**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, May 4, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Academic Planning Committee Confirmation***

The following members have been confirmed by affirmation to serve on the Academic Planning Committee.

***Madeline Trimble, ACC (2022-2024)***

***Jennine Harvey-Northrop, CSD (2022-2024)***

***Chad Kahl, MIL (2022-2024)***

***University Hearing Panel election***

The following members have been confirmed by affirmation to serve on the University Hearing Panel.

***Jin Guang, HSC, (2022-2024)
Robin Trost, MCN, (2022-2024)***

***Presentation: Faculty Salary, Tenure, and Promotion report (interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Roberta Trites, Assistant Vice President for Budget and Planning Sandy Cavi, and Director of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis Angela Engel)
FY22 Faculty Salary Analysis Tables 1-5 Final***Dr. Trites: I assure you all good numbers come from these people. I apologize that you have not had a single Faculty Caucus meeting that didn’t include me this year. Those of you who are new to the committee should be delighted, it’s the only time you have to see me. I’ve had a blast. My many thanks to the Faculty Caucus. You have been an amazing group, those of you who are continuing to work with. And those of you who are new this year, and the coming year, you will be in good hands with your fellow Senators on the Faculty Caucus. This is an amazing body. I’ve only been at ISU 31 years, but I have always been impressed with the workings of the Faculty Caucus and the Academic Senate. As I leave to retire May 31, I do wish the record to show that my gratitude is with all of you for your commitment to shared governance and also to our Provost, to the chair of the Academic Senate, Senator Nikolaou (who couldn’t be here), and also to our President. I do really appreciate this University’s commitment to shared governance has made my career possible. And I think it has made the careers of many possible. So, thank you.

Table one, and I want to again acknowledge that these are being provided to us from various offices in the Vice President of Finance and Planning in conjunction with my role in the Vice President of Academic Affairs. We take faculty salary seriously. We care a lot about this conversation. So, table one, you can see over the years since the five-year spread, the percent of salary increase by year and employee classification, which does include promotions and job changes. For example, when I became a department chair interim in Management and Quantitative Methods, my bump from becoming a chair was reflected in this back in the first column 2016-17. I think the most important column we have here is the one on the right, which reflects a year that we had no institutional raises. And so, when you look at the very bottom, ISU Merit Increase applied, and you see that is zero. That was a year that no one got a merit increase of any sort. But when you see up at the top that there were 9% raises, that was because some people did take new positions, and some people did get those types of increments. Overall, though, people in that year did not do well. Are there questions now about table one? I will remind you that we have two types of instructional assistant professors. Those who belong to the collective bargaining unit, and those who do not. Most of those folks that do not are in Milner and Mennonite and serve on twelve-month contracts. So, when you see under instructor lecture negotiated and non-negotiated, those were governed under different policies than ASPT faculty.

Senator Webber: Would the promotion adjustments, that’s the footnote one, when did that change? Do those ever change?

Dr. Trites: They did change, but I think they changed… The increment for promotion to associate went from 3 to 5, and associate to full went from 5 to 8 in the second column.

Senator Horst: Professor Trites, if I’m understanding this correctly, there was no raises in the 2021 year?

Dr. Trites: That’s correct.

Senator Horst: However, because people went from assistant to associate or associate to full, those other positions have a greater increase in salary, as opposed to the full professors, most of which did not change ranks. Is that correct?

Dr. Trites: That’s correct. And that also would include people who assumed and became department chairs.

Senator Horst: Right. So, that’s the only way you would have gotten a bump in that year.

Dr. Trites: That’s right.

Senator Horst: Further questions about table one? (Pause) Seeing none.

Dr. Trites: Then, moving on. Table two is good news if you are an assistant or an associate professor, and less good news if you are a full professor. I really call your attention to the average salaries compared to our IBHE peer mediums. We are doing well by our assistant and associate professors. We are doing less well competitively compared to IBHE full professors. So, again, I ask you—this is a much farther range, we only had five years on the last table, this one’s ten—I ask you to look at this closely and let me know what questions you have about ourselves as comparators without IBHE sibling universities.

Senator Mainieri: Thank you for this information. I am heartened to see table four and five breaking down disaggregated data by race and gender…

Dr. Trites: Yes. I was on table two and I’m certainly coming to those.

