

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 24, 2014
McCormick Room, Library

Faculty Senate Members Present

Kriszta Kotsis, Haley Andres, Leslie Saucedo, Cynthia Gibson, Ariela Tubert, Amanda Mifflin, Andrew Gardner, Andrea Kueter, Jonathan Stockdale, Sunil Kukreja, Alisa Kessel, Nila Wiese, Brad Dillman (Chair), Maria Sampen, Derek Buescher, Mike Segawa

Guests

Matt Warning, David Sousa, Doug Cannon, Steven Neshyba

Chair Brad Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:02 noting the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) members present.

Announcements

FSC meeting at 5:00 pm in Thompson 395 on Thursday March 6 encourage all non-administrative faculty to come and/or share comments via email to Matt Warning.

Nila Wiese noted that invitations to Prelude went out last week. She asked those present to encourage new colleagues to participate.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of January 27 were posted with a factual error. The line was the "BTF recommended a tuition increase of 3.4% but the actual recommendation was 3.75%." Dillman noted that as a factual correction we could entertain a motion to change the fact. Tubert noted a second amount that may be incorrect. MSP to amend to seek confirmation of both items, correct for factual errors, and repost the minutes.

MSP to approve the minutes of February 10, 2014

Liaison Reports

Sampen noted the UEC is working on applications for 2014-15 faculty release units as well as Trimble research awards for faculty and students. The UEC is also updating the faculty resources page.

Mifflin brought a draft of report of Student Life Committee to the Senate. In the Fall term, the SLC focused on charges 1, 3, and 4 including the sexual assault working group charge, programmatic initiatives of Commencement Hall, and the evaluation of CHWS. They found the sexual assault policy should not be implemented, as they are unclear on the policy and how the policy would relate to existing policies as a potential duplication of those policies. They found they did not have enough data to

complete the charge with CHWS and they made recommendations on how to complete the charge in the future. This semester they are working on final charges. Kessel asked a follow-up to the SLC committee report and the wording of the charge regarding the evaluation of CHWS. The charge is included in prior meeting minutes. Mifflin reported the committee reported it did not have enough data to complete the charge and the committee recommended that the faculty senate create an ad hoc committee to review the efficacy and function of CHWS. Wiese noted that the committee could undertake data collection and that data should be available from prior SLC committee work. CHWS reports that potentially lower numbers of students using CHWS services may be do in part to new fees but SLC indicates that causal factors of use decline are not capable of being teased out of current data. The SLC committee indicated that the health care costs were beyond the committee's scope. With respect to staffing of CHWS they indicated they had partial data on need and could not fully assess the staffing but that a full evaluation of CHWS could undertake this. Sampen asked if Dean of Students Segawa might be able to assist with some of these items. Sampen asked if there was a member of CHWS on the SLC.

Kotsis provided an update on LMIS. The committee discussed the use of electronic evaluation files and course evaluations. They are looking at Moodle but there are significant IT issues with making the process anonymous and secure. They would like a policy in place moving forward so that programmers may implement electronic evaluations. They are working with PSC. They also discussed Turn-it-in, providing numbers of faculty using. They are looking at Wed at 4 and orientation inclusions to broaden the use of Turn-it-in. A new library online system is due for roll out. The system will require training of faculty on how to use the system. LMIS is Collaborating with library to develop displays for faculty scholarships and more systematically collecting electronic submission of faculty scholarship. They reaffirmed they will not eliminate the due dates for non-summit items. Stockdale asked about recent changes to the library website and what the new rollout is. Kotsis noted we the new site have a uniform interface with a multi-university collaboration. Kueter added that Collins catalogue and Puget Sound CAT will no longer exist and the new system is a shared system for all 37 summit libraries with much more news to come. Dillman asked if the PSC and LMIS like the idea of moving toward with electronic evaluation. Kotsis said this was not clear.

Agenda Item: Faculty Salary Committee

Noting the significant work of the FSC, Dillman invited the members of the committee present to talk about their work.

