Special Faculty Meeting  
October 18, 2001

Barbara Greenman, Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee, gave an overview of the issues to be discussed that had also been sent to the faculty earlier in a memo.

Charlene Kelsoy, FPC member, presented examples of different workloads under both compensation plans.

COMPENSATION

Explanation:
Under the new plan the Libraries’ budget allocation would be divided into three pots for the three different categories of workload. The charts on the overheads (also paper copies handed out) showed examples of the compensation for an 80-10-10 workload for last year with librarianship score of 4, research score of 2, and service score of 3 under the new system and the current system. The money (using the amount from the 2001 budget) was divided into pots of 40% for librarianship, 40% for research, and 20% for service for the new plan. Each pot was divided by the number of points received by all librarians (using 2001 scores) for that category. This determined the amount of money per point that each person would have received for each category. There were more points in librarianship than the other categories so the amount of money per point was less. With the new system the research dollars would be higher.

Discussion:
FPC has to resolve equity issues for those who are below salary level where they should be based on previous ratings. Has to take money off the top of the budget allocation to do this.

New system as established has flaws for senior instructors. 80-10-10 would result in lower salaries and has built-in salary compression issues.

More people involved in librarianship and fewer in research. Research dollars will be higher so will make research the higher role while making librarianship less.

Instructors currently receive an average of 6% more in raises than tenure stream each year. Increasing the value of research will help bring this into balance.

Tenure-stream salaries are compressed now. New system will bring equity. 80-10-10 will bring scores down but instructors can request differentiated workload.

Instructors can do 60-20-20. Will be no pay cuts but instructors will get less in raises if they don’t differentiate their workloads.

FPC looked at 2-3 years of data. Those who consistently had 80-10-10 workloads were receiving 6-7% higher raises.

Is it now fair to go the other way and compress salaries of senior instructors?

New system will tie salary increases to what evaluation system evaluates. There is a pocket of both tenure stream and non-tenure stream who are not receiving what they should.
We need more time to understand all the issues involved. Let’s not have the mail ballot immediately following this meeting.

Career merit is involved with this process. Career merit plan is 1/3 for each category, so 2/3 of the equation is not librarianship.

Career merit is weighted toward research to serve as check and balance for evaluation system that currently favors librarianship.

Career merit needs to be revisited in light of proposed changes. We need to see the scatter chart without names.

Scott will give chart to FPC who will send it out.

We are basing equity on career merit which is flawed. Career merit needs to be redone. Sometimes FPC can only address worst inequity cases due to smaller budget allocation.

If instructors fall behind, FPC will see and can remedy.

Career merit needs to be reexamined every few years.

People are getting less money because their workload has been constricting what they receive.

Going with what University says it values in faculty.

Career merit benefited people during the four years we received market equity raises.

May not be so important now.

If we change the workload of instructors to 80-10-10 and change nothing with compensation, we would institutionalize the disparity in raises.

Question: Could we use the number of people who are instructors and tenure stream and divide the pot of money on a percentage basis? Each group could be evaluated against others in the same group.

Response: No. It would be too divisive. Can’t divide up just people and pots of money.

Would have to divide salaries, too.

Question: Have we run figures on future compression? Could be done statistically five years into the future.

Response: No compensation system should remain in a static state. None is perfect. We are addressing a problem that could change over time. If senior instructors salaries become compressed, look at the system again. If you know a system is skewed, you must change it. Irresponsible to continue with flawed system. Equal dollars are given to different categories that are not the same weight when evaluated. There will never be all 4’s in research and service. In these categories we are compared to our colleagues. Not compared this way in librarianship. This is a disadvantage to people who succeed in research and service.

Question: Rather than just 80-10-10, could we divide the funds into more pots by how many people are in each permutation of workload?

Response: There are too many different ways that workload can be differentiated.

We could phase the division of the money into the 40-40-20 pots over two to three years.

Junior tenure stream faculty is at a disadvantage with the current system. This needs to be addressed. We can investigate the possibility of phasing in the division of funds but can’t continue as we have been going.

Need to find middle ground. Should not divide funds between instructors and tenure stream as it would be too divisive for us as a faculty.

FPC should talk with Scott (who has the figures) and look at issue of doing phased in changes.
Critical decisions need to be reached in a timely matter. Should implement by next evaluation period.

Scatter charts indicate inequities every year. Inequities take away from total pot of money and take away a lot. If we no longer have this problem to address, it should eventually balance out.

If we phase the plan in we will still need to address inequities. Pot will be generally lower.

FPC will create a new scatter plot based on current salaries. Will look at phasing in new plan and send a memo out.

Agreed that FPC will take back plan to work on phase in possibilities.

WORKLOAD

Discussion:

Tenure stream can take differentiated workload.

Differentiated workload is supposed to be based on your workload.

