

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY-FALL, 2001

Faculty Governance-

In an effort to promote greater transparency in College decision-making, and, with it, a greater faculty role in College governance, a number of changes were introduced last year, with more to follow this year. The Chair of the Faculty introduced the practice of reporting, at Faculty meeting, on the activities of the various elected committees of the faculty on which he sat, providing the faculty with ongoing information about decisions of, and issues confronting, the committees they had elected. This provided the faculty with an opportunity to have at least some limited impact on the decisions of those committees. In addition, the Chair regularly attended meetings of all three divisions, both to gather and to provide information to the faculty in this more intimate setting.

During the spring, the faculty voted to request more information about, and greater faculty input into the decision-making process on the Fund for Excellence. Simultaneously, the President decided to revise the College budgetary decision-making process. A new Budget Steering Committee was created, to be chaired by the new Vice-President for Institutional and Budget Planning, Jonathan Brand, and to include the other vice-presidents, other administrators, the Chair of the Faculty and an additional faculty member selected by the Executive Council. While faculty representation constitutes a small part of the membership of the committee, and it remains to be seen what impact faculty input will have, the potential exists for greater input, and the fact that the two faculty members of this committee would report back both to the Executive Council and to the faculty-at-large will at least enhance transparency.

The Executive Council is mandated to be the long range planning body for the faculty. Last year the Executive Council began, in a preliminary way, to engage such planning. Two extended meetings looked at a wide range of academic/curricular topics. It is intended that we undertake more systematically such planning this year.

Finally, the faculty voted last fall to revise its personnel appeals procedure, making clearer both the grounds for appealing a negative personnel recommendation, and the routes to be taken for such an appeal, given different grounds.

Faculty salaries: outcome

We have recommended for three years that Grinnell College have a long term salary policy which would set the average salaries of each of our ranks at 105% of our twelve school comparison group average; we have kept that 105% in mind as the figure at which we are aiming.

The original provision in 2000-2001 by the Trustees of a 4.5% increment for the tenured faculty, and 4.5% plus an additional thousand for the regular, untenured faculty for fiscal year 2001-2002 were more generous than that of the previous two years. The

subsequent decision at the end of the year by the Board to add a further percentage point to the salaries of the tenured faculty further enhanced the salary package. The resulting average percentage increases were 5.5% for the tenured faculty and 6.5% for the untenured tenure-track faculty. However, the rate of inflation had risen, to 3.4%, so the real gain in income for the former was only 2.1% and, for the latter, only 3.1.

We will not have comparative data on the impact of these raises on our ranking within our peer schools until the spring of 2002. However, the raises of 1999-2000 (4.5% for everyone, with an additional \$45,000 for untenured tenure-track faculty) had the following impact, according to the March-April 2001 issue of *Academe*. Full professors' salaries fell to 102.6% (103.6% the year before) of the average, remaining 5th in rank. Associates' salaries fell to 102.2% (105%) of the average, and fell to 6th in rank. At the Assistant Professor level, we made some progress, rising to 102% (99%) of the average, but fell to 9th in rank. Thus, for 1999-2000, full professors declined somewhat in comparison to our peers and associate professors continued a fairly steep downward trend. While Assistant Professor salaries improved as a percentage of the average salary for our peers, we are nearing the bottom of our comparison group at this rank.

Moreover, AAUP data for a more extended period is very discouraging. For the nine peers for whom we have three year data – we're missing Colorado College, Macalester, and Kenyon - Grinnell ties with Carleton for 7th in average increases for professors over that period, with only Washington and Lee beneath us, is 8th of 9 at the associate rank, with only Washington and Lee beneath us, and, at the assistant rank, ties with Amherst at 7th, with only Washington and Lee beneath us. Thus, during this period, we appear to have been losing ground, rather than gaining it. Last year, data for the 12 school comparison group show us at 9.5th, 12th, and 11th for the three ranks, in average percentage raise. We appear to have given up competing with this peer group.

These data suggest the urgency of reminding the trustees of the long-term policy we have recommended and of urging them strongly to reverse this downward trend in our comparative standing. We will do that this year.

Faculty salaries: process and policies

The Budget Committee of the Executive Council (the Chair of the Faculty and the three Division Chairs) utilized essentially the same procedure for recommending salaries as had been utilized for a number of years. Using Faculty Activity Reports provided by each faculty member, as well as recommendations by each department chair, every faculty member's performance for the previous year was evaluated. Scores were assigned for teaching, scholarship and service. Weights were assigned to each of these, 3 for teaching, 2 for scholarship and 1 for service. However, given the faculty's reluctance to make available to the Budget Committee End of Course evaluation data, and the Committee's reluctance to make teaching evaluations based on reputation, most faculty were assigned an average score on the teaching dimension, with only those reviewed by the personnel committee the previous year or last year given higher or lower scores. As a result, there was little variation in teaching scores. Consequently most variation in final

scores, and, thus, in merit raises, was due to variations in scholarship, with some weight given to service.