Matt Warning, Chair of the FSC, began with a personal narrative. Warning noted that the University's faculty salary scale is imbalanced: salaries are weighted toward full professor lines. Warning indicated this imbalance in the faculty salary scale may present problems for both faculty (in terms of retirement savings) and the University (in terms of cost and numbers of full faculty compared to assistant and associate ranks). The back loaded salary scale is difficult to justify not only for

reasons of recruitment but also for savings potential, retirement, etc. Warning noted the back loaded salary is also complicated by a faculty that is increasingly full and associate. When combined with the large increase from associate to full this structure causes financial problems for the university. Warning added that looking at the scale over time we see an erosion of the real value of the salary scale. Warning raised the question of how the economic burden is shared across the employees of the university, and notably the administration. One shocking number is President Ron Thomas's salary increase in one-year (2011-12) which he guessed could be close to the median staff salary. In addition, the administration has not disclosed recent year administration salaries. This information does not bear out the narrative of shared sacrifice during the difficult financial times beginning in 2008.

Warning clarified that the history of the FSC is that the FSC makes recommendations to the BTF and there isn't a necessary correlation between those recommendations and the actual outcomes. Two-years ago the FSC presented its recommendation and was told by the VP of Finance and staff "this is how much tuition we would need to increase to implement this recommendation." Warning noted that this assumes a proper ordering of priorities, a point made earlier by Sousa.

Sampen asked for clarification in the difference between base and total compensation. Doug Cannon noted it is likely deferred compensation.

Sousa, adding to the history, noted that there was an adjustment of the scale, slightly, in favor of assistant professors in the 1990s, and at some point after that the scale was readjusted with a tilt toward the full professor rank. In the mid 1980s there was a clear goal for faculty salaries to be at the top of the NW peer institutions and equivalent with aspiring institutions. But that goal is now gone. Now we see a flat faculty salary scale, an erosion of benefits, and an increasing administration compensation scale. In light of these issues, Sousa noted the FSC has made simple recommendations included in the November 15, 2013 memorandum to the Budget Task Force (see appendix).

Stockdale thanked the committee for their work and asked if the committee has only been met with stonewalling concerning transparency of administrative salaries or has there been a broader discussion. Warning indicated that VP Mondou provided the "executive compensation philosophy." Since then they have had no word. Sousa indicated that the FSC has met with Kris Bartanen who has been forthcoming with information on the structure and modeling of salaries, processes of salary determination, and aggregate data regarding administrative salaries.

Wiese noted an earlier FSC email that showed comparison to peers that showed a marked difference for Puget Sound in relation to the peers.

Mifflin asked if it is a different body that determines faculty salaries from administration salaries. Cannon noted that the BTF makes recommendations on the

faculty and staff salary pools and those recommendations are considered in relation to tuition income and increases. The Dean then evaluates the allocation of the academic salary pool, including steps and inflation adjustments for faculty. The Board of Trustees determines the executive compensation packages. Those discussions are within the Board and closed to the executives.

Sampen asked, with regard to the salary scales of administrators, if the FSC has data from other institutions beyond the NW peers. Warning noted that Puget Sound has a larger disparity between faculty and administration than other NW peers but doesn't have the data beyond this group.

Sampen noted that in the Senate's previous meeting with the Budget Task Force, the BTF stated that most, if not all funds were going to faculty salary increases this year. She suggested that this implies that faculty is put in a position to choose between the funding of raises in salary or the funding of other projects that are important to the health and mission of the university. She stated that this puts faculty in a difficult position. Warning noted he takes a skeptical look at the stated relation between tuition and these other projects.

Cannon noted that he wishes to emphasize institutional priorities. The current campaign did not include faculty compensation. The "Enrollment Work Group" was charged with considering pricing, discount rate, tuition, but not with considering faculty compensation. Any decisions made about pricing and enrollment strategies intertwine with resources available for faculty compensation. The absence of faculty compensation in those meetings is striking especially when they were part of the conversation and priority twenty years ago. Cannon noted that he wanted to give Dean Bartanen credit because she has been very forthcoming with information.

