

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Assembly

February 19, 2016

ATTENDANCE:

ANTHROPOLOGY:	J. Haws, S. Parkhurst, J. Peteet, G. Stocks, C. Tillquist, J. Zhang
BIOLOGY:	J. Alexander, G. Cobbs, C. Corbitt, P. Eason, D. Schultz
CLASSICAL & MODERN LANG.:	W. Cunningham, T. Dumstorf, T. Edison, B. Fonseca-Gruber, J. Gabbard, M. Makris, A. Mastri, F. Nuessel, W. Pfeffer, L. Wagner
COMMUNICATION:	M. Cunningham, M. D'Silva, S. Esrock, A. Futrell, S. Phillips
CRIMINAL JUSTICE:	B. Campbell, D. Keeling, J. Nix
ENGLISH:	B. Boehm, J. Dietrich, A. Jaffe, C. Petrosino, G. Ridley, S. Ryan, A. Willey
FINE ARTS:	R. Singel
GEOGRAPHY/GEOSCIENCES:	C. Hanchette, P. McCutcheon, K. Mountain, F. Stevens, M. Walker
HISTORY:	B. Beattie, G. Carlton, C. Ehrick, T. Keeley, D. Krebs, J. McLeod, J. Westerfeld
HUMANITIES:	P. Beattie, S. Bertacco, M. Moazzen, N. Polzer, P. Pranke, T. Soldat-Jaffe
MATHEMATICS:	B. Bradley, L. Larson, T. Riedel, D. Swanson, J. Wildstrom
PAN-AFRICAN STUDIES:	T. Adams, L. Best, R. Jones, K. Logan, B. McCormack, T. Rajack-Talley
PHILOSOPHY:	J. Carter, J. Gibson, A. Kolers, D. Owen, T. Maloney
PHYSICS:	D. Brown
POLITICAL SCIENCE:	D. Buckley, D. Clayton, J. Farrier, S. Hua, M. Merry, L. Moyer, R. Payne, L. Rhodebeck
SOCIOLOGY:	D. Austin, J. Busch, P. Gagné, R. Högnäs, C. Negrey, J.H. Rieger, D. Roelfs, R. Schroeder, H. Taniguchi
THEATRE ARTS:	N. Burton
WOMENS & GENDER ST:	J. Griffin, D. Heinecken, S. Jarosi, D. Pecknold, K. Story, N. Theriot

Dr. Andrew Rabin convened this special meeting of the Faculty Assembly at 2:04 PM.

The next meeting of the Faculty Assembly will be March 25, 2016. The meeting will be held at 2:00 PM in SK 102. Susan Howarth will present on the university's budget for next year and

motions proposed by the Undergraduate Council concerning changes to the undergraduate catalog will also be heard.

The Faculty Assembly next turned to consideration of the remaining motion from the February 12th special meeting. The Faculty Salary Work Group accepted two friendly amendments from Dr. Avery Kolers and Dr. Beth Willey. Dr. Susan Ryan moved that language be inserted into the document indicating that priorities two and three were viewed as being equally urgent. The work group did not accept this insertion as a friendly amendment, leading to a discussion. Dr. Ryan argued that failure to address both items simultaneously would result in an exacerbation of faculty salary compression. Dr. Susan Jarosi responded that the work group listed priorities to reflect "order of cost," arguing that priority two would be less expensive to address than the third one. The committee reasoned that asking for a large sum of money to address A&S salary concerns could easily result in the administration deciding not to take any action at all. When the question was called, Dr. Ryan's proposed change was defeated 39 against, 32 in favor.

Dr. Rabin then requested that a motion be made to call the question. The motion was made and properly seconded. The Faculty Assembly voted 76 in favor and 2 opposed with one abstention.

The Faculty Assembly recessed at 2:20 for ten minutes to allow staff members invited to meet with the Assembly at 2:30 PM to discuss the A&S Climate Survey to arrive.

