

**Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the October 26, 2015 meeting**

Senate Members Present

Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Raine Black, Derek Buescher, Rachel DeMotts, Bill Haltom, Nakisha Renee Jones, Brandon Lanctot, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Jennifer Utrata, John Wesley

Guests

Bernie Bates, Ben Lewin, Lynnette Claire, John Hanson, Andrew Monaco, David Sousa, Keith Ward

Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Announcements

Tubert reminded the Senate of Justin Tiehen's upcoming lecture on Wednesday, October 28 at 5 p.m. in Trimble Forum.

M/S/P Approval of minutes from September 28, 2015 as revised.

M/S to approve minutes from October 12, 2015.

Stockdale and Bartanen proposed minor amendments to the minutes.

M/S/P Approval of minutes from October 12, 2015 as amended.

Discussion of the work of the Faculty Compensation Task Force (FCTF)

Peine asked if the peer group that the FCTF used for comparative purposes was the same as the peer group used by the Presidential Search Committee. Claire stated that she was unsure about this and would ask for more information. Bartanen noted that the Compensation Committee of the Board of Trustees was responsible for setting the president's salary, not the Presidential Search Committee.

Stockdale asked for context and background regarding the FCTF document (emailed to the faculty in advance of the meeting). He asked whether the document represented an intervention with regard to past procedures.

Claire said that the FCTF was a recommending body made up of 10 faculty members, the Academic Vice President, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and one Trustee. She said that Puget Sound has never had a faculty compensation philosophy before. The lack of a compensation philosophy puts the faculty in a weak position with regard to how and why to ask for increases in salary. She added that the FCTF would be making a recommendation to the President at the end of the year.

Stockdale asked for clarification on the first Guiding Principle [*see Appendix A for the Guiding Principles*], specifically the phrase, “At the same time, the university acknowledges the role of merit-based compensation, both *within* the salary scale through promotion and steps, and *outside* of the salary scale with teaching awards, for example.”

Claire said that Puget Sound’s teaching awards and promotion system are in fact merit-based compensation. She added that the FCTF was in favor of the salary scale. She noted that this view seemed concurrent with the general opinion of the entire faculty.

Buescher said he was surprised to learn that different departments within the university have different salary scales. He noted three different scales university-wide.

Claire said that these scales do not represent merit pay. Merit pay is awarded based on achievement. The differences in departmental salary scales are based on market forces.

Bartanen concurred, adding that there is a disciplinary differential in these particular departments (for Business, Computer Science, and Economics, \$7000 is added to Assistant Professor steps; the additions recede from \$5000 at the Associate steps; and there is no differential at Professor, but steps and promotion are still based on the same scale).

Claire described this disciplinary differential as a supplement to the general Puget Sound salary scale. Bartanen noted that the FCTF was still discussing this disciplinary differential.

Tubert wondered if the Guiding Principles were ranked or random order. She stated that an order, whether intentional or not, might influence future decisions.

Monaco said that the Guiding Principles were not in a ranked order at this time. However, he said that the FCTF intends to develop a system of how to prioritize the principles if needed.

Stockdale asked about strategy with regard to discussing salaries with the Board of Trustees. He wondered if the FCTF’s approach to merit-based pay might be called into question by someone who wished to change the tenure system into a merit-based system.

Claire said that she did not see this as an issue. She pointed out that Puget Sound is one of only a handful of universities that has a salary scale but is not unionized. She also noted that many universities have merit-based salary scales but simultaneously have tenure.

Tubert asked why “faculty salary scale” was in lower case rather than in upper case in the document.

Claire said that the FCTF didn't want to tie the faculty to this particular scale.

Sousa said that the existing salary scale was devised during a different era. Currently, each step marks a 2½ % increase in salary (an increase, Sousa noted, that can be hard to maintain in years when finances are tighter). The FCTF talked with the compensation consultant on ways to compress the steps. One scenario proposed was to start the Assistant 1 salary higher and then make the increases smaller in order to make the scale more sustainable over the long-term.

Tubert asked whether a system based on how many books professors write represents a salary scale or a merit-based system.

Both Claire and Hanson agreed that Tubert's example was a merit-based system. Hanson added that merit and scale do mix together, however. In a scale-based system, a faculty member still needs to achieve a certain amount of professional growth in order to receive promotion.

Claire said that the FCTF was seeking feedback on the content and concepts in their document, and was not necessarily looking for editorial "wordsmithing." She noted that it had been challenging and time consuming enough to get the FCTF members to agree on language. She said that she was happy to take suggestions on language, but that she was hesitant to open up for discussion on language to the whole faculty.

DeMotts said that she understood and respected this; however, she still wanted clarification on whether "salary scale" refers to the existing scale as it has been or a potentially new salary scale.

Claire said that the FCTF used the article "the" not "a" to modify "salary scale." She said that the current scale may not be sustainable and eventually, might have to change. The FCTF did not want to lock in its principles to the current scale.

