

Fall 8-29-1984

Senate Meeting August 29, 1984

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting August 29, 1984" (1984). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 408.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/408>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

August 29, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 1

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of July 18, 1984

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Items: Election of Faculty Senator to Serve on Executive Committee

Rules Committee Recommendations:

Civil Service Representative to JUAC

Three Nominations for SCERB Grievance Committee

Information Items: None

Committee Reports

Communications

Adjournment

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

August 29, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 1

Call to Order

Chairperson Gowdy called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Seating of New Senators

Three new faculty senators were seated: Larry Belknap, HPERD, Kenneth Strand, Educ. Admin. & Foundations, and George Petrossian of Foreign Languages.

Roll Call

Secretary Sessions called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of the Minutes of July 18, 1984

Ms. Getsi noted on page 6, bottom paragraph, first sentence should read: "JUAC did pass a resolution urging each university to standardize terms of office of serving on JUAC."

Mr. Charnogorsky noted on Page 3, Student Body President's Remarks, third sentence should read: "The SBBB Party Patrol is considering disbanding...."

XVI-1

It was moved by Mr. Spencer (Second, Christian) to accept the minutes as corrected. Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Ms. Gowdy welcomed back the Senators who had been gone for the summer. She asked that the schedules found at each senator's seat be filled in and turned in to the Senate Secretary this evening.

She commented that Dr. Watkins was wished a happy birthday (in absentia) because his son was home visiting.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Christian welcomed the new senators. He announced that plans are under way to fill student vacancies on external senate committees. Applications are available in the Senate Office. An advertisement will appear in the Vidette on September 4, 1984, and the date for return of applications is September 12th. Screening will be held on September 14 and 17, 1984.

Student Body President's Remarks

The SBBD had an extremely busy summer with several accomplishments. They sought and received the allowing of 19-and-20-year-olds to enter local bars. They worked with the party patrol in the city. They are working on getting the city to rescind the ban on keg sales in late evening. Several proposed parking changes may be implemented. Any questions about parking can be directed to Dr. Boaz or to the Parking and Traffic Committee. There will be several committee changes on campus. They are working with the President on these, to allow for more student input. The Book Exchange is running smoothly. Students will be screened in the next few weeks for the Fee Boards. He encouraged students to apply at 146 Bone Student Center (Student Life Office). They are setting up an ad hoc committee on voter registration. Jeff Ferry, SBBD Vice President, and Tom Crawford, Community Relations Director, will co-chair this. Students will again play the Town of Normal in a 12" softball double header.

Administrator's Remarks

Dr. Strand commented about the untimely breakdown of the air conditioning system in Julian Hall. Computer center operations have been shut-down. Program changes have been scheduled for next Tuesday through Thursday. The computer center is encouraging faculty members and students to be sympathetic to the problems. The Registration Office was in the process of completing one of the most efficient and effective enrollment processes in recent semesters. In answer to a question from Mr. Zeidenstein about whether this would make the ten-day class list late, Dr. Strand said he hoped it would not be delayed.

Dr. Harden replied that they hoped the Air Conditioning will be fixed in time to get the computer center back in operation by Friday.

Dr. Strand distributed copies of his Provost Letter to Members of the University Community. There were four major topics discussed in this newsletter: (1) Faculty salary increases and how those were handled; (2) Personnel changes in the Provost Office [Resignation and departure of Dr. Gene Jabker, Associate Provost. Acting Assistant Provost through June 30, 1985 will be Dr. Jack Chizmar. Addition of Dr. Catherine Batsche as Assistant to the Provost.]; (3) Dr. Richard Dammers, Professor of English, is on special assignment in the Provost's Office to assist with the preparation of North Central Association Documents. NCA will be on campus February 20-22, 1985; (4) Report on Admissions Requirements to Public Universities by the Board of Higher Education. Dr. Jeff Chinn compiled a report for the President and BHE. Reports were summarized here. The two recommendations which some of us are concerned about are: The Board of Higher Education recommends that all public universities consider for adoption the following high school subjects as a minimum admission requirement: four years of English; three years of Social Science; three years of Mathematics; three years of laboratory sciences; and two years of electives in foreign languages, music or art. The startling aspect of this recommendation is that it is a one-size-fits-all recommendation for all public universities in Illinois. Apparently Board members did not feel that public universities were going far enough with the analysis of

admission requirements. Raises questions about whether schools can deliver. These and other questions will be discussed at the Board of Higher Education meeting next week at Eastern Illinois University.

Another aspect of the report which brings some concern is, "In the short term access to higher education may be affected by minimum subject requirements." If this standard is imposed on everyone, there will be some problems. Following the implementation of this requirement, two categories of applicants may not be able to meet these requirements: (1) Those who seek admission to a baccalaureate degree immediately after high school, but did not successfully complete the requirements in high school; (2) Adults who have been out of formal education for some time and whose high school education did not include the required subjects. Access to baccalaureate degree programs should be available through some form of provisional admittance. Adult or non-traditional learner can be handled through a provisional process. Others need admission considerations. Requiring standards of all who seek admission to a baccalaureate degree program would open up problems all over the state. If a student could not get in, he could call his state representative to lean on the institution for admittance; all sorts of political maneuverings would be chaotic. We have the recommendations and BHE recommendations are usually endorsed. We shall wait and see if they take effect. We will be reading and hearing more about this.

Mr. Eimermann asked for clarification of items in the Letter. Page 1, How was the figure for salary minima (\$82,000) arrived at? What was the basis for this figure?

Dr. Strand replied that there was a smaller figure initially presented based on 6% of the salary increase dollars. The \$82,000 is a negotiated figure, negotiated as a result of additional revenue funds being available for distribution by the University.

Mr. Eimermann recalled the 6% was contained in the original URC proposal to the Senate, from the salary increase allocations. Dr. Strand said that working with the URC representatives on this process, they had tried to come up with a sum that fits some of the formula defined on page 2; and had come up with \$82,000.

Mr. Eimermann thought what the Senate did was two things: (1) Set a maximum of 6% to be allocated; (2) Set some target salary schedules of the minimum.

Dr. Harden said the total salary available to regular faculty was \$1,424,194.00. Six per cent of that -- or \$85,451.64 -- is how the figure was generated.

Mr. Eimermann said when he added the four items on page 1 of the report, he came up \$21,000 short: \$1,403,892 is \$21,000 less than Dr. Harden's figure.

At the time that Harden and Strand had discussed this, there was a given faculty base. But because of resignations, not that full amount of money was given.

Dr. Strand said there were two purposes for which the remainder could be used. (1) To annualize the market adjustments. It could be expended this year, but could not be a permanent addition to the budgets. (2) Contingency fund.

Mr. Mohr was concerned about this amount of money (\$21,000). Ms. Gowdy questioned whether this was the appropriate time to discuss this. She thought it might be better to wait until the Executive session following the Senate meeting.

Mr. Eimermann felt that this was an appropriate time, since issues raised here should be a matter of public record. Comments made in executive session were not recorded.

Ms. Gowdy felt what was going to be discussed in public should be discussed privately first. If it bears public discussion, then it certainly will be publicly discussed.

Mr. Schmaltz agreed with Eimermann that it should be a public discussion.

Ms. Gowdy thought there should be a private discussion before having a public discussion.

Mr. McCracken asked Provost Strand what the policy was for market equity? Was this a market analysis for individuals or for departments?

Dr. Strand replied that this was a market analysis that compared us with a peer group and took positions by rank and department. Dr. Jack Chizmar ran the study. Once the money was distributed to the Deans, they discussed with the Chairs how that money was to be distributed. The Deans made the final determination at the college level; and the college level recommendations then went to the Provost's office. The reason for involving the Deans and Department Chairs was to take merit into account.

Dr. Mohr asked if the Board of Regents had originally recommended 15% increase. One of the members of the BOR suggested \$500,000 to be divided by all three regency universities. The Board decided that was too little, and asked for 7.5% increase by raising tuition.