Sousa noted that questions of the sustainability of the salary levels and scale are priorities. The University needs to consider the long term implications of faculty salaries both in terms of recruitment of strong faculty and of economic costs.

Tubert asked to what extent the FSC looks at compensation outside of salary. She suspects our total compensation package is going down. Warning noted that this is a problem everywhere and that faculty tend to view wellbeing through compensation not just salary. He speculated that our compensation package might be falling faster than our salaries depending on how it is valued.

Wiese asked whether in order to move the conversation forward the FSC felt that that its mission needed to be expanded? Or its structure within University governance changed? Sousa responded that he thinks the idea of bringing the FSC under the Faculty Senate as a permanent standing committee would erode the committee's autonomy with the addition of a dean and a student, and that bringing the committee under the control of the senate won't necessary solve any existing problems. Sousa continued to explain that faculty involvement in these issues is of value—if there had been faculty participation in discussions of the state of the

education benefit over the long term, that might have come out differently. Generally the faculty lacks the legal and subject area expertise to deal directly with most benefits issues. Cannon noted that all benefits are in common to the staff and faculty. Any alterations to benefits would need to involve the staff. Faculty salaries are, on the other hand, independent from staff salaries. A question is whether the faculty and staff should work together more concertedly to address joint concerns.

Buescher asked whether compensation figured into the salary numbers when Puget Sound was compared to peer institutions. Members of the FSC indicated that total compensation data is not necessarily available from the AAUP. The FSC collected AAUP data for salary figures at Puget Sound and peer institutions.

Buescher inquired if the University's decision to change its peer group decision has an impact on the overall salary comparisons. Since this change is relatively new, members of the FSC were not certain of the impact but noted that NW peer institutions are still part of the new grouping.

Kotsis asked if the faculty wanted to change the faculty salary scale to frontload the salary scale how would we go about making that change. Sousa noted that the process was done, in modest, several years ago, and we started with Assistant 1 and then used a multiplier from there in concert with the Dean. He added it is a matter of arguing the case.

Kotsis asked about recommendation # 2 (we would like our leadership to adhere to a norm of shared sacrifice and shared gains) wondering how to go about implementing this shared sacrifice. Cannon noted that by having conversations and by making information part of the public discussion we can effect change. He further noted that the bylaws do not authorize faculty involvement in determining faculty salaries but that the deans have a history of listening to the faculty on matters such as salaries.

Sampen asked if cost of living was taken into consideration when projecting salaries, e.g. it is more affordable to live in Walla Walla than Tacoma. Sousa noted that it is not generally considered.

Saucedo added that Puget Sound was recently recognized as being in the top ten most accessible faculty in the nation, but that that news was not placed on the website which was odd considering the rapidity by which news of that nature is posted. She wondered if this omission was because of the current conversation about faculty salary that would give evidence for raising compensation due to the clear outcomes of faculty work.

Stockdale stated that he would like to hear a justification by the Board of the executive compensation philosophy. Warning noted that peer institutions are seeing strong capital campaigns but not levels of compensation to their administration such as Puget Sound is witnessing. Warning also noted that faculty have been very

involved in fundraising and meetings with donors but have not received any increase compensation as a result of this labor.

Stockdale asked where the Board has pulled money from to make the compensation of administration possible. Cannon noted that there is a pool of staff salaries and his belief is that many of the administrators are in that pool and it is probably VP Mondou's decision as CFO to allocate the staff salaries. Cannon further noted that the board has oversight over the President's salary.

Warning noted that he is very happy with the job Ron and Kris are doing despite this one issue. He thinks the appreciation of administration's work is a shared feeling of the faculty. This is why the numbers of administration compensation packages were most surprising, especially because of the felt sense of shared purpose with this administration.

Cannon noted we have a list of things Kris has suggested we discuss with her, things like the scale, competitive compensation with hiring new faculty, etc. There are some issues Cannon does not feel comfortable having the FSC *as such* discuss with the Dean, issues such as the staffing of leave replacement. Cannon noted these issues would fall under conversations regarding curriculum and class size. Those are matters that clearly fall under the bylaws of the senate and the faculty as a whole and are better discussed in those forums.

