

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, December 8, 2009
2:30 – 4:15
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Kathryn Hanna (chair), Ben Bornsztein, Marilyn Bruin, Dann Chapman, Vladimir Cherkassky, Randy Croce, Jayne Fulkerson, Morris Kleiner, Holly Littlefield, Theodor Litman, Karen Miksch, Jessica Reinitz, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Jason Shaw, Roderick Squires, James Wojtaszek

Absent: Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Barbara Elliott, George Sheets,

Guests: Sarah Waldemar (CAPA); Jackie Singer (Employee Benefits)

[In these minutes: (1) concerns of P&A staff; (2) ad hoc Subcommittee on Principles and Strategies for Salary Adjustments for Faculty]

1. Concerns of Academic Professionals and Administrators

Professor Hanna convened the meeting at 2:30 and welcomed Ms. Waldemar to the meeting to discuss concerns academic professionals and administrators (P&A staff) have about participation in governance.

Ms. Waldemar began by reporting that the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) is considering becoming a senate in order to be better integrated into the University's governance system; issues arise for them because they are not part of the formal senate structure. They report to the President but are "out on the side" in terms of the senate and documents do not always flow well. CAPA intends to work on this issue over the next several months; and she will come back to the Committee to seek its support and advice. The reason for the agenda item today, however, is to seek a statement about P&A participation in governance.

Mr. Croce explained his long involvement in CAPA, dating from before it was CAPA, and observed that P&A staff have made a lot of progress in participating in governance. Both Senate committees and the administration have been active in involving them. There is frustration, however, among P&A staff, because despite the President's annual letter endorsing participation in governance, obstacles remain.

For faculty, service is part of their job; for many P&A staff, it is not, so participation in governance is over and above their regular duties, and they may even be penalized for participating.

Some are allowed to participate but must do so on "their own time" and any time spent on these activities must be made up and some have job duties that prevent attendance at or participation in meetings (for example, P&A staff on sponsored research funds may not be able to participate.)

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Specific to the issue of P&A who are penalized for participation and those who do not participate because the activity does not count in their evaluation was the request that this Committee demonstrate support of P&A participation in University governance through a statement to the University Senate. Mr Croce suggested that there may need to be a at the policy level and asked the Committee for suggestions.

Professor Hanna said, apropos of the lack of participation because of the "chilling effect" that P&A staff could be penalized, that there is no good way to identify it and it occurs in other areas of the University as well. The University loses talent when that happens. Mr. Croce reminded the Committee that faculty may not be aware that P&A staff can face non-renewal of their appointments for any reason. He also noted that they do not lack participation; there are more applicants for seats on committees than there are seats, so he does not want to overstate the case, but there is concern that some departments do not support governance participation.

Committee members offered a number of observations.

-- The problem may be identifying what is meant by service. In some departments there is a distinction between internal service and service to the profession; most see the former as necessary but the latter as more likely to have a role in salary decisions. If something is not given credit, people won't do it, it was said, but it was also said that people do it for fun even though they receive no credit.

-- What are the chilling effects and what supervisor constraints exist so they come down on employees who participate? There are many parts of the University in which no P&A staff participate in governance (e.g., AHC units with P&A staff on sponsored funds—the department would have to put up non-sponsored funds to permit participation). There are sectors where the leadership philosophy is not geared to service outside the department; there are other areas where P&A staff participate in significant numbers. There are also productivity issues, such as five hours per month to participate in CAPA; in other cases it may simply be a control issue, the supervisor versus the employee.

-- Are there P&A staff who are refused permission to participate in governance despite the President's letter? There are, and everyone knows it is unlikely an employee is going to complain to the President. By the same token, they do not wish to force anyone to serve.

-- If they have more applicants than available spots, it is not clear what they are trying to fix. There may be a problem in certain units. What they are seeking, Ms. Waldemar said, is endorsement/support/recognition that P&A staff serve a valuable role in governance and that the faculty recognize and support their participation and contributions. The statement could go to supervisors and the "DDD" list. The problem (Professor Hanna commented) is if there is a talented person in a unit who believes he or she will be punished for serving in governance—or IS punished for service. While it is hard to protect everyone, Mr. Croce said, a policy encouraging participation could be helpful. Many faculty-like P&As are supervised by faculty, so faculty endorsement is important and participation could be included in annual evaluations.

-- Much of what this Committee talks about is relevant to P&A staff.

Ms. Waldemar agreed to draft a statement the Committee could consider adopting. A policy change would also have to go through Human Resources. Professor Fulkerson suggested the language

might speak to the issue of including service as part of the job description for P&A staff. Ms. Waldemar agreed, except for staff who are appointed 100% on sponsored research funds.