Dr. Strand said that the tuition increase was generated to get additional dollars for the University to use as the University saw fit. Dr. Harden said that some of the tuition increase money goes for general extra costs, not purely for salaries.

Ms. Gowdy asked if senators wished to go on with discussion. Senate responded yes.

Dr. Strand proceeded with a chronology of what had happened. Last October's goal statement from the Provost's Office addressed questions in regard to market adjustments. There was discussion in the URC during the Fall and Spring about market adjustment plans. It was brought to the faculty members of the Senate in March. After that meeting it was said that faculty members of the Senate had endorsed the concept of faculty salary minima, but had rejected the market adjustment unless some additional funding source could be located to do so.

The Board of Regents reopened the question of equity and decided that it was going to raise tuition, as the University of Illinois had done the previous year, and use the additional revenues on whatever they deemed necessary. That reopened the door for discussions about market adjustments.

Members of the Senate and other people became nervous in May and an ad hoc committee was appointed to represent the Senate, URC, etc. The ad hoc committee was to answer how adjustments should be handled and what amount of money should be used. It is included in the amount of money Dr. Harden cited, taken off the top of personal services money. The package was put together around it. Considerations were given to Administrative/Professional, Civil Service, and labor associations as well.

Dr. Mohr asked if it was correct that Civil Service and Administrative personnel received 7.5% across the board raises?

Dr. Harden said this was partially correct: average was 7.5%. It was not across the board, it varied according to individuals. Dr. Strand added that labor contracts received less.

Dr. Getsi asked if the additional funds which were created by a tuition increase were not to be used for faculty salaries? These funds were to pay our severely underpaid faculty. Dr. Strand said that the original Board of Regents guidelines did not have any increases for other parts of the budget. Dr. Getsi asked if it was the BOR intent that 7.5% go for salary increases? Dr. Strand answered, no.

Dr. Getsi mentioned that some faculty members who were performing adequately only got 6.5% or lower. Dr. Harden said some with exceptional merit got 8%. It depended upon what amount of money the department got, what the department assigned for exceptional merit, and how many people were to get it.

Dr. Getsi said she was concerned with the regular, performing faculty member out in the trenches and what the Board of Regents had intended to be done with the faculty salary increase money.

Dr. Strand said there was never any specific directive or instructions. According to Dr. Harden, the figures were applied to the full personal services base. Personal services money is not exclusively earmarked for faculty or civil service. The same thing applies to the tuition increase money.

Dr. Schmaltz went back to the figure of \$170,000. That figure was never approved by the Academic Senate. Dr. Strand replied that was correct. The Senate was never asked to approve this. It came out of the personal services base of the University, off the top. After that decision was made, and after the faculty package was made, then it was decided what was to be done with the Administrative/Professional and the Civil Service packages. Dr. Schmaltz asked where this \$170,000 would have gone otherwise? Dr. Strand said this money was not originally ear-marked for faculty.

Dr. Schmaltz said this \$170,000 was pulled at Provost's authority. Could we go over the ASPT document where the justification for this appears. Dr. Strand referred to the handout, Market Adjustments, Page 2, Item 3, Paragraph 2: The ASPT document states: "Additional monies may be used for these (equity) adjustments if other sources of funding become available." (Article IV. E. 5. of the ASPT document).

Dr. Schmaltz said that assuming we have the same document, under E. 5., "After review of the DFSC's recommendations, the CFSC may designate that up to 10% of the annual salary increase funds for a Department shall be used for equity adjustments within the Department. Additional monies may be used for these adjustments if other sources of funding become available." That statement justifies market equity? Isn't this restrictive? Strand said he had drawn a different conclusion.

Mr. Mohr asked if this money was allocated because of a decision by the administration of the University and not the Board of Regents.

Dr. Strand answered, yes, the Board of Regents was not involved in the process. It was an institutional question.

Mr. Mohr asked if the majority of the faculty received around 5%. Dr. Strand clarified that in any given year, after everything is done, there are wide disparities in ranges of salaries due to the ASPT process and what departments do with their exceptional merit. Secondly, the faculty will emerge as a result of Market Equity with more than 7.5% before it is over and will move ahead of the Administrative/Professional and Civil Service groups. Faculty will be the highest ranking group of people in regard to percentage increases.

Mr. Eimermann asked for a presentation as to how Market Equity was handled.

Dr. Virginia Owen, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, was Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Market Equity Adjustments. Also on the committee were: Dean Andrew Nappi from the College of Business; Steve Meckstroth, from the URC; Anita Webb-Lupo from the Provost's Office; Len Schmaltz and Tom Eimermann as representatives of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and Budget Committee. The Committee was not designed to discuss the merit of the market adjustment problems, but rather to recommend methods by which it should occur. Service on this committee should not be interpreted as support for the Market Equity program.

The committee met and answered a prescribed set of questions that were given to it as part of the charge from the Provost, and made comments as to general guidelines for the program. We unanimously recommended that the source of the funds be from new money rather than from reallocations of existing funds. We unanimously recommended everything except the amount of money. We recommended that a two-stage procedure be used. In the first stage, money would be allocated to colleges by comparing all colleges to the same external study. Deans and Chairs were to seek individual disciplinary studies in order to allocate funds within the college. We unanimously recommended that the money be spread as widely as was feasible, rather than seeking out super stars in each college and giving them the benefit of the funds.

When it came to the amount of money, the range of recommendations was from \$40,000 to \$500,000. The committee did not reach a unanimous agreement. The middle ground concensus was the figure of \$170,000 which we gave to the Provost as our best estimate. This was the only thing on which the committee did not have unanimous agreement, except whether the Market Equity should be in existence at all.

Dr. Jack Chizmar handed out a paper explaining his model process: "ISU Market Equity Assessment". After considerable research he had decided there were three outside studies that did salary comparisons by rank and by discipline: (1) The Oklahoma State University Study, 1983-84 Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline; (2) The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) 1983-84 National Faculty Salary Survey by Rank and By Discipline; (3) Ball State University Salary Study which included the 10 schools in the Mid-American Conference and eleven other schools of which ISU is one. He went with the first study because the institutions in it were on the whole more prestigious than ISU and that was the type of institution that we were losing faculty members to. He asked Deans to poll their Chairs about where faculty were going.

Mr. Chizmar started with a master file which was current as of August 16, 1984. He used the Oklahoma State University Study and created a working file with all the information on it. SIU had done a market equity adjustment study in the past few years; he consulted theirs. A predicted monthly faculty salary was calculated using three different models -- I, II, and III. Model II was chosen as the superior model on the basis of regressing statistics and sign expectations. Variables were: FTE, Rank, Years Since Last Promotion, Degree Held, and Oklahoma Salary Study (commensurate with rank and discipline). The model was used to make the following allocations to the colleges: Arts & Sciences - 52.6%; College of Applied Science & Technology - 13.8%; College of Business - 6.8%; College of Education - 11.7%; Fine Arts - 8.2%; and Library - 6.9%.

Deans were presented with two printouts: (1) Names and information for 639 faculty members (master file); and (2) Second printout was an aggregate (Department & College) of those people whose actual salary was less than their predicted salary.

Dr. Strand said that in preparation for the actual implementation of the funds or the allocation of the distribution of the funds, Deans and Department Chairs were doing some work on who within the department might merit the market adjustment when the actual percentage distributions were made. You can look at those figures and ascertain who was delighted and who was unhappy.

A question arose on the part of some of the Deans as to whether they could go beyond the \$170,000 for Market Equity purposes. There was a way to do so. Each year when the entire personal services package is put together for each of the components, as you bring together these figures, there is some type of contingency. Ususally, it is used to distribute to Deans for temporary faculty, graduate assistants, etc. This year we said that, if the Deans wished to do so, they could utilize these funds to help additional

faculty members to get into the market equity process. Or they could supplement funds for those who had a small amount of the distribution of \$170,000. The result is that there is a second process and that the end result is that the faculty will have received more than 7.5% in salary monies when this procedure is concluded.

