

# **Faculty Senate**

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
November 19, 1990  
U. C. BALLROOM 3 p.m.

## **AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of October 15, 1990 meeting
- III. Additions to and/or deletions from agenda
- IV.. Senate President's Report - Jim Thomas
- V. Committee Reports
  - A. Faculty Benefits - Gary Scott (5 minutes)
  - B. Professional Concerns - Ray McNeil (5 minutes)
  - C. Curriculum - Phil McCartney
    - 1. Policy Statement - voting item (5 minutes)
    - 2. Respiratory Care Program Courses - voting item (10 minutes)
    - 3. Justice Studies Program - voting item (10 minutes)
    - 4. Foreign Language Majors - voting item (10 minutes)
  - D. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs - Ljubomir Nacev
    - 1. Market/Equity Salary Policy - voting item (30 minutes)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

JT/pg

# **Faculty Senate**

Northern Kentucky University

Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

## MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 1990 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Avey, Diana Belland, Carol Bredemeyher, Gary Clayton, Y. Datta, Frank Dietrich, Sudesh Duggal, Nancy Lee Firak, Ron Hickey, Randy Holt, Don Kelm, Mike King, Nan Littleton, Dennis Lye, Phil McCartney, Ray McNeil, Frances Mosser, Bob Mullen, Margaret Myers, Ljubomir Nacev, James Niewahner, Dennis O'Keefe, Terry Pence, Michael Prioleau, Bill Recker, Vince schulte, Gary Scott, James Thomas, J. Michael Thomson, Bill Wagner, Stephen Walker, Bob Wallace, Emily Werrell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lawrence Borne, Vinay Kumar, L. Mackenzie Osborne

GUESTS: Al Pinelo, Carla Chance, Dennis Taulbee, John Filaseta, Katherine Kurk, Hilary Landwehr, Fred Rhynhart, Jerry Legere, David Jorns, Darryl Poole, Janet Johnson

- I Meeting was called to order 3:05pm
- II Approval of minutes of Oct. 15, 1990  
Minutes were approved as read.
- III Additions and/or deletions to the agenda  
Clarification--The market/equity salary policy itself is not a voting item. The voting item is a request for more information.
- IV Senate President's Report--Jim Thomas
  - A The Board of Regents has passed the Sexual Harassment Policy and the Masters Program in Nursing.
  - B The Drug-Testing Policy has been published in Campus Digest.
  - C Jim is currently representing the faculty on the search committee for the Vice-President for Administrative Affairs.
- V Committee Reports
  - A Faculty Benefits--Gary Scott  
Ranking of Proposals continues--deadline for final list is Dec. 1st
  - B Professional Concerns--Ray McNeil  
Discussion of Revised Faculty Handbook continues.  
Work is expected to be completed early next semester. Nan Littleton's work on Who's Who continues. A subcommittee on the issue of tenure for administrator's is working on a statement.
  - C Curriculum--Phil McCartney
    1. Policy Statement--voting item  
This statement updates sections of the curriculum manual. It takes into account the fact that we now have an electronic catalogue in addition to a printed catalogue. It also attempts to clear up various definitions and policies regarding non-traditional courses and how they are handled. The policy also makes a clearer statement about course numbering policy. In response to a question, the course of development of a non-traditional course was restated. The proposal goes first to the non-traditional course subcommittee. This subcommittee decides which academic unit will be responsible for the course. The proposal then goes on to the University Curriculum Committee.

The motion to approve carried.



2. Respirator Care Program--voting item

This is a continuation of action begun in 1978. There has been much discussion over the way to proceed with this program, what documentation was necessary, etc. Phil referred the Senate to his memo to Tom Isherwood regarding the evaluation of resources and the proper documentation.

The motion to approve carried.

3. Justice Studies Program--voting item

There was discussion regarding this program concerning prerequisites, necessity for additional faculty, interdisciplinary aspects, and career opportunities for graduates.

The motion to approve carried with one vote opposed.

4. Foreign Language Majors--voting item

The motion to approve carried.

D. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs--Ljubomir Nacev

1. Request for Information--voting item

A request was made that additional information be added to the Faculty Salary Data Base. Dr. Jorns expressed his support for the proposal but stated that the data entry involved may take time due to a work backlog. Also, he reaffirmed that the individual's right to privacy will be respected.

2. Informational Item--6 page document

Ljubomir outlined its major aspects:

1) Eligibility--it attempts to broaden the number of faculty eligible. It contains 3 criteria--2 of which are objective

2) Merit

3) Distributional Effects

Several reservations and questions were discussed. Several senators found the proposed formula too restrictive. They felt that the chairs should have more control over these decisions since they are in the closest contact with the people involved. Concerns over CUPA's applicability to all departments were voiced. It was also pointed out that CUPA was intended as an average, but that it was rapidly becoming a ceiling. Members of the committee defended the proposal, stating their belief that bringing NKU up to CUPA will ultimately benefit the above-average faculty member rather than rewarding mediocrity, as some have stated. Other concerns were that the formula would wipe out merit history by bringing everyone up to a statistical average. The proposal's placement of merit as the 2nd criteria for consideration was questioned--why not make merit the 1st consideration? Ljubomir stated his belief that the proposal would not wipe out merit history. He also stated his belief that two issues were being confused in the discussions--1) who gets merit pay? and 2) when do they get it? He then asked for guidance for the next step of the process. A straw vote on the document was 7-5 against. It was recommended that the definition of eligibility be sufficiently broadened to include all deserving individuals.

VI. Old Business

NONE

VII. New Business

NONE

VIII. Meeting was adjourned

Submitted by Michael King, Secretary

## Part I: Policies

The University Curriculum Committee is responsible for overseeing the smooth and efficient operation of the curriculum process as outlined in the following policies:

1. In order for a course, an academic major or minor, or a certificate program containing credit earning courses to appear in the printed catalog, it must receive approval through the curriculum process. This also applies to course changes or deletions and to changes in, or deletions of major and minor program requirements. When delays occur in the process, the affected department or program must be notified concerning the nature and the length of the delay by the appropriate individual in the process.
2. In order for a course, regular or experimental, to appear in the Schedule of Classes, the course must have received approval through the curriculum process and be entered into the automated catalog maintained by the Office of the Registrar.
3. Course numbers shall be assigned by the academic unit initiating the course in accord with the course numbering policies in the printed catalog and in Policy 13. For the purpose of conveying further information about a course a "letter" at the end of the course number (E = extension (off campus); H = honors; L = lab; P = paired; T = telecourse or TV assisted; X = experimental) may be used.
4. Experimental courses are approved by the Experimental/Non-Traditional Subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost. An approved experimental course may be taught only twice, after which the course shall be deleted from the experimental curriculum. To become part of the regular curriculum, the course must receive approval through the curriculum process.
5. Non-traditional courses are submitted to the Experimental/Non-Traditional Subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee. All non-traditional courses must be associated with an academic unit. This committee will decide which academic unit(s) should engage in the initial review of the course. The academic unit(s) so identified will review not only the academic content of the course but also the question of administrative responsibility for the course and report in writing to the subcommittee which in turn makes its recommendation to the University Curriculum Committee.
6. If a course is deleted from the regular curriculum, then the academic unit requesting the course deletion may not initiate a new course that has the same course designator and number until the deleted course no longer appears in the printed catalog unless the new course is intended to replace the course being



deleted. The academic unit must notify in writing all affected academic units and the University Curriculum Committee of the proposed deletion. If approved, through the curriculum process, the deletion is effective the next semester.

