

**IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES**

**VOLUME XXV, MEMO 1**

**August 29, 2005  
Faculty Senate Conference Room  
Red Hill Building  
4:00 pm**

**I. PRELIMINARIES**

- A. Attendance: Allen, Beard, Bowen, Christensen (Chair), Cleary, Crews (via teleconference), DeJesus, Delehanty, Devaud, Devine, Frank, Hill, Kantabutra, Klein, Lohse, Masserini, McCurry, McLaughlin, Newsome, Norton, Oliphant (via teleconference), Ottaway, Reynolds, Rodnick, Semenza, Sieber and Vik  
*ex officio*: Francis (Curriculum Council), Krehbiel, and Wharton  
Graduate Assistant: David Robinson  
Guests: Kent Tingey, Ken Prolo, Barbara Adamcik, David Miller, Richard Wabrek, Habib Sadid, Eryn Lowe, Leonard Hitchcock, and Dan Boyd
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes of
1. May 2, 2005  
**ACTION**: Moved by Bowen and seconded by Devaud to approve the Minutes of May 2, 2005. Moved by Semenza and seconded by Bowen to table approval of the minutes. Section IV. E. "The (workload) policy was passed by Faculty Senators via email" was not recollected by some senators. **Motion tabled.**

**II. Open Forum – Dr. Wharton, Dr. Tingey, Ken Prolo, Dr. Adamcik, and David Miller – Administrative raises.**

Christensen stated that Dr. Wharton had requested that some administrators join the senate in an open discussion regarding administrative raises.

Ken Prolo, Vice President of Finances, gave a history of salary equity for faculty, administrators and classified employees. In 1999 the legislature funded \$1 million to address faculty salary equity, however it was a \$2 million issue. In 2000, adjustments were made with \$200,000 funded by the legislature. There were then two years of no salary adjustments; only promotion increases. In 2005, 1.3% increase for faculty equity was given while a 2.2% was given to executives and administrators. David Miller, Director of Human Resources, presents survey data to Dr. Bowen each year regarding non-classified staff salaries. Prolo noted, "Dr. Bowen was concerned that the rates have dropped so far behind so quickly that he wanted to rectify administrative salaries to bring everybody to at least 85% of CUPA". However, many administrators' salaries are now far greater than 85% of CUPA. Faculty surveys show that on average, faculty salaries are at 90% of CUPA rates.

The following are questions and issues raised by faculty with the administrator's responses:

Why were these raises not discussed in the open?

- Prolo stated that Dr. Bowen has discussed this many times in President's staff and Deans' Council meetings. He also stated that Dr. Bowen discussed it at the general faculty meeting – no faculty in the room remembers him discussing this issue.

How can university monies be used for increases?

- Prolo stated that the money came from university reserves, which are ongoing, and the increases are maintainable, therefore they can be used for increases.

The faculty were told “this is all the money available” then suddenly the administration finds \$350,000 for increases.

- Prolo stated that there are university dollars every year. For the past seven years there has been a higher budget for salaries. “We are not going to run out of money”, he stated. Prolo remembered that since May, Dr. Bowen has discussed salary increases.
- The Deans have data on faculty who are below 85% of CUPA averages, which is due to Dr. Bowen next Tuesday. Prolo stated, “We can fund \$400,000, it is a matter of how the Deans approach it”. Dr. Bowen believed giving the administrative raises first was the right decision, now he will move forward for the faculty.

Faculty were definitely told there was no money. A faculty senate committee (Budget Oversight and Priorities Committee) was formed last year to find any money for faculty salary increases. The books regarding the funds where the \$350,000 came from were not available to the committee. Reserve money was not an option. There was a suggestion for better dialogue between deans and faculty. DeJesus and Norton were a part of the committee that attempted to find money for faculty increases, they both stated there was budgetary information that was not available to that committee; the budget should be more transparent.

When is the administration going to stop new programs and new buildings for one year until faculty get what they deserve? Every year it is said that faculty salaries are #1 yet they are not given raises. The issues have not changed for 25 years. What can the faculty do to make this issue a real priority?

- Prolo stated that bonds fund construction; there is no revenue through the state.

Staff, faculty and administrators are all working harder; administrators are not being begrudged their raises, however, when is it the faculty's turn? This issue was not conveyed properly; discussions between deans and administrators are not being shared with the rank and file faculty.

This process looks dishonest, faculty are lied to, they feel betrayed, faculty morale is very low. This information came from the media, not the administration.

- Prolo again stated that Dr. Bowen uses the staff meetings to relay this type of information.
- He then stated, “I'm not here to defend my own salary; a decision that the President made.”
- Prolo recognizes there is a communication problem, however he stated that the Deans and the Faculty Senate Chair attend all of the President's staff meetings.

Christensen stated that she believes the deans (administration) would not be looking at faculty salaries if this incident had not happened.