We proceeded with this because it would help more people close gaps between market and existing salaries. It was never anticipated that this one shot would take care of all the problems. Being able to supplement the \$170,000 will bring us a bit closer. The result of a higher overall salary increase for faculty was perceived as a desirable outcome. The Deans and the chairs were asked to distribute these funds over as many people as possible.

Another problem emerged. Deans may have made commitments to certain individuals before the \$170,000 distribution was made. I am aware of two instances where that did occur. The instructions to the deans were that the \$170,000 distribution could not be used to honor prior commitments. Other funds must be used for this.

In view of the amount of interest, there is going to be a follow-up provided by the ad hoc committee and a summary report as to how the funds were distributed by colleges. We hope to have this out a week from Friday, September 7th. We will report this in a newsletter-type publication so that the university community may know where the \$170,000 went by college, the number of people affected by it; and how much additional money was used for market equity, where that was allocated, and the number of people affected.

Mr. Eimermann asked Dr. Strand to be more specific about the additional money being available above and beyond \$170,000.

Dr. Strand said this resulted from the various components of the personnel funds, rather than from reallocation of existing lines. It was personnel services money which, after the personal services were implemented, was not allocated.

Mr. Eimerman asked about Northern Illinois University instituting a market adjustment last year. Did they use a reallocation of the base as opposed to salary increase money? Did they use a reallocation of the base as opposed to salary increase money? Dr. Strand answered that NIU had done two things in the last two years: (1) It had taken existing positions and used dollars from those positions as a source of funds (cannibalized itself); (2) It had killed its pre-session program.

Mr. Eimermann asked about the positions of temporary faculty, Administrative-Professional, Civil Service, and tenure track faculty with regard to salary minima and market equity.

Dr. Strand answered that most of the discussion had pertained to regular faculty lines and that pool of money. There is no prohibition against the type of allocations mentioned. In the last two years the Provost's office, working with the Business and Finance Office, has liberalized and made more flexible the means by which departments can use personal services

funds. The rigid process of a few years ago has been relaxed, to give deans and chairs more flexibility in trying to address problems in their particular areas. There are some constraints about what they can do. That is why, when we get to the end of the lines of the budget, we allocate a sum of money to each college and then give discretion to the deans as to how they wish to allocate that within the college.

Mr. Eimermann asked when you made the statement before that faculty would come out ahead of everyone, was that statement based upon tenure-track faculty? Dr. Strand answered, yes, the regular faculty (tenured and tenure-track).

Mr. Eimermann asked about Operation Bootstrap, done in 1974. In that study the money was allocated to departments as opposed to colleges. Secondly, it was done on the basis of average salary, whereas your study was done on the basis of people considered below the average.

Mr. Eimermann wanted to know why the present allocation was to colleges rather than departments. Dean Owen stated that the guidelines by the ad hoc committee recommended this.

Mr. Eimermann asked if the difference in calculating on the basis of the average salary by department -- would that lead to any different outcome than Chizmar's method of figuring this. Dr. Chizmar thought his procedure would be appropriate to each individual person in determining the allocation.

Mr. Schmaltz asked if it was not true that if someone had been identified as being below the predicted salary, they would not get 1/10 of that money? The answer was yes.

Mr. Eimermann continued that part of the report of the advisory committee in determining eligibility indicates that a university-wide set of criteria and process should be developed within which each department and college should operate. He wanted to know what criteria were developed.

Dr. Strand went back to the model which he thought captured the issues. Instructions to Deans included two important factors: (1) Distribution was to be to as many people as possible; and (2) Merit was to be a contingent factor for each individual. Merit was not built into the formulas.

Mr. Eimermann asked if there were any plans at this time to continue such a procedure next year? Dr. Strand replied no plans at this time. They will refer the matter to the URC.

Dr. Mohr had perceptive problems with the Model II that was used. He had to explain to his people in the College of Business why certain things had been done. The Provost's Office had decided that Model II was the better model. On what grounds did they decide this?

Dr. Chizmar answered that the Model II was the simplest. They had fed in salaries from an outside source, averaged by rank and by discipline.

Dr. Mohr asked why college and department could not be used in Model II? Dr. Chizmar answered that the rationale for exclusion of colleges and departments in Model II was that the Oklahoma State Survey Salary was already adjusted for rank and discipline. Dr. Harden said that the nature of regression equations is that they will generate R values. The higher the R, the better off you are. Dr. Mohr wanted to see the details of the model. Dr. Zeidenstein asked if rank was a "dummy" variable?

Dr. Ken Strand commented that no matter what model you select, there will be some winners and some losers. Person X may want one variable; Person Y may want another variable.

Dr. Chizmar said that the data they used broke down salaries by rank and by discipline. Not all variables were taken into consideration -- merit, for example.

Dr. Mohr commented that the most important variable would be how much money the Dean gets.

Ms. Getsi asked whether or not the money was distributed at the department level to individuals on market levels? Dr. Strand presumed that there was a strong relationship.

Dean Owen spoke about the distribution process in her college. She consulted with chairs. In the instructions to the chairs in Arts and Sciences, she asked them to look at the lineup of salaries and identify any problems that they saw. They were asked to determine if there were problems with groups (assistant professors making more than associate professors, etc.). Asked them to provide her with evidence of what the market was in their discipline. As to how much money goes to the Deans being the most important variable; she wished they had gone for the \$500,000 amount. Even \$800,000 or \$900,000 would not be enough. Evidence showed enormous gaps. She did not look further at the printout, but relied on materials from Chairs, upon the program review recommendations, and upon the equity adjustment recommendations from DFSC last January. She did not tell chairs to give money to all low-paid people in their department. Distribution will not reflect that. Gave recommendations to chairs on Monday morning, followed by more discussions and modifications. She turned in her report to the Provost on Tuesday. In Arts and Sciences, merit was a very important consideration.

Ms. Getsi asked if it was conceivable that some of the Market Equity monies could be used to address some of the equity (salary minima) problems in departments. Dr. Strand answered yes.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the department chairs had received printouts? Dr. Strand said no. Dean Owen said the printouts used by Dr. Chizmar were to figure the salaries.

Mr. Zeidenstein thought chairpersons would not know which of their faculty members were below the market without looking at the differential on the printout. Dean Owen hoped that they would know the market in their discipline. Chairs brought in national studies done in their disciplines.

Dr. Getsi wished to introduce a motion but was turned down because the discussion at present was in the Administrators' Remarks in the agenda.

Mr. Zeidenstein said there are two ways to look at anything that happens: (1) Before the fact; and (2) to look at the results of the process. He would prefer to wait on any policy changes until after the results of this process have come to light.

Dr. Harden commented that at the July Board of Regents meeting, the University was authorized to hire an architect to develop schematic designs for the new arena. We have hired: Caudill, Rowlett, Scott/Sirrine, a large Houston Architectural firm, which has built about fifteen arenas. They are currently on campus. The target date is to finish schematics by the Board of Regents' meeting, September 20th.

Dr. Gamsky said the problem of international students not being housed in residence halls during vacations had been resolved. The Office of Residential Life and International Students Office had met several times. Students may stay over vacation if there are enough students to justify opening a dorm. Mr. Spencer asked how many people justified opening a dorm? Dr. Gamsky replied, not that many students. Dr. Mohr commended them for trying to solve the problem. Dr. Gamsky said the Provost's Office had been instrumental.

Dr. Gamsky said the air conditioning problem in Julian Hall is causing computer problems for the registration procedures.

ISSC had decided to change their award formula. All awards have been sent out already. In many cases the students have already paid their bills. ISU has the situation of trying to get some money back, or in some cases, giving additional money. Some money may have to be deducted from workstudy funds. ISSC caused the problem.

Vote for Executive Committee Member

Dr. Wayne Nelsen was elected.

Rules Committee Recommendations

XVI-2 It was moved by Mr. Pontius (Second, Getsi) that nomination of Leon Toepke as representative to JUAC by the Civil Service Council be confirmed.
Motion passed on a voice vote.

