

Minutes, SFA meeting, October 16, 2013  
8:30-10:00, PLC 125

The Meeting opened at 8:30 with a Devotional from Jane Rodeheffer: She noted that an old Yiddish saying suggested that if you want to make God laugh, tell him your plans. She read and prayed over text from Corinthians about spiritual gifts.

Announcement by Sarah Stone-Watt: The Women's Faculty Committee had sent out a survey to tenured, visiting, and adjunct women faculty. She wanted to make sure everyone got it. The first women's faculty caucus meeting will be on Wednesday, Oct 30 in Fireside Room 10:00-11:00.

President Andy Yuengert: "report on miscellaneous initiatives"

Recognition: Andy noted that some individuals serve on really hard committees with heavy burdens for their chairs. He thanked Chair, of the Rank, Tenure and Promotion Committee: Levon Goukasian and the Chair, Academic Integrity Committee, Chris Heard

Andy gave a brief update on activities of SFA executive committee so the faculty would know what is on the table and also so people would know who to talk to about various initiatives. Also, he welcomes any questions on them.

Ongoing initiatives:

1. Ad Hoc committee on faculty-administration relations has already reported; Ron Cox is taking the lead to follow up and will report as things are followed through
2. Annual Review Process—Yuengert has heard from divisions that this is uneven, some divisions have struggles and there is concern to make sure the annual reviews are implemented in systematic way.
3. Visiting Prof Policy: Murrie, Rivas, have a draft ready, we will bring it to you soon
4. Experience of International Students: Clegg going to chair a committee to explore issues
5. International Programs academic quality; he has asked Academic Affairs to look into
6. SGA Proposal for reading period; he has sent this to Teaching and Learning (Dan Morrison Chair)

Rick Marrs: Global introductory comments on merit pay and growing Seaver

First global comments on Growing Seaver: He began with history, noting that last summer, a conversation began about whether Seaver has the capacity/potential to grow, so he worked with small group, his office, some faculty. The result was this white paper, a proposal to the president: He called it similar to a concept drawing in architecture, providing a building's general look, but not schematics. We will spend a year figuring out the specifics about how to go about this. The white paper offers a rationale, assumptions, principles; It came from a two day retreat involving faculty,

staff, administrators, most from Seaver, and included Murrie and Clegg; Rick Gibson and Hung Lee were only University people--all the rest were Seaver.

Driving principle: We would grow only if Seaver would improve, defined as increase in academic excellence and enriching Christian mission.

He noted the white paper includes language about mission and momentum; Seaver has momentum—there is a demand for what Seaver offers, and we could do some things if Seaver were bigger that we can't do now. He gave the example that one or two more faculty for some depts. would be a game changer for how they are perceived in their academic arena.

While some talked about Seaver 4000, that is not a goal anymore. He explained that Los Angeles County has a maximum on our full time enrollment, for all university, not just Seaver, with an FTE at Malibu of 3500. We already have more than that when you include Law, Drescher, but this is based on 12 month cycle. Seaver could increase by 450-550 and would not break the 3500. We don't want to go to LA County, so we would keep with the current standard, using the 12 month cycle.

He wants to have focus groups where faculty would suggest what they could do if we captured more revenue? What would take us to the next level with more resources? What could we do that we can't do now?

People who handle the budget, are sympathetic to push resources toward Seaver, are happy to let us figure out goals, but they want to know what we need, and then they'll try to figure out how to make that happen.

One of biggest challenges Seaver faces are schools with deep pockets who are our competitors. We are capturing a lot of student but putting a lot of financial aid out of door. We need to figure out a balance of how much aid we should we give to get the class we want.

The nation is entering a demographic trough, fewer high school students in general, and more of them not traditional demographic for Seaver, such as adult learners, first generation. To grow, in some ways we would be going against current, but he think we can do it.

The plan talks about capacity, gradual pace of growth, spread over 10-15 year period, with increments of 18 students.

We would need to stabilize to set this off (large class came in this year, last year had bigger melt). This is partly because families double book, give intent to enroll, then negotiate to get more aid. We have a small class going out this year, so if we bring in 850 next year, only 750 out, we will need to figure out how to fund those new students with the smaller exit class's financial aid. So, let's spend 5-6 months or

next year to flesh out what we'd like to do if we were to grow Seaver, then come back with more specifics about pace, what resources we need, etc.