7. If an academic unit requests that a course (or courses) in another academic unit be added to the requesting academic unit's curriculum then the request must be accompanied by a statement in which the appropriate administrative officer of the affected academic unit assesses in a preliminary manner the impact of the request.

8. An outline indicating the number of copies associated with curriculum action shall be established by the University Curriculum Committee and be transmitted to all academic units and to the members of the Committee.

9. Courses will normally be offered regularly. Each Fall, the Registrar will prepare a list of courses which have not been offered during the previous three year period (six semesters). This list will be provided to the Chairperson of the University Curriculum Committee who will request that the appropriate administrative officer(s) of the affected academic unit(s) determine if the course should be deleted from the regular curriculum and from future catalogs or if there is justification for keeping it. If the course is to be deleted, the approval process outlined in this manual must be followed.

10. Each course listed under the general studies designation will be offered annually or in some cases on an alternate year basis. Each Fall, the Registrar will prepare a list of "general studies courses" which have not been offered during the previous year (two semesters). This list will be provided to the Chairperson of the University Curriculum Committee and to the Chairperson of the General Studies Subcommittee who will request that the Chairperson(s) of the affected department(s) determine if the general studies designation should be removed or if there is justification for retaining the designation. The University Curriculum Committee may recommend the deletion of the general studies designation for those courses in violation of this policy.

11. The University Curriculum Committee has final recommendation authorization on every course satisfying general studies requirements and has the responsibility for reviewing the general studies requirement structures and categories within those structures. Any recommended action on the part of the University Curriculum Committee in the area of general studies must be forwarded to the Faculty Senate and, if appropriate, the Office of the Provost.

12. A course being taught by one academic unit may be cross-listed by a second academic unit provided the academic unit offering the course has no objections. Once an academic unit has permission to cross-list a course, a "Catalog Information - New Course Form" must be completed. The cross-listing must receive approval through the curriculum process.

13. There are some courses that fall into the category of variable topics courses. In these courses the subject matter may vary drastically from year to year. Consequently, a detailed catalog course description involving the precise nature of the subject matter is impractical.

These courses fall into two groups: 1) those designated to be taken by a class of several students and 2) those designated to be taken by a single student. Special course numbers are reserved for new courses of these types. The block of numbers from X90 to X94 shall be reserved for those courses in the first group and the block of numbers from X95 to X99 shall be reserved for those courses in the second group. These restrictions shall not affect the numbering of existing courses.

NOTE: for the purposes of these policies:

(a) the term "academic unit" is defined to be a department, a dean's office or the Office of the Provost.

(b) the term "course" is defined in terms of its place of origin:

(i) "traditional course": a course whose academic content has been reviewed by a department and the department has accepted administrative responsibility for the course; or

(ii) "non-traditional course": a course which does not satisfy (b. i.)

and by its routing through the curriculum process:

(iii) "regular course": a course which must be reviewed by (or has been approved by) the University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate (if appropriate) and the Office of the Provost and has been approved for inclusion in the Schedule of Classes and the printed catalog; or

(iv) "experimental course": a course which must be reviewed by (or has been reviewed by) the Experimental/Non-Traditional Subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost and has been approved for inclusion in the Schedule of Classes.



To: Faculty Senate  
Fr: Budget Committee  
Da: Nov. 13, 1990  
Re: Voting Item

In addition to this voting item, the committee's working document on its market/equity adjustment policy will be distributed to the Faculty Senate in a separate mailing later this week as an informational item for purposes of discussion and debate, with the view towards submitting the working document to the Senate as a voting item in December.

## 1) EXPANDED FACULTY SALARY DATA BASE REQUESTED:

This committee is requesting that the Office of the Provost expand the faculty salary data base as indicated below by April 15, 1991.

To effectively examine the results of any salary policy, one needs a much more detailed data base readily available on a computer system. Given the fact that current salary policies are attempting to make adjustments using CUPA data, equity, comparisons across disciplines, etc., much more data are required to evaluate the impact of the current (and any new) salary proposal.

Info currently given on each individual:

- Department
- Status (academic year or fiscal year)
- Last year's salary
- Rank
- Current year's salary
- % increase for ATB (Across-the-board)
- Total % increase
- Status of increase (yes/no for ATB, Market (M), Discretionary (D), Promotion (P))

Info still needed to effectively compare salaries with CUPA :

- Discipline
- Years at rank
- % increase for Equity/Market
- Level of Equity/Market Increase (level # 1, #2 or # 3)\*
- % increase for Discretion (or Merit)
- Additional status letter ( S = stipend included)
- % CUPA (adjusted) (OR equivalent datum) for that individual last year
- % CUPA (adjusted) (OR equivalent datum) for that individual in the current year

## 2) ADDITIONAL INFO REQUESTED:

Each year NKU sends a faculty salary report to CUPA. This committee is requesting that this report be placed on file and be made readily accessible to all faculty. Likewise, any salary analysis that NKU receives from CUPA should also be placed on file and be readily available to all faculty.

---

\* This information will only be relevant when (or if) the forthcoming equity/market proposal is accepted.

ONCE THE SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE EQUITY/MARKET PROPOSAL IS APPROVED  
CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:

**RESOLUTION # 1:**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommendations (SEE NEXT PAGE) on Market/Equity Adjustments ~~is~~<sup>are</sup> accepted as part of the 1991-1992 Salary Policy with the following exception:  
Eliminate Recommendation #2 which places a cap on the market/equity adjustment.  
The salary subcommittee equity/market proposal (NOV. 90) sets limits on the size of the equity/market adjustments that are adequate.



To ~~Dawn~~ 5:1 4/20

Salaries/Contracts  
prior to graduation

# Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

Recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Market Equity  
Adjustments as part of the 1990-1991 Salary Policy

## I. Appropriateness of data

The following recommendations apply to the calculation of:

- a) 1989 NKU salaries as percentage of CUPA National Averages by Discipline and Rank.
- b) 1989 NKU and CUPA mean salaries by rank and discipline.
1. Only tenured and tenure track faculty should be included in the calculations.
2. Faculty on leave should be included in the calculation, at the the salary they would receive were they not on leave, but were performing their usual duties.
3. It is crucial that department chairs be able to review and verify the data for accuracy.
4. Further information about CUPA data should be gathered to make sure that decisions made using CUPA comparisons are sensitive to issues such as years within rank and terminal degree obtained.

## II. Recommendations.

1. One-fourth of available salary increase pool for fiscal year 1990-91 (up to 2% of faculty salary maximum) devoted to market equity adjustment.
2. The total market equity increase for an individual faculty member in a 1990-91 be capped at 10 percent of the individual's base salary. Individuals receiving market equity adjustments would, of course, still be eligible for an across-the-board and merit increase, consistent with departmental policies.
3. The chairs will prepare a prioritized eligibility list based on the factors of:
  - i) the terminal degree held by a faculty member
  - ii) performance history of the faculty member
  - iii) years in in-rank average salary
  - iiii) departmental rank average salarymust be considered in the awarding of market adjustment funds.