XVI-3 It was moved by Mr. Pontius (Second, Christian) to approve SCERB Grievance Committee Recommendations: Marian Carroll, Milner Library; J. Chris Eisle, Educational Administration & Foundations; and Pat Chesebro, Psychology.
Motion passed on a voice vote.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. No report.

Administrative Affairs. Dr. McCracken announced that the calendar will be coming up.

Budget Committee. Mr. Eimermann asked if the Rules committee was considering JUAC's terms of office. Yes. And they would also be considering the unwritten rule of the Senate Chairperson being a member of JUAC.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Schmaltz asked the committee to meet briefly following the meeting.

Rules Committee. Mr. Pontius will be contacting committee members for a meeting.

Student Affairs Committee. Sheila Mayhorn was elected secretary. Approved a recommendation to change the Athletic Council operating procedures. Will meet again September 12, 1984, in the Circus Room at 6:30 p.m.

JUAC. Dr. Getsi said JUAC will be meeting September 20 at the regular meeting of the Board of Regents. JUAC members would like to solicit items of interest from Senate and faculty members that need to be discussed at that meeting.

Ms. Gowdy said JUAC has a committee studying the annuity companies.

Dr. Mohr asked if we could forego the executive session since the matters had been discussed. Senators Eimermann and Spence wished to make remarks that were off the record. Ms. Gowdy was pleased with the tenor of the meeting thus far, and wished that it would continue in a seemly manner.

Communications

Mr. Marchio mentioned an article in The Daily Pantagraph on August 29th. He thought the Town of Normal, especially the police force, should be aware that student parties are not the only problem. Preservation of student rights should be first and foremost. He was referring to three incidents in which student injuries occurred. Emphasis was drawn more to the underage drinking than to the incidents. He called attention to the remarks about the student body "helping them build their case against the student body". He emphasized the restrictions now placed on the students. The student body is no different or worse than it has been in the past. The only difference is in the restrictions for the student body. Compliance with such an ordinance is impossible, with over 20,000 students at the university. Not pushing for noncompliance with the laws, but for fair laws.

Mr. Charnogorsky responded that 41 of the arrests were made for open alcohol. (29 of the 41 were minors.) That is not just the new ordinance, it is the law, not only here in Normal, but all over the state of Illinois. There were no arrests connected with the new mass gathering ordinance. In a meeting with the city council, it was decided they would probably not pursue the ordinance because of legal difficulties.

Mr. Charnogorsky continued about the stabbing at 405 Broadway. It was not a student involved in the attack, it was an outside person with a prior criminal record. The police did take care of the individual that was causing the problem. Hopefully the problem of open alcohol will be addressed in a media blitz by the Student Body Board of Directors. Students need to know the laws. In response to a question about the media blitz, Mr. Charnogorsky answered that an advertisement would read: "You can be ticketed for: with a list of offenses."

Mr. Eimermann had a few further comments on the Market Equity Adjustments. He was on the ad hoc committee for Market Equity; some on committee did not approve of the concept of market equity. (1) He thought the manner in which it was done outside the ASPT procedure is contrary to the ASPT document. Dr. Strand indicated that the Senate did not object. No one at that time had a copy of the ASPT document in front of them to examine the context. After having examined it, he had come to the conclusion that the interpretation was not justified. (2) The manner in which the financial market equity was financed was contrary to the will of the Senate. Support expressed for such a market adjustment was based on the assumption that money used was money above and beyond the regular salary system.

Dr. Watkin's example of a bootstrap effort was not from salary increase money, but from new money. When NIU instituted their market equity, they got last year the same percentage as our faculty received, then they got market equity on top of that. With the \$170,000 market equity, our faculty will get the same 7.5%, and administrators get the same 7.5%, that NIU faculty get without the market equity adjustment. The only exception will be because of extra money which is coming from temporary faculty and graduate assistant lines. Board of Regents approved market equity adjustment on top of a 15% raise.

Mr. Spence said that the one thing that seemed clear from the studies was that we are all behind; some of us are just farther behind than others. It was surprising to some that they were not as low as they thought they were. The way the money was distributed was a reasonable effort. What concerned him most was the perception that this should not have taken place at all. Things happened that were outside the ASPT document. There was a general breach of faith with the Senate by not bringing matters forth for a vote on matters of faculty salaries. We need to be concerned about URC recommendations in the future.

Mr. Taylor commented about the timing of the adjustments. The meeting in March was at the switch of the Senate. It came at the worst possible time, when the old Senate was going out and a new one was being seated.

Ms. Getsi agreed. She moved the following:

XVI-4

"That the Faculty Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the University Review Committee, immediately begin to develop policy and procedures governing any future Market or Salary Minima Adjustments of faculty salaries; that these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate; and that no further Market or Salary Minima Adjustments take place until the policy is in place." (Second, Schmaltz).

Mr. Spence understood that it was an on-going process. Mr. Mohr understood that the URC and Provost would consider that in the future. Dr. Strand said there was one conflict with the ASPT document. There is a provision by which a department may designate 10% of their salary monies for equity adjustments. Probably a clarification of the continuation of that policy may need to be made.

Ms. Gowdy persisted in concern about the validity of the motion. Dr. Boaz said it was in order. Ms. Gowdy voiced concern about the motion conflicting with the ASPT document. Mr. Eimermann said that, in the final analysis, Senate action is advisory to the President. If he sees a conflict, he is free to reject the motion.

Mr. Zeidenstein suggested we wait for the results of this year's adjustments. He moved to table the motion until after the Provost's report. Ms. Getsi did not accept the friendly amendment.

Dr. Pritner wished for a clarification of intent. The Faculty Affairs Committee and the URC had been identified. The URC is more knowledgeable on these matters. URC in conjunction with Faculty Affairs Committee could review and clarify these issues before they come to the Senate for consideration. Dr. Getsi replied that it should be a conjunctive process.

Ms. Gowdy was concerned about communications between two committees. The Faculty Affairs Committee already had an onerous load of work.

Dr. Zeidenstein thought the Senate should be in on the take off as well as the landing.

XVI-4 *Motion passed on a voice vote. (Three negative votes.)

**[In passing the motion, the Senate did not follow procedures in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate (Article I.1 and I.2) for the adoption of policy matters. Hence the motion must be considered as out of order even though it was declared by the Chair as having passed.]*

XVI-5 Motion by Christian (Second, Schmaltz) to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

KYLE SESSIONS, SECRETARY

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

August 29, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 1

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of July 18, 1984

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Items: Election of Faculty Senator to Serve on Executive Committee

Rules Committee Recommendations:

Civil Service Representative to JUAC

Three Nominations for SCERB Grievance Committee

Information Items: None

Committee Reports

Communications

Adjournment

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(not approved by the Academic Senate)

August 29, 1984

Volume XVI, No. 1

Call to Order

Chairperson Gowdy called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Seating of New Senators

Three new faculty senators were seated: Larry Belknap, HPERD, Kenneth Strand, Educ. Admin. & Foundations, and George Petrossian of Foreign Languages.

Roll Call

Secretary Sessions called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of the Minutes of July 18, 1984

Ms. Getsi noted on page 6, bottom paragraph, first sentence should read: "JUAC did pass a resolution urging each university to standardize terms of office of serving on JUAC."

Mr. Charnogorsky noted on Page 3, Student Body President's Remarks, third sentence should read: "The SBBB Party Patrol is considering disbanding...."

XVI-1

It was moved by Mr. Spencer (Second, Christian) to accept the minutes as corrected. Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Ms. Gowdy welcomed back the Senators who had been gone for the summer. She asked that the schedules found at each senator's seat be filled in and turned in to the Senate Secretary this evening.

She commented that Dr. Watkins was wished a happy birthday (in absentia) because his son was home visiting.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Christian welcomed the new senators. He announced that plans are under way to fill student vacancies on external senate committees. Applications are available in the Senate Office. An advertisement will appear in the Vidette on September 4, 1984, and the date for return of applications is September 12th. Screening will be held on September 14 and 17, 1984.