This procedure, utilized for a number of years by successive Budget Committees, is extremely time consuming for department chairs and members of the Budget Committee. Moreover, the faculty has never ratified policies which would so privilege scholarship. The Council will examine these procedures and policies this year and, with luck, bring to the faculty a proposal for a radically altered procedure.

Given the 4.5 % pool plus the \$1,000 increments designated for improvement of the Assistant Professors' salaries, we established the following initial policies:

- 1) the salary pool for 2001-02 had to equal 104.5% of the 2000-01 pool plus the additional \$1,000 set aside for each assistant professor to raise his/her relative position;
- 2) tenured faculty, regular faculty not on a tenure track, and untenured faculty on a tenure track, but past the first year, were to receive a merit raise calculated so that the average merit raise was 4.5%;
- 3) untenured faculty on a tenure track and in their first year were to receive a 3.9% (CPI plus 0.5%) raise as a market increase;
- 4) all untenured faculty on a tenure track were to receive \$1,000 in addition to their merit raise;
- 5) first-year temporary faculty in continuing positions were to receive a 3.9% (CPI plus 0.5%).

The subsequent decision of the President to recommend, and the Board to approve, an additional 1% for tenured faculty enabled us to recalculate the average merit increase for full and associate professors at 5.5%. The average merit increase for tenure track assistant professors was 6.5%. While these represent higher increases than in the previous two years, they are unlikely to reverse our downward move among our peers.

Diversity

In the late spring of 2000, a dynamic began to build among students, faculty, administrators and trustees to push hard to make real our largely rhetorical commitment to increased faculty diversity. Over that summer an administration/faculty committee met to prepare an action proposal to achieve that. That proposal was submitted to the Executive Council in the fall and was revised and ratified by that body. The administration and trustees accepted that proposal. It called for four strategies to increase faculty diversity: 1) the submission by interested departments of possible new tenure slots which might help us to achieve that goal, with a possible increase of 3-5 new slots through this initiative, 2) a vigorous exploration of strategies to find and recruit diversity candidates in our regular tenure-track searches, 3) continued use of possible CSMP conversions, and 4) opportunity hires, if appropriate diversity candidates could be found. In addition, the proposal called for campus attention to strategies which might improve

the campus climate for faculty, administrators and students of color. Executive council approval of this initiative was followed by divisional discussion. It was made clear that the Council's conception of diversity included the diverse experiences of candidates of color, diversity in curricular offerings, and pedagogical diversity. Subsequently, a large number of departments made proposals to advertise for possible new tenure track slots. Nine departments from across the College received approval to so advertise. Five of these brought candidates to campus and three offers were made. One was accepted. While this was a somewhat demoralizing outcome, given the amount of effort put into the strategy, the Council felt it worthwhile to try a second time, and proposals were solicited in the spring. Three departments have been approved to make searches for possible tenure-track slots this year.

The other strategies advocated by the Diversity Initiative, however, also bore fruit. One additional diversity candidate was hired as a result of a regular tenure track search. A second was essentially a CSMP conversion. During a regular tenure-track search, a candidate was found who did not quite meet the job description, but who make a substantial contribution to curricular diversity as well as increasing the number of faculty of color at the College. Thus, through these diversity initiatives, we created and filled four new tenure track slots. On the whole, then, there was a significant, albeit inadequate, increase in faculty diversity, and the same four strategies will be used again this year.

Curricular Changes

The Council, the Curriculum Committee, and the Committee on Academic Standing brought to the faculty a number of proposals last year. Legislatively it was – to use a Congressional term – a productive session. These proposals including abolition of the American Studies department and major, with the understanding that a proposal to create an American Studies concentration was forthcoming, the approval of a new end-of-course evaluation system, the approval of limits on transfer credits for students, and the approval of new goals for the tutorial. In addition, as previously mentioned, we approved a change in the personnel appeals process.

Agenda for 2001-02

Let me pull out of this document our unfinished business from last year, which, in large part, will shape this year's agenda: we must work hard to improve both the transparency of administrative/faculty decision-making, and to increase the role of the faculty in such decision-making; we want to institute a systematic process of faculty long range planning; we have to work to reverse the downward slide in our salaries vis-à-vis our peer schools; we may want to revise radically our policies and processes for determining faculty salary increases; finally, we want to continue a concerted effort to enhance diversity, and work to improve the campus climate. The Executive Council solicits from the faculty additional agenda items, as we go through the year.