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***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: I think we have really one main item of business, and we’ll see how far we get. And then if we have time, we’ll do the second item. So, we’re going to hand it over to Senator Stephens, who is going to talk to us, as I said, about our salaries. He’s giving the annual salary report for us. Go ahead.

***Advisory Item:  
Faculty Salary, Tenure and Promotion Presentation (Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens, Director of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis Angela Engel, Assistant Director of Planning Cheryl Fogler, Director of Budget Planning and Operations Sandi Cavi)***

***04.05.19.03 Percent Salary Increase -Table 4***

***04.05.19.04 Average Faculty Salaries - Table 1***

***04.05.19.05 Dist of Continous Faculty Salary - Table 2a - All Faculty***

***04.05.19.06 Dist of Continous Faculty Salary - Table 2b - TT Only***

***04.05.19.07 Dist of Continous Faculty Salary - Table 3a - All Faculty***

***04.05.19.08 Dist of Continous Faculty Salary - Table 3b - TT Only***

***04.05.19.09 Dist of Continous Faculty Salary - Table 3c - NTT Only***

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. Along with me, I have Angela and Cheryl from our PRPA organization, that is, the two ladies that have gathered a lot of this information. So, as we get into some of the detailed questions, I may turn the microphone over to them. But my goal this evening is to talk through the schedules that were included in your packet. I will very much hit them at a very high level. Some of you have seen these documents before, so I’ll try not to belabor the education process. But please ask questions as you have them as I proceed.

So, we’ll just start with, in a particular order, the first table, Table 1. This is a comparison, as you can see, where we’re attempting to compare the compensation of our assistant, associate and full professors across a number of years. In this particular case, it’s 8 years. But more importantly, it’s comparing where each of these levels of faculty compare to our peers. Now, if you look at the far right-hand corner, you will see for fall of 2018 and spring of 2019, it says N/A. That’s simply because of the timing by which we prepared this information. The peer data—which are about 30 schools that are selected by IBHE—that information won’t be available until the springtime.

But if I can point out one particular point where we’re hoping that we’ve made ground; if you look in the fall of 2018, comparing to fall of 2017, just for example, on the full professors, you see the salary move from an average of $94,200 up to $99,000, and then it moves up in spring 2019 to a little over $100,000. That jump from fall of 2017 to fall of 2018 is attempting to recognize that the promotional adjustments we made at the end of 2017 and beginning of 2018 that had been a long time coming, where prior promotional adjustments just did not satisfy a sufficient level of comparison in order to keep up with peers. So, that’s why you’re seeing a significant jump there. And what we’re hoping in our comparison data is that we were able to make up some ground. As you can see, we do fairly well with assistant professors, but we continue to fall in a gap when we get to associate professors and full professors. But, hopefully, next year’s report will be able to see we’ve actually made some ground.

Before I move on to the next schedule, I want to stop and ask if there are any particular questions on this particular table.

Senator Aduonum: I have a question. So, for spring 2019, for full professors, this is the figure for full professors. Are all full professors making this money? This amount?

Senator Stephens: This is an average.

Senator Aduonum: Okay.

Senator Stephens: We share average data. We don’t share individual data.

Senator Aduonum: Okay. So, there could be some that be receiving less than this, right?

Senator Stephens: That’s correct. And, obviously, some that make more.

Senator Aduonum: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Senator Aduonum, online—and we can send this out, actually, as a link—the [IBHE has all of the faculty salaries](http://salarysearch.ibhe.org/default.aspx) for all institutions across the state. So, our individual salaries are totally public. You can actually look by last name. I don’t think it’s possible to look by department, but one of the things that you’re probably noticing here is that some of the departments on average get a lot more than others. And then also, within departments, obviously, first of all, full professors are made full at different times. And, so, some of them will have more and some of them less. But you can kind of look at those and compare across people. And then see if you see anything that seems out of the ordinary, you can call it to the attention, for example, of OEOA.

Senator Aduonum: Great. Thank you so much.

Senator Kalter: The only thing I was going to say, Dan, is just asking, when do those numbers come in each year for those?