Student Body President's Remarks

The SBBB had an extremely busy summer with several accomplishments. They sought and received the allowing of 19-and-20-year-olds to enter local bars. They worked with the party patrol in the city. They are working on getting the city to rescind the ban on keg sales in late evening. Several proposed parking changes may be implemented. Any questions about parking can be directed to Dr. Boaz or to the Parking and Traffic Committee. There will be several committee changes on campus. They are working with the President on these, to allow for more student input. The Book Exchange is running smoothly. Students will be screened in the next few weeks for the Fee Boards. He encouraged students to apply at 146 Bone Student Center (Student Life Office). They are setting up an ad hoc committee on voter registration. Jeff Ferry, SBBB Vice President, and Tom Crawford, Community Relations Director, will co-chair this. Students will again play the Town of Normal in a 12" softball double header.

Administrator's Remarks

Dr. Strand commented about the untimely breakdown of the air conditioning system in Julian Hall. Computer center operations have been shut-down. Program changes have been scheduled for next Tuesday through Thursday. The computer center is encouraging faculty members and students to be sympathetic to the problems. The Registration Office was in the process of completing one of the most efficient and effective enrollment processes in recent semesters. In answer to a question from Mr. Zeidenstein about whether this would make the ten-day class list late, Dr. Strand said he hoped it would not be delayed.

Dr. Harden replied that they hoped the Air Conditioning will be fixed in time to get the computer center back in operation by Friday.

Dr. Strand distributed copies of his Provost Letter to Members of the University Community. There were four major topics discussed in this newsletter: (1) Faculty salary increases and how those were handled; (2) Personnel changes in the Provost Office [Resignation and departure of Dr. Gene Jabker, Associate Provost. Acting Assistant Provost through June 30, 1985 will be Dr. Jack Chizmar. Addition of Dr. Catherine Batsche as Assistant to the Provost.]; (3) Dr. Richard Dammers, Professor of English, is on special assignment in the Provost's Office to assist with the preparation of North Central Association Documents. NCA will be on campus February 20-22, 1985; (4) Report on Admissions Requirements to Public Universities by the Board of Higher Education. Dr. Jeff Chinn compiled a report for the President and BHE. Reports were summarized here. The two recommendations which some of us are concerned about are: The Board of Higher Education recommends that all public universities consider for adoption the following high school subjects as a minimum admission requirement: four years of English; three years of Social Science; three years of Mathematics; three years of laboratory sciences; and two years of electives in foreign languages, music or art. The startling aspect of this recommendation is that it is a one-size-fits-all recommendation for all public universities in Illinois. Apparently Board members did not feel that public universities were going far enough with the analysis of

admission requirements. Raises questions about whether schools can deliver. These and other questions will be discussed at the Board of Higher Education meeting next week at Eastern Illinois University.

Another aspect of the report which brings some concern is, "In the short term access to higher education may be affected by minimum subject requirements." If this standard is imposed on everyone, there will be some problems. Following the implementation of this requirement, two categories of applicants may not be able to meet these requirements: (1) Those who seek admission to a baccalaureate degree immediately after high school, but did not successfully complete the requirements in high school; (2) Adults who have been out of formal education for some time and whose high school education did not include the required subjects. Access to baccalaureate degree programs should be available through some form of provisional admittance. Adult or non-traditional learner can be handled through a provisional process. Others need admission considerations. Requiring standards of all who seek admission to a baccalaureate degree program would open up problems all over the state. If a student could not get in, he could call his state representative to lean on the institution for admittance; all sorts of political maneuverings would be chaotic. We have the recommendations and BHE recommendations are usually endorsed. We shall wait and see if they take effect. We will be reading and hearing more about this.

Mr. Eimermann asked for clarification of items in the Letter. Page 1, How was the figure for salary minima (\$82,000) arrived at? What was the basis for this figure?

Dr. Strand replied that there was a smaller figure initially presented based on 6% of the salary increase dollars. The \$82,000 is a negotiated figure, negotiated as a result of additional revenue funds being available for distribution by the University.

Mr. Eimermann recalled the 6% was contained in the original URC proposal to the Senate, from the salary increase allocations. Dr. Strand said that working with the URC representatives on this process, they had tried to come up with a sum that fits some of the formula defined on page 2; and had come up with \$82,000.

Mr. Eimermann thought what the Senate did was two things: (1) Set a maximum of 6% to be allocated; (2) Set some target salary schedules of the minimum.

Dr. Harden said the total salary available to regular faculty was \$1,424,194.00. Six per cent of that -- or \$85,451.64 -- is how the figure was generated.

Mr. Eimermann said when he added the four items on page 1 of the report, he came up \$21,000 short: \$1,403,892 is \$21,000 less than Dr. Harden's figure.

At the time that Harden and Strand had discussed this, there was a given faculty base. But because of resignations, not that full amount of money was given.

Dr. Strand said there were two purposes for which the remainder could be used. (1) To annualize the market adjustments. It could be expended this year, but could not be a permanent addition to the budgets. (2) Contingency fund.

Mr. Mohr was concerned about this amount of money (\$21,000). Ms. Gowdy questioned whether this was the appropriate time to discuss this. She thought it might be better to wait until the Executive session following the Senate meeting.

Mr. Eimermann felt that this was an appropriate time, since issues raised here should be a matter of public record. Comments made in executive session were not recorded.

Ms. Gowdy felt what was going to be discussed in public should be discussed privately first. If it bears public discussion, then it certainly will be publicly discussed.

Mr. Schmaltz agreed with Eimermann that it should be a public discussion.

Ms. Gowdy thought there should be a private discussion before having a public discussion.

Mr. McCracken asked Provost Strand what the policy was for market equity? Was this a market analysis for individuals or for departments?

Dr. Strand replied that this was a market analysis that compared us with a peer group and took positions by rank and department. Dr. Jack Chizmar ran the study. Once the money was distributed to the Deans, they discussed with the Chairs how that money was to be distributed. The Deans made the final determination at the college level; and the college level recommendations then went to the Provost's office. The reason for involving the Deans and Department Chairs was to take merit into account.

Dr. Mohr asked if the Board of Regents had originally recommended 15% increase. One of the members of the BOR suggested \$500,000 to be divided by all three regency universities. The Board decided that was too little, and asked for 7.5% increase by raising tuition.

Dr. Strand said that the tuition increase was generated to get additional dollars for the University to use as the University saw fit. Dr. Harden said that some of the tuition increase money goes for general extra costs, not purely for salaries.

Ms. Gowdy asked if senators wished to go on with discussion. Senate responded yes.

Dr. Strand proceeded with a chronology of what had happened. Last October's goal statement from the Provost's Office addressed questions in regard to market adjustments. There was discussion in the URC during the Fall and Spring about market adjustment plans. It was brought to the faculty members of the Senate in March. After that meeting it was said that faculty members of the Senate had endorsed the concept of faculty salary minima, but had rejected the market adjustment unless some additional funding source could be located to do so.

The Board of Regents reopened the question of equity and decided that it was going to raise tuition, as the University of Illinois had done the previous year, and use the additional revenues on whatever they deemed necessary. That reopened the door for discussions about market adjustments.

Members of the Senate and other people became nervous in May and an ad hoc committee was appointed to represent the Senate, URC, etc. The ad hoc committee was to answer how adjustments should be handled and what amount of money should be used. It is included in the amount of money Dr. Harden cited, taken off the top of personal services money. The package was put together around it. Considerations were given to Administrative/Professional, Civil Service, and labor associations as well.

Dr. Mohr asked if it was correct that Civil Service and Administrative personnel received 7.5% across the board raises?

Dr. Harden said this was partially correct: average was 7.5%. It was not across the board, it varied according to individuals. Dr. Strand added that labor contracts received less.

Dr. Getsi asked if the additional funds which were created by a tuition increase were not to be used for faculty salaries? These funds were to pay our severely underpaid faculty. Dr. Strand said that the original Board of Regents guidelines did not have any increases for other parts of the budget. Dr. Getsi asked if it was the BOR intent that 7.5% go for salary increases? Dr. Strand answered, no.

