

Idaho State University
Faculty Professional Policies Council
Minutes

Thursday, February 28, 2008
11:00 AM
Clearwater Room, Student Union Building

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

1. Minutes from last meeting, January 31, 2008

Skipped this item; deferred until next meeting

2. Announcements

a. Faculty/Staff Handbook changes: Academic Rank update

Academic Council approved the recommendation during their February 19th meeting, with one minor change. It is now in President's Cabinet for consideration.

b. Phased Retirement Policy update

Still under consideration by the Office of Finance and Administration

3. Continuing Business

a. Salary Schedules – findings

Before the meeting, Council members forwarded the information they had found in their assigned segments. Most had gathered data from websites; Hasenpflug stated that in some cases phone calls might yield more specific information. The Oklahoma State Study referenced by some institutions is a repository of salary information submitted by various colleges and universities, similar to CUPA and AAUP. Hasenpflug would like more **information about whether Boise State University uses a salary schedule**, since their promotion increment between academic ranks is similar to ISU's. Johnson said they allow salary inversion (full professors being paid less than associate professors within disciplines) whereas ISU tries to avoid that situation.

ISU's peer universities in the region are University of Montana, Montana State, Weber State, Oregon State, Eastern Washington, Northern Arizona and other universities in the Big Sky Athletic Conference; none of them appear to use salary schedules. University of Idaho and Boise State University should also be considered because they are in Idaho. Hasenpflug **concluded that salary schedules are not the norm for this area**. Reno's modified market-based system uses national survey figures from 51 land grant institutions. Another model from Puget Sound had a stepped time-in-rank system. North Idaho College has a very complicated system based on degrees held. Spokane had longevity bonuses built into their adjunct contracts based on number of academic quarters and contact hours per week served.

Shropshire pointed out that the Big Sky schools are not in the same Carnegie classification as ISU; it would be interesting to find out whether the same and higher Carnegie class institutions have salary schedules.

Hasenpflug reminded the Council that they do not have to agree on whether a salary schedule is a good idea; the minority opinion should be reflected as well and the vote count

for and against should be included. Possible salary schedule models should be outlined in enough detail for the Faculty Senate to understand the issues, similarities and differences, and the pros and cons of each model. The main goal of the Council is to research salary issues, identify problems and advantages that should be taken into account, and gather hard data that can be used in deciding what the next steps might be. Salary increases are a primary concern for faculty, and this project will help keep the topic on the table.

Hasenpflug requested the Minutes formally commend Mark Johnson for the research, work and effort he has put into this project. Among many other things, Johnson found a report on Faculty Compensation Systems ASHE-ERIC Higher Ed Report 2001 that discusses various salary models. [A hard copy of the report will be kept in the Faculty Senate Office.]

Problems identified in the data collected so far included:

- salary ranges so vast they are virtually meaningless
- strict schedules tend to ignore market-based factors
- a schedule can potentially be easily defeated by exceptions (e.g. for market-based factors)
- some subdisciplines should be considered individually because market conditions make it difficult to recruit new faculty in those areas
- some ranking systems are based on the inherent value of the position to the institution
- time-in-rank requirements specify raises without regard to merit, (there is some question about the legality of such raises)
- merit-only systems ignore inflation and cost-of-living increases
- salary equity issues need to be addressed
- performance evaluation and measurements used,
- consideration of non-tenure-track, clinical, research, technical, adjunct faculty, and use of soft money
- fringe benefits have to be taken into account as well as salaries

Hasenpflug requested **all members submit two or three specific questions to him**. He will incorporate those questions into a working draft for the Council to discuss and work on next time. There was some discussion about how the information should be presented and various possible formats for the final recommendation. The project should be completed by the end of the semester.

4. Adjournment: 12:15 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, March 13, 2008 at 11:00 a.m.** in a location yet to be determined.

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