Professor Miksch noted that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure had recently proposed changes to the Regents' Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy (which were accepted by the Board) that covered everyone who participates in shared governance. That policy change is another indication that support for shared governance is broad and that everyone is expected to do his or her part.

2. ad hoc Subcommittee on Principles and Strategies for Salary Adjustments for Faculty

Professor Hanna turned next to Professor Kleiner, chair of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Principles and Strategies for Salary Adjustments for Faculty. (A copy of the recommendations, distributed to the Committee, is appended to these minutes.)

Professor Kleiner began by thanking Professors Hanna and Kulacki, Mr. Croce, and Vice President Carrier as an ex officio member of the subcommittee. The work of the subcommittee followed from the discussion at the September 29 meeting and was driven by the statement in the annual academic salary memo that salary increases must be based on merit; they interpreted that to mean individual merit. The subcommittee wondered how this would affect the ability of faculty members to work across units; when the University wants work across disciplines, the salary memo could lead to development of "silos," where heads of units want individuals to work only in one unit.

The recommendations are presented on the first page of the report, the rationale on the second. It was the view of the subcommittee that "we are all at the University of Minnesota, it has one motto, and we will rise and sink together depending on how the University does." In that light, it makes sense that some proportion of salary increases should depend on how the unit and the University does, Professor Kleiner said. They recognize that faculty members are highly sought-after and the subcommittee does not in any way suggest that the University should not seek to retain faculty members who are highly productive and in great demand. They think that a component of compensation should recognize individual achievement, but there is room for both methods of recognition in compensation.

Professor Hanna noted the background to the subcommittee's report, including the 2008-09 academic salary memo, an annual document from the Provost and the Vice President for Human Resources; the subcommittee suggests changing the wording. She also noted that this would apply only to individuals not in a bargaining unit, and recalled that the UEA (the bargaining unit for the faculty at Crookston and Duluth) contract provides for three different ways to deliver compensation: an across-the-board percentage, an across-the-board lump sum, and a percentage based on merit. The University has, thus, allowed across-the-board raises for a segment of the faculty.

Professor Kulacki said he hoped that the Faculty Consultative Committee would review the report and the minutes of the meeting and comment on the recommendations. It is important to get recognition that there are different pay schemes and to at least start the debate, even if the recommendations are not accepted at this time. Professor Kleiner added that the subcommittee sees this as a way to make the entire University more productive; it is not just a matter of equity but also reflects the fact that part of faculty responsibilities are tied to the University, not just the individual departments in which they are appointed.

Mr. Croce said that Vice President Carrier made it clear that the administration supports salary decisions based on merit, but in practice almost everyone receives a raise. The subcommittee thought that the practice should be made explicit so that all feel rewarded for a common effort by a smaller workforce. In addition, Professor Hanna said, with a pay freeze, when the University has a chance to grant an increase, an across-the-board increase would be a statement about the efforts everyone is making in difficult times. In one college, the administrators took salary decreases as a budget strategy but the central administration refused to allow them.

Dr. Littlefield inquired how the recommendations relate to market force increases. That is a point to be considered with some raises, Professor Hanna said. Professor Kulacki said that when she was asked, Vice President Carrier said the funds for responding to market pressures would come from the units, which implies they come from vacant positions or perhaps the dean. In his experience as dean, the Provost's office could also help, but that was before the current budget model was adopted; there are no longer any central funds available for this purpose.

Professor Bornsstein observed that the wording of the recommendations could allow a unit to deliver salary increases that were 1% across-the-board and 99% based on merit. That is correct, Professor Kleiner said; the intent was to leave the decision at the discretion of the units because the subcommittee did not think that one size fits all. Faculty and administrators in each unit should decide. A unit could still decide to base its salary increases entirely on merit, if it wished. The intent of the recommendations is that the wording in the salary memo be changed, at least for next year, Professor Kleiner affirmed.

Professor Squires said he was pleased with the subcommittee recommendations—although he was under no illusion that they would go anywhere. The administration has made it clear it believes in merit.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the subcommittee report and to forward it to the Faculty Consultative Committee for review and comment. It was noted that the deadline for final action by the governance system is early in February.

Professor Hanna thanked everyone for attending, wished Committee members a good holiday, and adjourned the meeting at 3:35.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

TO: Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
FROM: Subcommittee on Principles and Strategies for Salary Adjustments for Faculty
SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Subcommittee

At the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) meeting on September 29, 2009, SCFA discussed the need to review the guidelines for the annual salary increases for Fiscal Year 2011 (Academic Year 2010-2011) and to review allocation agreements and schemes for the other campuses of the University.

At the meeting we were informed that units will be allocated a 2% compensation increase pool pending action by the Legislature and Governor during the next several months. The projected compensation pool is to include retention offers and the automatic increases for promotion in rank. Funds for these categories of compensation, according to Vice President. Carrier, are to come from the recurring funds already allocated to the units.