Ms. Fogler: The comparison salaries that we use come from the AAUP survey, which is the American Association of University Professors, and that data for the fall there that reported earlier this year, we should have that in the summer. So, we’ll have that data soon, but just not in time for the report for this meeting.

Senator Kalter: Great. Thank you. Any other questions on Table 1? All right.

Senator Stephens: Okay. If you move to Table 2, it’s where we’re attempting to separate information, Table 2A and Table 2B. Table 2A represents all faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. In this particular compensation grid, it’s showing—again, this is a five-year window, fall of 2014 through fall of 2018—and it represents the cumulative percentage change that includes merit increases over that period of time, promotional increases that occur, and also any scenario where there is a job change. And a job change could be moving from a professor to a director role. Schedule 2A includes promotion and job changes for all faculty, and if you look at Schedule 2B, it’s the same exact information except that Schedule 2B is tenured and tenure-track only. So, for me to just outline one particular example on 2A, if you look at the largest single group, right about in the middle, about 175 faculty during this five-year report cumulatively received an increase between the 10% to 14.9% compensation range. And then that group represents about 26%. Obviously, as you’ll see, the grand total is over 665 faculty, and there is just a variety of compensation changes over that period of time, depending on how faculty moved through their promotion and job changes.

Senator Kalter: Any questions about that set of tables?

Senator Horst: Do you have any more detail on the two faculty who received over a 60% increase? Was there a job change involved?

Ms. Fogler: Those were instances where someone had a job change where they became a department chair or school director.

Provost Murphy: Sometimes coupled with a promotion at the same time, so over that five-year period.

Senator Kalter: Any other questions? All right. So, I think that was 2A and…

Senator Stephens: 2A and 2B. I mean, it just simply separates, on 2B, just a smaller population. It excludes the non-tenure-track but shows similar data.

Senator Kalter: The only thing I was going to say for those is if next year we could get a 2C that has it only for non-tenure-tracks as well. I think we didn’t ask for that last time, but that would be helpful, I think, to our non-tenure-line representatives, but not for this year, just for next year.

Senator Stephens: Right.

Senator Kalter: So, I was going to ask that because 3A, B, and C do seem to do that, but they’re also the ones—and I was a little bit confused about this—but I think they are the ones that excluded the promotions. Thank you so much.

Senator Stephens: Right.

Senator Kalter: And, so, essentially, in the future…

Senator Stephens: I don’t think you have non—correct me if I’m wrong here, there’s…

Ms. Fogler: You would have a duplicate. You would see this table twice.

Senator Stephens: You’d have the same exact table twice, which, I think what Cheryl is saying is Table 3C, because promotions aren’t applicable in the non-tenure-track.

Senator Kalter: In the non-tenure… I see.

Senator Stephens: It would be the exact same series of data.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. I see. Okay. Sorry about that.

Senator Stephens: But a very good question. If you move to, essentially 3A, 3B, and 3C, this is an attempt to take the same information that was shared in Schedules 2A and 2B, except only isolate merit increases and job changes, not promotional changes. And, so, obviously 3A would be all faculty; 3B represents tenured, tenure-track; and 3C represents non-tenure-track. And, again, at the end of the day, most of the ranges of increases are going to represent where, over these last five years, where we had the opportunity for either merit increases, which we did have—there were two years where we did not have merit increase that caused some of that compensation to not move quite as much. But it would factor in, if I’m correct, it would factor in that adjustment that was made in January of 2018. And if they’re from a non-tenure-track, it would also be the longevity adjustments of those factored in as well.

Senator Kalter: Do we have questions on those tables?

Senator Martinez: If somebody steps down from, say, a chair position, is that data not collected in these tables?

Senator Stephens: If they step down back into their professor role?

Senator Martinez: Right.

Senator Stephens: They’re still employed. They’re still in the grouping.

Senator Martinez: So, no one ever loses or gains, according to these tables.

Provost Murphy: It depends on how long they’ve been a chair. But after a certain number of years, if a chair steps back to the faculty, they retain their monthly salary, but they go from a 12-month to a 9-month. So, they’re base salary does change, not their monthly salary, though. Does that make sense?