Senator Mainieri: Yes. And in regard to table two, I wonder if similar disaggregated data could be provided for the actual salary packages?

Dr. Trites: I’m sorry, are you asking if we could break it down by… Yes, that would be possible, except when the N as it were, the number of full professors of color, or women, or men in certain departments is so small that we can’t report it out. So, that’s possible, but I’m sorry, you’re sort of ahead of me in the questioning.

Ms. Engel: We don’t have comparator data, so we wouldn’t have apples to apples.

Dr. Trites: So, yes, we could break that down for ISU, but that’s right our IBHE comparators are not comparators, most of them are not comparators, but IBHE schools do not report out by race and gender.

Senator Cline: If I could ask, I’m not asking questions about gender or race, but I think it would be instructive to disaggregate the colleges, or at least similar like colleges, because there’s a fairly substantial differentiation from college to college, and it would be helpful to compare, again, apples to apples rather than the entire aggregate.

Dr. Trites: Senator Cline, I couldn’t agree with you more. Unfortunately, IBHE doesn’t report that data out to us in that manner. Partly because, for example, we don’t have a law school or a medical school. Several IBHE institutions don’t have, for example, College of Applied Science and Technology. So, this is how it’s reported to us is in the full aggregate. It would be wonderful if we could get this disaggregated. Unfortunately, IBHE doesn’t report it to us this way.

Senator Horst: Would it be possible at all just to see the data, as Senator Mainieri suggested and Senator Cline suggested, maybe not compared to the peer group but just have that data for ISU specifically at the college level and then also disaggregated data with gender?

Dr. Trites: I think that’s tables four and five here for ISU.

Senator Horst: Okay. Very good. Senator Mainieri, did you have further questions?

Senator Cline: That’s not what four and five… forgive me, those are percentages.

Dr. Trites: I must have misunderstood the question. I’m so sorry.

Senator Cline: That’s okay. Those are percentage of increases. We’re not asking necessarily for you to… obviously we understand that IBHE does not provide exact comparators, but it might be helpful to disaggregate internally what the average is across college are, not percentage of increase. Does that make sense? I understand the response that the IBHE does not provide a college by college average for a comparator institution; but, nevertheless, I think it might be helpful data to list the averages within the university for salaries at the different ranks in the different colleges, even if we don’t have direct comparators. Disaggregating that information internally could be instructive, even if we don’t have comparators.

Ms. Cavi: Yeah, we can get you that data.

Senator Cline: Thank you very much.

Senator McHale: My question has got to do, and you may have already explained this, I’m sorry if I’ve missed it, but looking for an explanation on how full professors here are salary dropped $1,700? I see that on the last two column, fall of 2020 our average was $100,900 and in 2021 it was $99, 200.

Dr. Trites: That would be two retirements, including among distinguished professors and senior department chairs.

Senator Blum: I just want to say that these are the best numbers since I’ve been on the Senate, in some regards. I also want to say that, as you noted, the full professor is still a problem.

Dr. Trites: Exactly.

Senator Blum: And I also want to note that when the changes were made to the retirements, the full professor was not included in those changes. Right. So, another words, there was (actually I know this well because I was promoted to full professor at the $5,000 in the next year the $8000 just as an individual anecdote) many people, not just myself, that were entered into that amount. I can see, I believe those promotion numbers are moving the associate level in the right direction. So, I think that’s a good thing. I do think that as a full professor and a senior faculty who’s been here 17 years, I think we have to make sure that all people are taken care of. I mean, people who are dedicated and have been here for many years.

The other thing is that many departments use a flat rate structure. Everybody gets—whatever their system is—the same number rather than a percentage. That kind of structure in merit pay is regressive.

Dr. Trites: Yes.

Senator Blum: Anyway, I know this is not much of a question, but I think those things are food for thought, and it’s not the first time they’ve been brought up.