The Faculty Assembly was reconvened at 2:31 PM. Dr. Rabin repeated the announcements that opened the meeting, inviting staff members in attendance to the March budget presentation from Susan Howarth. Dr. Rabin read an e-mail message from Dean Leonard in which she apologized for her absence from the Assembly to attend a required meeting with President Ramsey. She expressed her commitment to "welcom[ing] constructive ideas" for improving morale and encouraged faculty and staff to celebrate the College's exceptional accomplishments. Dr. Rabin then recognized Drs. Ricky Jones, David Owen, and Ryan Schroeder. After Dr. Jones offered introductory remarks, Dr. Schroeder presented the results of the A&S climate study conducted in October 2015. Dr. Schroeder described the survey's construction and analysis by members of the Department of Sociology and, later, acknowledged some of its structural limitations, noting particularly that it was constructed comparatively quickly and was never pre-tested. The instrument will be refined based on received input. The A&S chairs have proposed that this document be administered every two years to monitor morale in the College.

Among the survey's major findings:

- Morale is perceived to be low in the College, but this low morale is not unique.
- Perceptions of climate are slightly higher than perceptions of morale, but there is no prevailing sense that A&S has a unique climate problem.
- Perceptions of department chairs and departmental climate are generally higher than perceptions of the dean or the president/provost. The study seems to indicate that close interaction is the mitigating factor. Persons who interacted more closely with the dean's office or the dean personally, for example, rated them more highly than those who did not.

- Even if perceptions of the dean's office's leadership were sometimes less than ideal, many respondents located the major problems impacting morale, climate, and job satisfaction as coming from central administration.
- Staff assessment of A&S climate tended to be more negative than that of the faculty.
- Several factors impacting morale were presented, but low pay was commonly cited.

Responding to a question about how the survey's results had been shared, Dr. Jones replied that it had been delivered to President Ramsey, Provost Pinto, and Senior Vice President Sands, none of whom had responded. The survey has also been shared with the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Larry Benz, who has responded by expressing interest in speaking with the A&S Faculty Assembly.

Discussion continued briefly after Dr. Schroeder's presentation concluded.

The Faculty Assembly was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, A&S Dean
Tracy Eells, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Neville G. Pinto, Interim Executive Vice President & University Provost
James Ramsey, President

FROM: Faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences

DATE: January 22, 2016

RE: Recommendations for correcting low salaries in A&S

The state of salaries in the College of Arts & Sciences is poor. No department in A&S is unaffected by low salaries, and faculty salaries at every rank fall well below national benchmarks.¹ Senior faculty in particular who have not benefitted from recent recruitment or retention, especially when they have strong records of research, teaching, and service, are suffering a "loyalty penalty."

President Ramsey has committed to implementing salary corrections for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the next fiscal year. Having examined the particularities of faculty salaries in the College, we recommend four salary correction priorities that are intended to rectify the most severe cases of inequity among tenure-stream faculty.² The priorities laid out here do not, however, derogate from the larger and urgent problem of inadequate compensation across the board for staff, graduate assistants, part-time lecturers, term faculty, as well as tenure-stream faculty.³

The proposals below presuppose an infusion of new monies earmarked for equity corrections to tenure-stream faculty salaries. The price tags indicated for each recommendation are estimates based upon available data.⁴ They reflect the costs of salary adjustments only and do not include additional benefits.

Note that these proposals specifically address the issue of salary correction: they are neither intended to substitute for nor supersede annual merit raises. Both the process for determining faculty eligible for salary correction and the funds allocated for correction should remain separate from compensation for merit.

1) **Inversion** (9 faculty)

Approximate cost = \$65,429

Correcting the nine cases of outright salary inversion evidenced in the data should be our first priority. Inversion is defined as faculty at higher ranks who have lower salaries than faculty at lower ranks in the same department; the estimated cost of \$65,429 represents the amount necessary to bring the salaries of these nine faculty into parity with their colleagues at lower rank.

Once the existing cases of inverted salaries have been corrected, greater attention must be paid to new faculty hires, retentions, and promotions in order to avoid salary inversion in a department. Every attempt should be made to ensure that faculty members of equal accomplishment within the same discipline at the same rank receive salaries as similar as possible; and meritorious faculty at higher ranks should, as far as possible, have higher salaries than faculty members within their discipline who are at lower ranks.

