



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate
Senate Consultative Committee
154 Klæber Court
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of December 15, 1977

The All University Senate Consultative Committee convened its eighth meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, December 15, 1977 in Room 403 of the Campus Club.

Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Mark Bufkin, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Harriet Lewis, Terry Marchiniak, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett (chairperson), Philip Ryan, Barbara Stuhler and Mahmood Zaidi.

Professor Robinett called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

For Information Only:

1. Student Representation on the Regents' Committee of the Whole

Professor Robinett reported that the Regents have agreed to seat a student representative on the Committee of the Whole.

2. Vice President for Administrative Operations

Professor Robinett told the committee that the Regents had confirmed the appointment of Professor Robert A. Stein as the new Vice President for Administrative Operations.

Action Items:

3. Salary Equalization Study

This December 15 meeting had been called specifically to discuss the Salary Equalization Study which committee members had received a few days prior to this meeting from the President's office. The report itself originated from Vice President Henry Koffler's Office of Academic Affairs. Professor Robinett began the discussion of the study by saying that she felt the President would appreciate a timely response from the SCC on this document because of the retroactive nature of the recommendation.

Professor Glick volunteered to describe to the committee the history of the study and the legislative rider. Professor Glick said that he was most familiar with the background for UMD and so began to tell the committee the highlights of what had happened at that campus over the past twenty-five years. When UMD began functioning as part of the University of Minnesota, there were no funds appropriated to it by the State Legislature. Efforts were made by UMD to secure funding from the Legislature, largely without assistance from Central Administration. Their eventual success was attributed in part to legislative fatigue, that body having been approached often by persons lobbying for UMD, coupled with a general feeling that some action must be taken to respond to the obvious need for funds

at UMD. Professor Glick went on to say that during the '60's students and faculty became especially concerned about comparisons of mean salary levels at UMD with those of junior colleges, state colleges and public school systems in Minnesota. This made it particularly difficult for UMD to attract superior faculty to its campus, although it was able in certain cases to secure some additional staff of excellent quality during this period ('60's).

The '60's also saw the beginning of some improvement in salary levels, but not enough to bring average salaries at UMD up to par with those in the state college system, and still only better than three or four of the junior colleges in Minnesota. Professor Glick commented that because of the apparent unwillingness of Central Administration to address the problem of salary inequities, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) became involved in lobbying efforts with the State Legislature on behalf of UMD. It was not until 1973, when AAUP put pressure on Central Administration through its influence on the Legislature, that Central Administration, particularly through the efforts of Vice President Kegler, began to allocate some funds for UMD.

Even this germinal effort by Vice President Kegler was reacted to by UMD as an attempt to gloss over the problem of salary inequities between UMD and the Twin Cities' Campus; there was still an obvious discrepancy between salaries paid to faculty members at the two campuses and this discrepancy appeared to be increasing, not decreasing. At this point, UMD decided to go directly to the Legislature to push for full equalization. This resulted in the rider now attached to the last legislative appropriations to the University. (The Salary Equalization Study under consideration at today's SCC meeting is in response to that rider.)

Professor Holt began the general discussion of the study by asking for a definition of equalization. Professor Glick said that the Legislature is using a functional definition of equalization of salaries on these campuses as meaning similar overall means by academic rank.

Professor Barber (UMM) added an aside to the effect that his campus has been the beneficiary of UMD's efforts with the Legislature. He added that two other factors which have helped UMM keep pace with salary levels were the newness the campus and timing (UMM came into being as a campus of the University close to the point at which years of effort on the part of UMD were coming to fruition.)

Professor Purple commented that the Waseca and Crookston campuses of the University are modeled after the New York state college system.

Professor Barber concluded his comments about UMM with the statement that his campus has formed a committee which is working on considering what is referred to as an "eminence factor" which will be used in determining differentials between salary levels for faculty hired to teach at UMM and then on the Twin Cities' Campus.