Bartanen noted that the index of the faculty salary scale was changed slightly in 2005.

Monaco said that the faculty can be committed to the salary scale and still be open to changing the index.

Buescher asked if the FCTF could share some of the policies that they have been working on.

Claire said that transparent clear communication is one of the goals. Her hope was to make the principles enduring and the policies more changeable.

Monaco presented data collected by the salary consultant and the Office of Institutional Research. The peer group for comparison was a collection of 50 mission-related schools

that are roughly similar to Puget Sound. In order to measure faculty salary data in the peer group, the FCTF looked at both our percentile rank (how many schools were above and below us) and how Puget Sound salaries compared to the median of the peer group. Using both metrics gives us a fairer picture of what the data is telling us—how well we're doing comparatively in an ordinal sense as well as in an absolute value sense. Monaco went on to present faculty salary scale data from 2014-15, outlining the 2 ½ % step increase for each rank. He then compared this data to the average Assistant, Associate and Full Professor salaries of our peer group. Puget Sound average salaries for 2014-15 were as follows:

Assistant: 66,700
 Associate: 80,300
 Full: 106,500

Bottom, Median and Top salaries for Assistant Professor in our peer group were as follows (peer group data was adjusted for an average geographic salary differential relative to Tacoma salaries):

Assistant Professor:
 Top (Barnard): 89,542
 Median (Stonehill): 70,502
 Bottom (Knox): 56,141

Beuscher asked if it was possible to do a compensation package comparison that did not include health care. Bartanen replied that the purpose of the FCTF was to address salaries, not benefits and that it was the job of the Benefits Task Force to address issues related to benefits.

Monaco continued with comparison data on Puget Sound's salaries. He stated that the average Assistant Professor salary at Puget Sound is farther from the median than our average Associate and Full Professor salaries. In summary, comparison data on Puget Sound salaries is as follows:

Our Average Assistant Professor Salary ranks at the 30.6 percentile, earning 94.61 % of median
 Our Average Associate Professor Salary ranks at the 36.7 percentile, earning 95.48% of median
 Our Average Full Professor Salary ranks at the 44.9 percentile, earning 96.25% of median

Monaco stated that at each rank, Puget Sound salaries fall below the median of our peer group. In our comparison group, the Full Professor average outperforms the Associate Professor average, which outperforms the Assistant Professor average. The average Puget Sound Assistant salary is farther from the median than the average Associate or Full salary.

Sousa said that if we want to make our salaries competitive then the scale should be tipped in favor of the Assistant Professor salaries. He stated that this was a very important policy question and encouraged faculty feedback on this issue.

Hanson said that this had been an area of very active discussion in the group. He said that everyone in the FCTF felt that Puget Sound was underperforming its peer group. There was also a general feeling that Assistant Professors have a harder time in comparison to Associate and Full Professors. He suggested that we think about raising the Assistant salary faster in order to make salaries more competitive.

Peine asked if the supplemental salaries in Computer Science, Economics and Business pulled up the assistant level average. She stated that if this is the case, then in reality, Assistant Professors are doing even worse than the data suggests.

Claire and Monaco said that yes, the supplement to the base salaries in Computer Science, Economics and Business pulls the average up.

Peine said that it would be interesting to know whether we are comparing our faculty and administrative salaries against the same yardstick.

Lewin said that the presidential salary was outside of the purview of the FCTF.

Sousa noted that a staff salary philosophy and an executive salary philosophy already exist. He said that the principles in each area (faculty, staff, and executive) are different.

Utrata applauded the FCTF on the work it has done. She asked what the best way was for faculty to give feedback to the FCTF. She stated that she predicts that the faculty will have a lot of feedback about the policies and principles, in particular noting that Question #9 (“What should be done if, during difficult economic times, it becomes impossible to cover all salary increases associated with steps and promotions?”) will warrant a lot of discussion and might change faculty views on the preceding Questions. Utrata asked if visiting professors should be paid on the same scale even though they don’t have the same duties as tenure-line faculty in terms of advising and service.

Claire said that feedback can come verbally, through email, or in whatever form is most comfortable. She said that the FCTF wants to know that their final work accurately reflects something the faculty fully supports. She stated that unless the faculty is behind this philosophy, it would be useless.

Claire outlined the timeline for the rest of the semester, noting that the work of the FCTF would be done by December.

Beardsley questioned the wording used in the Guiding Principle which reads: “Faculty compensation must be competitive insofar as possible given the university’s current

resources and future financial stability. The university recognizes market forces are neither irrelevant to faculty compensation practices nor sufficient as the sole justification for faculty compensation decisions.” Beardsley stated that the gap between the words “irrelevant” and “sufficient as the sole justification” is as broad as it can possibly be. He said that this rendered the statement as empty as could possibly be. He went on to describe it as “somewhere between not mattering at all and mattering more than anything else.”

