

Indiana University Kokomo Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, February 20th 2017 at 2:30pm in KC130B

Attended by: Almalag, Alnusair, Alshuwayer, Bever, Blackwell, Boruff-Jones, Bourke, Bradley, Canada, Chauret, C., Clark, Cook, Coppola, Cox, Darr, Davis P., Deerly, Dodd, Downey, Fisher, Gottemoller, Hampshire, Hancock, Heath, Holcomb, Horn, Hughey, Hur, Jones Scott, Keener, Kim, Knudson-Stanley, Korne, Krause, Lukes, Masuda, McFarland, Medley-Rath, Morgan Mossburg, Nur, Preece, Rassel, Rifai, Roden, Rosales, Sebastian, Sposato, Steel, Steinke, Sullivan, Thorpe, Townsend, Tupa, VanAlstine, Weller, Whang, Zhong, Zody.

Note: *Quorum was met*

1- Approval of January meeting minutes

Discussion: none

Action: *approved*

2- Budget discussion (Hancock)

David Hancock represented the budgetary affairs committee, and gave a presentation that included some background information on raises, who contributes to the raise pool, and also presented an overview on how budget decisions by the board of trustees are made based on the state raises. The raises that are given will be distributed into three areas: 1- pay compression, 2- base salary raises, and 3- merit raises.

Kathy Parkinson in the summer of 2016 ran CUPA averages for faculty on campus, and based on the results of these averages, the committee agreed to **1-** allot compression only to faculty who fell below 80% of CUPA average, **2-** increase the proportion of the standard merit (=base) and **3-** decrease the merit awards, but increase the amount of the merit award by 50% from 2016.

Depending on the salary raise pool that we will receive the committee offered two proposals: **1-** if the salary raise pool approved, is 2.0% vs **2-** if the salary raise pool approved, is 2.5%. Each unit on campus received these proposal documents from their Budgetary affairs committee representatives. Both proposals are based on the same three points above.

Proposal 1 (if 2.0% increase approved): would close 50% of gap between current pay and 80% CUPA pay.

Proposal 2 (if 2.5% increase approved): would close 60% of gap between current pay and 80% CUPA pay.

Summary:

	Proposal 1	Proposal 2
Compression	16%	16%
Standard	74 % (=1.5% raise)	72% (=1.8% raise)
Additional merit	10%	12%

The third proposal presented was the “merit pay distribution”: In 2015 faculty senate voted that additional merit should be decided by each unit, but this had not been adopted yet.

Summary of the proposal presented:

- merit pay decisions should be made by the units. Faculty in each unit comes up their criteria to distinguish meritorious faculty
- allocations of merit pay shall be distributed proportionally across the units (min. of 1 raise per unit)
- merit pay increases will be equal for all recipients
- merit pay dollar amount would stay the same
- proportionally distributed by size of school/unit
- dissociating the far from the merit pay
- having an association process
- establishing clear criteria that highlight excellence within the units
- deciding the adjudication process (faculty vote or dean/chair decisions)

Discussion: a list of questions, concerns that came up during the discussion:

- Issue with CUPA: only shows ranking, not how long you have been at your position (e.g. 1 year of professor vs 10 years of professor no difference) nor does it include different instructor levels.
 - Budgetary affairs committee will re-evaluate what data to use for us, once we get to 80% of CUPA for all faculty.
- Motivational issues with faculty who repeatedly perform just below the merit level
 - possible solution is to use a cascading system (same total dollar amount, but bigger pool of people).
- Motivational issues with faculty that continue to get a standard merit (base salary) raise, no matter how poor their performance.
 - committee decided at this point not to change how these standard raises are given.
- The overall merit discussion amongst faculty was to re-consider how the merit raise pool should be distributed, rather than increasing or decreasing the total merit raise, and the issues around motivation, fairness, etc.

Action:

- 1- *Vote on Proposal 1 & 2 only → both proposals were approved (two nays only)*
- 2- *Proposal 3 was not voted on, but will instead be changed and a decision will be made at a later time.*

3- Representative faculty senate proposal – discussion (Sullivan)

This was an informational item only and not for debate at this time. T.J. Sullivan gave an overview over the proposed representative faculty senate. The proposed changes to the constitution will be posted on canvas.

Some of the changes/adjustments to the constitution:

- **Elected** representatives are from divisions

- a change for representative emeritus faculty and Perdue faculty
- the eligibility for senators and officers will continue to be the same as defined by the current by-laws → only difference is the pool of officers (elected senators only)
- in the fall the number of people per unit is determined, and there will be 1 representative for every 5 people per unit
- elections of senators will be determined by the individual units
- senators will serve two-year staggering terms
- special meeting by incoming senators in April to elect officers
- Units can recall people (if done by 2/3rd vote) and vacancies will be filled by elections
- One member of the senate will serve on every senate committee
- Everyone can attend meetings, but only senators have votes
- Officers are members of the incoming senate
-

Action: *none (informational item only)*