Allocation models for 2010-2011 at the campuses with University Education Association bargaining units (Duluth and Crookston) have negotiated a mix of merit and across-the-board increases in annual compensation. The sub-committee understands that reference here to “compensation” refers to the annual B-, or A-base salary.

Within this framework and after some extended discussion elaborated in the Minutes of the September 29th meeting, SCFA Chair Hanna appointed an *ad hoc* subcommittee to examine the “principles and strategies for salary adjustments for faculty.” This memorandum contains a summary of the sub-committee’s work and its recommendations to SCFA. Sub-committee members included Randy Croce, Kathryn Hanna, Morris Kleiner, subcommittee chair, and Frank Kulacki. Vice President Carol Carrier was an ex-officio member of the committee.

Recommendation of the sub-committee

All members of the sub-committee met on Friday October 30th to consider the current and proposed principles and strategies for salary adjustments for faculty, academic professional and administrative. Staff (P&A), and others covered in the annual “Academic Salary Memo” from the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Vice President for Human Resources. The Academic Salary Memo covers the following employees (see <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/toolkit/compensation/payplans/2008acad/index.html>):

- * Faculty in the 94XX series, (but not including UMD or Crookston faculty represented by UEA)
- * Academic professional and administrative staff (97XX, 96XX, and 93XX series)
- * Graduate assistants and others in the 95XX series.

Specifically, the sub-committee focused on the current language in the Academic Salary Memo indicating that all increases must be based on merit and not across-the-board. Based on our discussions at this meeting and subsequent deliberation, the subcommittee recommends that this language be dropped as a policy and that the following be adopted for the salary increases for 2010-2011 Fiscal Year:

Units (i.e., colleges or administrative equivalents) are encouraged to consider allocating a portion of their compensation increase for the Fiscal Year 2011 in an across-the-board manner. The portion of the increase allocated in an across-the-board manner shall be at the discretion of the chancellor, vice president, or dean as appropriate after meaningful consultation as outlined in the University's faculty compensation policy and the academic professional and administrative staff compensation policy.

We present below the rationale for our recommendation.

Rationale

Although allocating annual salary increases based solely on individual merit, apart from increases related to promotion in rank and retention packages, is a strong and important tool to motivate faculty and staff to be productive researchers, teachers, and public servants, it may not in all cases and across units be the optimal compensation policy within the University's goals of attaining a top international status.

Additionally, we think that a broadly based recognition for the accomplishments of the University over the past fiscal year, during which base salaries have been frozen, is now appropriate. Over the past several years in a climate of decreased resources to colleges and departments, the University has improved baccalaureate graduation rates, maintained and in some areas expanded its graduate research funding base, and attracted better prepared and highly capable first year students. To be sure, all groups of employees and the Central Administration share equally the credit for advances in these touchstone areas. A broad recognition of the role of the groups covered by the Academic Salary Memo in this progress is, we think, not only appropriate but necessary.

The subcommittee therefore thinks that allowing units to choose to allocate some portion of the annual salary increase in an across-the-board manner will provide a measure of recognition that the front-line faculty as a whole deserve.

The subcommittee thinks that with some portion of compensation adjustment linked to the overall performance of the unit and the University, continued institutional improvement and quality can best be fostered. We think that having a choice architecture for compensation that allows for greater freedom to allocate some portion of compensation linked to college or University performance would create a greater willingness of faculty to serve the unit and University in many different and productive ways.

As faculty at the University it is important that we view that when the university does well through an increase in the quality and quantity of students that all should at some level share in that accomplishment. As the University gains in its ability to attract external research funding, this should also be viewed to some extent as a group accomplishment. To the extent that we provide advice, expertise, and service to the state, nation, and internationally all the faculty should at some level share in those accomplishments. We think that having some compensation linked to the success of the unit or University would foster greater faculty commitment to the institution. Just as the University has one theme "Driven to Discover," that sets one tone for the University; some portion of pay similarly should reflect the overall accomplishments of the unit or institution. We think that this approach would encourage more collegial and interdisciplinary work, and a greater willingness to serve the University in all its stated goals, rather than just individualistic ones.

We recognize that faculty at the University are highly productive and are often sought after, and this proposal in no way suggests that when these faculty are offered alternative employment, that we do not do all that we can to keep and provide faculty on an individual basis with a advantageous work environment.

Clearly we think that an important component of the compensation increase should reflect individual achievement and productivity. However we also think here is room in the University's academic salary plan for Fiscal Year 2011 for both recognition of individual achievement and the overall advance of the institution over the past two fiscal years. Some portion of the salary increase therefore should reflect this reality so as to encourage the faculty to contribute even more to the overall advancement of the goals of the University.