## **SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE EQUITY/MARKET PROPOSAL**

John Filaseta (Subcommittee Chair) - Dept. of Physics and Geology

Terry Pence - Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology, and Philosophy

Gerry Williams - Steely Library

### **POINTS OF INTEREST:**

- 1) The general purpose of this proposal is to address **two** salary concerns:
  - a) **equity cases** for those individuals (or departments) who have been unjustly at the bottom, and
  - b) **market (or compression) cases** for those individuals whose salaries have not kept appropriate distance from those who have less experience or poorer performance.
- 2) To prevent delays (in the current year 90-91) in the implementation of this proposal once accepted, this committee is requesting that the **Office of the Provost** gathers and process the following information on each tenure-track faculty member by **Wed., Dec. 5, 1990**:

Current (90-91) salary

Number of years at current rank

Current salary as a % CUPA (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) or equivalent

Dollar increase (if any needed) to raise the individual to 91.1% CUPA

Dollar increase (if any needed) to raise the individual to 97.1% CUPA

The above information can be obtained from the Chairs or the Institutional Research Office. Once collected, the following information should be computed:

The mean number of years for each rank as determined from averaging over all faculty in a particular rank (University-wide).

With the above data, any individual can determine their eligibility for equity/market as well as what maximum increase is allowed. Thus any individual may make a request to his/her Chair for an equity/market adjustment.

- 3) In order to discuss some specific details and questions regarding this equity/market proposal (once accepted), this committee is requesting that the **Provost** arrange a meeting between the Faculty Senate (or the Senate Budget Committee) and the Dean's Council. A meeting time in **December, 1990** is recommended so that questions may be addressed prior to implementing this proposal.
- 4) Critical to the success of any equity/market policy is the **evaluation process**. An individual is evaluated for equity/market adjustments based on his/her entire performance record and all input (prepared as explained in this proposal). Some individual may be found eligible for large increases, but during a careful evaluation they are identified as inexperienced (i.e., new to the rank) or as poor performers and thus should receive no increase (or at best a small increase). (SOME EXAMPLES ARE GIVEN AT THE END OF THIS PROPOSAL).
- 5) Without an effective data base on faculty salaries it is impossible to compute the numerical effect of this (or most any other) new salary policy. Thus, the numbers specified by this proposal, such as those used to determine who will be eligible for equity/market, may need to be modified. This committee is requesting that the **Office of the Provost** develops an expanded faculty salary data base (see the next page for details) by **April 15, 1991**. The effects of this proposal (or any other) can be more easily calculated once this expanded data base is made available.



## REQUESTS:

NOVEMBER 90

### 1) EXPANDED FACULTY SALARY DATA BASE REQUESTED:

This committee is requesting that the **Office of the Provost** expand the faculty salary data base as indicated below by **April 15, 1991**.

To effectively examine the results of any salary policy, one needs a much more detailed data base on a computer system that is readily accessible to those on this salary subcommittee (or other concerned faculty). Given the fact that current salary policies are attempting to make adjustments using CUPA data, equity, comparisons across disciplines, etc., much more data are required to evaluate the impact of the current (and any new) salary proposal.

Info currently given on each individual:

- Department
- Status (academic year or fiscal year)
- Last year's salary
- Rank
- Current year's salary
- % increase for ATB (Across-the-board)
- Total % increase
- Status of increase (yes/no for ATB, Market (M), Discretionary (D), Promotion (P))

Info still needed to effectively compare salaries with CUPA :

- Discipline
- Years at rank
- % increase for Equity/Market
- Level of Equity/Market Increase (level # 1, #2 or # 3)
- % increase for Discretion (or Merit)
- Additional status letter ( S = stipend included)
- % CUPA (adjusted) (OR equivalent datum) for that individual last year
- % CUPA (adjusted) (OR equivalent datum) for that individual in the current year
- Number of faculty in that discipline-rank

### 2) ADDITIONAL INFO REQUESTED:

Each year NKU sends a faculty salary report to CUPA. This committee is requesting that this report be placed on file and be made readily accessible to all faculty. Likewise, any salary analysis that NKU receives from CUPA should also be placed on file and be readily available to all faculty.

## **SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE PROPOSAL DETAILS**

**NOVEMBER 1990**

John Filaseta (Subcommittee Chair) - Dept. of Physics and Geology

Terry Pence - Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology, and Philosophy

Gerry Williams - Steely Library

### **COMMENTS ON FIRST YEAR EQUITY/MARKET ADJUSTMENTS:**

a) **Parity Among the Departments:** Using the CUPA data available in the College of Arts and Sciences, one finds that discipline averages in 1989-90 ranged from 80% - 100% of CUPA means. After last year's equity adjustments the range has narrowed, now at 88% - 102% of CUPA means. Thus, with the desired goal of achieving parity among departments and disciplines, **some** success has been achieved with the first year of **equity adjustments**. It should be noted that this success was achieved through individual equity adjustments, and in some cases all individuals throughout a department received equity increases.

b) **Compression:** Using the faculty salary report for the Fall 90, one finds that equity adjustments were given principally to low-salary individuals (i.e., those who were below the 90.1% CUPA level). A concern has been expressed that this policy tends to skew the salary distributions in that the low end is pushed up, but those in the middle or at the high end do not maintain their appropriate standing as achieved through meritorious work or by years of experience. Provost Jorns indicated (at the Oct. 26th 1990 budget committee meeting) that the first year adjustments were made principally for equity cases and that **only a few market adjustments** (as those needed to handle compression) were specifically addressed. He stated that more market adjustments may be possible in the remaining 2 years of the three-year program and was open to suggestions.

### **PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTING EQUITY/MARKET ADJUSTMENTS:**

The proposal below is intended to address **BOTH** equity and market adjustments (as needed to fix compression). This proposal does **NOT** conflict with the recommendations (from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) that were followed in the first year of equity/market adjustments. The available pool of money for equity/market adjustments will be divided into 3 levels:

**Level #1: (40% - 60% of pool) Equity Adjustments for Low Salaries**

**Level #2: (40% - 60% of pool) Market Adjustments for Individuals With Experience Above the Average Number of Years at Rank (to fix compression).**

**Level #3: (0% - 15% of pool) Very Experienced OR Exceptionally Meritorious Faculty (at ANY Rank).**

### **ELIGIBILITY (WHO MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR ADJUSTMENTS ?):**

**Note:** Eligibility does **NOT** guarantee an adjustment. The evaluation process (described later) will determine who is deserving of an increase.

Take the **mean** salary (University-wide) for 1990-91: **94.1 % CUPA (Adjusted)**

(Adjusted CUPA: take the latest available data (89-90) and add 5.7% )

For eligibility at **LEVEL #1:** Only those individuals with a salary that is less than the current year (90-91) **mean minus three percentage points**, i.e., only those with a salary at **91.1% CUPA or lower** as determined by national CUPA data (adjusted) for their discipline-rank.

For eligibility at **LEVEL #2:** Only those individuals who pass both of the following:

(a) have been at their rank for a number of years that is **above the average number of years at rank** (as determined from averaging over all faculty in a particular rank, University-wide).

(b) have a salary that is less than the current year (90-91) **mean plus three percentage points**, i.e., only those with a salary at **97.1% CUPA or lower** as determined by national, discipline-rank CUPA data (adjusted).

For eligibility at **LEVEL #3:** Only those who have been at their rank for a length of time that is considerably above the average for their rank (as determined University-wide) **OR** who have an exceptional meritorious record for an individual at their current rank. In addition these individuals must not receive increases from level # 1 or level # 2 in the same year as an increase from level # 3.

