

Minutes, SFA meeting, April 15, 2015  
8:30-10:00, Elkins Auditorium

Ron Cox opened the meeting at 8:35

**Devotional:** Ron Cox. Hebrews 12:1-2, cloud of witnesses. He integrated comments on retirees and gratitude to their service.

**Minutes:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes from the SFA meeting of March 25, 2015. Approved!

**Honoring Retirees:** Retirees were honored and given gifts by the SFA. Milt Shatzer, Jere Yates, Sonia Sorrell, V. Seshan, Mike Mullens

**Presentation on Faculty Salary Scale:**

Andy Yuengert presented on salary dispersion by years of service. Questions about salary dispersion under our current system emerged after we viewed a chart from the merit pay proposal that showed various levels faculty would be rewarded and the differentials that would have been generated by the merit pay proposal. There was not much salary dispersal induced by the (speculative) merit pay proposal. People wanted to know: how much dispersion do we have now by years of service? Presumption was that if you were here a certain number of years you would get the same salary, but upon investigation, he found this was not true.

Andy noted that salary data was sensitive and he only looked for dispersion by years of service. Data includes only those on the tenure track, no university professors, and base salary only without stipends or extra pay. It was based on a modified years of service that considered initial rank, needed because comparisons not valid just by year of service. He described his process (percentiles of residuals, salary regression by modified years of service) and showed a chart of results, particularly noting if/how differences increased the longer faculty have been here.

The results showed that salaries do show increasing differentials over years of service. There is very little variation at pre-tenure, with more variation increasingly at 7-12 years, 13-20 years, 21-30, and 31-40 years. There was less increase at the interquartile range (between 25 and 75%--which shows increases especially after 13 years but only up to 5% difference after 31 years) than at the extremes (10-90%--this shows a 28-29% spread after 31 years). Andy suggested that factors increasing the differences are when people delay promotion or steps, and in particular, when there is a delay in getting to full professor (around year 13). The biggest differentials result from some faculty members remaining at associate professor after many years. Point: the current system does have pay differential.

Q and A: There were questions about what data was included, and clarification that the data was without stipends, extra jobs, etc.; there was no data on gender.

Andy will share this information with the Benefits, Salaries, and Stipends committee, so we can think about what it means.

**Discussion of Faculty Scale Adjustment Resolution:**

Introduced by Tim Lucas. It was sent to faculty by e-mail on April 13 and had been passed by SFA Executive Committee. The basic idea is that base salaries have fallen with respect to inflation since 2004, and the proposal asks for 5.7% to bring base scale salaries to the amounts in 2004 (this represents inflation). A chart showed base salaries 2004, present value of 2004 salaries, 2015 base salaries, and required adjustment to get to 2004 present values.

Challenging times in 2008 meant that for three years, there was very little salary adjustment. In the last three years, we've had very good salary adjustments, 4, 3, and 2% all outpacing inflation in the last three years; thankful to administration for addressing this problem, addressing what was largely a salary freeze. Not trying to be critical of what administration is trying to do.

Six weeks ago, he had said it would take 5.7% increase, but has learned that there will be a 3% salary pool increase for next year for base—unusually, promotions and steps won't come from that. So we are catching up faster than he had thought when he first wrote the proposal. He noted some might think we should just drop the proposal since we are getting a good raise? But he thinks it is important to preserve this salary scale, to make sure that associate three has the same value as it did in the past, as an example. The proposal is trying to affirm that salary adjustments are made so that they keep up with inflation.

He noted that administration does not see salaries the same way—not wrong, but they don't think about it the same way he does—trying to keep base pay the same; they have different metrics they use to evaluate salaries. Vote for proposal, is saying we want this kind of metric to count when looking at salaries

Also, proposal asks for increases for visiting and adjuncts, and we also got positive news on Monday from administration on that front as well.

