

MINUTES

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Thursday, March 12, 1992
3:15-5:15 p.m.
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club

Present: Avner Ben-Ner (chair), Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Ann Fallon, Daniel Feeney, Roger Feldman, Richard Goldstein, Audrey Grosch, Steve Laursen, Diane Mulvihill, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, Gayle Graham Yates

Guests: John Fossum, Marvalene Hughes, Gailon Roen

CHAIR'S REPORT Professor Ben-Ner convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m. and outlined the agenda. As chair of SCFA, he said, he serves on the Provost's Council, which meets approximately every other week. Anyone wishing to place an item on the Council's agenda should contact him.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND SALARY INCREASES WORKING GROUP Professor John Fossum, staff of the Working Group, presented the committee's recommendations for Professor Morris Kleiner, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Committee members were reminded that the Working Group had previously presented three options for consideration. Option 1 focused on what might be considered minor modification of the current system. Option 2 provides a system for cost-of-living, annual merit, and special merit awards. Option 3 offers a salary-step system between ranks and within ranks so that at least minimum floors exist. Common to all three options are 1) greater faculty involvement in the salary determination process, 2) greater sharing of information on the salary determination process, and 3) requirement of periodic reviews. Differing features are 1) Option 1 includes annual salary increases that are linked to performance while Options 2 and 3 include across-the-board salary increases, and 2) timing of reviews -- Option 1 requires annual reviews and Options 2 and 3 allow for reviews every 3-5 years. Benefits over the present system are 1) all three options positively affect the role of faculty in the salary determination process, and 2) all three provide better information on the process and outcome. Cost-of-living was defined as "the amount available for salary increases."

Professor Fossum said the Working Group's recommendation included blending Options 1 and 2. He reviewed the different components of the recommendations including "criteria for salary determination," "process and method for annual and promotional salary increases," "faculty involvement," "increase method," and "promotion increases."

Criteria for Salary Determination The criteria for salary determination must be nondiscriminatory. Initial salary decisions, periodic increases, and retention offers may not be based on considerations related to race, gender, religion, national origin, sexual preference, age, etc. The salary determination process should result in an unbiased evaluation following a competent and thorough review of an individual's work. The process should encourage greater performance and competency, which, in turn, should be rewarded by the implementation of the compensation system. The criteria for determining salary increases should be similar to those used for promotion and tenure. Specifically, research, teaching, service, and performance of any assigned administrative duties.

Process and Method for Annual and Promotional Salary Increases The annual salary program seeks to reward contributions of faculty members, establish equitable methods for recognizing cumulative contributions leading to promotion in rank, and to respond to declines in real income suffered as the result of inflation.

Faculty Involvement Faculty will be reviewed annually and must be provided with information on the standards and process used to determine individual salary increases and the relative emphasis assigned to activities associated with salary increase determinations. Faculty must be given the opportunity to participate in determining the relative emphases and provide rankings or evaluations through the election of a salary committee or as a committee-of-the-whole with the (budgetary) unit.

Increase Method Each year, the annual salary increase pool received by the unit will be divided into portions for across-the-board and merit increases in ratios prescribed by central administration. Each faculty member will receive an across-the-board increase equal to his/her proportion of the total salary base for the decision-making unit. Merit increase amounts will be determined using an evaluation of the activities of the individual faculty member, consistent with the relative emphases determined by the unit.

Documented unsatisfactory performance against standards as previously determined by the faculty members within the unit, and communicated to them each year, shall serve as justification for withholding the across-the-board portion, as well as the merit portion, of an individual's increase.

Documented particularly meritorious performance awards, in addition to regular merit increases, may be made from a pool set aside from the overall merit pool within the unit, on the recommendation of the faculty members within the unit, and in concurrence with the head of the administrative unit.

Promotion Increases Beginning with the 1992-93 salary year, promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, or promotion from associate professor to professor, will be accompanied by a \$2,000 increase in base salary. To prevent a relative devaluation of promotion increases, the initial \$2,000 base will be increased annually by the same percentage at which the social security maximum salary increases. This indexation shall become effective on January 1st of each calendar year.

FICA or
only Soc.
Sec.?