Dr. Trites: And my tenure is in a department—I don’t work there right now—but I tenured in a department that I think have very flat numbers for that exact reason that you described. I also want to reiterate what I implied earlier. So, I’m actually going to vocalize it, I’m concerned about the numbers involving full professors here. I do agree with those who have expressed concern that we’re not reporting out exactly where the jump from 3 to 5 and 5 to 8 happen with promotions. We can do that. We can fix that for next year. But I want to say that I’m concerned that we’re going down with full professors relative to the rest of the state. Thank you for bringing that up. I wanted to talk about it. Thank you.

Senator Holland: Just looking at the graph, over this last five or six years at 2% or 0% raises, we seem to be making significant progress against the state. Does this mean that other universities are basically getting zero or decreases?

Dr. Trites: In some cases, yes.

Senator Holland: All righty.

Dr. Trites: That would be some of the people that have directions in their title.

Senator Horst: The peer groups, is there another peer group that we could analyze this against that would not just be in state?

Dr. Trites: That would be wonderful if we could look at our comparators and our aspirational schools, but they’re not required to report out the data the same way we do. So, the reason we focus on the IBHE schools is because they’re required to report out the same metrics we are. We can say, depending on the department, Miami of Ohio is comparator or aspirational, but it’s not consistently, sometimes it’s comparator, sometimes it’s aspirational, and they don’t report out the same measures we do.

Senator Horst: I see.

Senator McHale: I just had a general concern based on one of your earlier comments. Our motto here is Gladly we Learn and Teach. It seems to be what you are saying is that ISU and maybe academic in general value administration more than teaching. That if I would aspire to administrative position and teach less, you’re telling me that I would be significantly rewarded more.

Dr. Trites: No. Because, for example, I’m not counted among the full professors at this point in my career. I was when I was a department chair, but I’m not now.

Senator McHale: Okay. I guess my question is do we value administration more than we value teaching?

Dr. Trites: We don’t measure administration. It’s not their… the job of the Faculty Caucus is to measure the faculty salary and that is not the data that I’ve reported to you. I have not given you… at this institution, your department chair is a member of the faculty. That is the data I have given you. I have not given you comparator information, for example, on provosts. Not that I would ever do that, sir. Also, I misspoke. There is a link—please forgive me again—AVP Cavi has really helped me on this. If you look at footnote two, a list of peer institutions identified by the IBHE for salary comparisons can be located there, and I misspoke. That includes Ball State, Cleveland State, Florida, Atlanta, Georgia State, Indiana State. I could go down the list, Texas A&M Commerce, University of Southern Mississippi, UT Dallas (where I got my master’s degree, thank you very much). So, it is not limited. I misspoke. Forgive me. This is the first time, and the last. I assure you my successor will make the first time out too.

Senator Horst: Thank you for that clarification. And just so we’re clear, this includes school directors and chairs who are on twelve-month appointments, but it does not include provost stuff, and deans…

Dr. Trites: Correct. I find the more interesting data on table three, four, and five.

Senator Horst: Okay. Let’s move to table three.

Dr. Trites: Personally, I find the easiest way to read table three is to consistently look across the top. We have 635 tenure line faculty. they received an annual percentage increase overall of 2.02%. The standard increase by department we got the ASPT merit increase and the provost increase. Now, you will recall out of 2%, 1.8% goes to merit. .2% goes across the board. And .2% is held back for the provost increase. The provost for the last several years has given the deans and the deans have give, for the most part, back to the departments their requests. The provost has not been hanging on to his .1% that he could hang on to, he’s been giving it to the deans. Okay. So, those standard increase by department, standard merit increase, which is the lions share, and then the provost increase we call it, but that is much more likely to be a college level increase than a provost level increase. So, university wide, you can see how it all adds up if you look at that top row that shaded you can see the numbers for the 272 faculty members in CAS, 112 in CAST, the 68 in the College of Business, the 68 in the College of Ed, the 18 Mennonite, the 15 in Milner, and 82 in the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts.

Senator Horst: I wonder if you have any perspective as to how Criminal Justice seems to be unusually high?

Dr. Trites: I do not have a perspective on that, other than to note that there were four departments in that college that received no provost allocation, which is at this point a dean’s allocation. But according to policy we call it the provost allocation.

Senator Blum: For example, for the standard incrementation there’s just no deviation. Right. And for the merit increases, it doesn’t quite make sense to me why… aren’t they given the same amount of money? Why would it vary? Is there a reasoning for that?

Dr. Trites: Exactly what you said earlier, some departments reward everybody the same way, some people, there’s variability because of performance.

Senator Horst: I think some actually even taking from the ASPT merit increase they might do some more equity restrictions.

Ms. Cavi: No, there’s no equity involved. It’s all merit. But it’s distributed based on a pot of dollars that are generated from your base salaries in your unit, and then distributed according to performance. So, your percent’s can be the dollars you received divided by when you started.

Senator Blum: The deviations are small, I agree.

Senator Horst: Are than any further questions about table three? (Pause) Okay. We can move on to table four and five.

Dr. Trites: The most important thing I want to point out to you first are the footnotes. By underrepresented, we are including American Indians, Alaskan natives, Black or African Americans, Asian, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and those who have chosen two or more as their choice of how they self-identify within the demographics counted by the US labor department. More important for the purposes of this conversation, when we have fewer than six people in a category, we do not report those numbers out because that would render them discoverable. If, for example, a department is a small department and it has one woman, or it has one man, or it has one member of an underrepresented category, that person’s salary raise percentage would then become discoverable to everyone in the room. So, we follow federal guidelines when the numbers are five or fewer, we do not report that data out to you. Alright. We’re not trying to hide something from you, we are trying very very much to protect federally insured privacy of all parties involved. With that said, I would like for you to review, last year’s Senate asked for us to report the data, increased percentages by underrepresented groups as compared to overall, and the total increase percentage by gender identity.

Senator Hollywood: I see that the table shows only tenure track faculty. Do you have anything that has the same breakdown for non-tenure track?

Dr. Trites: I believe that that would come under the collective bargaining agreement, reporting those numbers out, and this is the Faculty Caucus reporting within the ASPT policies. So, we were not asked to present that data.

Senator Horst: Do you receive that data in another context, Senator Hollywood?

Senator Hollywood: No. Not that I’ve seen.

Provost Tarhule: Those increases are collectively negotiated. So, it’s whatever the bargaining agreement says people should get is what they get.

Senator Hollywood: I wasn’t specifically talking about salary, I was talking about the breakout in four and five of the underrepresented, what portion of the non-tenure track is an underrepresented group? As more of a demographic thing.

Dr. Trites: We don’t have that information available to us now, but it has been historically part of the Fact Book that is on the PRPA page. It’s not like it’s covert, it’s not hidden, we just don’t have that data with us now. I’ll find it on a webpage for previous year, not current year. It always lags a year or two.

Senator Hollywood: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Mainieri: One of the things I note here is my college, CAST, the only one that has lower percentage increase for underrepresented faculty compared to the larger college. So, I wonder, is this information shared with the deans? And if there is additional reporting made available for the deans, actions, steps, and things to be thinking about in regards to these numbers?

Dr. Trites: This information is indeed presented to the deans. It is not disaggregated further because to do so would, again, violate individual rights. I will ask that to be left with Senator Tarhule as to how he proceeds with that information. But I do want to report to you that when the N is the small, we will expect some volatility in the way the numbers are presented. For example, I’m fortunate enough to work in Arts and Sciences where it looks like women get more. But CAST it looks like women get less. But when you aggregate it across the university that flattens out. That’s largely a function of the fact that Arts and Sciences has a larger N. We have many more people. Male, women, and gender non-binary or not disclosed. So, the smaller your unit is the more likely you are to look as if there are perhaps inequities, that when you look at the university in the aggregate the number looks very different. When you look at your own college, please do also compare it to the university.

Senator Horst: Just to pick up on that though, was this something, Provost, that could be addressed with provost increment later?

Provost Tarhule: It’s certainly a point to bring up with Todd, to look at what the cost is. But I agree with Senator Mainieri, it stands out. So, it’s clearly a point that needs further investigation. And we’ll be addressing it based on what we find for sure.

Senator Mainieri: Just an additional question. I see in table four we’re provided with the number of faculty, college versus underrepresented, for future reports it would be helpful to also see number of faculty for the genders as well. For example, there may be colleges that have more men than women, and then it allows us to interpret these percentages a little bit more discretely as well.