Merit pay global introduction: The Dean says he was told this would generate more interest. He said this was driven completely at the Seaver level and developed by an ad hoc committee. He wanted to dispel rumors; it was not discussed at Board level. He is a liaison to a committee on the Board, but the Board and Seaver don't really talk to each other about details. The Board "does not drill down to this level."

He noted that Seaver is unique in its rigid salary schedule. He explained that the pool percentage for increases is determined every year, and then schools and administrative areas decide how to use their pool, say 3%. Other schools and units base their decisions on merit. At Seaver, we use the scale to fund steps and promotions and then divvy up whatever is left.

As Dean, he had asked for larger pool for Seaver; that got a bad reception, so he backed up, and asked for different buckets of money; specifically, what he could get beyond pool was for merit. He has been divvying it out each year on one time basis. He wanted to figure out how to do this so it would be in base lines. He also wanted to address rigidity of scale, because it is not helping us as it had historically. So he tried to figure out best practices, found that we were unique after looking at lots of universities and colleges. No one has this rigid salary schedule, and he believes we need flexibility to help at hiring and retention and so that performance is recognized and acknowledged.

In the proposal, big merit jumps are based on RTP/faculty evaluations. Smaller jumps would be decided by chair. We would check how the process is dealing with gender and diversity. He said there is a sense that merit doesn't help with gender/diversity, but he suggested that studies don't show that merit isn't fair based on gender/diversity, but the perception is that it does. We would look at data every 3 years or so, so that no one would be able to tell who you are dealing with in smaller divisions, to keep identities private. Again, the proposal was generated out of ad hoc committee in Seaver.

Rick Marrs, Growing Seaver White paper, Opened to Questions at 9:15

Q: What data is driving growing Seaver--are there students who want to come here? Will it sustain over 10 years?

A: The application pool jumps dramatically each year, from 5500 to 10,500ish. WE have doubled applicant pool, and hear on the road of demand, of people interested in Pepperdine; the biggest drawback is financial aid and competition with other schools, including big ones, Wake Forest, Emory, Princeton, Vanderbilt, etc.

Q: Will this continue to increase? What about debt worries that will impact private universities?

A: The University hasn't done a lot of marketing, Seaver never marketed. There are some thoughts about marketing Seaver, "college reality check.com, compare net cost, etc., we actually compete with Abilene ACU financially and debt load is low 20s compared to USC in high 20s. We need to market that info. Also parents want to know graduation rate; across country it is high 40s-50s, we are in 80s but we are competing with schools that have a higher rate.

Q: How will this impact our ranking, and growth of facilities? If rationale is mission driven, have you thought about other schools, like engineering or nursing schools to grow Seaver?

A: We've thought a lot about space, we have grids and spreadsheets about how many faculty, what pace, how much square feet, etc. We are commissioned to be Seaver focused, but we will need space, and university people are thinking about how we could capture space. It's better for them to look for it than for us, politically, diplomatically. As to starting new schools, the President mentioned that at faculty retreat, but Marrs doesn't know what he's thinking. Those kinds of schools do come up at university level, and it's a university discussion; in focus groups we could look at that. We are open to the idea there could be different increases in different areas.

Q: Glad you are acknowledging we have already been growing, 132% in sports medicine....we have class sizes that are too high for them, we have given you our request for quality improvement plan. We've been growing, and our requests have been turned down. Something needs to stop. Doubling class size on backs of faculty is a bad idea.

A: He agrees. Money we've got has been from over-enrollment and we've been pushing it into academics, primarily in faculty and undergrad research and in visiting lines, etc. What would happen if we did this, would be to increase in budgeted numbers, to get money on baseline. In economic bad times, sciences grew over business, but it might not stay that way. Point of growing Seaver is to figure out how to capture more money.

Q. How do we measure academic and Christian mission improvement?

A: Goal is not to go sidewise. We'll still want diversity, C of c, gpa, so that's why we'll need to market this. We want to be more specific about targeting certain markets that we think we could do well in. Also, in conversations at senior administrative level, we've got safety measures so we don't have to keep going if it isn't working.

Q: About numbers/incremental growth; do we have that much control over how many students we will end up?

