

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Assembly**  
**16 October 2018**  
**Room 1020 Hazel Hall**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of 17 September minutes
- III. General Statements
  - a. Words of Encouragement - Dr. Heidi Anderson
  - b. News from across the Bay - Dr. E.W. Chapin
  - c. Committee on Chairs - Dr. Eric May
  - d. Maryland Charities - Alissa Carr & Keith Davidson
  - e. Report on Pay Equity - Dr. L. Marsh
  - f. Other?
- IV. **Old Business**
  - A. Other
- V. **New Business**
  - A. Resolution on removal of Prescription Benefits (wording below)
  - B. Other
- VI. **Announcements**
- VII. **Adjournment**

+++++

**Resolution**

The UMES Faculty Assembly regrets the decision by the state of Maryland to remove the prescription benefits already vested in its retired employees. We encourage the USM to find a way of returning these benefits, at least for its vested employees.

We understand that the state is saving money by passing these costs on to the federal tax payers and to the retirees themselves in their purchase of supplemental prescription plans.

We also understand that it is normal for the state to change benefit rules of new employees when fiscal situations change.

Nevertheless, removing a benefit in which employees and retirees were already vested does not lead to great confidence that the state will honor its other previously-made commitments to those already vested, whether active or retired employees.

The current situation will make it more challenging to hire new faculty and staff in an atmosphere of lack of confidence about the reliability of benefits offered and will surely lead many active employees to delay retirements as long as possible.

We particularly deplore the lack of communication to staff and faculty bodies of the possibility of this change during the entire four-year period that the legislature was devising and modifying this plan. It would be much better to be in a situation in which we could rely on those in authority in Adelphi and on the campuses to communicate potential challenges to the faculty and other groups at the state level and on campus, even in cases that the matter was of financial benefit to the campus and the system at cost to the faculty and staff.

+++++

#### **Progress Faculty Salary Workgroup Report-**

Date: May 24, 2018

The workgroup met twice to discuss the Hanover report. Following is a list of the comments related to the 2 charges.

#### **A. Make recommendations related to this study**

1. Need a copy of the Excel data supplement used for the report.
2. Need to confirm how the data was computed in the UMES working budget. Is it 9-month salary that is used or is summer salary added to this for the report? There was concern that summer salaries would inflate faculty salary. The salary figures do not seem to reflect the UMES working budget 2016-2016. The document does not reflect UMES campus faculty salaries; e.g. Fig1.4 and Fig 1.5.
3. Are the salaries of administrators with interim appointments and/ other administrators with faculty rank reflected in this report?

4. Besides enrollment and proximity (pg. 20), what other criteria were used to determine peer group? Need cited source of documents.
5. The validity or applicability of the data to existing UMES programs is not true e.g. Fig1.4 and Fig 1.5.
6. Many of the charts seem not to be taken directly from UMES data; Fig 1-11 and Fig 1-12 are among the few data figures where UMES is reflected.

**B. Make any other recommendations-Not discussed**

Will look at other resources related to faculty salary issues and break up tasks into smaller groups for fall meeting.