

Idaho State University
Faculty Professional Policies Council
Minutes

Thursday, January 31, 2008

11:00 AM

Clearwater Room, Student Union Building

In Attendance: Allen, Dundas, Hasenpflug (Chair), Hatzenbuehler, Johnson, Marsh, Olah, Payne, Savage, Shropshire
Excused: Adkison
Absent: Meyer
Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)

1. Minutes from last meeting, November 29, 2008

ACTION: Hatzenbuehler **moved to approve** the minutes, Shropshire seconded. No discussion. The motion **passed** with one abstention.

2. Preliminaries and Announcements

A. Faculty/Staff Handbook Changes Academic Rank update

Faculty Senate approved the revisions in December and forwarded the recommendations to Dr. Wharton. It is scheduled to be on the Academic Council's Agenda for their February 19th meeting.

B. Phased Retirement Policy update

John Masserini has been following up with Dr. Fletcher's office. Leo Herrman requested an electronic version of the recommendation yesterday. It is being considered.

3. Old Business

A. Salary Schedules

Hasenpflug said today's task was for the Council to decide on the issues to be addressed and assign tasks for each Council member to look into. He asked that everyone submit their findings the week before the next meeting so he has time to compile it into a draft document which can be discussed and revised. Hasenpflug read the Salary Schedule charge to the Council members. He reminded that according to John Masserini, Faculty Senate Chair, the Council is not to come up with an actual salary schedule, but rather to present recommendations or dissenting opinions on what a potential salary schedule model would look like. This is similar to the Phased Retirement Policy the Council worked on last year in that they are to find out what issues are involved and how might ISU best implement a salary schedule if they were to do so. Hasenpflug opened the meeting for discussion.

A report of ISU's Faculty Salaries for 2006-07 compiled by Christy Lauer and printed from ISU's Academic Affairs Institutional Research website was handed out to Council members. Hasenpflug drew attention to Section 4 which shows a breakdown of salary ranges and how many ISU faculty of each rank fall into those salary ranges. The first three columns in both the 9-month and 12-month sections are the tenure-track positions that will be the most meaningful for the Council's task. The ranks of Lecturer and Instructor cover a lot of different levels, including adjunct and other part-time faculty members.

One question that immediately arose is whether a potential salary schedule should be based on current salaries, or on what reasonable salaries on par with those at peer institutions would be.

Payne suggested looking into merit and cost-of-living increases and how they are handled at other universities. Johnson mentioned CUPA and ISU's Human Resource department as good sources of information as well. Hatzenbuehler suggested looking at BYU-Idaho's salaries because her understanding is that faculty is paid based on degree alone and she wondered how they managed that. Hasenpflug recommended the Council investigate various models and present pros and cons for each model. The more specific information the easier it will be to make recommendations for implementation if that is the conclusion that is drawn.

More discussion ensued about various members' experience at other institutions they had worked for or were familiar with. Market-based factors should be considered in the models. Federal and State stepped pay grades such as that used for classified employees were brought up and discussed, including ideas about how much the overlap between grades might be, how much time in rank would be required to move to the next step, and how to modify it to accommodate the peculiar nature of university professorships. Shropshire reminded that ISU has both 9-month and 12-month contracts that would need to be addressed. Hasenpflug pointed out that further complications arise when considering tenure-track versus non-tenure-track faculty such as clinical and research faculty. College of Technology faculty are in still another classification, as are faculty whose salaries are split between different funding sources. Johnson stated the Cal-State system was based on rank with a few steps for each rank. Several members felt time in rank should count toward receiving higher pay, but step increases should be primarily merit-based. Cost of living issues were of great concern to many members, which automatically would take into account longevity spent in a position. Cost of living increases should be kept separate from merit increases, since if one's date of hire is after the deadline for eligibility for merit, then if no more merit increases are authorized for a few years, it is quite possible to not receive any increase in pay at all for those years, despite rising costs and good service.

Merit-based systems are problematic because of the way performance evaluations currently are structured. If there are only two or three measurements of merit, (e.g. "satisfactory" or "superior") it is too easy for disparity to occur, depending on how many "superiors" particular departments or Chairs think is normal. Criteria for merit should be made less subjective to ensure more fairness across the university. There should also be some consideration for faculty members who teach a lot of 101 level classes and do not have as much opportunity for research or other productive activities.

Allen asked if the Council were limited to only looking at Idaho institutions. Boise State and particularly North Idaho College have different funding sources, so their Technology units are not strictly comparable to ISU's. Catherine reminded that Faculty Senate had expressed an interest in knowing what ISU's peer institutions nationwide were doing in terms of salaries. Unionization was briefly discussed as a model, but several members seemed hesitant to believe such a step would really help increase salaries long-term. Hasenpflug reminded that the Council needs to consider all options but come up with recommendations that will reflect pros and cons and specify workable solutions.

Hasenpflug asked Council members to choose one or more institutions from those mentioned in the discussion, **research the salary models used, write up a paragraph to a page** of their findings and send them to the Administrative Assistant **the week of February 18, 2008**. She will then forward those summaries to Hasenpflug to compile into a document for the Council to consider next time. Do not forget that the **opposing view is a valid position to present** as well.

Salary Schedule Assignments:

- Diane Allen – College of Technology side of Boise State University and others
- Bruce Savage – Idaho State Hay System (classified employee pay structure)
- Mark Johnson – CUPA Journal, talk to ISU's Human Resources people
- Tracy Payne – Idaho Public Schools

- Mary Dundas – Boise State University
- Kevin Marsh – University of Idaho
- Linda Hatzenbuehler – Cal State University system
- Mark Olah – Carnegie Designate 3 universities/institutions
- Sandra Shropshire – Carnegie Designate 2 universities/institutions
- Thom Hasenpflug – compiler of the findings

4. New Business – *none to discuss*

Adjournment: 12:00 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, February 28, 2008** at 11:00 a.m. in the Clearwater Room of the Pond Student Union Building.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Wallace
Administrative Assistant 1
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Faculty Professional Policies Council: March 13, 2008
Accepted by Faculty Senate: March 17, 2008