

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, March 28, 2018, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Carlson, J. Chen, Chung, Creed, Crowley, Gray, Guo, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Lampi, Luo, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Naples, Nejdil, Newman, Novak, Powell, Rheineck, Ryu, Saborío, Shi, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Subramony (for Mooney), Surjadi, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Zheng

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Briscoe, Bujarski, G. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Duffin, Fredericks, Glatz, Grund, Hathaway, Konen, Krmeneč, Li, Liu, Maddali, Mogren, Mooney, Moraga, Patro, Penrod, Plum, Riley, Rodgers, Schatteman, Scherer, Sirotken, Song, Staikidis, Stephen

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Doederlein, Groza, Klaper, Myers, Nicholson (for Andree), Wilcox

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Andree, Click, Gelman, Korgtegest, Falkoff

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**L. Saborío:** Good afternoon. This meeting is now called to order.

Faculty Senate President **L. Saborío** called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**L. Saborío:** First up is the adoption of the agenda. Can I get a motion? Thank you, Laura Beamer. And a second? We have a lot of seconds. Did you grab one, Pat. Second will be Rebecca Hunt. All in favor of adoption of the agenda – or any discussion first of all – sorry, discussion, changes? No? All in favor, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**L. Saborío:** And opposed? Abstentions? None? Okay, thank you, the agenda passed.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2018 FS MEETING**

**L. Saborío:** Next up, approval of the minutes of the February 21, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, Michael Haji-Sheikh. And a second? Second, George Slotsve. Any changes, suggestions, discussion? Okay, all in favor of approving the minutes, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**L. Saborío:** Any opposed, abstention? None. Minutes passed.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**L. Saborío:** Okay, President's Announcements. I have just a few, because we do have a long meeting planned for today.

As you are all aware, I did have the chance to visit with Bob Pritchard and also with our state senator, Julie Morrison. She was a guest at the last FAC-to-IBHE meeting. And I also received a letter from State Senator Pat McGuire. So I just kind of wanted to wrap up that discussion. These were visits and a letter that resulted from the resolution that we passed in Faculty Senate regarding sustainable funding in higher education. So I can tell you that, in general, our senators are concerned about higher education spending and simply maintaining the status quo. They're looking for innovative approaches to higher education. For example, Senator Morrison asked about creating centers and received several noes from everyone in the room. She also asked if community colleges should offer four-year degrees and again received several noes to that. So I can tell you that they're looking for something new. I'm not sure what, but they're just looking for something new in higher education, and she said that legislators are no longer going to just throw money at higher education. I think there are many assumptions out there about higher education, and I think we also need to respectfully challenge those assumptions when dealing with our legislators. If you're interested in reading the letter that McGuire sent me, I have it here with me today.

Also, the FAC to IBHE is producing a one-page infographic document that's titled Make Illinois Great Again Through Funding Higher Education, and I would be more than happy to share this document with you once it is finalized in May. It again highlights the need to revitalize higher education, and it's a document about that. And in June, we're going to be in Springfield handing it out to the legislators as they walk in. That will be fun.

I did meet with the faculty representatives on our Student Conduct Advisory Board. I know there was a discussion maybe a month or two ago about the Maxient system. And it was a very informative conversation between, I think there were four of us there. I invited Kelly Wesener Michael and Jeanne Meier to attend our next Faculty Senate meeting, because I think they really are the appropriate people to discuss what's happening with Maxient and any developments regarding the system. So please feel free to send me your questions if you have questions for them.

And also it was recommended from this meeting that we had with the reps on the Student [Conduct] Advisory Board that the Student Conduct Office develop an FAQ sheet that they can post online and perhaps even share with the Greek orientations during orientation week. And I thought that was a really good idea.

Also just a reminder that Provost McCord will be attending our next meeting in April. He has agreed to attend every semester, at least once a semester. So he's coming in April. He's going to be giving us an update on the budget. So if you have any questions for him, let me know.

And Matt Streb will be there with the legislative update on HB4103, which I think is just sitting there in committee, and the IPAC bill.

And final reminders that we do have elections next month for Faculty Senate president, and your letters are in your agenda packets today.

Any questions for me, or are we ready to move on. That was quick.

## **V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

- A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to [Kendall Thu](#) – Page 3

**L. Saborío:** So for Faculty Senate consideration, item V., we have the presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award to Kendall Thu. So, Kendall, come on up so we can [applause]. I have to embarrass you for a moment. I'm going to read. This is a letter that George submitted for your nomination, and it states, "As a long-standing member of NIU's community, Professor Thu has become a familiar face to many across campus. In fact, I have often marveled at his ability to be present in so many places at the same time. Since joining University Council in 2008, Professor Thu has been proactive in acting pointblank the tough, unanswered questions, yet always with the best intention of creating enhanced transparency and greater accountability. He was a key player in the Program Prioritization Task Force and is currently serving as a member on the Presidential Search Preparation Committee. His untiring commitment to the university exemplifies what it means to be a dedicated member of our profession."

So thank you for asking the tough questions. There you go, congratulations.

**K. Thu:** Thank you very much. Thank you all. [applause]

**L. Saborío:** And I do believe that the plaque has been updated already in the Holmes Student Center.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Clanitra Stewart Nejd, Chair – no report
- C. Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession – Laura Beamer, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Keith Millis, Liaison/Spokesperson

**L. Saborío:** So Reports from Standing Committees, we really don't have any reports this month. I just wanted to note under D., Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, Keith Millis is here, did you want to say anything.

**K. Millis:** Yes.

**L. Saborío:** Sure, go ahead.

**K. Millis:** So last time we met, there were four nominations for president of Faculty Senate. Two of them have accepted the nomination. You can see Therese and Michael have. And you can see their narratives on those pages. And next meeting we will be voting.

**L. Saborío:** Any questions for Keith. It's pretty clear I think, right? Okay.

1. Letter of acceptance of nomination for President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council; Faculty Senate will vote at the April 25 meeting.
  - a. [Therese Arado](#) – Pages 4
  - b. [Michael Haji-Sheikh](#) – Pages 5-6

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

## **VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Linda Saborío – [report](#) – Page 7

**L. Saborío:** So, let's keep going. The Reports from Advisory Committees, you have a report on page 7, the FAC to IBHE, and you're welcome to read that, and ask me if you have any questions.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report  
Barbara Andree, Cathy Doederlein, Alex Gelman,  
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

## **IX. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 2.1](#),  
Officers of the Faculty Senate – Page 8

### **FIRST READING**

**L. Saborío:** Let's move on to item IX., New Business. Under New Business, we have a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.1, Officers of the Faculty Senate. It's on page 8, and I've asked Kendall to go ahead and introduce this first reading of this amendment to the bylaw, since it was his suggestion at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

**K. Thu:** Just as a reminder, when we were entertaining nominations for Faculty Senate, the same day, we just became aware of who was eligible. So in other words, we had basically 30 minutes between who was actually eligible to be Faculty Senate president and then nominating them. That's just not appropriate. So we need to give ourselves more time. And this is thanks to Pat Erickson. She came up with this elegant solution, which is that we actually nominate the candidates in the third month rather than the second month, and that's all there is to it. So it gives us a month to talk to our colleagues to see whether they're willing to serve.

**L. Saborío:** Right. So then the time line remains the same, basically. You still have your elections to University Council in February that are done at the college level. And then you would have nominations for the Faculty Senate president in March. And then you would have elections in April, is what that means.

**K. Thu:** And this is just a first reading. There's no vote.

**L. Saborío:** No vote today. Any questions. Okay, go ahead, George.

**G. Slotsve:** I was just going to mention, the nominations occur in the third spring semester meeting, in March, basically, and then we'll vote in April. We'll need to know who's running about halfway between. So we're going to have to inform people prior to the meeting who they've got a choice between so they can read the letters.

**L. Saborío:** Yes, so we always post the agenda at least 48 hours in advance, and it would have the letters attached to it. But I'm sure that we would entertain the idea of perhaps sending the letters out once they've been accepted. We might want to consider putting a deadline in there for the nomination.

**G. Slotsve:** I think that's probably a good idea.

**L. Saborío:** Yeah, acceptance letters.

**K. Thu:** At least a week's lead time.

**L. Saborío:** Even better, it's a procedure, let's keep it in the office. Another idea would be to post it on the website and let people know that nomination letters are in. That might work too. Okay, any other questions? It's a good question.

