

We will meet on

Monday, March 7, 1983

at 3:05 PM in BP 120.

Agenda items attached.

Please attend.

Agreed to endorse the
administration's salary recommendation.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
March 7, 1983

Senators Present:	Kathy Brinker	Geraldine Rouse
	Julie Gerdsen	Janet Simon
	Gary Johnston	Michael Ryan
	Paul Joseph	James Thomas
	Jim Kinne	Jonathan Bushee
	Jerry Warner	Lynn Ebersole
	Macel Wheeler	Nancy Martin
	Kay Cooper	Tom Cate
	George Goedel	Linda Olasov
	Glen Mazis	Becky Sturm
	Dennis O'Keefe	Fred Schneider
	Mack Osborne	Linda Newman
	Vernon Hicks	Tom Barone
		Nancy Campbell

Senators Absent Without Alternates:

Frank Dietrich	Susan Kissel
Nan Littleton	Thomas Rambo
Byron Renz	Edwin Weiss
Patricia Dolan	Elly Welt
Billie Brandon	

Guests Present:

Jeffrey Williams, Faculty Regent
Dr. Lyle Gray, Provost
Dr. Mike Adams

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:11 p.m. by President Cate.
- II. Agenda Items
 - A. Discussion of Faculty Salary Increases Policy recommended by Faculty Senate Budget Committee in comparison to version recently passed by Regents.
 - B. Discussion of the Merit Policy proposed by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.

III. Two Salary Increase Policies

Dr. Michael Adams was asked to speak on behalf of the Chair's Council. He explained the Chair's Council wanted to do away with the whole categorization of "merit pay" versus "across the board". This causes a grouping of a few people into the "superstar" who get a larger amount, and the rest of the department are lumped together at a much lower level. The Chair's proposal attempts to give a graduated scale of faculty performance, with a graduated scale of salary increases. Dr. Adams stated the only weakness of this system is if you don't trust your chair to be unbiased in making salary decisions. He asked that we not penalize the whole faculty for the sake of a few incompetent chairs. Dr. Jim Thomas stated he fears inequities between departments. Dr. Adams stated the "across the board" approach is the approach which gives more money to a department with a number of full professors than say a department with many assistant professors. Mr. Paul Joseph stated that the Chair's proposal may be a source of division for the University whereas the Senate's proposal would not have that effect. Dr. Adams thought this might be good for the University, as were the recent AAUP dissemination of salaries. Dr. Adams stated he thought there is a trend to a more honest and candid system. Dr. Thomas stated that he thought the large pieces of a limited number of merit increases was the Administration's preference. Dr. Adams stated that this was not an Administrative principle, but rather had pointed to the problem that there had not been a detailed evaluation procedure. Dr. Lyle Gray stated that at one point the salaries at NKU were "compacted" with little difference between ranks, but this is no longer the case. We now have several years of performance review material which gives the chairs a solid basis for evaluation.

Ms. Kathy Brinker stated that although the two policies appear compatible, i.e. the chairperson's version passed by the Regents and the policy proposed by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, there had not been faculty input into this formulation. President Cate answered this input can continue at a departmental level and through the Budget Committee. Ms. Kay Cooper asked whether it was not a waste of time to discuss this if the Administration has decided the policy already. Dr. Gray explained that the original policy was written in a broad manner to accommodate additional input about exact percentages and figures. Mr. Fred Schneider stated that his department would prefer 50-60% "across the board" and to substitute "good" for "satisfactory performance". Dr. George Goedel asked if the Chairs' Council proposed maximum and minimum levels for salary increases. Dr. Adams stated there was not a set minimum increase, although the maximum will be set at a certain percentage (by request of the Administration). Dr. Adams stated they oppose a fixed minimum, as individuals should be treated as individuals. The Chairs prefer to rank the faculty performance and give them proportionate increases. Dr. Jonathan Bushee asked whether the Chairs would object to setting a range of percentages for categories of performance. Dr. Adams stated that the Chairs could live with that although they oppose lumping people in categories. Mr. Joseph stated that the 80% across-the-board is a hedge against inflation, and then the rest can be for merit. Dr. Adams stated that this seems to assume that most of the faculty can't earn an increase on the strength of their performance. Ms. Becky Sturm asked Dr. Gray how departments receive funds. Dr. Gray stated that in general each department will get 6% of its base, except for exceptionally distinguished departments (positively or negatively). Dr. Goedel stated that the sense of the Senate seems to be with this "small of a pot" there needs to be an "across the board". Dr. Adams stated the opposite is the case. With a discretionary system, less people will "fall through the floor". Ms. Sturm stated that she would like to give the discretionary system a try, since the other systems have not worked well. Mr. Schneider made a motion that the Senate endorse the Board's decision. It was recorded, but then withdrawn, since other Senators protested that they wanted more discussion. Dr. Dennis O'Keefe asked Dr. Gray why the Chairs' salary was so high. Dr. Gray explained that Chairs were on a 12 month contract, and also that three years ago, the Chairs were underpaid significantly compared to other chairs of comparable records. Dr. Gray stated that the whole University needs to prepare (again) a proposal that NKU's salary structure should be adjusted.