Ms. Lewis raised the question of including a consideration of the cost of living in the different areas where the University's campuses are located. Professor Purple responded to her question by giving a brief history of the study done by the AAUP of the Duluth and Twin Cities' Campuses. Professor Thomas Bacig (UMD) took a quarter leave to concentrate on lobbying in St. Paul with the Legislature for equalization of salaries and his study showed that there is in fact very little difference in the cost of living in the Twin Cities as compared to Duluth. Morris' cost of living may be just slightly lower, but not enough to be significant.

Professor Morrison said that he felt an "attraction factor" should be taken into account. He was of the opinion that faculty at Duluth and Morris often traveled to the Twin Cities for University-related activities (e.g., research at the Twin Cities' library facilities, faculty committee meetings) or for personal reasons (e.g., to attend the theatre, shopping), all of which means the expenditure of additional time and money for the faculty member at an out-state campus.

Professor Purple provided the committee with the information that the AAUP has gone to the past twenty-three legislative sessions, totally independent of the University. He said that UMD has also gone before the Legislature three times on an independent basis in an attempt to have that body consider the rider: The first attempt appeared to be successful, the second was not, and the third resulted in the rider now under consideration.

Professor Holt returned to the discussion of whether a comparison of salaries which uses as its basis the mean salaries by rank of faculty is truly a just means to accomplish equalization. He pointed out that, due to the variance in individuals within a given rank, the means for some ranks may be misleading. Professor Glick agreed, commenting that UMD does not have as many faculty "of eminence" as does the Twin Cities' Campus, so the means of faculty at UMD would appear lower in comparison to Twin Cities' figures than is really the case, if individual salaries within ranks were to be compared instead of mean salaries. Professor Holt said that another factor which should be kept in mind when comparing mean figures is that these lumped dollar amounts do not account for differences in promotions and the number of younger faculty within ranks. Professor Morrison said that, in addition, the question of advancement needs to be dealt with, since it is his feeling that there are many UMD faculty who are not likely to advance beyond the rank of associate professor. Professor Glick agreed, but remarked that part of the reason for faculty not advancing on the UMD campus was and is the lack of resources to advance. He cited as an example the differences in the Departments of Economics at the two campuses.

Professor Robinett reminded the committee that the purpose of today's meeting was not only to discuss the Salary Equalization Study but to prepare a committee response to President Magrath on the merits of the study. She asked members to be thinking about what this response would be once the discussion was concluded.

Professor Zaidi told the committee he felt that if the SCC wanted to meet with President Magrath during January on the Salary Equalization Study, perhaps this could be arranged. Professor Zaidi felt that the SCC could not be expected to react quickly to the report. He said that the actual deadline which President Magrath is working against, as stated in the rider, is January 1979. Professor Robinett reminded Professor Zaidi that the SCC has a meeting scheduled with the President for January 19, so perhaps no additional meeting would have to be set up.

Professor Purple remarked that he would like to have the opportunity to talk with other resource persons such as Professor Edward Foster of the Graduate School and Professor George Green (AAUP), before making a final recommendation on the study. Professor Purple expressed the concern that the methodology used in the study needed to be evaluated more closely, and that persons outside the SCC could help with this evaluation. Others on the committee responded that there was probably enough expertise

among committee members to evaluate the methodology, but that a meeting with persons from outside of the SCC would be useful for other reasons. Professor Glick said that Professor Bacig's figures on salary comparisons did not agree with those of Professor Foster and Professor Green and that their figures, in turn, did not agree with those of Professor Bacig. Professor Blake added that Vice President Koffler's office has figures which can be used to project the cost to the University of equalization. Professor Purple maintained that he would like to get some additional verbal estimates of the cost to the University.

Professor Holt remarked that he wished that President Magrath had consulted with the SCC last summer, rather than now, after the study has been completed.

Professor Zaidi spoke to the group about the constraints on the President to present this study to the Legislature. The members of the committee discussed their concerns about the pattern of after-the-fact referral of reports and studies to committees and the general tensions arising from this situation. Professor Zaidi eventually focused the group on Professor Robinett's earlier request for a statement of response from the SCC on the Salary Equalization Study which would be sent to President Magrath.