Sousa noted that part of the focus of the recent conversation is whether the university should hire a consultant on salary and compensation.

Warning said the FSC would really like to hear from faculty their opinions about the faculty scale and whether the scale should be maintained. The FSC wants to have a feel for how the faculty thinks about the scale.

Draft Faculty Survey on Faculty Governance

Tubert opened the floor to questions and comments about the draft survey. The senate discussed the survey with minor modifications. MSP: send the survey to faculty with minor revisions.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30

Respectfully submitted by Derek Buescher

Attached:

2013 Memorandum from the Faculty Salary Committee to the Budget Task Force.

November 15, 2013

To: Budget Task Force

Fr: Faculty Salary Committee (Warning, chair; Cannon, Claire, Nealey-Moore, Sousa)

Background

In October 1986 the Long-Range Financial Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees set a goal for Puget Sound faculty salaries. By FY 1991-92, the committee asserted, "average faculty compensation for all ranks combined should be first among Northwest independent institutions and should be in the top quartile of national comparable institutions." In 1989 the Faculty Salary Committee reported to the main campus faculty that the goal had been achieved or was nearly achieved; by 1991-92, roughly, the goal was fully realized.

Since that time the salary picture has changed dramatically. The 1986 objective is long gone, and as far as we can tell it has not been replaced by *any* explicitly stated goal. Therefore, we are left to try to extract evidence of the university's commitments on faculty salary from institutional comparisons and trends in our own salaries. These show us that priorities have changed sharply. First, we have known for years that faculty compensation at Puget Sound is no longer at the top of the northwest institutions. This remains the case this year. Second, the salary trend figures in the attached tables show a disturbing long-term decline in inflation-adjusted salaries at all ranks from the late 1990s to 2012-13. The table below, meant to summarize what has happened in a glance, presents salaries in current dollars at the Assistant 1, Associate1 and Full 1 ranks in 1999-2000 and 2012-13. All of our data are available in the attachment.

	1999-00	2012-13
Assistant 1	\$59,479	\$58,431
Associate 1	\$72,807	\$72,571
Full 1	\$96,248	\$94,553

We must note that our data also show that the salaries of top administrators have grown considerably during the recent period of austerity. This concerns many faculty, who have believed that all of us at Puget Sound were sharing in the austerity forced upon us all by the financial crisis and the crash. Faculty have seen flat or declining real incomes across the ranks. This, in combination with rising out-of-pocket health insurance costs and the restructuring of the education benefit, define for us the institution's policies on and commitments to faculty compensation.

In 1986, in announcing a large pool increase for faculty and staff, then-President Phibbs cited the university's growing academic reputation and praised the faculty and staff for their contributions. Acknowledging both short term achievements in recruitment and retention and larger enhancements of the institution's national standing, he wrote to the university community, "And for this you are responsible." Today, faculty often hear our leadership express some version of this sentiment that we are the university's most important resource, but it is apparent from the evidence that the institution has not made faculty compensation a priority for many years. We cannot have a great university without a great, committed—and, in fact, an overcommitted—faculty. We hope that the university's priorities will reflect this reality and its need.

Recommendations

For many years the Salary Committee has made proposals to the BTF, presenting evidence on our eroding competitive position vis-à-vis peer institutions and calling for a renewed institutional commitment to competitiveness in faculty salaries. We have attached last year's recommendations to this memorandum. These reports have taken considerable time to produce, but in our judgment they have had no impact at all on outcomes. This year we decided not to engage in the ritual. We have four basic recommendations:

1. We would like the University to make a long-term, baseline commitment to no real erosion in the salary scale. Whatever else happens with salaries, the scale should be adjusted to reflect the cost of living.
2. We would like our leadership to adhere to a norm of shared sacrifice and shared gains.
3. In the longer run, we would like to open a more general discussion of institutional priorities in our salary discussions. The Salary Committee's recommendations last year were met with an immediate response that our request would require a tuition increase of a specific amount. This is only the case, of course, if we assume all other institutional priorities are properly ordered, and non-negotiable. We think all of those commitments are germane to the discussion of faculty compensation as an institutional priority.
4. If the BTF would like a more formal recommendation for next year's salary scale, we refer you to last year's FSC recommendation, attached. That document called for an across-the-board increase of inflation plus one percent.