**NOTE:** In rare cases, an individual may be considered for both level #1 and level # 2 if he/she passes the stated eligibility restrictions above.

(Proposal details continues on the next page)



### **RESTRICTIONS (HOW MUCH IS A MAXIMUM ADJUSTMENT ?):**

For those individuals at **Level #1**: An equity adjustment must not allow an individual to exceed the cut-off used for consideration, that is, a **MAXIMUM** increase this year will push an individual up to **91.1% CUPA** (adjusted, discipline-rank). Note, the evaluation process below will determine how much (if any) of this maximum increase will be awarded to each individual. For example, an inexperienced faculty member or a poor performer is likely to have a **high maximum**, but when evaluated he/she receives no increase or one that is much less than the maximum. Also note, additional departmental increases (across-the-board and merit) as determined by the chair may push certain individuals at level #1 above 91.1% CUPA.

For those individuals at **Level # 2**: A market adjustment must not allow an individual to exceed the cut-off used for consideration, that is, a **MAXIMUM** increase this year will push an individual up to **97.1% CUPA** (adjusted, discipline-rank). Note, the evaluation process below will determine how much (if any) of this maximum increase will be awarded to each individual. For example, an inexperienced faculty member or a poor performer is likely to have a **high maximum**, but when evaluated he/she receives no increase or one that is much less than the maximum. Also note, additional departmental increases (across-the-board and merit) as determined by the chair may push certain individuals at level #2 above 97.1% CUPA.

For those individuals at **Level # 3**: These adjustments may not exceed 3% of the individual's salary.

### **THE EVALUATION PROCESS (WHO IS DESERVING AND WHAT IS AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF INCREASE?):**

The total equity/market pool is determined in the same manner as done for the first year of equity increases. The following procedure is followed in this order:

#### **1) Input from the Chairs:**

(a) Following the restrictions stated above, each chair determines who in his/her department is eligible for consideration at level #1, level #2 and level #3. The chair also computes the **MAXIMUM** increase allowed for each individual **AND** the **NUMBER OF YEARS AT RANK** for each member. Note, each individual member may compute his/her own **MAXIMUM** increase as a check.

(b) The chair prepares a **list** that ranks his/her faculty from "most pressing" equity/market case to "least pressing" equity/market case. To simplify difficult decisions, the chair may choose to have "ties" in his/her list or the chair may choose to place all faculty at the same location. This list need **NOT** be made public.

(c) The chair prepares a **list** that ranks his/her faculty from "most meritorious" to "least meritorious" by considering each individual's entire history (not just the last year). To simplify difficult decisions, the chair may choose to have "ties" in his/her list or the chair may choose to place all faculty at the same location. This list need **NOT** be made public.

#### **2) Input from the Deans:**

The Dean takes the input provided by the chairs and determines the total requests for each level. At this time the Dean may wish to estimate how the equity/market pool will be divided following the restrictions stated above, i.e., for level # 1 (Equity) 40-60% of the pool, for level #2 (Market) 40-60% of the pool, and for level #3 (Very Experienced) 0-15% of the pool. The Dean is likely to find that the requested totals exceed the available funds. Keep in mind that the evaluation process (see step # 4 below) is likely to significantly reduce the funds actually needed. In any case, he/she reports the totals to the Provost.

( PROCESS continues on next page)

### **3) Input from the Provost:**

The Provost takes the input from the Deans and decides how the available funds will be divided among the various colleges. This decision should be based upon the total equity/market requests made by the Deans and NOT merely using the percentage of the general salary pool normally received by a college. The Provost informs the Deans on how much they must cut-back on requests for equity/market in their respective colleges.

### **4) Output from the Deans-Chairs:**

Now comes the difficult task of making **evaluations** on all individual requests. Each individual is considered by his/her Dean (in consultation with his/her Chair) to determine if their case warrants an equity/market increase and to determine the appropriate size of the increase. The individual increases should be based upon his/hers entire performance record as well as all input prepared earlier, i.e., the number of years at rank, the list of most pressing equity/market cases in each department, and the list of most meritorious individuals. The Dean cuts back from the maximum allowed for each individual taking into account all input given to him/her. Note, the maximum individual increases as computed by the Chairs should be double checked at this point. In some cases, a percentage cut may be appropriate, and in other cases some individuals may be completely eliminated from consideration. For example, an inexperienced faculty member or a poor performer is likely to have a **high** maximum, but when evaluated he/she is found deserving of no increase or one that is much less than the maximum. Each Dean makes cuts maintaining the percentage allocated to each level as determined in step # 2. The total college request is cut as specified by the Provost.

### **5) Output from the Provost:**

The Provost verifies that the level of cuts made by the Deans are as he requested. He compares the distributions made to the various colleges, and only if he sees a serious problem (such as one college "suffering" more than another) does he ask the Deans to attempt a different level of spending. If the Provost wishes to adjust individual salaries, his request should be passed back to the Dean and Chair of that individual.

### **6) One final check:**

If the equity/market adjustment policy has been accomplished effectively, the **Chairs** should NOT have to make changes to the current departmental salary policy plans. However, if time permits, the finalized individual equity/market adjustments will be made available to all Chairs so that they can use this input in determining across-the-board and merit increases in their departments, if they so choose.

5



### EXAMPLES:

Consider the following nine **Associate Professors\*** in two different disciplines (and data):

Average Number of Years at Associate Professor Rank at NKU = **9 years**

(actual average is not currently known, Nov. 1990)

#### DISCIPLINE A: (The following is prepared by the **Chair**)

100% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$37,650

91.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$34,300 = 0.911 (\$37,650)

97.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$36,560 = 0.971 (\$37,650)

	<u>Salary (% CUPA)</u>	<u># of Years at Rank</u>	<u>Increase to 91.1%</u>	<u>Increase to 97.1%</u>
Joe Slow	\$32,000 (85%)	7	\$2300	not eligible
Beth Better	\$33,510 (89%)	6	\$ 790	not eligible
Al Average	\$35,010 (93%)	10	-----	\$1550
Sally Senior	\$36,900 (98%)	17	-----	-----

(Sally places request for level # 3 increase: MAX = 3%(\$36,900) = \$1110)

Chair's equity list\*\*, most pressing to least pressing:

Tie: Sally Senior and Beth Better, followed by Al Average and then Joe Slow

Chair's merit list\*\*, most meritorious to least:

Beth Better, Tie: (Al Average and Sally Senior), then Joe Slow

#### DISCIPLINE B: (The following is prepared by the **Chair**)

100% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$41,000

91.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$37,350 = 0.911 (\$41,000)

97.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$39,810 = 0.971 (\$41,000)

	<u>Salary (% CUPA)</u>	<u># of Years at Rank</u>	<u>Increase to 91.1%</u>	<u>Increase to 97.1%</u>
Nancy New	\$36,900 (90%)	2	\$ 450	not eligible
Treated Unjustly	\$35,670 (87%)	10	\$1680	\$4140
Mary Mean	\$37,720 (92%)	8	-----	not eligible
Hank Hardworker	\$38,130 (93%)	8	-----	not eligible
Layback Longtime	\$40,180 (98%)	20	-----	-----

(Hank places a request for level # 3 increase: MAX = 3%(\$38,130) = \$1140)

(Layback places a request for level # 3 increase: MAX = 3%(40,180) = \$1205)

Chair's equity list\*\*, most pressing to least pressing:

Treated Unjustly, Tie: (Hank Hardworker, Mary Mean, Nancy New), then Layback Longtime

Chair's merit list\*\*, most meritorious to least:

Hank Hardworker, Tie: (Nancy New, Treated Unjustly, Mary Mean), then Layback Longtime

The **evaluation which follows on the next page** must be done with a great deal of caution since clearly there are a few individuals with HIGH increases as tabled above, but they are undeserving of any increase (or perhaps at best a small fraction of the amount listed).

