next fiscal year. Linzer replied that the Administration does not announce a general figure. Each individual on the staff, he said, is evaluated based on performance and receives a merit-based increase. There was an occasion in the past, Stern recalled, when the College announced a freeze on salaries. The statement was later repudiated; but it is not the case that we have lived as a university with meaningful faculty governance. We have not seen any kind of figures giving us an idea whether our staff are receiving some pool of money set aside by Central Administration to be divided up in different ways by different schools. Linzer replied that he does not recall that such an announcement has ever been made to the University. An absence of any information, said Stern, is surely not a desirable situation. Linzer said that there is a salary pool that is the duty of deans, department chairs, and others to distribute. Eisenman commented that a minimum transparency requires that the faculty know what the pool is. Linzer replied that such information is complicated, not an easy number. Eisenman explained that WCAS would have one amount, the Feinberg School of Medicine another, and so on. Linzer responded that the University cannot simply give out a number. Another variable, he said, is the number of people coming up for promotion and tenure, because promotions entail significant one-time salary increases. Eisenman replied that the aggregate of the pool for each school would necessarily be a known number. Linzer said rather that the amount depends upon each school's ability to bring its own funds into the salary budget. But each dean must know, and the total amount is eventually known. Stern added that we have drifted from the situation when faculty knew what they would be paid by about April 15 of each academic year to a situation where they are told at some much later time. Linzer replied he was never aware of a salary being set by April 15. However, different schools have a process by which they must plan their FY '11 budget, and that process is not yet complete. The central distributions for budget information went out to the schools over the last two weeks. Stern asked how the Board of Trustees is able to act in two days on anything to do with Living Wage or any similar question if the University is in a situation of such uncertainty. Eisenman explained that this is an ongoing discussion rather than an immediate decision. Stern added that the Senate has so little information given to it that it is hard to know how it can function. Eisenman asked the Provost whether the new Senate can expect to receive information about the aggregate salary pools in the several colleges. Linzer replied that this is a potential development, and might be discussed at the school level. Eisenman remarked that it has not happened at WCAS; if the aggregate salary pool is known there, then it would be known to the Provost.

Laurie Zoloth observed that the GFC has been asking less about specific numbers than about a change in climate. One of the things that builds collegiality is the sense that the University is a social location. The budget can be seen as a moral as well as economic fact. The Faculty role in governance is strengthened when it understands an Administration position whose transparency is displayed in some way. We get information from *The Chicago Reader* about how much we will make; we get it from *The*

Chronicle of Higher Education. In a public university, everybody's salary from president on down is published and may be seen in the library. What we ask for is something along those lines. The more transparency and moral accountability there is, the more cohesiveness the faculty can feel. Bob Decker, a former GFC chair, remarked that we had that kind of information as recently as ten years ago. That information disappeared as school governance changed. The University was not coming apart because we had such information. More transparency is needed today, he said. As GFC chair, he saw the budgets of the schools and the University. Most of us would be bored with the budget, but some are interested and should be able to see. It is not rocket science.

7. Eisenman introduced the next agenda item by reporting that the matter he had heard the most about in his email this year has been E-Verify. People expressed their concern about how it worked and voiced lengthy objections to its moral, political, and economic ramifications. To this point, over 10,000 staff have enrolled. One reason for the objections has been that Northwestern at an early point adopted a system of compliance that went beyond what other universities had, electing to have all its employees sign in to the system. Law requires it only of Federal contractors whose performance is 120 days and attains a value of \$120,000. It does not apply, for example, to people in the humanities who receive an aid grant. The number of faculty and staff who would be required by law to run through E-Verify would be relatively small. A number of people who expressed their concern felt that the number required by Northwestern to sign up was greater than necessary. The political and moral objections have to do with the possible use of enrollment to screen out people who are undocumented workers. The sense of a Big Brother role and its association with Homeland Security ran against the grain of many citizens. The GFC discussed this problem with the Central Administration. At that time some history of the project was supplied. Illinois law provides that no one may be dismissed on the basis of the E-Verify system unless there has been a positive finding of non-compliance. Pam Beemer, Associate Vice President of Human Resources, provided an update. The total number of people identified as needing to go through the E-Verify process, she reported, is 16, 233. As of June 2, Human Resources had completed 15,570 registrations for a compliance rate of 96%. The office is hopeful of completing the remaining 650-odd still outstanding. Many of those are temporary employees. The difficulty of determining eligibility for the requirement led to the decision to interpret the requirement broadly. Enrollment in E-Verify is a simple process and sometimes uncovers related problems that have been easily remedied. Some individuals have chosen not to go through the process; these were advised that their application at a later date would be welcome. Eleven have left their employment rather than submit to the E-Verify process. None of these were faculty.

8. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel H. Garrison
Secretary to the University Senate