A: Yes, we do actually; reason running over-enrolled, came in 2008, when we were flying blind because economy tanked. We knew couldn't come in underenrolled. Each year it's a different dynamic; last year, we tried a whole new financial model and it worked incredibly well; we thought we would be 980 students and got melt of over 100 (typically only 40); families can pay, but don't want to, they all want a scholarship. We've been trying to tweak the model every year, but our budget is being used for financial aid; our model is 30% but we're awarding at 40%. This complicates our financial picture, we want to fix that, part of our proposal, so we can direct other moneys to academics. We might need smaller classes to stabilize our size at first.

Q: What about visiting/adjuncts? Is there a plan to replace them with fulltime/tenure track/tenured people?

A: Yes; we plan to bundle adjuncts into tenure track or visiting (there are huge financial implications, and we have to work with budget people) If we grew, we'd need 45-50 additional faculty fulltime.

Q: With increase of faculty, could we have discussion of distribution of faculty? Would they be in place?

A: A purpose of focus groups is to answer, what could we do with more resources that we can't do now. What would academic excellence look? With your particular area, what would needs be? We do know faculty needs in some areas. The increases on the grid we made showed what we would need but in rough form (not specific as to type.)

Dean ended this discussion by saying he would work with SFA Exec to schedule focus groups.

Andy Yuengert and Mike Feltner: Merit Pay proposal

Andy Yuengert made opening remarks with PowerPoint:  
He stated he would put the proposal in perspective to show where committee was coming from, where they preceded from; He noted that Michael Feltner did analytical heavy lifting in the development of the proposal and would handle details.

Andy stated that for perspective, there are two questions:

1. Merit Pay v. Scale
2. This proposal v. other merit pay proposals

He then suggested four ways to come down on this, using a matrix

He notes that as the committee worked on merit pay idea, these concerns were raised:

- Arbitrariness about merit decisions across divisions (you and supervisor, annual review, etc. problems of division chair and dean and being vulnerable to them if bad relationship)
- Will over-emphasize research (pay for productivity, but care about teaching)
- Gender equity concerns

To address these concerns: We decided process should be RTP; let's make more use of it. Idea it addresses all three concerns. Faculty committee, division chairs weigh in on merit, but so do peers. Use RTP process already in place

- Decision made at Seaver level, with faculty input
- RTP weights on teaching, scholarship, service would be maintained
- Gender equity can be monitored

Michael Feltner made his opening remarks, also has a PowerPoint slideshow

Ad hoc committee members listed, Clegg, Kilpatrick, Murrie, Strong, Feltner, Marrs, Semerau, Yuengert

#### Objectives

- Provide an overview of the merit pay proposal
- Answer questions about the merit pay proposal
- Receive feedback regarding the merit pay proposal

His presentation went over the proposal in great detail. See the proposal for details and charts. Why introduce the merit? To advance Seaver faculties, implement best practices, develop an open and transparent process with high degree of faculty involvement, reward performance,

Retains some features of current faculty scale, same ranks, steps, reviews, but new reviews through RTP at mid Assistant and mid Associate. Also, amounts have changed and are variable depending on merit. Faculty performance awards/5 year reviews continue and amount of FPA faculty performance award the same (those are already variable).

New features include a starting salary determined by Dean of Seaver, the granting of tenure and promotion must occur simultaneously for all faculty hired at the rank of assistant professor. Pretenture review previously having no effect on salary is now associated with a salary increase from 4-10.5%. The mid-associate review, proposed, like pre-tenure review, by RTP committee, with a salary increase from 3-9.25%. This will increase demands to RTP, with two benefits, feedback before full promotion and increase in faculty determination for salary increases. Salary increases for favorable step reviews at are 2% (smaller than currently) due to other new opportunities for salary increases at pretenture and mid-associate reviews and

also the goal of decreasing the influence of the chairperson in determining early career salary while increasing the role of faculty in determining salary increase. Chair reviews would become more formative and less summative and evaluative. Five year reviews, unchanged, except begin immediately. Because of increased demands on RTP committee, these would be conducted by a newly formed 5 year review committee.

A set of slides compared merit and scale salary models with average performance of faculty member. Average is 77%/3.85. This was an attempt to show that the old scale and merit model aren't that different in the long run.

