

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Feb. 7, 2013

---

*In attendance:*

*Paul Abegg (PA)*

*Robert Carlson (RCa)*

*Ani Comeford (AC)*

*Rob Cowan (RCo)*

*Ross Decker (RD)*

*John Goldhardt (JG)*

*Jerry Harris (JH; secretary)*

*Lish Harris (LH)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Scott Lindsey (SL)*

*Erin O'Brien (EO)*

*Del Parson (DP)*

*Russ Ross (RR)*

*Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)*

AC: I think we have a quorum, so we'll get started. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? (LH moves, SL seconds.) Discussion? (None; approval passed with one abstention). OK, I don't want to take more time from Pam Montrallo (PM). I've asked her to talk about the faculty salary schedule. We've had some questions about it, especially from SL's group. Pam is open to questions about this, but I thought it would be useful for all of us to have a general idea about how it works to pass to our constituencies, so everyone knows it's a transparent process.

PM: Yes, some people think that I pull numbers out of the air, but I don't. I've been here since 1996; when I got here, the maximum amount that full-time faculty could make was \$36,000—I was paying my nanny more than that 10 years earlier! I try and maintain some integrity in our schedule. I think we're able to do that. Five to six years ago, the Faculty Senate took it on themselves to revise the schedule, which made my life much easier, and brought our wages up to be comparable to those of other institutions. Here's how we do it each year: we pay by discipline and by rank. We use the national [College and University Professional Association for Human Resources \(CUPA\)](#) survey—it's a report they put out annually. I have access to the raw data for that. CUPA has many institutions participate in the survey, and I use the faculty survey for four-year institutions. Previously, I used the one for community colleges. The data come out at the end of February, and I can sort it any way I need to. I meet with the deans and the Academic Vice-President, and explore diff ways to extract the info. I have a tendency to choose the median salary numbers that come out the highest. Each year, I look at 4-5 different ways to sort the data using different criteria. The Board of Regents wants us to do it by budget—that is, compare us to other institutions that have similar operating budgets. I think ours is too low for our kind of institution and enrollment, so I don't think that's fair. But ours would fit in the \$30-70 million category—those median salary numbers come out lower. The Board of Regents has also set up a peer-institution system, and I can't use that because there aren't enough institutions like ours in-state to provide data. From the CUPA survey, I pull out information on salaries for other four-year institutions offering BAs that are public institutions, and look at all institutions reported in the survey. The metric we've used for 3-4 years, because it has the highest figures, is the one for other schools that have enrollments between 4500-10,000 students. That consistently, across all disciplines, has the higher median salaries vs. budgets versus the ones from other four-year institutions, etc. So I try to get the *best* numbers possible, not the *lowest* possible. I pull out the information and, in the disciplines, go down to the classification of instructional programs (CIP) data, and use those. I talk to the deans and the Academic Vice-President about choosing these—I tell them "Here's the faculty in your division; let me know if these numbers look good." I'm not the final decision maker on this. Some faculty have come to me and asked how they get classified; some want to be switched, but that can result in less pay. Any time, though, anyone can come see their CIP code. For the enrollment data I use, 267 institutions report on the survey in our category. Not all institutions report all data categories, though. Sometimes, only a few institutions, or only a few faculty members, are comparable—when that happens, I'll look at other surveys, such as for all public institutions, to get good comparative data. This takes many months to do. I put all these data into a spreadsheet so I can then look at it in different ways, then go back and make recommendations to the President & Academic Vice-President. I also compare it to the data from previous years; if a new number drops significantly, I can use a different number, but I've never seen it drop more than a few hundred dollars. Then I put our faculty into the spreadsheet, along with their current salaries and month-long term assignments (9 months, 12 months, etc.), plug in the number for the median salary, and then see if it's at 100%, 95%, 90%, or less of equity. That way I can see how much money I need in order to get that person up to 90%. When we started this back in (I think) 2006, we were aiming to

have everyone at 95%, but when we got less money from the legislature, we went to 92% and then to 90%. Some faculty are at 98%, or even over 100%, but we don't want anyone *under* 90%. For the current year, the majority of faculty are at 93% and above. I run those figures to see what it's going to cost to get everyone to 90%, and tell the President "This is the amount of funding I need—give me these amounts to get everyone to 100%, to 95%, etc." We now have in the faculty schedule that if someone is rewarded a rank advancement, it's a 2-year process to get them up to equity. They get an automatic 10% increase (on July 1 of the year they get the rank increase), but we don't reanalyze where they are in terms of equity until the next year. The 10% from the first year itself often brings them up to equity.

EO: I went through this, and I had the 10% and the equity thing—was that because I was significantly below equity?

PM: Yes; that doesn't happen often, but does occasionally. One of those increases might have been the year we all got 1%, across-the-board salary increases. Then we had the equity and rank promotion.

MS: If you get the 10%, but it doesn't bring you to 90%, then *next* year that will happen?

PM: Yes. Usually, when I look at anyone getting rank advancement, they're pretty close to the proper level. But there can be huge differences between disciplines. In some cases, the Associate median salary is lower than the Assistant, and in those cases, I don't use the lower number—I don't want things like that affecting our faculty. How long I can keep doing that, I don't know—right now we have over 170 faculty members.

RD: When you make those comparisons, do you do them with or without benefits factored in?

PM: Without. There are some surveys that we have to report on, or that the Board of Regents reports on, and if we added our benefits to compensation, and compared that to the numbers for other institution in the CUPA survey, we would be higher—over 100%. I do get information about figures with our benefits added—it's our retirement that puts us over. Utah is the only state with a really high amount (14.2%) for that; most states are at 10% or less. I don't want to get locked into making comparisons based on that as our benefits erode over time.

RD: What happened to the annual contracts we are supposed to sign?

PM: Those are up to Scott—we haven't seen those in a while. Initially, they were supposed to be out in July, then that was pushed to August; last year, I didn't get them until November, so I didn't even send them out. And those don't include overload pay—they are just for base salaries. So we've missed 2 years of contracts. Everyone thinks they come from me because Scott puts my name on them. Anyway, I only look at base salaries—nothing from added assignments, overloads, etc. But I compare on the 9-month, or whatever appropriate month, schedules. I am part of administration, but I try to advocate for both faculty and staff on this issue—I want people to be as highly paid as possible. I will usually bring two recommendations to administration, and so far, they have been funding at least the rank and equity to 90%. Our policy doesn't state that they have to do that if the legislature doesn't give the required funding, but they've been good about doing it. Ultimately, it's up to the legislature. Over the past 2 years, the amount of money that went to RTP (with benefits included—we have to add to that to cover FICA taxes, etc.), I think the amount has been about \$150,000. Three years ago, it was well over \$200,000. Staff was getting nothing, but last year, staff and faculty both got equal amounts. For the next couple of years, we won't have huge numbers of people up for rank advancements, so I can use the extra money to bring others up to 90%. Sometimes, when we get money from the legislature, they mandate what we can do with it (cost of living increases, etc.), and it cannot be applied to equity issues.

DH: Will staff get more this year?

PM: That depends on the legislature—I have no clue. I don't foresee a lot of new funding coming this year. I think they will cover a couple-percent increase for faculty and staff; we won't know until mid-March. We have separate funds for new positions—those salaries don't come from the existing pool for faculty salaries, so I don't know if we'll have any new faculty this year, either.

MS: I know you have over 170 faculty members to deal with, but can you send us each a note telling us "Here's where you are"?

PM: In the past, I did that, but in the last couple years, my workload has gone up so much that I haven't been able to. But I will try and do that for people getting an increase. I can't publish the data I have, or give it out, but anyone can come in and ask about it. I usually know by mid-end of April what funding I'll get and how it'll be allocated.

DH: If you're not here, or busy with your other things...