- Prolo denied this, stating that Dr. Bowen has put down faculty salaries “every year and again through 07” as top priority. The faculty survey was not completed; however, now the information is available.

A concerted effort was not made to share this information. This happened in May when faculty are giving final exams and then leave for the summer.

Adamcik explained the CUPA averages for faculty. This new information is now available. Research has been done for CUPA averages by college, rank, and discipline. This is the same data that the deans have for salary equity increases for faculty that are due next Tuesday. She highlighted every faculty member who is below 85% of the average. Data is not available for Technology, Pharmacy, or many disciplines of Health Professions. Adamcik stated from this time forward there will be data by each faculty name comparing to CUPA averages or Oklahoma data (peer institutions). There are approximately 94 professors, assistant professors and associate professors that have been identified as below 85% of CUPA averages (this does not include those where data is not yet available). Adamcik invited faculty to her office to look at the data and encouraged faculty for information from another sources if not available through CUPA or Oklahoma. Adamcik stated that in May, when Dr. Bowen saw the faculty salary inequities, he was truly concerned and said that he had to fix this.

Prolo described the differences between equity raises and merit raises. The raises are separate issues. Merit increases are approved by the state and the President approves equity. The College of Technology does not receive state appropriated funds; the equity adjustments have to be approved through the Division of Professional Technical Education. Prolo encouraged COT faculty to discuss faculty equity issues with Dean Marsh. The college is funded differently than other university colleges.

Collectively, how does the university community make this (faculty equity) a visible priority? The students took an increase in tuition on the assumption that some money would go to faculty salaries.

This is the second critical university issue reported in the newspaper before the faculty was informed. Prolo realized that it is better for the administration to have the information come from them instead of the media. He stated that they need to make sure that happens.

Faculty retention is very expensive and is a large problem at ISU; it doesn't seem to be a problem with administration. Faculty depart ISU much more often than administrators. It is felt that administrators are in place to serve faculty and students at ISU.

- Prolo stated that there has been an increase for new science faculty packages.

When is the earliest timeline for faculty equity increases? Midyear? Can they be made retroactive for the academic year?

- Prolo did not know when they would happen.

Senator Bowen stated, “The strength of this institution is born on the credentials, the morale, and the work ethics of this faculty”.

It was noted that there was a poor accreditation report this year, the faculty was commended and the administration was implicated. To give a raise to administrators, some faculty feel is repugnant. Administrators should consider faculty morale and faculty perspectives on this issue. Even the “little things” could boost faculty morale. The faculty senate conference room has no air conditioning and is not suitable for Senate’s needs. Some faculty find it difficult to continue to work at ISU, however, students are counting on them.

It is still not believed by some senators that an equity increase will happen for faculty.

What about a plan for an increase each year instead of addressing a large gap and large increases several years down the road again?

- Prolo agreed that large increases are not the way to address the issues, the administration does need a plan and he feels it is in place with this new data from CUPA.

Vik stated that as Past-Chair he was not informed of a salary adjustment for administrators until late April, which came with a promise that faculty would be addressed next year. Dr. Bowen told Vik “there are no hidden pots of money”, however, faculty were not aware of this revenue money of \$350,000. He also stated that a major part of the accreditation report was that ISU has a non-transparent budget. The budget process is not understandable at ISU. One and a half years ago Faculty Senate approved a Perk’s document. Dr. Bowen stated that the items asked for take money and he asked what programs should be cut in order to give faculty the perks? No perks have been given to faculty to date.

Vik also stated that the budget is not discussed at the President’s staff meeting or Deans’ council; the issue may come up as a point of information, however, there is no discussion of process. Faculty are not involved in the budget process.

Dr. Wharton stated that the ’07 budget has just been submitted to the SBOE. He asked all present if anyone has seen the budget. No faculty in the room has seen it.

A budget “wish list” from the Deans is provided to the administration for the SBOE. The administration then moves the data around in different categories. The Faculty Senate Budget Committee was given the new categories and could not use the data, as it was not understandable.

At the request of Dr. Wharton, Ken Prolo agreed to send a copy of the university budget to Faculty Senate– the same that was submitted to the SBOE.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Vik and seconded by Cleary to convene the meeting on Tuesday, August 30, 2005 – amended to Wednesday, August 31, 2005 at 4:00 to discuss how to proceed and to attend to the agenda. **Passed unanimously.**

III. ADJOURNMENT: 6:00

---

Kay Christensen, Chair

---

Connie Patchin,  
Administrative Assistant I

Approved: August 31, 2005

Documents:

Faculty Senate Minutes of May 2, 2005

Faculty Senate Minutes of August 29, 2005

2005-2006 Salary Planning document

Market 2004-2005 CUPA Ad-Comp, ISU Salaries to 85% of CUPA Median