2) **Family Economic Security** (47 faculty) Approximate cost = \$220,535

Forty-seven faculty in the College earn salaries below \$60,764, the annual income identified in the Economic Policy Institute's 2015 report, "What Families Need to Get By," as necessary for a family of four in Louisville to "attain a modest yet adequate standard of living" (in 2014 dollars).⁵

As highly trained and accomplished professionals whose hard work and service make possible the educational mission of the University, all tenure-track and tenured faculty deserve a secure standard of living free from economic hardship. We insist that no faculty members in the College earn less than \$60,764.

3) **Salaries furthest below benchmark** (67 faculty)

Subsequently, priority should be given to correcting faculty salaries that lag the furthest behind national benchmark. For example:

- At least nineteen faculty members (all at the full professor rank) in the College earn salaries below 70% of the OSU national benchmark. The approximate cost to raise these nineteen salaries to 70% = \$119,414.
- An additional twenty-six faculty (21 full, 5 associate; thus, combined with the above figure, 45 faculty in total) earn between 70-75% of the OSU benchmark. The approximate cost to raise these forty-five salaries to 75% = \$307,296.
- Another twenty-two faculty (9 full, 13 associate; thus, 67 faculty in total) earn between 75-80% of the OSU benchmark. The approximate cost to raise these sixty-seven salaries to 80% = \$629,937.

The salaries of this cohort earning 80% or below national benchmark represent 24% – or nearly 1 in 4 – of the tenure-track and tenured faculty in A&S. We recommend that these salaries be addressed immediately.

4) **Low salaries and compression**

Final priority should be given to correcting the remaining faculty salaries that lie below national benchmarks, with consideration given to variation in time at rank. We recommend that the College adopt a predetermined strategy for correcting these salaries. Corrections should be calculated using both a percentage of benchmark (to avoid across-the-board raises) and years at rank (to avoid compression). We stress the importance of factoring in a portion of a percentage of the OSU benchmark mean per year of service, which is essential for preventing further salary compression as these corrections are applied. Annual targets as a percentage of benchmark should be set until departmental salary means achieve parity with national benchmarks.

Notes

¹ All benchmark comparison data was taken from the 2014-15 *Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline*, which compiles data from sixty-four (64) Carnegie classified “very high research activity” public and land grant universities. The OSU data set is significantly larger than the sixteen (16) “very high research activity” universities included in the Provost’s salary study. We would argue, therefore, that the OSU Faculty Salary Survey is a superior instrument for the comparative evaluation of faculty salaries than the benchmark data used by the administration.

² See the attached A&S Faculty Salary Working Group report (November 17, 2015) for specific data on College salaries.

³ Since the examination of salaries was confined to tenure-stream faculty, hereinafter, for the sake of brevity, references to “faculty” mean “tenure-stream faculty.”

⁴ Estimated costs are based on data supplied directly by 19 of 21 department chairs in Arts & Sciences.

⁵ See Elise Gould, Tanyell Cooke, and Will Kimball, “What Families Need to Get By: EPI’s 2015 Family Budget Calculator,” *Economic Policy Institute* 403 (August 2015), accessed October 23, 2015, <http://www.epi.org/publication/what-families-need-to-get-by-epis-2015-family-budget-calculator/>.

The EPI’s model assumes that families in Louisville allot less than 14% of their income to housing via renting a two-bedroom apartment and also follow a “Low Cost” USDA food plan (as compared to a more expensive “Moderate” or “Liberal” plan) that requires 15.4% of annual income. It assumes that a family spends an additional 48.8% of its annual income on transportation, health care, and childcare, while devoting 14.2% for other necessities and 11.6% on taxes. According to the EPI, this Family Budget Calculator provides a more complete and accurate measure of economic security than the federal poverty line of the Supplemental Poverty Measure.

However, the EPI’s model provides only a baseline that families need to earn simply to live with some level of security. It does not provide a measure of what families need in order to develop a healthy emergency savings or retirement account, save for college, pay off student loan debt, purchase a home, or other common costs of what might be considered a middle-class lifestyle.