Ron opened up for Q and A and Comments

Q: There was a question about how he came up with \$1500 for adjunct salaries per unit? He noted that he threw a number at it, because some are making \$1000 a unit here and some are paying more. There was concern expressed that adjunct pay needed go higher, (reference to going rate in CA in 6000 for 4 unit course, the Adjunct Project). This is a start—would be 50% increase per unit for some people; need to continue to discuss it.

Comments: Appreciation was noted for a statement near end of proposal, for a commitment that salary increases would not be offset by costs of benefits being pushed off onto faculty. There was also appreciation expressed for his work.

Q: There were questions about the metrics the administration used, but Tim declined to speculate since he did not know enough.

Q: Why 2004 as base point? If point is to keep up with purchasing power at a particular time, why 2004, why is it better or worse than another time? A: Benefits committee and others had information back to 2004, because they could make comparisons with Chronicle of Higher Ed. If we go 2005, the numbers don't have to be adjusted as much, 2003, numbers need to be adjusted more. 2004 was in the middle and fair way to do it. Did not want to consider benefits, because costs to both university and us as well, so did not want to include them in analysis.

Comments: There was some discussion of the idea of the ladder analogy, going up not just amount of inflation. Other schools have been exceeding inflation, and this is just asking to keep up with inflation.

Ron noted that administrators were familiar with idea of sinking ladder; their perception is that they focus on actual salaries, which they see as real salaries. He noted that they wanted to meet with the SFA ExCom but there was no time, so they communicated their disagreement with the proposal to him because they say it doesn't reflect the way the budget process works. He emphasized that there was no interference on their part in this going to the faculty. The story they want to emphasize is that they've made progress deliberately with raises since 2012: 4%, 3%, 2%, 3%. A faculty member sits on UPC, a budget committee, where things like this are hammered out. They got 3%, and the resolution puts them in awkward situation because they are trying to fight for improved salaries at base. He noted the image of the three buckets: scale/base salary, promotions and steps, and bonuses. There is a faculty worry that the other two buckets might erode the base, but the administration thinks they are improving/protecting the base and getting people opportunities to make more. They have separated out base bucket and steps/promotions bucket—that's a step forward, just in communication. Before when they threw out a number, it did include steps, promotions, and what was left went to base, but now it's clear what the base salary increase is.

Can cost of living be guaranteed? From their perspective higher education is in difficult circumstances, from their markers, Seaver College has been doing well in a difficult environment. Their concern is that you have to put salary increases on the students, tuition goes up or resources shrink. That would mean they would have to take this from other areas, like not as many new faculty, and then more students but no increase in faculty.

Couple of positives: they are committed to salaries that recruit, retain, reward, and to improving the base (not as much as we want), also committed to dialogue, and he's told them, a lot of this is about communication, they have not been as forthcoming as they could have been; e.g. because Seaver efforts were in the face of other schools getting less, so they've created pickle, they see us as working on our behalf but have not been as open as they might because of other schools.

Comment: Was concerned that the proposal was sent to the dean before faculty. Administration's response should be presented by administration, not faculty president. Was concerned about process and communication to the faculty.

A: Ron noted that he had told the executive committee about sharing this with Dean as courtesy; one of flaws he sees in the SFA system, one he has inherited, is that SFA presidents are the main connection between administration and faculty. He thinks that needs to be expanded out to executive committee as a whole. ExCom is empowered to do this, and so we need to do better at meeting with administrators and SFA ExCom and also improve communication.

He noted he was not trying to stifle conversation, but was sharing administration perspective. He will ask SFA ExCom about process for next year, under president Karen Martin. He's been trying to make equitable and reasonable forms of communication. He's been trying to understand the issues, perspectives, that's why presenting them, to increase understanding of perspectives.

Comment: It seems reasonable to look at administrator's salaries. What was their percent increase in the last ten years, and how does that compare nation wide and compare with Seaver faculty? If we want to be open/transparent, that would be good. Where is their bucket coming from for increases and how much is their difference from 2004 to now?