Dr. Gray stated two such previous salary adjustment requests have been denied because of the youth of this institution versus other institutions. Dr. Gary Johnston stated that given the small amount of money available which, at maximum, hardly covers inflation he still favors the Chairs' policy. Dr. Mike Ryan stated that since the "pot" is only 6%, this is the year to experiment with a plan like the Chairs. An amendment was proposed by Dennis O'Keefe to change the Faculty Senate policy to 40% across the board, 60% merit. The motion was defeated 14 opposed to 11 in favor. The motion to ratify the Faculty Senate proposal was called and defeated (by voice vote). A motion was made to endorse the chairs' policy and seconded. Dr. Goedel asked to have it clarified that this motion endorses the chairs policy for the year. The motion has passed by 23 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention. A motion was made by Ms. Linda Newman to pass an amendment set a minimum of 3% or increase for satisfactory performance. Dr. Warner pointed out that we had just given the chairs' discretionary power, and should not take it away. The nays had it on the ensuing vote.

IV. Merit Policy

- A. Dr. Thomas felt that this policy contradicted the sense of the salary increase policy, since it states merit as reward for "excellent performance" and only a given percentage of the faculty may qualify. A motion was made and passed to strike the portion designated under the heading "purpose". Dr. Bushee made a motion that this be sent back to committee. Dr. Glen Mazis stated that this merit policy didn't seem to fit with the endorsement given departmental chair performance review. Ms. Cooper stated the report should be sent back to committee. Dr. Thomas objected to making teaching the only criteria that enables one to be eligible for a merit increase. Mr. Joseph called the motion to return the policy back to committee, which was passed by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. by President Cate.

Salary Recommendations for 1983-84

The Budget Committee of the Faculty Senate of Northern Kentucky University recommends the following:

1. From the total dollars available for faculty salary increases for 1983-84, eighty (80) percent should be allocated to across the board increases and twenty (20) percent to merit.
2. From the remaining dollars allocated for across the board salary increases for satisfactory faculty performances 75% be granted on a percentage of the faculty members salary and 25% be granted in a lump sum equal payment.
3. Merit awards should be made on the basis of exceptional teaching performance, professional development and university and community service.
4. The Northern Kentucky University administration should move more vigorously to seek funds for salary adjustment to bring Northern in line with benchmark institutions.

Jim Levine, chairperson

$$B1 = \underbrace{.80 a + b}_\downarrow + .20 M$$

$$.60\% + .20\$ + .20M$$

stated breakdown

Recommendation:

That faculty salary increases be based on performance reviews conducted by the Chairpersons and reviewed by the Deans and Provost.

Background:

The recommended approach reflects the continuing emphasis of the institution on the relationship between performance evaluations and salary. Faculty are evaluated according to criteria initially established five years ago and which have subsequently been refined. The evaluation process also contains an appeals provision for those faculty not satisfied with the reviews conducted by their Chairperson or with the attendant salaries. Discussions with the academic leadership of the institution revealed a strong commitment to performance reviews and for individual salary decisions to be made solely on the basis of performance. All faculty, where performance is judged satisfactory, will receive an increase. Minimum and maximum adjustments will be incorporated into this proposal once the final salary figures are known.

Division left to later

NKU POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION AND ^{Compensation} ALLOCATION OF MERIT

I. Purpose

Merit compensation may be defined as a reward for excellent job performance. Merit money should be limited so that only outstanding work and only a given percentage of the faculty may qualify.

II. Assumptions and Objectives

Faculty merit pay should in no way be tied to rank or seniority. Merit increases serve to reward achievement, not as cost-of-living adjustments and should serve as positive motivation to improve performance. A well-designed merit reward system assumes that a sound salary structure exists, with salaries both externally competitive and internally equitable and reflects levels of responsibility, experience, and individual performance. Structure of the evaluative process will be made known to the faculty before the evaluation period begins.

Appropriately merit allocation criteria will closely follow those guidelines outlined in the Faculty Handbook for promotion and tenure, i.e. teaching effectiveness and/or job performance; professional development; university service; and community service. The merit allocation policy shall be standardized for university wide use but also flexible enough to take into consideration the uniqueness of each department. The criteria for awarding merit shall be directly related to the mission of the institution and will reflect performance in those areas mentioned above.

III. Overview of the Evaluation Method

The basis of faculty evaluation for merit must coincide with the primary categories of faculty activity for promotion and tenure. Flexibility of evaluation is essential for the recognition of the individuality between departments.

In order to qualify for a merit award during any given academic year, faculty would be expected to have achieved:

1. Outstanding teaching effectiveness and/or job performance for non-teaching faculty. Standards shall be set by each department and may include: student evaluations, peer evaluations, course and teaching materials, quality of syllabi, appropriateness and quality of texts/course materials, exams, papers, assignments, and a self-review.

2. Outstanding performance in at least one other major area. Each department shall establish a listing of outstanding and acceptable activities or services for each major area. This list shall be approved by the department and the director or chairperson. This information shall be disclosed to all departmental faculty.
3. Acceptable performance in two remaining areas. Acceptable performance must be achieved in the two remaining areas, as defined by each department.

IV. Departmental Standards

Each department will be responsible for defining outstanding teaching effectiveness and/or job performance for non-teaching faculty within their department. They shall also develop and maintain lists of activities and services considered outstanding and those considered acceptable within their department. All standards must be approved by the department, the director/chairperson, and the college dean.

V. Acknowledgement to Faculty

At the first possible faculty meeting the director/chairperson will disclose to the department those names of faculty who were awarded merit, accompanied by brief supporting statements.

VI. Appeal Procedure of Individual Evaluation

Within ten working days of the merit disclosure, the faculty member must submit a written appeal for reconsideration, accompanied by supporting documentation, to the departmental director/chairperson. The subsequent procedure will be identical to the one outlined on pages 23-25 of the Faculty Handbook.