Dr. Getsi mentioned that some faculty members who were performing adequately only got 6.5% or lower. Dr. Harden said some with exceptional merit got 8%. It depended upon what amount of money the department got, what the department assigned for exceptional merit, and how many people were to get it.

Dr. Getsi said she was concerned with the regular, performing faculty member out in the trenches and what the Board of Regents had intended to be done with the faculty salary increase money.

Dr. Strand said there was never any specific directive or instructions. According to Dr. Harden, the figures were applied to the full personal services base. Personal services money is not exclusively earmarked for faculty or civil service. The same thing applies to the tuition increase money.

Dr. Schmaltz went back to the figure of \$170,000. That figure was never approved by the Academic Senate. Dr. Strand replied that was correct. The Senate was never asked to approve this. It came out of the personal services base of the University, off the top. After that decision was made, and after the faculty package was made, then it was decided what was to be done with the Administrative/Professional and the Civil Service packages. Dr. Schmaltz asked where this \$170,000 would have gone otherwise? Dr. Strand said this money was not originally ear-marked for faculty.

Dr. Schmaltz said this \$170,000 was pulled at Provost's authority. Could we go over the ASPT document where the justification for this appears. Dr. Strand referred to the handout, Market Adjustments, Page 2, Item 3, Paragraph 2: The ASPT document states: "Additional monies may be used for these (equity) adjustments if other sources of funding become available." (Article IV. E. 5. of the ASPT document).

Dr. Schmaltz said that assuming we have the same document, under E. 5., "After review of the DFSC's recommendations, the CFSC may designate that up to 10% of the annual salary increase funds for a Department shall be used for equity adjustments within the Department. Additional monies may be used for these adjustments if other sources of funding become available." That statement justifies market equity? Isn't this restrictive? Strand said he had drawn a different conclusion.

Mr. Mohr asked if this money was allocated because of a decision by the administration of the University and not the Board of Regents.

Dr. Strand answered, yes, the Board of Regents was not involved in the process. It was an institutional question.

Mr. Mohr asked if the majority of the faculty received around 5%. Dr. Strand clarified that in any given year, after everything is done, there are wide disparities in ranges of salaries due to the ASPT process and what departments do with their exceptional merit. Secondly, the faculty will emerge as a result of Market Equity with more than 7.5% before it is over and will move ahead of the Administrative/Professional and Civil Service groups. Faculty will be the highest ranking group of people in regard to percentage increases.

Mr. Eimermann asked for a presentation as to how Market Equity was handled.

Dr. Virginia Owen, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, was Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Market Equity Adjustments. Also on the committee were: Dean Andrew Nappi from the College of Business; Steve Meckstroth, from the URC; Anita Webb-Lupo from the Provost's Office; Len Schmaltz and Tom Eimermann as representatives of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and Budget Committee. The Committee was not designed to discuss the merit of the market adjustment problems, but rather to recommend methods by which it should occur. Service on this committee should not be interpreted as support for the Market Equity program.

The committee met and answered a prescribed set of questions that were given to it as part of the charge from the Provost, and made comments as to general guidelines for the program. We unanimously recommended that the source of the funds be from new money rather than from reallocations of existing funds. We unanimously recommended everything except the amount of money. We recommended that a two-stage procedure be used. In the first stage, money would be allocated to colleges by comparing all colleges to the same external study. Deans and Chairs were to seek individual disciplinary studies in order to allocate funds within the college. We unanimously recommended that the money be spread as widely as was feasible, rather than seeking out super stars in each college and giving them the benefit of the funds.

When it came to the amount of money, the range of recommendations was from \$40,000 to \$500,000. The committee did not reach a unanimous agreement. The middle ground consensus was the figure of \$170,000 which we gave to the Provost as our best estimate. This was the only thing on which the committee did not have unanimous agreement, except whether the Market Equity should be in existence at all.

Dr. Jack Chizmar handed out a paper explaining his model process: "ISU Market Equity Assessment". After considerable research he had decided there were three outside studies that did salary comparisons by rank and by discipline: (1) The Oklahoma State University Study, 1983-84 Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline; (2) The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) 1983-84 National Faculty Salary Survey by Rank and By Discipline; (3) Ball State University Salary Study which included the 10 schools in the Mid-American Conference and eleven other schools of which ISU is one. He went with the first study because the institutions in it were on the whole more prestigious than ISU and that was the type of institution that we were losing faculty members to. He asked Deans to poll their Chairs about where faculty were going.

Mr. Chizmar started with a master file which was current as of August 16, 1984. He used the Oklahoma State University Study and created a working file with all the information on it. SIU had done a market equity adjustment study in the past few years; he consulted theirs. A predicted monthly faculty salary was calculated using three different models -- I, II, and III. Model II was chosen as the superior model on the basis of regressing statistics and sign expectations. Variables were: FTE, Rank, Years Since Last Promotion, Degree Held, and Oklahoma Salary Study (commensurate with rank and discipline). The model was used to make the following allocations to the colleges: Arts & Sciences - 52.6%; College of Applied Science & Technology - 13.8%; College of Business - 6.8%; College of Education - 11.7%; Fine Arts - 8.2%; and Library - 6.9%.

Deans were presented with two printouts: (1) Names and information for 639 faculty members (master file); and (2) Second printout was an aggregate (Department & College) of those people whose actual salary was less than their predicted salary.

Dr. Strand said that in preparation for the actual implementation of the funds or the allocation of the distribution of the funds, Deans and Department Chairs were doing some work on who within the department might merit the market adjustment when the actual percentage distributions were made. You can look at those figures and ascertain who was delighted and who was unhappy.

A question arose on the part of some of the Deans as to whether they could go beyond the \$170,000 for Market Equity purposes. There was a way to do so. Each year when the entire personal services package is put together for each of the components, as you bring together these figures, there is some type of contingency. Usually, it is used to distribute to Deans for temporary faculty, graduate assistants, etc. This year we said that, if the Deans wished to do so, they could utilize these funds to help additional

faculty members to get into the market equity process. Or they could supplement funds for those who had a small amount of the distribution of \$170,000. The result is that there is a second process and that the end result is that the faculty will have received more than 7.5% in salary monies when this procedure is concluded.

We proceeded with this because it would help more people close gaps between market and existing salaries. It was never anticipated that this one shot would take care of all the problems. Being able to supplement the \$170,000 will bring us a bit closer. The result of a higher overall salary increase for faculty was perceived as a desirable outcome. The Deans and the chairs were asked to distribute these funds over as many people as possible.

Another problem emerged. Deans may have made commitments to certain individuals before the \$170,000 distribution was made. I am aware of two instances where that did occur. The instructions to the deans were that the \$170,000 distribution could not be used to honor prior commitments. Other funds must be used for this.

In view of the amount of interest, there is going to be a follow-up provided by the ad hoc committee and a summary report as to how the funds were distributed by colleges. We hope to have this out a week from Friday, September 7th. We will report this in a newsletter-type publication so that the university community may know where the \$170,000 went by college, the number of people affected by it; and how much additional money was used for market equity, where that was allocated, and the number of people affected.

Mr. Eimermann asked Dr. Strand to be more specific about the additional money being available above and beyond \$170,000.

Dr. Strand said this resulted from the various components of the personnel funds, rather than from reallocation of existing lines. It was personnel services money which, after the personal services were implemented, was not allocated.

Mr. Eimerman asked about Northern Illinois University instituting a market adjustment last year. Did they use a reallocation of the base as opposed to salary increase money? Did they use a reallocation of the base as opposed to salary increase money? Dr. Strand answered that NIU had done two things in the last two years: (1) It had taken existing positions and used dollars from those positions as a source of funds (cannibalized itself); (2) It had killed its pre-session program.

Mr. Eimermann asked about the positions of temporary faculty, Administrative-Professional, Civil Service, and tenure track faculty with regard to salary minima and market equity.