Senator Martinez: So, these are based on what?

Provost Murphy: And there is a limit. I mean, there is a certain number of years they need to be a chair. Good question.

Senator Kalter: And, just to make sure we’re clear, these were based on monthly? They were. Okay. So not the yearly, but the monthly. Okay. Any other questions on the Table 3C. The only thing that I observed here that I thought was interesting, and I kind of missed the last thing that you said, but if you look at, for example, the 8, 9, and 10-15, or nearly 15 ranges, the non-tenure-track faculty seem to be getting greater percentage raises on average than the tenure-line faculty. So, for example, in the category 8 to 8.9, you have 12.5 in the non-tenure-track, 20.5 in the 9 to 9.9, and then 38.4 in the 10-15ish range; whereas, on the tenure-line one, the faculty seem more spread out. So, you’ve got 10.8, 5.3, and 8.4. I thought that was interesting. I wonder if we know exactly what is happening there.

Senator Stephens: Yes, it’s true. If you look at it, the tenured to tenure-track lines have a much, much wider band. The only thing I’m thinking is it could represent the—well, it could represent the timing by which people—they have to be in the university for the entire five years.

Senator Kalter: AVP Catanzaro is raising his hand back there. Do you want to come to the microphone, Sam?

Dr. Catanzaro: I think one factor that would cause greater dispersion of increases for tenure-track faculty versus non-tenure-track faculty is that when there is a salary increase, the way the contract is written, all NTTs who qualify for an increase get the same increase. The ASPT system is a merit-based system. So, actually, if the announced raise pool is 2% and a faculty member only qualifies for satisfactory without any additional merit, in fact, that raise is only 1.7%, if I remember the math correctly. But someone who performs well could get 2.5%. And that’s the peer-review system.

Senator Kalter: That’s kind of what I was thinking. And, so, it’s something of a zero-sum game in a department, right?

Dr. Catanzaro: To some degree.

Senator Kalter: When the DFSC is distributing salary, if they give more to someone, they have to give less to somebody else, as opposed to the non-tenure-tracks who, as you said, would get all the same, if it’s 2%.

Dr. Catanzaro: If it’s 2% and they qualify, they get 2%. And they do get some longevity stipends that, in some ways, are roughly analogous to the kinds of increments available to faculty at promotion. Analogous, not the same.

Senator Kalter: I was going to say…

Dr. Catanzaro: They work very differently.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Any other questions about Table 3C. All right. Did we have a Table 4?

Senator Stephens: Yes. Table 4 is where there is a five-year history where it’s actually compensation by employee classification, where it’s broken out between showing ranked faculty as a group, instructors as a group, and then administrative professionals, and then the overall total. And if you move out, again, as I spoke earlier, on the first table, if you move to the far right, in the fall of 2017 and 2018, you’ll see, from a ranked faculty total, the overall average increase from that particular year moved up to almost, it shows, 4.6% on average. And that is the influence of both the merit raise as well as the promotion adjustment or catch-up that we did in that earlier year. So, we were fortunate enough to offer that. And if you move down to the instructor level, that range was between 3.7 to 4.3. And then, overall, the institution in all classifications ran around 4.4% for all employee classifications. And it shows the history here; we tried to show what our merit increases have been over the last several years. And, unfortunately, there was that two-year period of time—it looks like 2015 and 2016—where it showed a 0% increase. So, that caused a delay or a drag in the continued growth and compensation. And, I believe, now our promotional increases going forward beginning in fall of 2017 and 2018, moved from the standard $3,000 and $5,000, to now $5,000 and $8,000. And, so, that should help the compensation going forward.

Senator Kalter: Do you have questions on Table 4?

Senator Dawson: I’ve got some general questions. Let me focus in on non-tenure track because that’s who I represent. When I see the numbers here for number of employees for non-tenure track negotiated, are these just the employees that were here during this five-year period of time? Would it include any others?

Ms. Fogler: So, this table is different than the other ones, where this is just one year. So, if you’re looking at that fall 2017 to 2018, you are looking at people who were employed in fall of 2017 who were still employed in fall of 2018. So, each section is only one year.