PM: I always do this part.

DH: Is it something other Human Resources people can look up for us?

PM: Definitely. But I should be around for this April.

SL: In our group, there was some question as to why this information wasn't more readily available. Can you release aggregate salary data from the CUPA survey results?

PM: I can't give out survey information because one would still be able to identify individual data from the aggregate data, and that's confidential—when institutions submit their salary information, they do so contingent on it remaining confidential. So people can see data for their own areas, but not *all* the data.

SL: Well, what if I wanted to see everything in a particular CIP code, or for schools of a particular size?

PM: Some of that is on [CUPA's web site](#), but it's generalized, not the specifics or the raw data. Their numbers tend to be lower than mine because I'm making much more specific comparisons than they do in their general report. But even if the data were out there, it's not necessarily the data we're using by combining different parts together. So I don't know how helpful it would be.

RCa: Is there a specific policy on how you combine things?

PM: There isn't; I've had two people in the past ask to be put under a different CIP category, but doing so would have lowered their salaries. But I'm happy to look at any combination. I still do this all manually, so it results in the highest number.

RCa: There's no attempt to link pay to statements of job duties, etc.?

PM: No, but we might be able to do that in the future because we can use Banner to see where workload is and in what disciplines. Right now, it's up to the administrative assistants, so we don't have a true picture of it. I'll be able to pull things out per semester to match up to discipline. If I thought someone was under the category "finance," but find out that they're teaching lots of classes in some other discipline, I can look at how appropriate the category I have them in is. But I won't put anyone into something lower. I give my information to the Academic Vice-President, who passes it to the deans, and they make the decisions—it's not solely up to me.

AC: Are there any other questions? Thank you so much for coming here to explain this.

PM: Oh, one more thing: I mentioned to you (AC) that I was looking into these four new committees and their eligibilities, and I have a few questions I need answers to before I can get back to you on that. The big one is the Post-tenure Review (PTR) Committee—we have to define who's up for rank advancement and therefore can't be on the committee. I have a spreadsheet showing when everyone got their last rank advancements and can use that to determine who's up for a review. I look to see when they were last reviewed for rank or tenure, and give that information to Don in order of longest time since a person's last review—those names come to the top. For post-tenure review, we look at how many people (on a 5-year cycle)—that produced an average of 12 people/year up for review. So I broke it down by those 12 in order of longest time since each one's last review. Once he reviews that list, and selects who will be reviewed, we will know who can and cannot be on the PTR Committee. It won't be just a "pick out names" committee. But the RTP committee might have to be elected first. One more thing I'm pushing for: in the past, our committee assignments, for *all* college committees, was done by all the vice-presidents together in a group before July 1. In the past few years, I still never get that information until September! I'm hoping that this year, we can have it done by July 1 and have input from faculty. Hopefully Sheila will send an e-mail out soon asking about preferences you may have.

AC: We will do our part to get ours populated. Thanks so much for your presentation! (PM leaves.)

EO: I searched on the CUPA web site and [found their report very readily](#). They also have a [table with median salaries](#) of broad categories.

SL: Do they divide it by CIP code?

RCa: I don't think it's down to that level of specificity.

EO: The reports are only down to two-digit code, but PM said she went down to a 4-digit code.

AC: It's great to know that she's advocating for the higher salaries, especially because the 90% level isn't in the policy—I had thought it was. OK, I want to skip down our itinerary to the self-evaluation form approval—a few people sent me votes on it, but not enough for a quorum. I'd like to ratify it—is there a motion to approve it?

MS: I don't know what this is...?

AC: I did send it out...

SL: I received it.

AC: OK, I'll send it one more time, but we need a vote to get it through.

SL: I had one piece of feedback on it: one person said they'd like it more formalized, so i all faculty will submit similar documents.

PA: It will be valuable to give people another day to see the proposed guidelines.

AC: OK, so we'll table the vote on that, but we need to get it through Academic Council, where it's been sitting for 6 months or so.