Monaco said that the wording was simply to suggest that market forces could play a role though how much of a role was impossible to determine.

Claire said that the FCTF wants to at least reach the median with regard to faculty salaries. On the other hand, the university has to survive. She described this as two different forces at work.

Sousa suggested that the sentence could be omitted.

Tubert asked about process, specifically whether or not the principles will be voted upon and if so, when they might be recommended and enacted.

Claire said that there would be no voting. The full faculty will not vote on these principles. She said that that was why the FCTF has created so many opportunities for faculty to offer feedback.

Beardsley said that the Faculty could make a resolution to approve or veto it.

Hanson said that the FCTF does not know what will happen after the recommendation is sent to the President. He described it as being “out of our hands” at that point.

Sousa said that it in working on the document, it became clear to the FCTF that this is not the “Faculty’s” Compensation Philosophy. Instead, it is the “University’s Compensation Philosophy for Faculty.”

Tubert pointed out that sometimes the document uses the word “faculty” and sometimes it uses the word “university” interchangeably.

Claire said that the FCTF does not recommend salaries and/or pay raises. The President’s charge was to draft and/or recommend a Faculty Compensation Philosophy.

Tubert thanked the committee for its work.

Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees

Stockdale said that the Curriculum Committee (CC) was working on a course proposal for a SSI 1 course that was also going to be a KNOW course. This was the first time the CC had to answer the question as to whether a SSI could also be a KNOW course. Stockdale noted that there is language in the bulletin that may make this impossible. Stockdale has been in contact with both the chair of the CC and Amy Ryken (point person for KNOW courses). The CC will discuss this at their November 4 meeting and determine whether the rubric as it stands prevents KNOW courses as SSI or if the rubric should be re-written.

Buescher said that his assumption was that a SSI course could not overlap with a KNOW course.

ASUPS Report

Black reported that seven new senators had been elected and that ASUPS is preparing its presentation to the Budget Task Force. ASUPS is also making minor changes to the website, working on the Tacoma Coalition Foundation (an organization that brings together student government groups from other Tacoma Higher-Ed institutions) and preparing for its next Townhall Tuesdays.

Staff Senate Report

Skeel stated that the Staff Senate was meeting tomorrow with Sherry Mondou to help make their recommendations to the Budget Task Force.

Discussion of Procedure of Addressing Changes to the Minutes

Beardsley asked that substantive changes be discussed during meetings. He stated that this would give more respect and authority to the first draft and would be a more straightforward approach.

Tubert suggested keeping the first draft as a point of reference.

Beardsley said that word-smithing changes can be done on Google docs. However, because the document history is not reproduced in the clean document when it comes to the Senate for approval, most people won't be able to read all of the changes as they happen. One of the goals of the Senate is transparency, however, the current process is not transparent.

Lanctot said that all change prior to approving the minutes should be made in the "suggestion" format so that they are visible. This maintains the convenience of having the document online but also makes the edits more readily visible.

Tubert restated that the plan would be to use “suggestion” when making changes on Google Docs but to save large changes for in-person discussion at Senate meetings. She said that she would ask for the document to be sent with all the track changes so that the Senators can see what has changed. If changes are substantive, the Senator should put his/her initial next to the change.

Meeting adjourned 5:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Maria Sampen.

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments: Appendix A (FCTF Guiding Principles)

Faculty Compensation Philosophy

The University of Puget Sound is committed to teaching excellence, scholarly engagement, and promoting intellectual interactions between students and faculty; as a result, faculty play a central role in the fulfillment of the university's mission. Faculty compensation—which includes salary, benefits (such as health, retirement, education), and support for professional development—should reflect the institutional priority of attracting, retaining, and rewarding outstanding faculty who are dedicated to teaching, scholarship, and service.

The university is committed to a faculty compensation plan in accordance with the following five Guiding Principles and with respect to the ensuing Compensation Policies:

I. Guiding Principles

- The success of the university relies on the collaboration and contribution of faculty, staff, and administration. The faculty are committed to the institutional value of **sharing both sacrifices and successes fairly across the university community**. Faculty compensation decisions should reflect this value.
- Faculty compensation should be **just and livable**, commensurate with their responsibility, education, and experience.
- The faculty engage in a shared educational enterprise; as a consequence, the university is committed to a **fair distribution of compensation** across faculty ranks and disciplines as evidenced by the faculty salary scale. At the same time, the university acknowledges **the role of merit-based compensation**, both *within* the salary scale through promotion and steps, and *outside* of the salary scale with teaching awards, for example.
- Faculty compensation must be **competitive** insofar as possible given the university's current resources and future **financial stability**. The university recognizes market forces are neither irrelevant to faculty compensation practices nor sufficient as the sole justification for faculty compensation decisions.
- The process for making faculty compensation decisions must be **consistent, transparent, and clearly communicated** with the faculty.