Senator Dawson: Now, how come I have had listings of almost 400 NTTs each semester? Where does the 131 come from? What am I missing? All of them, granted, aren’t 100% FTE. Some of them are 150% FTE, which might explain some anomalies in percentages as well. But I’m not understanding the 131.

Ms. Fogler: So, these are only full-time non-tenure track, and it’s their only primary appointment. So, I don’t know if the other counts that you have would include secondary appointments, too, where this is only NTTs. So, that’s their primary appointment.

Senator Dawson: 131 just sounds way off. I’ll have to look at stuff.

Provost Murphy: I hear what you’re saying. I’m wondering if the 131 is full-time employees who were full-time in fall of 2017 and 2018.

Senator Dawson: There isn’t as much movement as you might think.

Provost Murphy: Oh, I get that. But when you think of full-time non-tenure-tracks who were here in fall of 2017 and then those same who were here full time in fall of 2018.

Senator Dawson: If it’s less than 180, I would be surprised. I mean, very surprised. I’ll have to go look at another year. I don’t have… Well, we’ll talk about that.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. They’re pretty consistent. So, if you look at cost, that’s not an anomaly.

Senator Dawson: Well, that’s what I’m wondering. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Dr. Catanzaro, were you going to add to that?

Dr. Catanzaro: I’m just wondering if this number is only 100% appointment, or above would be overload. Right? And I’m wondering if overload probably is not reflected in this salary data.

Ms. Fogler: No, overloads are not, because that would be their secondary appointment, not their primary.

Dr. Catanzaro: And another question about the sampling, might this only include folks who are continuously employed through the academic year? So, both fall and spring, and then again in the following fall? Is that a possibility?

Ms. Fogler: This doesn’t include the spring, so when we take the snapshot in the fall, you could have a 4-1/2-month contract, or you could have a 9-month contract.

Dr. Catanzaro: Okay, thank you. Okay. Yep.

Senator Dawson: I’ll have to study some stuff so that I can understand it better.

Dr. Catanzaro: The question of the sample is always key.

Senator Kalter: Any other questions about Table 4? The one thing I would like to observe about Table 4 that I just noticed, so up at the top—and I guess that’s just the faculty total, so I just circled that one—but, there isn’t a year where we are at or above the Illinois per capita income. We’re getting better for the faculty, and thank you for that. I think it’s largely the Provost and Senator Stephens who have been helping with that, but it’s disturbing to see those gaps between the rise in Illinois per capita income, especially in a state that’s losing lots of its population, and how all of our salaries are not increasing at that same pace.

Senator Stephens: Excellent point. I hadn’t focused on that.

Senator Kalter: Anything else about Table 4?

Senator Avogo: I just wanted to add that if you look at the consumer price index as well, especially for 2017, you would see 2.4 compared to a 2% raise. Which means all we were given was consumed by inflation.

Senator Kalter: Yes. It’s interesting, Senator Avogo, that I was looking at that, too; and, yet, in every single breakout, the average is above it, but it’s the problem with the people who are falling below that average. Right? So, there are some people who are not making even the consumer price index. All right. Any other questions about any of this?

Again, just a reminder. We don’t do this anymore. We used to in the Senate office, like, a decade ago, we would actually have delivered all of the exact salaries of every academic employee, and you could come in and look through them. So, part of the reason for this is equity. You know, looking at equity as well as looking at the merit system and all of that kind of stuff, and what’s working and that kind of thing. So, if you have any input into what other data we might want to be looking at during this annual review of the salary, please let the Senate office know, and we’ll get that information to PRPA and see if they have access to the information. All right. Thank you so much for coming. I think I neglected to introduce Angela Engel and Cheryl Fogler who were the people who were assisting you. And everybody knows Honorary Senator Catanzaro.

Dr. Catanzaro: Well, this will be one of the highlights of my career.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: Well, wait until we invite you back with another Russian, you know. So, we can say that there is life after the Senate.