Starting or initial salary is proposed to change in this model: we're proposing SFA Executive committee and Dean will work on minimum salary schedule, current is \$67,000. Most cases would be minimum, but we would be able to consider market based data, cupa, aaup, aacsb, other, etc. to recruit people to come to Seaver College. Market based stipends would no longer exist, as they would no longer be necessary; larger base salaries will maintain market effects.

The plan would start August 1, 2015, 2015-2016 year.

The transition would affect faculty hired before then. For equity reasons, would transition differently depending on rank, current placement on scale, as described in tables 9-12

Reporting and review: Annual reporting would be required to the SFA three years following implementation. The report would include data for each salary increase and starting salary, data disaggregated by gender and by ethnicity where possible, with consultative review in conjunction with SFA exec committee. There would be a joint review of the merit model by Dean's office and SFA 7 years after implementation.

Feedback is desired. There will be a merit pay wiki, with information on it sent by e-mail.

Feltner, Open to Questions on Merit Pay at 9:42 Note: Questions for clarification are sought at this time.

Q: What would the range be between lowest beginning and highest salary, and if it is on order of 40-50,000 difference, how is this going to avoid general resentment = for those at bottom or not in value disciplines? How are they going to feel under proposal? How are we to avoid this, since we have a culture of niceness and respect, which is atypical; most are snakepits and we are not. Will we be moving from a culture of niceness to a snakepit due to financial inequities?

A: We won't become vipers because we change the salary model; the evidence/data in literature talked about increased camaraderie, as people feel being rewarded for

their performance. Anecdotally that is an issue at Seaver College; we will need to be sensitive, and we know there is a perception that this will be harmful, but the data doesn't support that. I can't tell you the range, although currently one already exists. David Strong and the benefits and stipends committee know that average salaries are higher than scale due to stipends already. We would decide salaries based on market data. We don't want to blow up the model by bringing someone in who would do that. To get some people in our programs we have to offer salaries like that, and it's more transparent, but in some areas/disciplines we are already paying higher due to market.

Q. What will effect be on across the board salary increases? The pool is what has kept our salaries low, so if a fixed pool is going into this, what effect will this have on general cost of living increases? A Full prof getting maximum every five years, that's less than 1% a year, but if cost of living is not able to make up that, we are always going to suffer.

A: We have a general salary pool, performance pool, and merit pool (3 right now) as long as we can retain performance and merit, there should be minimal effect on across the board salary increases—Rick has been successful in getting these additional pools of money. Because Rick's merit argument has been supported, we will argue to retain it into the future, as long as it continues, incursions into the general pool and degrading across the board increase will be minimal.

Q: We've failed to catch money to catch up to losses over last 10 years, will this help us catch up over next decade? And what about distrust because larger numbers of students hasn't helped us increase salaries despite increased student load, so why should we trust this?

A: First question, is this policy better to address that relative to inflation we've had declining salaries? Yes, because the Dean was denied other increases but was given merit, and that's the main way we can get more.

And on increased student pool, I see this, growing Seaver will generate revenue we haven't gotten from over-enrollment; over-enrollment money has gone to financial aid and visiting positions/adjuncts. I think we will have to be attentive to this; In the last 2 years of salary growth, they have been responsive to issues raised by David Strong and the faculty salary and benefits committee; We've done well the last two years as this was made known, and this is an attempt to continue to grow salaries.

Q: Are we having discussions/feedback so that we can ultimately say we approve or disapprove? Is a deadline set? Does this have to go through the RTP handbook?

Feltner give over to SFA/Andy Yuengert to answer:

A (by Andy) We can say we don't like it/don't want it/want another proposal. It is up to SFA, how to proceed from here.

We have the Wiki. It is important how we proceed from here. How do we analyze this? I think we'll need to have a vote at some point. I'm not sure if the question is this proposal or merit pay in general. What would it mean to say no to this proposal? I don't know. We'll be talking about this in SFA Executive Committee. Please communicate concern on the Wiki so we can all see them and to division SFA Executive Committee representatives.

Cyndia noted that faculty wanted to address trust, and this was a faculty committee. Faculty had been working on this all along, and it needs to be a faculty conversation.

Feltner says 2015-2016 is the earliest this could be implemented.

Motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved at 9:57.

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Rivas  
Secretary/Treasurer SFA