Also, note that comparisons within a discipline as well as across disciplines (or departments) are essential.

---

\* FOOTNOTE: Any resemblance between these fictitious professors and actual professors is unintended and purely coincidental.

\*\* FOOTNOTE: These lists may include other ranks which have been ignored to simplify this example.

THE EVALUATION (Dean in consultation with Chairs, using all input):

- 1) Joe Slow - his low merit rating suggest that he is undeserving of a significant increase, and indeed he should trail Beth Better who is a better performer (as well as Treated Unjustly who is in another discipline).
- 2) Beth Better - given her merit ranking, an increase taking her to 91.1% CUPA is appropriate. Her number of years at rank prevents further increases; however, her departmental performance review will push her above 91.1% as desired.
- 3) Al Average - is probably about where he should be, given the fact that he is close to the average number of years at rank. Award him a small increase, placing him at about 95% CUPA.
- 4) Sally Senior - given her years of experience, she should be above 100 % CUPA even as an average performer. An increase at 3% of her salary (at level # 3) is funded.  
Note, Layback Longtime is not nearly as deserving of an increase.
- 5) Nancy New - is about where she should be, given her low number of years of experience.
- 6) Treated Unjustly - the most serious case listed. An increase at level # 1 will take him to 91.1 % and an additional increase at level # 2 should take him to about where Al Average is, that is, at about 95 % CUPA. Note, he should move to a salary that is above Mary Mean, who has somewhat less experience.
- 7) Mary Mean - is not eligible at any level and is about where she should be.
- 8) Hank Hardworker - a good, solid hard worker and producing excellent results. He is deserving of an increase but is ineligible under level #1 or level #2. His request for a level #3 increase is granted to the maximum ( i.e., 3% of his salary).
- 9) Layback Longtime - even though he has been at his rank for nearly 20 years, his low performance record suggests he is about where he should be. His request for a level #3 is denied.

POSSIBLE OUTCOME:

(Note: the increases given on the previous page are NOT closely matched to the final amounts awarded, because the evaluation process when done correctly finds those who are deserving).

	<u>Amount Awarded</u>	<u>% CUPA (before)</u>	<u>% CUPA (after)</u>
Joe Slow	\$ 0	85%	85%
Beth Better	\$ 790 (level #1)	89%	91.1%
Al Average	\$ 760 (level #2)	93%	95%
Sally Senior	\$1110 (level #3)	98%	101%
Nancy New	\$ 0	90%	90%
Treated Unjustly	\$1680 (level #1) plus \$1600 (level #2)	87%	95%
Mary Mean	\$ 0	92%	92%
Hank Hardworker	\$1140 (level #3)	93%	95.8%
Layback Longtime	\$ 0	98%	<del>98%</del> 98%

TOTAL MAXIMUM REQUESTED: \$11,135

TOTAL AWARDED (based on careful evaluation): \$7080



Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate  
Fr: Ljubomir Nacev  
Chair, Budget Committee  
Da: December 7, 1990

Re: Equity/Market Adjustment Proposal-General Explanation

The attached proposal is submitted to the Faculty Senate as the Budget Committee's voting item on the issue of equity/market adjustments to faculty salaries.

Based upon the conviction that certain faculty members are underpaid for historical reasons having nothing to do with their meritorious service as faculty members at the University, the Budget Committee is proposing that adjustments be made to such faculty members' salaries in order to bring them up to the optimal salary level which their performance history would dictate. These adjustments are to be made by the departmental Chairs with the approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost. The determination of which faculty member is eligible for the adjustment and the determination of the optimal dollar amount of the adjustment are to be made by the respective Chairs with the approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

These determinations are to be made by the appropriate parties after all facts and circumstances regarding a faculty member have been taken into account, such as (but not limited to) years in rank, meritorious past performance, initial NKU salary, terminal and/or joint degrees, and comparable salary paid to similarly situated faculty members at other institutions of higher learning. Faculty members are encouraged to make their cases for an adjustment to their Chairs. In turn, Chairs should justify their decisions to their faculty.

If, after determining the optimal level of salary for a particular faculty and thus the amount of dollar adjustment necessary to bring that faculty member to that optimal level, and after adding up all other similar adjustment amounts University-wide, it is determined that sufficient funds are not available to make all adjustments fully, the Budget Committee proposes that the following distribution scheme should be adhered to in making the adjustments: an amount shall be distributed to a faculty member from the monies available for adjustments which bears the same ratio to that faculty member's optimal adjustment amount as the total amount available for adjustments bears to the total amount necessary to make all adjustments fully.

Please feel free to call me or any other member of the Budget Committee if you have any questions about this voting item.

**VOTING ITEM: AN EQUITY/MARKET ADJUSTMENT PROPOSAL****PREAMBLE: Comments on the first year equity/market adjustments:**

**A) Parity Among the Departments:** According to the CUPA data available in the College of Arts and Sciences, the discipline averages in 1989-90 ranged from 80% -100% of CUPA means. After last year's adjustments the range has narrowed to 88% - 102% of CUPA means. Thus, **some** parity among departments and disciplines was achieved with the first year of adjustments. Note that this parity was achieved with individual adjustments, and that in some cases all individuals throughout a department received increases.

**B) Compression:** According to the faculty salary report for the Fall 90, the equity/market increases were given principally to low-salary individuals (i.e., those who were **below the NKU mean % of CUPA**, which was then at 90.1% of CUPA ). A serious flaw in this policy was that it skewed the salary distributions. Those at the low end were pushed up, but those in the middle or at the high end did not maintain their appropriate standing that was achieved through meritorious work or years of experience.

**RESOLUTION:****(1) Size of the Equity/Market Pool:**

As was done last year, the funding devoted to equity/market adjustments is to be limited to one-fourth of the available salary increase pool for fiscal year 1991-92, but not exceeding 2% of the faculty salary pool.

**(2) Information used for Individual Evaluations of Equity/Market Adjustments:**

Each individual is to be considered by his/her Chair and Dean to determine if their case warrants an equity/market increase and to determine the appropriate size of the increase. An individual's % of CUPA (or equivalent) should be only one of many factors considered in this determination. Other factors may indicate that an individual (who may be below or above the NKU mean % of CUPA) is deserving of equity/market adjustment. The following information is to be factored into the evaluation process for equity/market adjustments:

- a) the terminal and/or joint degrees held by the faculty member
- b) performance (merit) history of the faculty member
- c) years in rank
- d) the faculty member's % of CUPA (or equivalent) for discipline-rank
- e) the department's (or discipline's) overall % of CUPA (or equivalent)

Note, this list of factors is not intended to exclude other information relevant to this evaluation process.



### **(3) The Equity/Market Evaluation Process:**

#### **STEP A Individuals apply for an equity/market increase:**

Any faculty member may apply to his/her Chair for an equity/market adjustment. The faculty member may present his/her case using all of the factors listed in item (2) of this resolution.