<u>Ronald R Thomas</u>						
Year	Base Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase	Total Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase
2011-2012	\$ 430,641	\$ 32,730	8.2%	\$ 622,847	\$ 45,750	7.9%
2010-2011	\$ 397,911	\$ 15,425	4.0%	\$ 577,097	\$ 34,031	6.3%
2009-2010	\$ 382,486	\$ 15,595	4.3%	\$ 543,066	\$ 13,765	2.6%
2008-2009	\$ 366,891	\$ 6,891	1.9%	\$ 529,301		
*2007-2008	\$ 360,000					
<u>Sherry B Mondou</u>						
Year	Base Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase	Total Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase
2011-2012	\$ 243,741	\$ 17,833	7.9%	\$ 306,957	\$ 21,190	7.4%
2010-2011	\$ 225,908	\$ 6,848	3.1%	\$ 285,767	\$ 19,361	7.3%
2009-2010	\$ 219,060	\$ 12,122	5.9%	\$ 266,406	\$ 15,706	6.3%
2008-2009	\$ 206,938	\$ 538	0.3%	\$ 250,700		
*2007-2008	\$ 206,400					
<u>David R Beers</u>						
Year	Base Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase	Total Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase
2011-2012	\$ 231,115	\$ 15,632	7.3%	\$ 300,192	\$ (5,606)	-1.8%
2010-2011	\$ 215,483	\$ 8,272	4.0%	\$ 305,798	\$ 17,362	6.0%
2009-2010	\$ 207,211	\$ 10,529	5.4%	\$ 288,436	\$ 17,263	6.4%
2008-2009	\$ 196,682	\$ 4,682	2.4%	\$ 271,173	\$ 271,173	
*2007-2008	\$ 192,000					
<u>Kristine M Bartanen</u>						
Year	Base Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase	Total Compensation	\$ Increase	% Increase
2011-2012	\$ 206,966	\$ 8,815	4.4%	\$ 268,570	\$ 29,964	12.6%
2010-2011	\$ 198,151	\$ 3,214	1.6%	\$ 238,606	\$ 8,063	3.5%
2009-2010	\$ 194,937	\$ 8,337	4.5%	\$ 230,543	\$ 7,345	3.3%
2008-2009	\$ 186,600	\$ (3,969)	-2.1%	\$ 223,198		
*2007-2008	\$ 190,569					

	2013-2014	\$ Increase	% Increase					
1 Assistant	\$58,431							
2 Assistant	\$59,892	\$1,461	2.5%					
3 Assistant	\$61,353	\$1,461	2.4%					
4 Assistant	\$62,813	\$1,460	2.4%					
5 Assistant	\$64,274	\$1,461	2.3%					
6 Assistant	\$65,735	\$1,461	2.3%					
7 Associate	\$72,571	\$6,836	10.4%					
8 Associate	\$74,032	\$1,461	2.0%					
9 Associate	\$75,493	\$1,461	2.0%					
10 Associate	\$76,954	\$1,461	1.9%					
11 Associate	\$78,414	\$1,460	1.9%					
12 Associate	\$79,875	\$1,461	1.9%					
14 Professor	\$94,553	\$14,678	18.4%					
15 Professor	\$99,695	\$5,142	5.4%					
16 Professor	\$104,960	\$5,265	5.3%					
17 Professor	\$110,318	\$5,358	5.1%					
Number of faculty in Each Rank Category								
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Asst	55	51	49	54	47			35
Assoc	46	47	48	42	41			56
Full	82	82	83	88	93			93