Professor Morrison said he wanted to express a few concerns that he had about the study before the SCC developed its response to the President. In summary, Professor Morrison was concerned that there is a lesson to be learned here that it is productive to hire good lobbyists, that there seems to be a continuing trend back to FYE's and treating the faculty as though it is on a step-in-grade salary progression scale similar to that used in some teachers' colleges, and that there needs to be a question raised regarding the use of the Minnesota state college system as a basis for comparison. Professor Purple asked Professor Morrison if he was also expressing the feeling that the study ignored the marketplace: Professor Morrison answered affirmatively and said that by ignoring the marketplace, the University may be incurring specific consequences. Professor Morrison pointed out that persons "of eminence" on the faculty could not be paid in relation to the mean for their rank as the only consideration; the marketplace for such individuals must be considered. He also observed that, if there are those who receive significantly more than the mean salary, then consequently there will be those at the other end of the range who will receive significantly less than the mean in order for the mean to be maintained. Professor Morrison also expressed the concern that merit increases might be distributed in such a way over the next two years that the effects of the equalization efforts are eliminated.

Professor Purple said that he felt an acknowledgement should be made of the position in which the administration finds itself. Without laying claim to being an administrative apologist, he continued, he urged the committee to consider that the administration was trying to engineer a compromise between demands of the Legislature and the mounting pressure from out-state campuses. He went on to outline to the committee some of his concerns regarding the need for UMD to be in a position to compete with other institutions. He noted that the Salary Equalization Study showed that the inequities are not as great as people have thought them to be. He said the report indicates that everyone would start "equal" this year by bringing everyone up according to merit, with a note that doctoral-granting institutions would seem to have to "rise higher" than others, if the marketplace is taken into consideration. Professor Purple predicted that Duluth would receive very little additional funding this year.

Professor Keller commented that the report seemed to establish a basis of comparison which would require that merit be ignored three years from now. Professor Purple quoted from President Magrath's cover letter -- that the issue would be "settled once and for all." Professor Holt was concerned that the means quoted in the study would be "out of kilter" in two or three years, and that this eventuality is built into the approach used by those doing the study. Professor Purple remarked that the study seemed to him to be a political solution. Professor Keller responded that if it was, then the SCC has a political role to play in considering the study.

The discussion shifted to consideration of what information/reactions should be conveyed to President Magrath. There was mention of three items which were not considered in the study which the SCC felt should have been included: 1) net dollar costs to the University of a faculty member; 2) recognition of people bringing in research money; and, 3) recognition of summer work without compensation which is required of some faculty.

Professor Keller felt that the SCC should take a stand on these three salary equalization issues. Professor Blake was concerned that it would be impossible to assess such costs. Professor Keller did not agree but added to his statement a definition of costs/benefits: Costs/benefits are funds which must go through the University Bursar's Office (Business Office). He added that his total income is controlled by the University for a maximum, but not for a minimum. Professor Blake felt that take-home pay would be the simplest basis for comparison.

Professor Purple said his perception of the report was that it represented a way of improving UMD's position within the University system. Professor Glick said he had told Vice President Koffler that everyone concerned should "sit around the table" and discuss this matter.

Professor Zaidi again returned to the matter of composing a statement which would be sent to President Magrath expressing the concerns of the SCC. There seemed to be agreement on the following items: 1) there should be equal compensation to persons of equal merit and competence; 2) where genuine inequities are recognized, the University administration should regularly address itself to the problem; 3) the methodology for equalization should reflect the first two principles above.

Professor Holt said he would endorse the spirit of the recommendation to bring UMD and UMM up to par with the rest of the University. Professor Purple felt that the coordinate campuses' faculty should understand the bases for the recommendation. Ms. Lewis said that TA's doing the work of assistant professors at UMD are going to want their share of the faculty salaries.

Professor Glick said that he felt the President knows that the whole University system will suffer unless some action is taken by the administration. Professor Blake was concerned that the report did not deal with the College of Agriculture salary inequities, and that absence of this information would raise questions. Professor Holt felt that St. Paul cannot ask for increases in salaries when units in Minneapolis are not getting paid for summer work.