#### **STEP B Chairs determine individual equity/market adjustments:**

Each Chair evaluates his/her faculty for an equity/market adjustment using each individual's entire historical record, including all of the factors listed in item (2) of this resolution. A Chair determines equity/market adjustments in a manner that does NOT distort the appropriate salary differences among faculty as established by past annual departmental performance reviews. The results from each Chair's equity/market evaluations along with adjustments (dollar amounts) are passed on to the appropriate Dean.

#### **STEP C Deans determine individual equity/market increases:**

Each individual is again evaluated by his/her Dean (in consultation with his/her Chair) to verify the Chair's adjustments. During the evaluation, a Dean is to make comparisons across departments so that individuals with similar performance records and years at rank are placed at similar levels of % of CUPA for discipline-rank. As a result of these comparisons, a Dean may deem it necessary to modify some Chairs' adjustments. A Dean may also choose to apply a percentage cut (or increase) across-the-board to the adjustments found by some Chairs in order to bring these adjustments to a level that is more consistent with other departments. Once an appropriate increase is determined for each individual, then the sum of all these individual increases from a college constitutes that college's total equity/market request.

#### **STEP D Provost sets funding of equity/market adjustments at the college level:**

The Provost (in consultation with the Deans) divides the available equity/market pool among the colleges using as a guide the following two factors:

- (a) achieving parity among the colleges using 100% of CUPA (or equivalent) as a reference point, and
- (b) the total college equity/market requests as determined above.

The funds made so available for equity/market adjustments in each college is then presented to the appropriate Deans.

#### **STEP E Cutting back from previously determined individual equity/market increases:**

If the available funds for equity/market adjustments in a college is less than that college's total equity/market request (as determined in step C), then the appropriate Dean applies the same percentage cut to all of the previously determined (in steps B and C) individual equity/market adjustments.

### **(4) Assessing the Equity/Market Evaluation Process:**

In order to better assess the results of this equity/market evaluation process, the Office of the Provost is to maintain a written record of the following dollar amounts:

Each Chair's determination of the total equity/market adjustment for his/her department (step B),

Each Dean's determination of the total equity/market adjustment for each department  
in the appropriate college ( step C),

Total equity/market adjustments awarded to each department,

The Provost's determination of the total equity/market adjustments awarded to each college (step D),

Total equity/market adjustment pool.

# CATALOG INFORMATION - COURSE CHANGE FORM

CURRENT CATALOG INFORMATION: PSC 103 International Politics (3,0,3) Fundamental  
factors governing international politics. Students taking PSC 116 may not also receive  
credit for PSC 103.

2. Current CIP Code \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed CIP Code \_\_\_\_\_

3. PROPOSED COURSE CHANGE(S) INCLUDE(S):

- |                 |  |                                     |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1) Number _____ | 4) Prerequisite/Corequisite _____ (circle one) |                                     |
| 2) Title _____  | 5) Description <u>X</u>                        | 7) Deletion of this course _____    |
| 3) Hours _____  | 6) Designator _____                            | 8) Addition of computer usage _____ |

Note: Course Change: Any two of the first five  
New Course: Three or more of the first five

PROPOSED CATALOG INFORMATION: (To be exactly as it is to appear in the catalog, double-spaced, complete, etc.; limit course description to 50 words)

PSC 103 International Politics (3,0,3) Fundamental factors governing international  
politics.

JWT 6 Apr 90  
University Editor Signature

5. JUSTIFICATION: We deleted PSC 116.



6. To be filled out by Office of Academic Computing (if needed): Status of computing resources for the course.

Hardware:    Excellent    Adequate    Poor

Software:    Excellent    Adequate    Poor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Academic Computing Director Signature      Date

7. SIGNATURES:

DATE RECEIVED

DATE APPROVED

Original Proposer

Department Chair

Teacher Education  
Committee Chair  
(if appropriate)

College Curriculum  
Committee Chair

Dean

University Curriculum  
Committee Chair

Graduate Council Chair  
(if appropriate)

Provost

8. NUMBER OF COPIES OF THIS FORM REQUIRED FOR A COURSE WHOSE NUMBER LIES BETWEEN:

000 thru 499 is 25

500 thru 599 is 35

General Studies/Remedial is 42

9. ENTERED INTO NKU CURRICULUM DATABANK:

\_\_\_\_\_  
University Editor Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

10. DISTRIBUTION: Registrar, Printer, Department Chair, Dean, Provost, University Curriculum Committee Chair, and/or University Editor.

BUDGET COMMITTEE EQUITY/MARKET PROPOSAL

NOVEMBER 1990

**PREAMBLE:**

**1) Comments on the first year equity/market adjustments:**

a) **Parity Among the Departments:** Using the CUPA data available in the College of Arts and Sciences, one finds that discipline averages in 1989-90 ranged from 80% -100% of CUPA means. After last year's equity adjustments the range has narrowed, now at 88% - 102% of CUPA means. Thus, with the desired goal of achieving parity among departments and disciplines, **some** success has been achieved with the first year of **equity adjustments**. It should be noted that this success was achieved through individual equity adjustments, and in some cases all individuals throughout a department received equity increases.

b) **Compression:** Using the faculty salary report for the Fall 90, one finds that equity adjustments were given principally to low-salary individuals (i.e., those who were below the 90.1% CUPA level). A concern has been expressed that this policy tends to skew the salary distributions in that the low end is pushed up, but those in the middle or at the high end do not maintain their appropriate standing as achieved through meritorious work or by years of experience. Provost Jorns indicated (at the Oct. 26th 1990 budget committee meeting) that the first year adjustments were made principally for equity cases and that **only a few market adjustments** (as those needed to handle compression) were specifically addressed. He stated that more market adjustments may be possible in the remaining 2 years of the three-year program and was open to suggestions.

**2) The general purpose of this proposal is to address two salary concerns:**

- a) **equity cases** for those individuals (or departments) who have been unjustly at the bottom, and
- b) **market (or compression) cases** for those individuals whose salaries have not kept appropriate distance from those who have less experience or poorer performance.

Critical to the success of any equity/market policy is the **evaluation process**. An individual is evaluated for equity/market adjustments based on his/her entire performance record and all input (prepared as explained in this proposal). Some individual may be found eligible for large increases, but during a careful evaluation they are identified as inexperienced (i.e., new to the rank) or as poor performers and thus should receive no increase (or at best a small increase).

**3) To facilitate the implementation of this proposal once accepted (in the current year 90-91), this committee is requesting that the Office of the Provost gathers and processes the following information on each tenure-track faculty member by Jan. 14, 1990:**

Current (90-91) salary

Number of years at current rank

Current salary as a % CUPA (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) or equivalent

Dollar increase (if any needed) to raise the individual to 91.1% CUPA

Dollar increase (if any needed) to raise the individual to 97.1% CUPA

The above information can be obtained from the Chairs or the Institutional Research Office.

Once collected, the following information should be computed:

The mean number of years for each rank as determined from averaging over all faculty in a particular rank (University-wide\*).

With the above data, any individual can determine their eligibility for equity/market as well as what maximum increase is allowed. Thus any individual may make a request to his/her Chair for an equity/market adjustment.

**4) In order to discuss some specific details and questions regarding this equity/market proposal (once accepted), this committee is requesting that the Provost arrange a meeting between the Faculty Senate (or the Senate Budget Committee) and the Dean's Council. A meeting time in January, 1990 is recommended so that questions may be addressed prior to implementing this proposal.**

**5) This proposal does NOT conflict with the recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee made last year.**

---

\* The Law School may need to be handled separately since promotions are dictated by a fix number of years.