Dr. Trites: Sorry, I’m not tracking you, Senator Mainieri. Table five reports by gender.

Senator Horst: table four has numbers of underrepresented faculty but table five does not.

Dr. Trites: And if we were to break it down within college by both underrepresented and gender, almost every college would be stared out because it would become identifiable information.

Senator Mainieri: Sorry, just to clarify, I am talking specifically about table five, just adding a column that has number of faculty to the existing rows, just like table four has.

Dr. Trites: Ah. I see. The number on table four in CAST is 112 total, so that would still be true, that there’s still 112 faculty members in CAST, when you look at table five. Yes, we can definitely fix that next year.

Senator Horst: She’s saying the underrepresented is 23 but then when you go over to CAST you don’t know the breakout of women and men. So, she’s suggesting that you could break out the gender numbers.

Ms. Cavi: If I could jump in. We didn’t do that on purpose because you can back into the non-binary number which is too small. We wanted to but we couldn’t.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Novotny: In table five, I see gender is broken out there for the increases, so for this one-year, fiscal year 2022, but I don’t see what the salaries are or if they’re shown any place the salaries differentiated by male or female for their actual salaries, not the percent of the increase. So, what the salary is currently or what it was—to look at differences between male and female salaries, not the percent of increase. I mean, the percent of increase looks like there’s no problem there. But when you look at the actual salaries, what’s the differences?

Dr. Trites: Are you asking if we could report on average?

Senator Novotny: Yes. For male versus female.

Dr. Trites: When the n is small enough, perhaps. But your college probably not.

Senator Novotny: But is it true that you can go and find anyone’s salary online?

Dr. Trites: Right. But that’s an individual thing, that’s not me violating someone’s privacy. Right. So, you can look it up, it’s not a violation of privacy, but if I told you institutionally it would be.

Senator Horst: But I think that would be very helpful, and if you’re concerned about the N, perhaps you could lump together some colleges that are small. But seeing the percentage of increase is sort of meaningless unless we know where we are starting from. I think that would be very useful. Are there any other questions regarding tables four and five? (Pause)

These are the last tables. So, just to reflect again, it seems like every year we come up with new things to ask for. But on table two, there was a request to have some data about salaries by colleges. There is also a request as to whether or not we can have some disaggregated data by gender or race and ethnicity. And I think that’s picking up on what Senator Novotny just said. Then there was discussion by Assistant Vice President Cavi as to whether or not, because of the problem with the non-binary, it might be problematic to give the gender number by colleges. So, I appreciate that. And then we have a request for investigation into the CAST difference in the numbers.

Dr. Trites: And I’d like to pick up what you said on table two, we did get a request to report that by college, but again, the IBHE doesn’t give us data by college.

Senator Horst: I think it’s just a request to have the breakout of the salary levels by college in ISU alone. Is that correct, Senator Cline?

Senator Cline: Yes, just within the institution. Thank you.

Senator Horst: Just within the institution, to get an understanding of the discrepancies in salary averages across the colleges. Is there any further discussions on these tables?

Provost Tarhule: I’d like to make a few quick remarks. I agree with everyone. The professor salaries are lower, and this is a matter of concern. I think structurally what’s happening is in most institutions I see some professor’s salaries tend to be very competitive because they’re driven by the market. If you don’t offer what the other schools are paying you won’t yield. So, those tend to work out well. And then associate professor salary, we do have an opportunity at time of promotion to raise those. So, there is a mechanism by which they can be adjusted at some point. We don’t have a similar mechanism for professor salaries. So, once you become a professor, basically, your salaries become driven by when we have increases, and that’s a major limitation. There are many universities that are creatively thinking about ways of fixing that. Some of them from time to time, every few years, you make an adjustment because if you rely only on the merit increases, the full professor salaries will always be depressed. So, I think this is something that as we take a look at our finances, and our budget, it’s really important that we figure out how do we keep our full professor salaries competitive. I’ll keep advocating for that and making some suggestions. I agree this is something that needs to be done.