Professor Purple said he thought the Legislature would not want to deal with the issue of salary equalization among campuses of the University once it has dealt with the rider. Professor Keller said he felt the SCC should not endorse the study but should acknowledge to the President that it was understood he must go forward with it to the Legislature. Professor Holt again said that the SCC should not

endorse the methodology. Professor Blake provided some wording for the general sentiments of the committee: Disparities in compensation should not develop among units of equal competence and similar mission.

Ms. Lewis wished to endorse UMD's efforts at having attention paid to their problems.

Professor Blake went on to phrase another statement: Units of equal contributions should receive equal compensation. It was also felt that a statement should be included to the effect that if inequities develop, the administration should address itself directly to correcting them.

Professor Glick wanted it mentioned that merit has many forms. Professor Robinett responded by saying that while merit may take many forms, those forms are fairly well-defined within the University system. Professor Glick replied that he felt the University system is too diverse to apply system-wide guidelines for assessing merit. Professor Holt expressed his opinion that it is not possible to say one thing is of merit on one campus, but not on another. Professor Keller said that there are different ways, different standards, used to determine merit (e.g., a poor professor of law may be getting a higher salary than a good professor of English). Professor Purple commented once again that the marketplace would be a determinant. Professor Blake acknowledged this, but felt that the marketplace could be manipulated.

There was some discussion of various statistics used in the Salary Equalization Study and how useful or relevant they were.

Professor Holt asked that it be stated in the letter to the President that the SCC recognizes the study as a political document and that the parties affected by it should meet to discuss it. Professor Keller observed that the SCC is not in the position of responding to a legislative mandate, as are President Magrath and Vice President Koffler. Professor Purple wanted to have the SCC meet with some outside experts on methodology and then meet with President Magrath and Vice President Koffler. Professor Blake said that in fairness, St. Paul Campus should not be left out of the report. Professor Glick asked why St. Paul was not included. Professor Blake and Professor Robinett answered that the figures are not yet ready to be discussed.

Professor Zaidi raised the issue of the SCC's role in regard to the study: Does the President want the SCC to endorse the report? Professor Robinett said that the President has said he would welcome comments from the SCC. She then asked if the SCC wanted a fourth statement in the letter to the effect that this was a political document and, as such, the parties affected should meet to discuss it. She also listed the persons the SCC might want to consult with concerning the report: Professor Edward Foster; the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs; Professor Thomas Bacig (UMD); Professor W. Donald Spring (UMM); Professor Dean Crawford (UMD); Professor Robert Evans (UMD). Professor Purple wanted those people who meet with the SCC to be familiar with methodology and to represent different interests.

Professor Keller wanted some expression included in the letter of the precedent-setting nature of such a study, and an emphasis on the fact that the SCC sees the document as a political solution. Professor Glick wanted a request included to the administration for a constant review of salaries. Professor Robinett felt this was addressed in one of the statements upon which the committee had already agreed. Professor Glick further noted that there seemed to be a bifurcation between the

methodology and the results contained in the study. Professor Blake commented that the study represented a piecemeal or ad hoc solution.

Professor Keller outlined three ways in which the solution was ad hoc:
1) it did not consider merit differences by unit; 2) it did not consider individual merit; and 3) it makes the assumption that all units are equal. Professor Holt added that it aggregates dollar figures across units, which distorts the resulting comparisons. Professor Glick thought that the schools against which the coordinate campuses were compared were inappropriate choices. There was also concern that some comparisons were made which are misleading because they do not take into consideration the differences between nine- and eleven-month salaries.

It was decided that Professor Robinett would meet with a subcommittee composed of Professors Blake and Keller to draft a letter to President Magrath which would be mailed to the other committee members as soon as possible for approval before it would be sent to the President.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee will be held at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 5, 1978 in Room 606 of the Campus Club.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda L. Compton
Administrative Fellow
Senate Consultative Committee