Hard for tenure stream not to do 40-40-20 workload.

Workload for tenure stream should be consistent over time.

Question: What if tenure stream people take time off the tenure track?

Response: Increasingly unusual to take time off the tenure clock.

Question: How would tenure stream faculty coming in as senior instructors be treated?

Response: These senior instructors are tenure-stream so contracts must reflect 40-40-20. Tenure-stream senior instructors have not had tenure clock start. Easy to get a 1 in service or research. Join an organization and do book review.

Question: Is this a problem if we’re supposed to distinguish between instructors and assistant professors?

Response: Difference is between tenure stream and non-tenure stream.

Senior instructors who are tenure stream can request differentiated workload.

Senior instructors (tenure stream) are reviewed at the end of two years for decision to move forward.

Tenure-stream instructors are encouraged to take differentiated workload.

Question: Ad hoc committee letter seems to imply no research for instructors. Has FPC talked with Michel Dahlin?

Response: Yes. Michel understands that librarians all do research and service. She said this proposal is OK.

Michel Dahlin has also closely compared librarians with clinical research people at the Health Sciences Center. Research in this context is keeping current in your field.

Policies are set by the University and we need to conform.

Question: Will FPC get into kinds of research to be done?

Response: No. FPC will not change what we do. Book reviews count as research as does having a research agenda. New plan covers how points are awarded for research.

Categories of research should reflect what senior instructors do.

Don’t need to change the research scale or examples as we are doing what the guidelines say.

New plan doesn’t penalize senior instructors. We are mandated by the University to indicate a difference in the workloads of instructors and tenure stream faculty.
Question: If instructors differentiate to 40-40-20 won’t this take us back to the same place where there is no difference between the workloads?
Response: Differentiation to 40-40-20 wouldn’t happen year after year for instructors. Under the new system, differentiation should disappear for tenure stream.
Under this new plan instructors will be evaluated against the tenure stream workload. Can’t have a policy to compensate one group based on the workload criteria of another group.
Question: Could we have a workload for all that is in the middle? 50-30-20?
Response: Tenure stream is the culture we now have in the libraries. On the path to more tenure stream faculty in total number of faculty.
Regents do not mandate 40-40-20.
Question: We have seven senior instructors going through reappointment this year. Do we need to add 80-10-10 to their contracts?
Response: Contracts change all the time. New contracts need to include workload percentages.
There are departments that would need more faculty lines if they didn’t have senior instructors. Could be a problem with library changing all lines to tenure stream. 60% of classes are taught by non-tenure stream faculty. Should we be replacing all instructors with tenure track faculty? Need a discussion but can’t address this now.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded that the FPC review the career merit formula.
No time limit was expressed for the motion, and it would be impossible to do this before our next meeting.

NEXT MEETING

Another special faculty meeting will be held on November 29, 2001 to discuss the phasing-in of the proposed plan.
EXAMPLES OF MERIT INCREASES USING CURRENT AND PROPOSED SYSTEMS

Current system (all points awarded equal dollars)

40-40-20

Librarianship: \(4 \times .4 = 1.6\)
Research: \(2 \times .4 = .8\) total points = 3.0 \(\times \$631.63 = \$1894.91\)
Service: \(3 \times .2 = .6\)

80-10-10

Librarianship: \(4 \times .8 = 3.2\)
Research: \(2 \times .1 = .2\) total points = 3.7 \(\times \$631.63 = \$2337\)
Service: \(3 \times .1 = .3\)

Proposed system (total dollars divided into 3 parts, 40%, 40%, 20%)

40-40-20

Librarianship: \(4 \times .4 = 1.6\) \(\times \$385.89 = \$617.42\)
Research: \(2 \times .4 = .8\) \(\times \$1484.05 = \$1187.24\) Total raise = $2237.73
Service: \(3 \times .2 = .6\) \(\times \$721.79 = \$433.07\)

80-10-10

Librarianship: \(4 \times .8 = 3.2\) \(\times \$385.89 = \$1234.84\)
Research: \(2 \times .1 = .2\) \(\times \$1484.05 = \$296.81\) Total raise = $1748.18
Service: \(3 \times .1 = .3\) \(\times \$721.79 = \$216.53\)
Proposed system 2nd example using lower scores

40-40-20

Librarianship: 3 \times .4 = 1.2 \times \$385.89 = \$463.06
Research: 1 \times .4 = .4 \times \$1484.09 = \$593.63 \quad \text{Total raise = } \$1201.04
Service: 1 \times .2 = .2 \times \$721.79 = \$144.35

80-10-10

Librarianship: 3 \times .8 = 2.4 \times \$385.89 = \$926.13
Research: 1 \times .1 = .1 \times \$1484.09 = \$148.40 \quad \text{Total raise = } \$1146.70
Service: 1 \times .1 = .1 \times \$721.79 = \$72.17