Question: How does the administration respond that we're not keeping pace with our peer institutions? There was some discussion about whether we had that information, and we do have data that takes into account peer and aspirational, back to 2001 perspective. Ron said would send that out again (Jan/Feb 2014 info). It was asked if administrators were concerned with keeping pace with peer and aspirational schools? Is that a factor that matters? Ron stated he would follow up to see if that does. It was noted that if we are trying to aspire to be a premier Christian university, that seems important.

Ron noted that these discussion need to happen, and we need to figure out how do we go forward, have disagreements, but have dialogue. He is asking that SFA ExCom, as a whole, not just presidents, as the constitution says, be empowered and entrusted to represent, meet with, dialogue with administrators, to answer these kinds of questions you have.

Comment: There were further comments on administrator salaries. Salaries for top administrators are required to be disclosed; they are also paid comparatively less than other peer and aspirational schools. But someone wanted to know percentage of increases. It was noted that the administration budgets on Paul Lasiter's slides appear that they have shrunk that cost, but we don't know enough.

Comment: Likes the proposal and that the SFA is producing practical proposals, but notes that it challenges a culture here, where we see a proposal as a crisis, and so administration reacts that way. When we have a problem and a proposal with good way to address it, we don't need to act like we're dropping a bomb in their lap. Let's be professional; let's just talk about it. And we need to model this from faculty side. During Growing Seaver this is a good, opportunity time to do that.

Comments: Noted that it feels like we get threats when we put something forward, e.g., that the students will pay for this or benefits will cost or you won't get resources. So again, why can peer institutions do this? This is a good discussion at the end of the meeting, but we don't have enough time. We need to keep talking.

Comment by Tim Lucas: What should we do? Putting this proposal forward has started a conversation. I think if we go through with it, we'd have to update it, with new information about next year's salary. Most important is to try to get an agreement on what we want to discuss when we're talking about salaries. Base salaries as a real salaries issue. I would be willing to go forward with it or with revised with new numbers, or even with a weaker proposal about going forward with base salaries as basis for conversation.

Comment: It was noted that 3% doesn't take away that we want the whole 5.7%.

Motion to go ahead and put the proposal to a vote was made and seconded.

It will go to electronic ballot. Ron will provide a box for people to make comments on what they think needs to be altered on resolution, (e.g., to increase adjunct pay).

**Other business: elections, parking, visiting professor proposal:**

Ron noted that he'd send the ballot with the salary proposal out also with the slate of candidates for SFA ExCom and RTP (see below). Lincoln Hanks was elected SFA President-Elect and Kindy DeLong Secretary/Treasurer in the SFA Officer elections.

Ron had planned to give an update on parking, but given the time, he will write a report. On the Visiting Professors issue, he's been working with ad hoc committee on a framework and has exciting things to share in fall, including a resolution that will answer questions/concerns of tenure track and long-term visiting faculty.

President elect Karen Martin interrupted meeting to give Ron a gift and thank him for his service as SFA president.

Motion to adjourn, seconded. At 10:06 Adjourned!

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Rivas  
SFA Secretary Treasurer

SFA ExCom and RTP Nominees

**Fine Arts**

SFA: Gary Cobb, Louise Lofquist

RTP: Gary Cobb, Cathy Thomas-Grant

**Natural Science**

SFA: Don Hancock, Cooker Storm

**HUTE**

SFA: Cyndia Clegg, Jane Kelley Rodeheffer

**Religion**

RTP: Dyron Daughrity, Daniel Rodriguez

**Library**

SFA: Katie Richardson, Jeremy Whitt

**SocSci**

SFA: Rebecca Kim, Khanh Bui

RTP: Jennifer Harriger, Robin Perrin

**ISL**

RTP: Mike Sugimoto, Robert Lloyd

**Pre-Tenured RTP Representative Candidates:**

Christina Littlefield, John Peterson, Jennifer Smith, Janet Trammell