Dr. Strand answered that most of the discussion had pertained to regular faculty lines and that pool of money. There is no prohibition against the type of allocations mentioned. In the last two years the Provost's office, working with the Business and Finance Office, has liberalized and made more flexible the means by which departments can use personal services

funds. The rigid process of a few years ago has been relaxed, to give deans and chairs more flexibility in trying to address problems in their particular areas. There are some constraints about what they can do. That is why, when we get to the end of the lines of the budget, we allocate a sum of money to each college and then give discretion to the deans as to how they wish to allocate that within the college.

Mr. Eimermann asked when you made the statement before that faculty would come out ahead of everyone, was that statement based upon tenure-track faculty? Dr. Strand answered, yes, the regular faculty (tenured and tenure-track).

Mr. Eimermann asked about Operation Bootstrap, done in 1974. In that study the money was allocated to departments as opposed to colleges. Secondly, it was done on the basis of average salary, whereas your study was done on the basis of people considered below the average.

Mr. Eimermann wanted to know why the present allocation was to colleges rather than departments. Dean Owen stated that the guidelines by the ad hoc committee recommended this.

Mr. Eimermann asked if the difference in calculating on the basis of the average salary by department -- would that lead to any different outcome than Chizmar's method of figuring this. Dr. Chizmar thought his procedure would be appropriate to each individual person in determining the allocation.

Mr. Schmaltz asked if it was not true that if someone had been identified as being below the predicted salary, they would not get 1/10 of that money? The answer was yes.

Mr. Eimermann continued that part of the report of the advisory committee in determining eligibility indicates that a university-wide set of criteria and process should be developed within which each department and college should operate. He wanted to know what criteria were developed.

Dr. Strand went back to the model which he thought captured the issues. Instructions to Deans included two important factors: (1) Distribution was to be to as many people as possible; and (2) Merit was to be a contingent factor for each individual. Merit was not built into the formulas.

Mr. Eimermann asked if there were any plans at this time to continue such a procedure next year? Dr. Strand replied no plans at this time. They will refer the matter to the URC.

Dr. Mohr had perceptive problems with the Model II that was used. He had to explain to his people in the College of Business why certain things had been done. The Provost's Office had decided that Model II was the better model. On what grounds did they decide this?

Dr. Chizmar answered that the Model II was the simplest. They had fed in salaries from an outside source, averaged by rank and by discipline.

Dr. Mohr asked why college and department could not be used in Model II? Dr. Chizmar answered that the rationale for exclusion of colleges and departments in Model II was that the Oklahoma State Survey Salary was already adjusted for rank and discipline. Dr. Harden said that the nature of regression equations is that they will generate R values. The higher the R, the better off you are. Dr. Mohr wanted to see the details of the model. Dr. Zeidenstein asked if rank was a "dummy" variable?

Dr. Ken Strand commented that no matter what model you select, there will be some winners and some losers. Person X may want one variable; Person Y may want another variable.

Dr. Chizmar said that the data they used broke down salaries by rank and by discipline. Not all variables were taken into consideration -- merit, for example.

Dr. Mohr commented that the most important variable would be how much money the Dean gets.

Ms. Getsi asked whether or not the money was distributed at the department level to individuals on market levels? Dr. Strand presumed that there was a strong relationship.

Dean Owen spoke about the distribution process in her college. She consulted with chairs. In the instructions to the chairs in Arts and Sciences, she asked them to look at the lineup of salaries and identify any problems that they saw. They were asked to determine if there were problems with groups (assistant professors making more than associate professors, etc.). Asked them to provide her with evidence of what the market was in their discipline. As to how much money goes to the Deans being the most important variable; she wished they had gone for the \$500,000 amount. Even \$800,000 or \$900,000 would not be enough. Evidence showed enormous gaps. She did not look further at the printout, but relied on materials from Chairs, upon the program review recommendations, and upon the equity adjustment recommendations from DFSC last January. She did not tell chairs to give money to all low-paid people in their department. Distribution will not reflect that. Gave recommendations to chairs on Monday morning, followed by more discussions and modifications. She turned in her report to the Provost on Tuesday. In Arts and Sciences, merit was a very important consideration.

Ms. Getsi asked if it was conceivable that some of the Market Equity monies could be used to address some of the equity (salary minima) problems in departments. Dr. Strand answered yes.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the department chairs had received printouts? Dr. Strand said no. Dean Owen said the printouts used by Dr. Chizmar were to figure the salaries.

Mr. Zeidenstein thought chairpersons would not know which of their faculty members were below the market without looking at the differential on the printout. Dean Owen hoped that they would know the market in their discipline. Chairs brought in national studies done in their disciplines.

Dr. Getsi wished to introduce a motion but was turned down because the discussion at present was in the Administrators' Remarks in the agenda.

Mr. Zeidenstein said there are two ways to look at anything that happens: (1) Before the fact; and (2) to look at the results of the process. He would prefer to wait on any policy changes until after the results of this process have come to light.

Dr. Harden commented that at the July Board of Regents meeting, the University was authorized to hire an architect to develop schematic designs for the new arena. We have hired: Caudill, Rowlett, Scott/Sirrine, a large Houston Architectural firm, which has built about fifteen arenas. They are currently on campus. The target date is to finish schematics by the Board of Regents' meeting, September 20th.

Dr. Gamsky said the problem of international students not being housed in residence halls during vacations had been resolved. The Office of Residential Life and International Students Office had met several times. Students may stay over vacation if there are enough students to justify opening a dorm. Mr. Spencer asked how many people justified opening a dorm? Dr. Gamsky replied, not that many students. Dr. Mohr commended them for trying to solve the problem. Dr. Gamsky said the Provost's Office had been instrumental.

Dr. Gamsky said the air conditioning problem in Julian Hall is causing computer problems for the registration procedures.

ISSC had decided to change their award formula. All awards have been sent out already. In many cases the students have already paid their bills. ISU has the situation of trying to get some money back, or in some cases, giving additional money. Some money may have to be deducted from workstudy funds. ISSC caused the problem.

Vote for Executive Committee Member

Dr. Wayne Nelsen was elected.

Rules Committee Recommendations

XVI-2 It was moved by Mr. Pontius (Second, Getsi) that nomination of Leon Toepke as representative to JUAC by the Civil Service Council be confirmed.
Motion passed on a voice vote.

XVI-3 It was moved by Mr. Pontius (Second, Christian) to approve SCERB Grievance Committee Recommendations: Marian Carroll, Milner Library; J. Chris Eisle, Educational Administration & Foundations; and Pat Chesebro, Psychology.
Motion passed on a voice vote.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. No report.

Administrative Affairs. Dr. McCracken announced that the calendar will be coming up.

Budget Committee. Mr. Eimermann asked if the Rules committee was considering JUAC's terms of office. Yes. And they would also be considering the unwritten rule of the Senate Chairperson being a member of JUAC.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Schmaltz asked the committee to meet briefly following the meeting.

Rules Committee. Mr. Pontius will be contacting committee members for a meeting.

Student Affairs Committee. Sheila Mayhorn was elected secretary. Approved a recommendation to change the Athletic Council operating procedures. Will meet again September 12, 1984, in the Circus Room at 6:30 p.m.

JUAC. Dr. Getsi said JUAC will be meeting September 20 at the regular meeting of the Board of Regents. JUAC members would like to solicit items of interest from Senate and faculty members that need to be discussed at that meeting.

Ms. Gowdy said JUAC has a committee studying the annuity companies.

Dr. Mohr asked if we could forego the executive session since the matters had been discussed. Senators Eimermann and Spence wished to make remarks that were off the record. Ms. Gowdy was pleased with the tenor of the meeting thus far, and wished that it would continue in a seemly manner.

Communications

Mr. Marchio mentioned an article in The Daily Pantagraph on August 29th. He thought the Town of Normal, especially the police force, should be aware that student parties are not the only problem. Preservation of student rights should be first and foremost. He was referring to three incidents in which student injuries occurred. Emphasis was drawn more to the underage drinking than to the incidents. He called attention to the remarks about the student body "helping them build their case against the student body". He emphasized the restrictions now placed on the students. The student body is no different or worse than it has been in the past. The only difference is in the restrictions for the student body. Compliance with such an ordinance is impossible, with over 20,000 students at the university. Not pushing for noncompliance with the laws, but for fair laws.

