

FACULTY COUNCIL
March 28, 2007
STRAND UNION 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Becker, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Idzerda, Jones, Kott for Bailey, Lei, Levy, Lynch, Livingston, Locke for Ashley, Neeley, Peed, Pinet, Prawdzienski, K.A. Scott, Seymour, Starkey for Zhu, Taylor, Watson, D. Weaver, T. Weaver

Members Absent: Ag Econ, Ag/ED/AOT, Chem/Biochem, English, Erickson, Gipp, Jackson, Johnson, M. McClure, Jacobs, Nursing On-Campus, Political Science,

Others Present: Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk, Rehm, Rognlie

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from March 7, 2007 were unanimously approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Taylor

- TIAA-CREF - HB 95 is out of committee (passed 17 to 2) and is headed for the senate. The bill advocates a 1% increase in the funding for TIAA-CREF participants and will take it to 5.5%. It comes with a \$1.1M price tag per year and will be rolled into the base.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Marvin Lansverk

- Section 400 of the Faculty Handbook, particularly section 430: Policy on Research Misconduct, is being amended and expanded, due to the needs of external granting agencies, which require that a detailed research misconduct policy be in place at universities receiving support. This proposed revision was drafted by university counsel to meet these requirements. Faculty Council, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs committee, has reviewed and subsequently voted to support this change in the Faculty Handbook. Key modifications include the articulation of more detailed definitions of research misconduct and the articulation of detailed due process procedures, when a violation is thought to have occurred. Motion for final approval to have the language placed in the Faculty Handbook → moved → seconded → all in favor → passed.

SALARY DISTRIBUTION – Chair Taylor

- The governor's college affordability plan wanted all MUS employee compensation to be included in the raises. The legislature passed the plan (HB13). The BOR have accepted the plan and they have directed us. Within the University system, professional and faculty salaries are not to be allocated on the basis of any flat increase; rather, the entire 3.6% raise pool shall be allocated based on "performance". All promotion raises are part of the raise pool. It should be noted that all campuses, except ours, are mandated by collective bargaining. Nothing in the BOR directives undermines that process.
- The Provost, as in the past two years, would like to hold back a certain percentage of the 3.6% raise pool. In the past two years, however, the hold back targeted the internal equity of those departmental faculty, by rank, who were the lowest compensated (particularly at the junior rank). The argument for that decision was that the disparity between the highest paid faculty and lowest paid faculty was unhealthy. Also, the newest ranked faculty were having the hardest time with the cost of living in Gallatin Valley and were unable to afford a house in Bozeman. It has not yet been decided if that would be done again this year.
- Should the .6% be centrally located in the Provost's office, one of the first things he will do is to raise the minimum floors with the existing specified floor calculations, before promotions are given. Promotion raises will not be used to move faculty up to their floors.
- Another of the Provost's intentions would be to hold some money centrally back to work with the deans to address market and equity cases (salary inversion and compression out of step with OSU) on a university level. The reason is because the disparity issues do not correlate with the specific departmental salary pools and, the Provost would like to target where the problems specifically exist.

- The Provost's office has not made any specific decisions about distribution mechanisms for the \$191,000 holdback (.6%), should that occur. One mechanism may have the deans bring forward their most compelling cases, based on criteria the President sends them via a memorandum with guidelines. The remaining 2.5% would go to the colleges with broad guidelines about they use it within the context of merit, market, equity. The Provost asked Faculty Council for input and to be sensitive to the disparity of those faculty who are the lowest paid.
- Discussion ensued (*italicized text is the Provost speaking*):
 - What criteria would be used for the 2.5% "review?" *The departments have their own formulas and structure for how that will be determined. Usually, departments/colleges weigh merit based on annual review, market and equity considerations. When they present their data, it is reviewed by the Salary Review Committee. This is a simple check to see if anything is way out of line regarding increase/lack of increase compared to the annual review data. It is a system of checks and balances. The Provost will flag cases, by working with the deans, directly, on significant equity problems. The largest portions of the 2.5% would be distributed based on internal comparisons, external comparison (OSU data), or any other factors which may influence any faculty member's standing relative to others.*
 - Do you see, in the future, that this hold back may be alleviated? *I do. The amount of progress you can make in a year is predicated on how much of a holdback you are allowed. Many of the urgent issues have been taken care of. .5% is not a large amount. \$191,000 only goes so far on a \$29M payroll for faculty.*
 - If the department head has a case that is significant, he has to make the case to the dean, the dean chooses to take that forward based on his criteria, a decision is made at that level, and then takes it to your office, and you evaluate it. In order for you to make your decision, you look at comparators from Jim Rimpau. It seems as if there is a step we don't need to do if you have data and are the final decision makers. *We want the dean to make decisions regarding their own departments and have a primary role in assessing the health of their salary distribution by making the case where they believe it is to be the most important. The Provost does not want to divert that process, unless there is something that should be brought to the dean's attention. In dealing with these issues, it is always good to have a second pair of eyes. The dean acts as the primary assessor of the situation and then we act as a check. With Jim Rimpau, we are in a position to ask about a potential oversight. It is a balance.*
 - If the dean is not willing to put anyone forward, are you willing to step forward? *Yes.*
 - Is there a software package that notes people that fall below the OSU data? *We can sort data and ask for the largest salary disparities based on OSU by rank.*
 - Do you send that data to department heads? *We make that available to all the deans.*
 - A FC member encouraged the Provost's office to continue their work with distribution of holdbacks for salary disparity.
 - This is a two-year process. Are we obligated to do the same thing next year? *No. We will come back to talk to FC next year. We will evaluate our last hold back distribution, this year's distribution and use the information to help guide our thinking and proposals.*
 - Current inflation numbers are 3.5% and, we are not keeping up with the cost of living. People in the middle also have COLA issues. Inflation is inflation. Are we really helping that many people with this holdback and redistribution? *The long term solution, given the fact that we are unlikely to get double digit increases, is to speak to the legislators and governor about this very issue and to acquire substantial endowments to increase faculty compensation that is entirely separate from the state. I believe that will make the campus healthier. It is a juggling act and not an easy situation.*
 - Also, one of the biggest problems is salary inversion. *3.5% cannot fix that. The only way to fix it is if we have more money to utilize solely for that purpose. We have inadequate salary raises. The problems don't track the percentages. For example, if someone had a salary pool of \$8M, it doesn't mean they have 30% of the market equity problems. They may have very few compared to a unit with a much smaller salary pool. At several universities, the only way you solve inversions is that you capture money and apply it specifically to those targeted areas. If one persists, the data shows you can make a significant impact that simple distribution would not allow you to do.*
 - I just reviewed the raises last year in excess of 10% and those in between the raise pool, and it means a lot of people are getting a lot less than whatever the legislature is handing out. It has differential affects on COLA. It appears that what you are doing is adding to the compression

problem. One is that the 4+ promotion raises are making very big changes in a person's salary, at one time, and without consideration that the larger discrepancy is performance based. *That is not the case. We look very carefully at performance reviews. The standard considered has to be "met expectations" or better. If you "meet expectations" that is meritorious, and we take a serious look at the annual review process for any of the candidates the deans bring forward. A differential is awarded in most departments. Last year most departments, based on merit, had significant spreads for their faculty. We communicate as early as possible to the department heads when we are planning to use central funds and they can, therefore, decide how to use those funds at their disposal.*

- FC would like to make a formal vote on their decision about salary distribution.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM, as there was no other business.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary