

## AGENDA

### FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

March 16, 2016  
UC 135, 3:15 p.m.

- Call to order
- Guests:  
Sue Hodges Moore (Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance), Mike Hales (Chief Financial Officer), Sue Ott Rowlands (Provost), Tim Ferguson (Chief Information Officer):  
Updates; Discussion of budget survey results
- Approval of minutes from February 2016 meeting
- Chair's report and announcements
- Old business
  - A. **Faculty budget priorities survey.** The narrative report of the survey results is now available on the Budget Committee website (<http://facultysenate.nku.edu/committees/budget.html>). The executive summary of this report is included in Attachment 1.  
Topics for discussion might include IT concerns/computer replacement policies, salaries (faculty, staff and administrative), workload, athletics, or the new budget model. Others?
  - B. **Salary policies and analysis.** Faculty, staff, and administrative salaries were an area of concern identified in the budget survey. Attachment 2 includes the information provided by Lori Southwood (HR) to Staff Congress re: recent senior administrative hiring. Discussion?  
Faculty salary analysis:
    - New CUPA information is available, and updated faculty salary information will be available in Blackboard and in Steely Library soon.
    - A sample analysis using the spreadsheet presented in previous agendas is being prepared by the budget committee chair to identify issues/questions before proceeding with further analysis. (See attachment 3 for research questions from previous budget committee salary study.)
  - C. **Summer compensation policy.** The budget committee chair will continue to follow up with the summer session committee.
  - D. **New budget model.** An information session for Arts & Sciences will be held on Friday, March 18 in at 3:30 p.m. Budig Theatre. One campus-wide budget forum has been held; another is scheduled for Thursday, March 17, at 10:00 a.m. in the SU Ballroom. Discussion?
  - E. **Revisions to Budget Committee bylaws.** Proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution are still being discussed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The plan is to present these to Faculty Senate before the end of the year. Some wording changes relating to the Budget Committee are being proposed. If approved, these will likely lead to some corresponding revisions in the Budget Committee Bylaws.
  - F. **Commonwealth affairs.** The state legislature is still deliberating over the governor's proposed budget. Other discussion/updates?
  - G. **Desired presenters and topics?**
    - New business
    - Adjournment

#### Future meetings:

April 13, 2016, UC 135

## Attachment 1: Executive summary of narrative report of 2015 faculty budget survey

### Executive Summary

**Background:** The faculty budget priorities survey was developed during Fall 2015 in consultation with the Faculty Senate Budget and Executive committees. Input into the survey questions was provided by the Provost, the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, and the Chief Financial Officer. The survey was conducted via Qualtrics and the faculty listserv in November 2015.

**Response rate:** There were 321 responses:

- 45% of full time faculty responded (265/583):
- 6% of part-time faculty responded (25/423)
- 8% of the 321 respondents preferred not to provide rank/position; 2% indicated "other"

The response rates by colleges varied, with Arts & Sciences (51.1%) having the highest response rate and Chase College of Law (21.7%) having the lowest.

**Budget priorities.** 87% of all respondents ranked "address salary issues for faculty/staff" among the top three priorities (69% ranked it first; 13% ranked it second; 5% ranked it third). Of 11 items to be ranked, the top 3 items were:

- Address salary issues for faculty/staff: 1.95 average ranking
- Fund reduced teaching workload for faculty to accommodate research, programmatic grants, strategic investment initiatives, and graduate mentoring/capstones: 4.43 average ranking
- Increase availability of professional development/travel funds for faculty: 4.97 average ranking

**Addressing salary/benefits issues.** Of 8 items to be ranked, the top three items were:

- Address salary issues for full-time faculty (e.g., cost of living, merit, salary, compression/inversion/equity – 1.70 average ranking
- Retain more full-time faculty – 4.05 average ranking
- Maintain effective/small class sizes – 4.22 average ranking

The results show substantial agreement about the need to address salary issues for full-time faculty, as "Address salary issues for full-time faculty (e.g., cost of living, merit, salary, compression/inversion/equity)" was ranked first by 72% of respondents.

In ranking merit vs. cost-of-living vs. equity/compression adjustments:

- 45% ranked equity/compression adjustments first
- 40% ranked across-the-board cost-of-living adjustments first
- 15% ranked merit raises first

These rankings differed notably by college, with the percentage ranking equity/compression adjustments first ranging from 26% in Business to 70% in Health Professions. The rankings also varied by faculty classification. However, the highest percentage of all ranks of tenure-track faculty rated equity/compression adjustments first, full (46%), associate (51%), and assistant (49%).

An important observation to consider is that any percentage-based salary increase made without addressing equity/compression issues will exacerbate these problems.

Question #7 asked faculty to rank five types of faculty benefits from (1) highest to (5) lowest.

- 47% ranked funding presenting at conferences first (2.14 average ranking)
- 20% ranked sabbaticals first (2.97 average ranking)
- 12.5% ranked project grants first (2.95 average ranking)
- 12.5% ranked other professional development first (3.40 average ranking)
- 8% ranked summer fellowships first (3.55 average ranking)

These results differed somewhat by college, with all colleges but Health Professions and Law rated funding for conferences as the highest priority, with the percentages placing it first ranging from 30% (Health Professions) to 91% (Steely Library). (See Table 4 on page 4 for details.)

**Technology issues.** The survey indicates that many faculty struggle with outdated technology and classroom design issues. Some faculty lack the technology to do their jobs because their departments/colleges have insufficient funding. Faculty teaching online report frustration with a lack of support for development and maintenance of online courses, in terms of equipment, software, and IT/instructional design. The problems with outdated and insufficient technology also seem to contribute to student satisfaction and retention.

The comments indicate that concerns for equitable distribution of technology must be balanced with disciplines' varying needs. Even within disciplines, faculty needs vary, so many suggestions indicate moving away from one-size-fits-all policies in some respects. Many suggestions for alternative computer replacement schedules were offered, including providing computer upgrades on as needed basis, providing stipends related to technology, and providing tablets to faculty who need them. Faculty would also like to see more standardization of classroom technology, with all classrooms being "smart" with consistent software and versions, with updates of the software timed to take place during non-class times.

**Class size/classroom design/effective utilization of classroom space.** Many comments throughout the survey indicate strong support for NKU to maintain its reputation for small class sizes. However, some faculty expressed concern that the new budget model is incentivizing larger class sizes. Others observed that class size need not necessarily be an either/or proposition. Overall, faculty would like more input into the design of classrooms to accommodate various teaching styles and class sizes.

**Reducing expenses.** Many expense reduction ideas were offered. Three areas received frequent mention: administrative positions and salaries, athletics, and consultants. The survey indicated strong perceptions of overspending in these areas. Many other suggestions were given, including reducing guest speakers, reducing spending on marketing/branding, and employing strategies to reduce spending on utilities.

**Alternate revenue sources.** The main categories of ideas offered for generating alternative revenue sources include expanding lifelong learning opportunities, renting facilities, recruiting students, establishing more community partnerships (e.g., room sponsorships), looking for utilities/conservation opportunities such as establishing a solar array, and strategizing with competitive tuition rates to attract more students (e.g., guaranteed 4-5 year rates). Echoing back to the theme of faculty salaries, increasing faculty morale could help faculty become more inclined to give back to NKU, both now and in the future.

**New budget model.** While some faculty expressed optimism about the new budget model, many identified concerns, often dealing with questions of implementation and transparency, including that beyond the college level. Some worry that the new budget model will be detrimental to students and in conflict with transdisciplinarity. While faculty seem to support the new model's guiding principles, they are not clear on how these principles will be achieved. Examples of specific questions are included on p. 8, and complete lists are available in the full report.

**Other.** The last survey question collected many additional comments relevant to the university in considering budget priorities. These comments reflected many issues evident throughout the survey, e.g., disconnect between faculty and administration, salary and workload issues, lack of resources, and the general feeling of being overburdened and underappreciated. While faculty have demonstrated a commitment to student success, they do not feel that the university demonstrates the same commitment to faculty success. There is a sense that faculty concerns are being collected, but not heeded. However, the sheer volume of responses indicates that there is still hope.

**Action plan for budget committee.** The Faculty Senate Budget committee hopes to address concerns raised in this survey by:

- further examining faculty and administrator salary issues
- promoting ways of increasing trust, collaboration, and transparency between faculty and administration regarding budgetary issues and decisions
- Investigating ways to have more institutional support for faculty for everything the strategic plan and new budget model are asking be done

**Attachment 2: Information re: Administrative Hiring from Lori Southwood (HR)**

In Academic Affairs we have worked to downsize or eliminate higher-level administrative positions where possible. Most of the hiring that you see in the division is due to retirements (current or upcoming), resignations, or filling positions that were vacant prior to January 2014. We continue to provide support staff to the various offices and initiatives to support our collective efforts towards student success. As part of the 2014 budget reduction, Academic Affairs eliminated a director position and an associate vice provost position. Some of the positions in Academic Affairs have been retitled, making it appear as though new positions have been created. For example what used to be the Associate Provost for Research, Graduate Studies & Regional Stewardship was renamed Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Research and Outreach. Changes such as these are position reclassifications, not new positions.

Activity in other areas of the university over the past year resulted in a reduction in the number of higher level administrative positions including:

- In Student Affairs we had two vacancies, the VP position and the Dean of Students position; we have combined the two positions and are currently in the search process. Another position was changed from Senior Associate Dean to AVP.
- In Institutional Effectiveness, we reorganized combining two Executive Director positions into one Assistant Vice President.
- In Administration & Finance we combined the Vice President of A&F position with the Senior Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness eliminating one position. We replaced the Senior Budget Director with the CFO position.
- In University Advancement we hired two Assistant Vice President positions to fill existing Assistant Vice President positions. We also replaced the Vice President of Government, Corporate and Foundation Engagement with an Assistant Vice President reporting to the VP for University Advancement.
- In Inclusive Excellence we added the Senior Advisor to the President.

---

---

**Attachment 3: Research questions from 2013-14 salary study**

For reference, the questions in the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Budget Committee faculty salary study were as follows:

- How do faculty salaries at NKU compare to CUPA salaries?
- If NKU salaries fall below CUPA, how much would it cost NKU to close the gap?
- Is there evidence of salary compression?
- Is there evidence of salary inversion?
- How have average salaries relative to CUPA changed over time?
- Have NKU salaries kept up with inflation?