Senator Mainieri raised some interesting questions about departmental comparatives and Roberta correctly said IBHE doesn’t give us that information. I’m actually very interested in advocating for more benchmarking of our departments and colleges. Something we don’t do enough. At some institutions, almost every department is encouraged to identify its peer comparatives as well as its aspirational peers. This is important, not just for salaries, but just to see how you are doing, because you are competing with your peers. So, if you don’t know what they are doing, and what you need to be doing, it’s easy to fall behind and also to find what is it that they’re doing that is better than us. That could be a discussion that as we go into the next Strategic Plan, maybe why departments can begin to have that. Once you have those peer comparisons it’s much easier, still difficult, but easier to get this kind of data, even if IBHE doesn’t collect it. A lot of university peer comparison data is not useful at the department level because some of the universities that will be compared may not even have our department. So, in general, departmental peer groups don’t always align with university peers, but that’s something departments have to initiate themselves, maybe with encouragement from the deans and my office about setting up those peers. I would actually really like to see more departments identify who their peers are for various comparisons.

And then finally, the question about the colleges, the salaries by colleges. I understand it’s interesting data to show. I worry about whether it might just create a bit more—we already know what it will show, right—Business will earn more than History or English. That’s just the way it is. I think if we evaluate what we already know, I don’t know what it will serve. But those salaries again are set by the industry. We have Nursing salaries. We’ll have Engineering. We’ll have to pay engineers what engineers make at comparison schools, otherwise we won’t yield them. Business professors get paid by what their peer Businesses are paid, otherwise we won’t yield them. So, it’ll be interesting to produce, but I just worry that it may lead to a bit… maybe it just puts a number to what we already know, that there are some differences by discipline. I’m not saying we can’t produce it; I’m wondering if it serves much.

Senator Horst: Well, you might discover that, for instance, the Fine Arts faculty might be paid significantly lower. I suspect that’s true.

Provost Tarhule: I know that.

Senator Horst: And it might be interesting to speculate compared to some CAS departments why that would be. But just getting back to your point about the professor problem, I’m just going to say that a couple years ago there was questions about this concept of a step program that you see over in California where they have different levels of professors; the URC had discussions about that last year. That’s one solution that’s out there. It’s pretty complicated to switch programs, but I’m just mentioning that as another system that’s used.

Senator Blum: I just want to make a note about comparisons particularly in Education. We have faculty, assistant professors, who have a master’s degree and 15 years of experience in CPS and to come here as an assistant professor take a $10,000 pay cut. I don’t know how Business or other colleges got comparisons, but our comparison within our own industry, that we pay less that other educators teaching K-12. I’m not sure—and this is why I think some of this information would be useful—I’m not sure that for whatever reason, more power to the Business college, or being able to find a way to compare to have their salaries up. But I would say that if you compare that at the expert level that we hire faculty into the same education level within our discipline, we’re actually paying less.

Dr. Trites: It is easier and the departments and schools and colleges that have accrediting bodies that gather this data. English does not have this, management does. Moreover, I’ve got to admit I do not have any market value as a children’s literature professor outside of academia. But you wouldn’t believe the number of administrative ads I’m still getting to apply to be deans of College of Business, where I would apparently have market value (some of you might know, I tenured in English, but worked for a while in the College of Business). So, I have more market value as an administrator in management than I do in my home tenure discipline. Now, I’m not here, in 1981 I got one of the many Cs I got in economics, but I know where I’ve got market value and where I don’t.

Senator Webber: This maybe silly, maybe it’s here. Maybe it was too long ago, that President Bowman did address these disparities among, maybe it was 2008 or something, they did increases for associate and full, I think. Do you remember that?

Dr. Trites: That’s happened actually quite a bit more recently than that when we changed from 3K to 5 for promotion to associate. And 5K to 8 for promotion to full. So, I think there was a one-time bump years ago, but we made it a more permanent thing a few years back. I think that’s what you’re thinking about.

Senator Webber: That’s a one-time bump. So, I’m wondering what the options are?

Dr. Trites: Right now, it’s getting closer to the market value of what happens when you get the common associate or full, rather than relying on what we were giving people in 1983, which is what we were doing for a long time.

Senator Webber: Okay.

Senator Horst: I want to acknowledge Dr. Trites for the many hours that she spent with us. Thank you. And thank you Sandy Cavi and Angela Engel for coming out this evening.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Garrahy, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.