Discussion of the recommendations followed. SCFA members favored the idea of an increase accompanying a promotion and one person suggested the language should read "at least" a \$2,000 increase in base salary. It was noted that the \$2,000 is strictly for promotion and that merit and across-the-board raises would be considered separately. When asked about the base salary for full professors, Prof. Fossum said, two things can happen. First, the bottom line is moderately expensive and represents an increase that would carry over. Second, the market as a whole would have more variation than the University would have if a \$45,000 or \$50,000 dollar base was established. It is very difficult to determine, he said, whether or not a \$45,000 or \$50,000 base would be appropriate in every situation, and thus, would require review of individuals case-by-case. The Working Group did not feel it made sense to do that if they were going to adhere primarily to a merit or merit and across-the-board type of increase program.

Several SCFA members expressed strong concern that, if implemented, many existing inequities would not be corrected and longterm faculty would continue to be disadvantaged. Some argued the proposal is a perpetuation of the current system. Others did not feel the problems associated with step-systems or base salaries were adequately addressed. One committee member

The External Review Committee made ten recommendations, which are outlined in its report [attached to these minutes]. Using the standards of the American College Health Association, specifically describing those characteristics which are considered to be essential to student health care, the committee unequivocally endorsed the continuation of a campus health service. The question of whether or not Boynton currently measures up in providing those features unique to a college health service, received a mixed response. The committee was particularly concerned with the hours of service on a campus the size of the U of M that has a high proportion of older and graduate students on campus in the later afternoons and early evenings. It was also concerned with the small number of staff assigned to health education. That issue, Vice President Hughes said, is currently being addressed. The External Review Committee also posed a question about the mandatory fee and suggested examination of the 6-credit rule exemption that is in place for students. Some students, it was found, take only 4 or 5 credits to avoid paying the fee, yet can use the service on a fee basis. Another area being reviewed is whether or not the mandatory fee can be reduced by assessing students a user fee in certain areas.

One of the greatest challenges, Vice President Hughes said, will be defining what is community and public health services on campus. Consumer involvement was also addressed, and found to be an area of major weakness. The Committee recommended developing a Consumer Advisory Board including all constituencies served by BHS to assist in developing plans, evaluate services, recommend budgets and fees, etc. International students, she said, pose special challenges because of their insurance plans and health care structures. The Committee also recommended that the University develop a comprehensive pre-paid health care option plan at BHS, not only for students but also for faculty and staff and their families. It was recommended that nurse educators and health educators would significantly enhance the health care programs, as opposed to a predominant practice of physician health care. Lastly, the Committee recommended reviewing the existing University-sponsored student health insurance to improve benefits and reduce restrictions at lower costs.

Professor Ben-Ner thanked Vice President Hughes for her report and introduced Mr. Gailon Roen, Director of Boynton Health Service.

One SCFA member said he believes, in cases where students are covered by another insurance plan, they should not be required to pay the "universal fee." By doing so, they are in effect paying twice for the same service. Other institutions, he said, generally change the fee for those who are covered by another health plan.

When asked if BHS charges other insurance providers for fees, Mr. Roen said it is not BHS practice to do so for a number of reasons. In many cases, students are looking for confidentiality. Mr. Roen added, that in an attempt to have a consistent policy, it would be difficult to separate which items should be billed and which should not. In addition, BHS looks at availability--students currently have the option of going in-and-out of Group Health and want BHS to be available when they do not have access to Group Health.

Several SCFA members felt Boynton should collect fees whenever it can and that a better system should be developed between Group Health and the student health insurance plan.

One committee member said it appeared the University has a very extensive health care system and that perhaps alternatives should be explored. Vice President Hughes responded, that determining the most suitable size is difficult, and in fact, universities that have attempted to

Page 5

down-size their health care services have discovered that it has adversely affected student retention and academic performance.

In response to a question about offering contracts to students for health care at the University Hospital and Clinic, Vice President Hughes said Ohio State attempted to merge its student health plan with its campus medical school and discovered it wasn't functional. In fact, she said, they sought help from the U of M to correct the situation.

It was noted that BHS currently is a participating provider in PHP but not in the State Health Plan. It was suggested that if BHS could participate in the State Health Plan, it would allow BHS to bill faculty and staff and their dependents who belong to PHP and the State Health Plan and who use Boynton Health Service.

In review, Professor Ben-Ner said, it appears there are some students who do not have adequate health insurance and believe Boynton should provide services for them. This raises the question of who should fund this? It appears some mechanism by which either central administration directly pays or students co-insure each other for the benefit of those who do not have insurance should be developed. Also, if there are any services provided to faculty, the general feeling is they should be assessed a charge.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

-- Linda Inman