PA: How about giving us until Monday...?

AC: OK. Only let me know if you *don't* approve it...? (OK.) RR, could you talk to us about the election-survey system?

RR: I've been looking at survey systems and installed an open-source system for us to use. This would makes it easy to send out votes of any kind, and can anonymize them. It basically generates an e-mail to send a specified list of people; that e-mail contains a personalized link with a token in it to make elections anonymous but guarantee that people only vote once. It can do other surveys, too, but I've only been using it to test elections. I did one with the Elections Subcommittee, and will do another test with this body to see if there are any problems before we implement it. I scraped the faculty contact data from the on-line directory, which has, like, 800 names.

RCa: Can you specify just particular groups?

RR: We can if it's in a spreadsheet I am building—we can sort in there and then copy and paste the necessary list into the program.

AC: When Pam gets her list of people of who has which rank, etc., that will help.

RR: It shouldn't change too much from year to year, so hopefully maintenance won't be a big deal.

AC: PM got information back to us very quickly. So with this, we hope to put out surveys as soon as we have information on who will be eligible for each of these faculty committees that need to be populated, as well as for the new Faculty Senate president. By the end of March, hopefully everyone will know this information. So that way, the vice-presidents will be able to account for that information those assignments when deciding who to put on *other* committees, so no one is overloaded.

EO: My only issue with using Pam's data is that we recently asked her for similar information for use in a grant proposal, and some of her data were not correct—it may require a self-check annually.

RR: Yes; maintaining our own database will hopefully do that to some extent.

AC: Whoever is in charge of the Election Committee should be in charge of doing that. Please give your faculty a heads-up about this, and let them know that if they get e-mails from this system, it makes voting very easy and they should participate, not delete the e-mail. We'll announce the results at the last meeting of the semester, which will be a lunch. So by the end of March, everyone should know where they are on any of these. The PTR Committee is partly done, the RTP Committee needs replacements, and the two appeals committees—we're in charge of dealing with those. OK, a committee update: we found out yesterday that the Registrar's office has put forth a motion to require all faculty to report mid-term grades for *every* freshman-level class. Previously, it was only necessary for those individual students with grades of C- or below, but now the motion is for *all* freshman-level classes, with the suggestion to have them to submit mid-term grades for *all* students. The athletics people are concerned that they have athletes doing poorly, but they are unaware of it.

MS: They can come ask the professors of their athlete's classes...!

AC: Well, I'm just presenting this.

SL: Isn't this what Starfish is for?

RCa: It's just another retention tool.

PA: At some point, we need to address the Study Abroad program that David is doing—it doesn't match up with our semester system, so it's up to individual teachers to decide what to do with students in the program.

RCa: That's not a curriculum issue...

PA: Students leave at the end of March for the summer program in Germany. I have students going, and they leave in the middle of our semester!

AC: On the University of Bremen's end, they have worked out a system in which they can complete their work there. But they shouldn't be doing Spring semester in both places.

RCo: There are some academic calendars that go on 3-month blocks with one month off in between.

AC: I know they have issues with the Fall & Spring semester students, and they have something in place to have them finish early on their end.

PA: It's on our end, our students enrolled here for Spring, but leave before April.

SL: What's up with the professionally qualified faculty policy?

AC: It's in the hands of someone, and there's a movement to get someone working full time on policies. Once that person is on board, this is what we'll take up. We've spent hours talking to Martha about it, but we need this addressed as soon as possible.

SL: The way it is now, it's not assigned to anyone...? We don't know who, or when it will be released for review...?

AC: It's still an unfinished draft, nothing that is ready for review. When the new policy person is in place, we'll say "Here it is, and here's the parts we want addressed."

SL: What happened to the Policy Subcommittee?

AC: It never happened—for a while, we kept hearing that it was still being worked on, and then I heard that no one is working on it.

RCa: But a policy person has been identified, and has been asked to take the job. We're very comfortable with this person.