# **BUDGET COMMITTEE EQUITY/MARKET ADJUSTMENT PROPOSAL:**

**NOTE:** The process for determining equity/market adjustments does NOT rely on any departmental salary policies. In other words, the Chairs should NOT make any changes to their current departmental salary policy plans.

Compute the available pool of money as done last year, that is, one-fourth of the available salary increase pool for fiscal year 1991-92 (up to a maximum 2% of the faculty salary) is devoted to equity/market adjustments. This available pool of money for equity/market adjustments is then divided into 3 levels:

- Level #1:** (40% - 60% of pool) Equity Adjustments for Low Salaries
- Level #2:** (40% - 60% of pool) Market Adjustments for Individuals With Experience Above the Average Number of Years at Rank (to fix compression).
- Level #3:** (0% - 15% of pool) Very Experienced OR Exceptionally Meritorious Faculty (at ANY Rank).

## **ELIGIBILITY (WHO MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR ADJUSTMENTS?):**

**Note:** Eligibility does NOT guarantee an adjustment. The evaluation process (described later) will determine who is deserving of an increase.

Take the mean salary (University-wide) for 1990-91: 94.1 % CUPA (Adjusted)  
(Adjusted CUPA: take the latest available data (89-90) and add 5.7% )

For eligibility at **LEVEL #1:** Only those individuals with a salary that is less than the current year (90-91) mean minus three percentage points, i.e., only those with a salary at 91.1% CUPA or lower as determined by national CUPA data (adjusted) for their discipline-rank.

For eligibility at **LEVEL #2:** Only those individuals who pass both of the following:

- (a) have been at their rank for a number of years that is above the average number of years at rank (as determined from averaging over all faculty in a particular rank, University-wide).
- (b) have a salary that is less than the current year (90-91) mean plus three percentage points, i.e., only those with a salary at 97.1% CUPA or lower as determined by national, discipline-rank CUPA data (adjusted).

For eligibility at **LEVEL #3:** Only those who have been at their rank for a length of time that is considerably above the average for their rank (as determined University-wide) OR who have an exceptional meritorious record for someone at their current rank. In addition these individuals must not receive increases from level # 1 or level # 2 in the same year as an increase from level # 3.

Note, this level is intended to handle two distinct cases pertaining to those individuals who are NOT eligible for increases from level #1 or level #2 above. One case involves those individuals who have been very meritorious over the years but received no (or little) merit pay in their departments. The other case involves those individuals (who are average or above average performers) who have been at that rank for so many years that now individuals with much less experience (and roughly equal performance records) have comparable salaries.

**NOTE:** An individual may be considered for both level #1 and level # 2 if he/she passes the stated eligibility restrictions above.

## RESTRICTIONS (HOW MUCH IS A MAXIMUM ADJUSTMENT ?):

For those individuals eligible at Level #1:

An equity adjustment must not allow an individual to exceed the cutoff used for consideration, that is, the **MAXIMUM** allowed equity increase for an individual this year will push his/her salary up to **91.1% CUPA** (adjusted, discipline-rank). Thus the equity increase is capped. Note, the evaluation process below will determine how much (if any) of this maximum increase will be awarded to each individual. For example, an inexperienced faculty member or a poor performer is likely to have a **sizable allowed maximum increase**, but when he/she is evaluated he/she receives no increase or one that is much less than his/her allowed maximum. Also note, additional departmental increases (across-the-board and merit) as determined **later** (using a totally separate process) by the chairs may push certain individuals at level #1 above 91.1% CUPA.

For those individuals eligible at Level # 2:

A market adjustment must not allow an individual to exceed the cutoff used for consideration, that is, the **MAXIMUM** allowed market increase for an individual this year will push his/her salary up to **97.1% CUPA** (adjusted, discipline-rank). Thus the market increase is capped. Note, the evaluation process below will determine how much (if any) of this maximum increase will be awarded to each individual. For example, an inexperienced faculty member or a poor performer is likely to have a **sizable allowed maximum increase**, but when he/she is evaluated he/she receives no increase or one that is much less than his/her allowed maximum. Also note, additional departmental increases (across-the-board and merit) as determined **later** (using a totally separate process) by the chairs may push certain individuals at level #2 above 97.1% CUPA.

For those individuals at Level # 3: The adjustments must not exceed 3% of the individual's salary.

## THE EVALUATION PROCESS (WHO IS DESERVING AND WHAT IS AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF INCREASE?):

The following procedure is followed in this order (STEP BY STEP):

### STEP #1 Input from the Chairs:

**NOTE:** This input will be used in STEP # 4 where individuals are carefully evaluated to determine ~~that~~ <sup>their</sup> appropriate individual increases.

(a) Following the restrictions stated above, each chair determines who in his/her department is eligible for consideration at level #1, level #2 and level #3. The chair also computes the **MAXIMUM** increase allowed for each individual **AND** the **NUMBER OF YEARS AT RANK** for each member. Note, each individual member may compute his/her own **MAXIMUM** increase as a check.

(b) The chair prepares a list that ranks his/her faculty from "most pressing" (or "most deserving") equity/market case to "least pressing" (or "least deserving") equity/market case. The chair's decisions should be made after looking at each individual's entire **historical** (over the years) record, considering all factors (such as years at rank, meritorious work, % CUPA, etc.). To simplify difficult decisions, the chair may choose to have "ties" in his/her list or the chair may choose to place all faculty at the same location. This list need **NOT** be made public.

(c) The chair prepares a list that ranks his/her faculty from "most meritorious" to "least meritorious" by considering each individual's entire history (not just the last year). To simplify difficult decisions, the chair may choose to have "ties" in his/her list or the chair may choose to place all faculty at the same location. This list need **NOT** be made public.

**NOTE:** This input should include information on **ALL** faculty within the department (even those ineligible for equity/market) since comparisons will be made in STEP # 4 below.



## **STEP #2 Input from the Deans:**

The Dean gathers the input provided by the Chairs. Each Dean determines the total equity/market requests made at levels #1 and #2 for his/her college, that is, the total request is equal to the sum of all the MAXIMUM increases allowed for individuals at level #1 and level #2 in the various departments of his/her college. Note, this total can be checked by anyone since the MAXIMUMS are fixed by the RESTRICTIONS stated earlier. Keep in mind that the evaluation process (see step #4 below) is likely to significantly reduce the funds actually needed. In any case, each Dean reports the requested total for his/her college to the Provost.

## **STEP #3 Input from the Provost:**

The Provost takes the total requests from the Deans and decides how the available funds will be divided among the various colleges. This decision should be based upon the total equity/market requests computed by the Deans (in STEP #2) and NOT merely using the percentage of the general salary pool normally received by a college. In other words, the college with the largest total equity/market request receives the greatest portion of the available equity/market funds. With this in mind, the Provost determines the amount of equity/market money awarded to each college, and then he informs the Deans on how much they must cut-back on their total requests for equity/market in their respective colleges.

