

**Review and Planning Committee
Minutes, October 31, 2001**

Meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

Present: Carlsen, Geffert, Hamlin, Kahn, Larson, Marotz, Morrison, Norton, Odell, Pence, Postlethwaite (chair), Solid, Sonnega, Van Wylen.

Minutes for October 24, 2001 approved as amended.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL TO CHANGE SECTION 3.VII.c.3 OF THE FACULTY MANUAL REGARDING THE NAME AND CHARGE OF THE CAMPUS MINORITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The committee is inclined to endorse the proposed changes, but confusion about membership (particularly which posts will be or should be ex-officio posts) led us to postpone action. The committee will contact Eida Berrio with its questions, and try to resolve them over e-mail.

DISCUSSION OF MARKET, EQUITY, AND MERIT

The subcommittee appointed to examine the composition of a cohort (Van Wylen, Norton, Pence, and Larson) presented its recommendations, the discussion of which occupied most of our time. The subcommittee offered some statistics compiled by Lynn Steen: a chart of colleges plotted by reputation in relation to compensation shows a clear correlation between both. St. Olaf salaries are at the bottom of schools with similar reputations. A second chart helps us think about cohorts. It ranks schools by *U.S. News and World Report's* overall score, with indications of those schools that (1) St. Olaf selected as a peer group in a list given to NCHEMS, (2) a peer group NCHEMS suggested for us, (3) a peer group IRP selected, (4) admission overlaps, and (5) those schools which are members of the ACM/GLCA.

Lynn Steen affirmed our inclination to use *USNWR* rankings, and we feel that such rankings allow us to make a persuasive, rhetorical point about salaries. Steen cautioned against creating our own cohort, noting that sticking to an AAUP or ACM/GLCA cohort insures consistency over time. RPC seems to agree that it may be useful to create our own cohort when addressing some questions, while relying on previously established cohorts for others.

The subcommittee suggests that St. Olaf adopt the following peer-group cohort (to be used in conjunction with the AAUP cohort of 500 baccalaureate-granting institutions):

<u>School</u>	<u>USNWR Academic Rank</u>
Smith	4.4
Bryn Mawr	4.3
Vassar	4.2
Barnard	4.0
Trinity Col.	3.9
Colorado	3.9

Kenyon	3.8
Frank & Mar.	3.6
Occidental	3.6
Rhodes	3.6
Skidmore	3.5
Dickinson	3.4
Denison	3.4
Kalamazoo	3.3
Gustavus	3.1
Allegheny	2.9
Hope	2.9
Luther	2.8
Ripon	2.8
Concordia	2.5

Average academic rank (3.5) = St. Olaf's academic rank (3.5).

The subcommittee also submitted suggestions for principles and goals regarding market, equity, and merit:

We agree with the subcommittee's recommendation that salary at time of hire accord with CUPA averages by discipline, where the CUPA cohort has an average USNWR academic rank comparable to St. Olaf's (see above cohort). We discussed a goal of meeting CUPA and AAUP (90% of 500 AAUP schools granting baccalaureate degrees) target salaries within seven years. Such a goal would place us in the top third of ACM/GLCA schools.

RPC supports the principle of merit pay, but we recommend that-until we meet market-based goals for salaries by rank-promotion remain the only vehicle for merit increases. We also recommend that merit increases at the time of promotion be substantial, discipline-specific, informed by our CUPA cohort. The budgeting process each year should allocate sufficient funds to make substantial increases. While we are unwilling at this point to recommend in any detail how merit increases might be implemented after a faculty member becomes a full professor, there was some discussion of implementing optional, post-professorial reviews (similar to reviews for promotion) on a five-year or seven-year cycle. We recommend that a standing committee address this suggestion, as well as other, as-yet-unknown approaches to the larger issues and implications of merit pay.

The principle of equity remains the most elusive principle. Markets and merit are becoming the dominant criteria in our discussions. It became clear that we must define "equity" in a different way than we have in the past, or that we may decide not to use the term at all. If we retain the term, "equity" will likely define our goal of catching up to peer institutions. The subcommittee suggested that the principle of equity be defined as meeting market-based target salaries through across-the-board-increases in all faculty salaries. Others suggested that we define equity as increasing salaries beyond cost-of-living increases as we move towards the 90% bracket of AAUP salaries. The subcommittee's recommendation that the budgeting process make faculty salary improvements the number one priority generated relatively little discussion, although one

member questioned whether we are genuinely committed to making such a strong statement. Some suggested that that we adopt a principle of equity by establishing a minimum salary across campus by rank, either in terms of percentages or through a constant minimum.

Questions arose regarding gender equity. While gender inequities within ranks have been addressed in the past few years, inequities remain in the percentage of women gaining promotions. RPC plans to revisit the Tenure and Promotion subcommittee's document reviewing the entire tenure and promotion process at a later date.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT YEAR'S SALARIES

RPC recommends that we raise salaries beyond cost-of-living increases (somewhere above 3%) to a level closer to the goal of the 90th percentile of AAUP salaries. We trust the Treasurer to determine an exact number.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Bryn Geffert, Secretary