Mr. Charnogorsky responded that 41 of the arrests were made for open alcohol. (29 of the 41 were minors.) That is not just the new ordinance, it is the law, not only here in Normal, but all over the state of Illinois. There were no arrests connected with the new mass gathering ordinance. In a meeting with the city council, it was decided they would probably not pursue the ordinance because of legal difficulties.

Mr. Charnogorsky continued about the stabbing at 405 Broadway. It was not a student involved in the attack, it was an outside person with a prior criminal record. The police did take care of the individual that was causing the problem. Hopefully the problem of open alcohol will be addressed in a media blitz by the Student Body Board of Directors. Students need to know the laws. In response to a question about the media blitz, Mr. Charnogorsky answered that an advertisement would read: "You can be ticketed for: with a list of offenses."

Mr. Eimermann had a few further comments on the Market Equity Adjustments. He was on the ad hoc committee for Market Equity; some on committee did not approve of the concept of market equity. (1) He thought the manner in which it was done outside the ASPT procedure is contrary to the ASPT document. Dr. Strand indicated that the Senate did not object. No one at that time had a copy of the ASPT document in front of them to examine the context. After having examined it, he had come to the conclusion that the interpretation was not justified. (2) The manner in which the financial market equity was financed was contrary to the will of the Senate. Support expressed for such a market adjustment was based on the assumption that money used was money above and beyond the regular salary system.

Dr. Watkin's example of a bootstrap effort was not from salary increase money, but from new money. When NIU instituted their market equity, they got last year the same percentage as our faculty received, then they got market equity on top of that. With the \$170,000 market equity, our faculty will get the same 7.5%, and administrators get the same 7.5%, that NIU faculty get without the market equity adjustment. The only exception will be because of extra money which is coming from temporary faculty and graduate assistant lines. Board of Regents approved market equity adjustment on top of a 15% raise.

Mr. Spence said that the one thing that seemed clear from the studies was that we are all behind; some of us are just farther behind than others. It was surprising to some that they were not as low as they thought they were. The way the money was distributed was a reasonable effort. What concerned him most was the perception that this should not have taken place at all. Things happened that were outside the ASPT document. There was a general breach of faith with the Senate by not bringing matters forth for a vote on matters of faculty salaries. We need to be concerned about URC recommendations in the future.

Mr. Taylor commented about the timing of the adjustments. The meeting in March was at the switch of the Senate. It came at the worst possible time, when the old Senate was going out and a new one was being seated.

Ms. Getsi agreed. She moved the following:

"That the Faculty Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the University Review Committee, immediately begin to develop policy and procedures governing any future Market or Salary Minima Adjustments of faculty salaries; that these procedures be approved by the Academic Senate; and that no further Market or Salary Minima Adjustments take place until the policy is in place." (Second, Schmaltz).

Mr. Spence understood that it was an on-going process. Mr. Mohr understood that the URC and Provost would consider that in the future. Dr. Strand said there was one conflict with the ASPT document. There is a provision by which a department may designate 10% of their salary monies for equity adjustments. Probably a clarification of the continuation of that policy may need to be made.

Ms. Gowdy persisted in concern about the validity of the motion. Dr. Boaz said it was in order. Ms. Gowdy voiced concern about the motion conflicting with the ASPT document. Mr. Eimmermann said that, in the final analysis, Senate action is advisory to the President. If he sees a conflict, he is free to reject the motion.

Mr. Zeidenstein suggested we wait for the results of this year's adjustments. He moved to table the motion until after the Provost's report. Ms. Getsi did not accept the friendly amendment.

Dr. Pritner wished for a clarification of intent. The Faculty Affairs Committee and the URC had been identified. The URC is more knowledgeable on these matters. URC in conjunction with Faculty Affairs Committee could review and clarify these issues before they come to the Senate for consideration. Dr. Getsi replied that it should be a conjunctive process.

Ms. Gowdy was concerned about communications between two committees. The Faculty Affairs Committee already had an onerous load of work.

Dr. Zeidenstein thought the Senate should be in on the take off as well as the landing.

XVI-4 *Motion passed on a voice vote. (Three negative votes.)

**[In passing the motion, the Senate did not follow procedures in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate (Article I.1 and I.2) for the adoption of policy matters. Hence the motion must be considered as out of order even though it was declared by the Chair as having passed.]*

XVI-5 Motion by Christian (Second, Schmaltz) to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

KYLE SESSIONS, SECRETARY

ISU MARKET EQUITY ASSESSMENT

SUMMARY

A regression analysis designed to pinpoint salary inequities due to the market suggests the following percentage breakdown of dollars (\$170,000) to the colleges.

A & S	52.6%
CAST	13.8%
BUS	6.8%
ED	11.7%
FA	8.2%
LIB	6.9%

METHOD

A master file was created by merging the individual salary data file (current as of August 16, 1984) with salary data representative of the market. The source of the market data was the 1983-84 Oklahoma State Salary Survey. Two tables were constructed. The first included national average salary at the 6-digit Hegis Code level for each rank. The second table contained these same averages for the 2-digit Hegis Code level.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Three general linear models were run on the data in order to obtain a predicted salary for each faculty member.

Model I: The first model predicted salary from variables that were entirely internal to ISU. The predictors include:

1. FTE
2. RANK
3. YEARS SINCE LAST PROMOTION
4. DEGREE HELD
5. DEPARTMENT
6. COLLEGE

Marketability adjustments are made in this model by the variables COLLEGE and DEPARTMENT.

Model II: The second model contained the following variables:

1. FTE
2. RANK
3. YEARS SINCE LAST PROMOTION
4. DEGREE HELD
5. OKLAHOMA SALARY: The 6-digit Hegis Code salary commensurate with the rank and discipline.

Marketability adjustments are made in this model by OKLAHOMA SALARY (after removing DEPARTMENT and COLLEGE).

Model III: The third model used the same predictors as Model II with the exception of RANK.

Model II was chosen as the superior model on the basis of regression statistics and sign expectations.

PRINT-OUTS

Print-out I: reports actual 83-84 monthly salaries (ACTUAL MONTHLY SALARY) and 83-84 predicted monthly salary (PREDICTED MONTHLY SALARY) for all 639 tenure track and tenured faculty at ISU. Note: NEW TOTAL SALARY is the sum of ACTUAL MONTHLY SALARY and any adjustments to the salary which have occurred to date (i.e. EXCEPTIONAL MERIT INCREMENT, MERIT INCREMENT, BOOTSTRAP ADJUSTMENT).

Print-out II: reports PROPORTION (the proportion of the \$170,000 that is recommended to go to each unit) and DOLLARS (the corresponding dollar amount) calculated over those faculty members whose ACTUAL MONTHLY SALARY is less than their PREDICTED MONTHLY SALARY. The procedure is similar to that used by Warren Harden in 1974, "Salary Parity Allocation," for ISU's last market equity adjustment. The Method involves the creation of a SCALAR DIFFERENTIAL, defined as the ratio of the PREDICTED MONTHLY SALARY to the ACTUAL MONTHLY SALARY. NUMBER is the number of faculty members in that rank and discipline for whose actual salary is less than their predicted. NOMINAL is simply the NUMBER times SCALAR and is a unitless number. Total NOMINAL equals 356.09. The PROPORTION is equal to NOMINAL divided by 356.09.

Finally, DOLLARS equal PROPORTION times \$170,000.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

1. August 22-August 27: Deans study results and recommend increments for faculty members perceived to be behind the market. Please write in the increment in the right-most column of print-out II. Please initial each page. Due: August 27, 4:00 P.M.
2. August 28: Dean's recommendations reviewed by Jack Chizmar.
3. August 29: Dean's recommendations reviewed by Provost Strand and any changes reported back to Deans.
4. August 30-September 3: Results entered into Board Report.
5. September 3: report submitted to Charles Harris.