***Information Item:***

***02.13.19.03 Policy 3.3.9 Proceedings In Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, And Non-Reappointment Cases CURRENT COPY (For Deletion)  
03.26.18.01 Policy 3.3.9 Markup by Kalter (For Deletion)***

Senator Kalter: All right, so we do have enough time for our information item. This is a very ancient item. Some of you were on the Senate when we did the disciplinary policies last year and two years before that. During that, I think it was the Rules Committee who identified that there is this thing called Policy 3.3.9 Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-Reappointment Cases. At the time that they were working on crafting the original drafts of the disciplinary policy, they also crafted changes to this policy. But in reviewing this, the Executive Committee is basically, even though you have a markup copy of it, we’re basically recommending it for deletion. We decided that pretty much this is a redundant policy, that all of the things expressed in it, whether the first copy or the markup copy, are actually embedded either in ASPT policy or in other policies or the Constitution, or what have you. Does anybody have any observations about it, about the concept of deleting this policy?

Senator Horst: Yeah, the Faculty Affairs Committee did it in 2014, or whenever it was. And, so, by and large, it’s not needed. But one question that I asked in Exec that I’m wondering if we came up with an answer to is, is this needed at all for populations that don’t fall under the ASPT document, like non-tenure-track?

Senator Kalter: I’m glad that Senator Catanzaro did not leave the room. Is this needed, Sam, for those kinds of populations?

Dr. Catanzaro: I’m going to have to ask some indulgence. My attention was divided, as psychologists like to say.

Senator Dawson: Are you using a lifeline?

(Laughter)

Dr. Catanzaro: I am using a lifeline. So, could you repeat the question, please?

(Laughter)

Senator Horst: So, there’s this old policy, 3.3.9, Proceedings and Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-Reappointment Cases. And it says they’ll look at the Constitution, they’ll look at AAUP documents, they’ll look at secret documents in the Senate office, and the discussions that the Faculty Affairs Committee had about this policy turned into the ASPT document. And, so, as we talk about deleting this policy, the ASPT document applies to the tenured and tenure-track.

Dr. Catanzaro: Right. Right.

Senator Horst: So, do we need this policy at all for the populations that aren’t covered by the ASPT document?

Dr. Catanzaro: I’m going to give the cautious answer and ask that I re-review… I haven’t thought about that. So, I don’t know at this point. I’d like to think about it. I’m thinking for NTT faculty, in the very unlikely, unusual scenario where we might wish to end employment, terminate employment, before the end of the contract, my thought is that the contract covers that contingency in some way, whether it’s through a discipline process or not. Setting aside the perennial questions about job stability, those are maximum one-year contracts. So, in the event that a situation arose where the best interest of the university was to see out the contract and not renew it, then it would be a matter of not renewing the contract and not a dismissal. It would simply be opting not to rehire somebody. Again, very rare. So, I don’t know that we need a distinct policy from the collective-bargaining agreement. And, so, now I’m thinking about those that are not included in the collective-bargaining unit. And I will apologize if this means that this item needs to be tabled or on an agenda for another meeting. But I think I really want to study that before I render my opinion, which is only advisory for you folks, anyway. But those are some thoughts to think about, that they’re represented, non-tenure-track faculty who are covered by a collective-bargaining agreement, but not the ASPT policies. And then there are folks who are not represented and are covered by general employment policies and state and federal laws that protect workers. Then the question would be if that existing apparatus is sufficient to provide, then, the protections they need, or this body thinks they need.

Senator Kalter: Actually, just happened to be talking to university counsel Lisa Huson, and she referred me to the contract. So, there is provision for both suspension and dismissal in the union contract, but you bring up an excellent point that we had forgotten to talk about, non-negotiated non-tenure-tracks. I will say the academic freedom stuff, I think, is covered in our policies. It’s in the AFEGC policy, and, I think—we can look again—but I think it’s also in the Constitution, just covering it as faculty. And, obviously, non-reappointment only applies to ASPT faculty. But we do have another Caucus this year, because we have to seat our external committees, so maybe within that time, we can find out the answer about the non-negotiated, non-tenure-track faculty with regard to suspension and dismissal. Does anybody else have any observations, questions, concerns?

All right. We will do that. In two weeks, we may have an answer. If not, you won’t see it again until next August. All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion by Senator Horst, second by Senator Lucey, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.