## **STEP #4 Individual EVALUATIONS - Output from the Deans-Chairs:**

Each Dean makes cuts in his/her college to the amount specified by the Provost (in STEP #3). To accomplish this, the difficult task of making evaluations on all individual requests is started. Each individual is considered by his/her Dean (in consultation with his/her Chair) to determine if their case warrants an equity/market increase and to determine the appropriate size of the increase. The individual increases should be based upon his/her entire performance record as well as all input prepared earlier, i.e., the number of years at rank, the list of most pressing equity/market cases in each department, and the list of most meritorious individuals. The Dean cuts back from the MAXIMUM allowed for each individual taking into account all input given to him/her. Note, the maximum individual increases as computed by the Chairs should be double checked at this point. In some cases, a percentage cut may be appropriate, and in other cases some individuals may be completely eliminated from consideration. For example, an inexperienced faculty member (i.e., new to the rank) or a poor performer is likely to have a sizable allowed maximum, but when evaluated he/she is found deserving of no increase or one that is much less than the maximum. Each Dean makes cuts in his/her college maintaining the percentage allocated to each level: for level #1 (Equity) 40-60% of the pool, for level #2 (Market) 40-60% of the pool, and for level #3 (Very Experienced) 0-15% of the pool. If excess money exists at one level, then those funds may transfer to another level in that college. If excess money exist at all levels for that college, then the excess funds should return back to the Provost.

## **STEP #5 Output from the Provost:**

The Provost verifies that the (college-level) cuts he requested were indeed made by the Deans. He compares the distributions made to the various colleges, and only if he sees as serious problem (such as one college "suffering" more than another) does he ask the Deans to attempt a different level of spending. Any excess money returned by one (or more) colleges may be given to the equity/market pool of other colleges or return back to the general faculty salary pool. The Provost should not need to adjust any individual's equity/market adjustment; however, if the Provost wishes to change any individual's adjustment, his request (with justification) should be passed back to the Dean and Chair of that individual.

### **One final point:**

The above process for determining equity/market adjustments is totally separate from the annual performance review processes that occur at the departmental level. Thus, the Chairs should NOT make changes to their current departmental salary policy plans.

# SUPPLEMENT TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE EQUITY/MARKET PROPOSAL

NOVEMBER 90

## EXAMPLES:

Information is prepared on each faculty member, even those ineligible for equity/market, so that comparisons can be made. Consider the following nine Associate Professors\* in two different disciplines (and data):

Average Number of Years at Associate Professor Rank at NKU = 9 years  
(actual average is not currently known, Nov. 1990)

### DISCIPLINE A: (The following is prepared by the Chair)

100% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$37,650  
91.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$34,300 = 0.911 (\$37,650)  
97.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$36,560 = 0.971 (\$37,650)

	Salary (% CUPA)	# of Years at Rank	Increase to 91.1	Increase to 97.1%	Level # 3 (3% MAX)
Joe Slow	\$32,000 (85%)	7	\$2300	not eligible	-----
Beth Better	\$33,510 (89%)	6	\$ 790	not eligible	-----
Al Average	\$35,010 (93%)	10	-----	\$1550	-----
Sally Senior	\$36,900 (98%)	17	-----	-----	\$1110

Chair's equity list\*\*, most pressing (or deserving) to least pressing (or deserving):

Tie: Sally Senior and Beth Better, followed by Al Average and then Joe Slow

Chair's merit list\*\*, most meritorious to least:

Beth Better, Tie: (Al Average and Sally Senior), then Joe Slow

### DISCIPLINE B: (The following is prepared by the Chair)

100% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$41,000  
91.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$37,350 = 0.911 (\$41,000)  
97.1% CUPA for discipline-rank (adjusted, 89-90 data + 5.7%) = \$39,810 = 0.971 (\$41,000)

	Salary (% CUPA)	# of Years at Rank	Increase to 91.1	Increase to 97.1%	Level # 3 (3% MAX)
Nancy New	\$36,900 (90%)	2	\$ 450	not eligible	-----
Treated Unjustly	\$35,670 (87%)	10	\$1680	\$4140	-----
Mary Mean	\$37,720 (92%)	8	-----	not eligible	-----
Hank Hardworker	\$38,130 (93%)	8	-----	not eligible	\$1140
Layback Longtime	\$40,180 (98%)	20	-----	-----	\$1205

Chair's equity list\*\*, most pressing to least pressing:

Treated Unjustly, Tie: (Hank Hardworker, Mary Mean, Nancy New), then Layback Longtime

Chair's merit list\*\*, most meritorious to least:

Hank Hardworker, Tie: (Nancy New, Treated Unjustly, Mary Mean), then Layback Longtime

The evaluation which follows on the next page must be done with a great deal of caution since clearly there are a few individuals with SIZABLE increases as tabled above, but they are undeserving of any increase (or perhaps at best a small fraction of the amount listed). Also, note that comparisons within a discipline as well as across disciplines (or departments) are essential.

\* FOOTNOTE: Any resemblance between these fictitious professors and actual professors is unintended and purely coincidental.

\*\* FOOTNOTE: These lists may include other ranks which have been ignored to simplify this example.



THE EVALUATION (Dean in consultation with Chairs, using all input):

- 1) Joe Slow - his low merit rating suggest that he is undeserving of a significant increase, and indeed he should trail Beth Better who is a better performer (as well as Treated Unjustly who is in another discipline).
- 2) Beth Better - given her merit ranking, an increase taking her to 91.1% CUPA is appropriate. Her number of years at rank prevents further increases; however, her departmental performance review will push her above 91.1% as desired.
- 3) Al Average - is probably about where he should be, given the fact that he is close to the average number of years at rank. Award him a small increase, placing him at about 95% CUPA.
- 4) Sally Senior - given her years of experience, she should be above 100 % CUPA even as an average performer. An increase at 3% of her salary (at level # 3) is funded. Note, Layback Longtime is not nearly as deserving of an increase.
- 5) Nancy New - is about where she should be, given her low number of years of experience.
- 6) Treated Unjustly - the most serious case listed. An increase at level # 1 will take him to 91.1 % and an additional increase at level # 2 should take him to about where Al Average is, that is, at about 95 % CUPA. Note, he should move to a salary that is above Mary Mean, who has somewhat less experience.
- 7) Mary Mean - is not eligible at any level and is about where she should be. Note, the data on her are recorded by her chair so that comparison between her and other faculty can be readily made.
- 8) Hank Hardworker - a good, solid hard worker who's producing exceptional results. He is deserving of an increase but is ineligible under level #1 or level #2. His request for a level #3 increase is granted to the maximum ( i.e., 3% of his salary).
- 9) Layback Longtime - even though he has been at his rank for nearly 20 years, his low performance record suggests he is about where he should be. His request for a level #3 is denied.

POSSIBLE OUTCOME:

(Note: the increases given on the previous page are NOT closely matched to the final amounts awarded, because the evaluation process when done correctly finds those who are deserving).

	<u>Amount Awarded</u>	<u>% CUPA (before)</u>	<u>% CUPA (after)</u>
Joe Slow	\$ 0	85%	85%
Beth Better	\$ 790 (level #1)	89%	91.1%
Al Average	\$ 760 (level #2)	93%	95%
Sally Senior	\$1110 (level #3)	98%	101%
Nancy New	\$ 0	90%	90%
Treated Unjustly	\$1680 (level #1) plus \$1600 (level #2)	87%	95%
Mary Mean	\$ 0	92%	92%
Hank Hardworker	\$1140 (level #3)	93%	95.8%
Layback Longtime	\$ 0	98%	98%

TOTAL MAXIMUM REQUESTED: \$11,135

TOTAL AWARDED (based on careful evaluation): \$7080