## **X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. [Faculty Salary Study](#) and [presentation](#)  
Kristen Myers  
Professor, Department of Sociology  
Director, Center for the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality

Virginia Wilcox  
Assistant Chair and Undergraduate Director, Department of Economics

**L. Saborío:** Okay, Unfinished Business, here we are. Today we have the presentation of the Faculty Salary Study that was available as a link in your agenda, and you were given a link to the current Faculty Salary Study, the task force members and a link to the different appendix pages.

Just a little bit of history. In 2016, former CFO Al Phillips and then-Provost Lisa Freeman asked former Faculty Senate President Greg Long to form a Faculty Salary Study Task Force. The study was announced in the April 11, 2016 Northern Star with an explicit goal of conducting a comprehensive, transparent and replicable study of NIU faculty salaries to investigate any systematic bias as well as issues of salary compression and inversion.

So today we have with us Professor Kristen Myers from the Department of Sociology and director for the Center for the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality, and Professor Virginia Wilcox from the Department of Economics, who were identified for their expertise to serve as co-chairs of this task force. Their backgrounds provided the leadership and knowledge to investigate salary issues, both qualitatively and quantitatively. I would like to take this moment to recognize the immense amount of time and effort both Virginia and Kristen have dedicated to this study. Thank you very much. [applause]

And finally the task force membership included 29 faculty members from across campus. I would also like to thank them for serving on this task force. [applause] So and now, Kristen, I think you're up first, so go right ahead.

**K. Myers:** Pat, I think we're down a couple slides. Yes, thank you. So thank you for letting us come in today. As Linda says, I'm Kristen Myers. My area in sociology is in equality, but also work in organizations. I'm a qualitative researcher, so I was asked to do the qualitative part of the study. The qualitative part of the study has not been done in the past salary studies since 2005. There have been several salary studies since 2005. I believe this is the fourth one, and so Greg [Long] wanted to bring the qualitative aspect back in. It's important to make it very clear that qualitative data is not used to generalize findings. It's not representative samples. It's just not possible to do those sorts of things with the kind of data that qualitative researchers collect and analyze. However, that doesn't make it useless. It doesn't make it anecdotal. It is systematic. It is comprehensive. And what we are able to do through qualitative research is to uncover social processes in particular. And because faculty salary negotiations are largely a product of social negotiations, social processes, we decided to focus the energy there. Past salary studies have had conversations about using starting salary as a variable. Virginia has done that, and she will talk about that. But it's seen as a black box a little bit, how starting salaries get determined, and so I took that on in a variety of ways. And we also looked at other ways that faculty are able to change their salary once they're hired, which includes, well we'll talk about it. We do ask for you to hold your questions until the end. Make notes. I'm sure you have a lot of things that you want to talk about. And before I move forward, I would like all of you who were on the task force to raise your hand and again be thanked for your work. Thank you.

All right, this is just the overview of the outline, so we can go to the next slide. Okay, so I used, with Jeff Kidder, who is not here, he's on sabbatical, but used a variety of methods. The first method that we used to collect data were faculty salary narratives. And we did this because Dan Gebo had submitted a memo to someone, I'm not sure who, where he outlined his starting salary and all the increments he's gotten along the way, based on promotions, awards, Board of Trustees

Professorships, and then noted his current salary. And the point of his argument was that his salary was very low, and as Virginia will say, NIU salaries are low. And so we decided to use this method to have faculty write their own narratives and see what along the way has affected where they came from and where they are now. And we got about 18 people, 15 people, to participate in that, and found very quickly that the most important thing is getting raises. And since there haven't been any raises in many years, we decided to turn that over to Virginia, and she has been able to run those variables much more sophisticatedly than we could do in the narratives.

And so then the next step was to do face-to-face interviews that I conducted by myself with chairs and deans who had been involved in salary negotiations. And as you read in the report, the mean and the average number of years that the chairs and deans that I was able to interview have been in their position is only seven years. So some have been longer, some have been less, but that means that some of you who may have done your salary negotiations before that are not captured here. So what I'm able to talk about is bound by where they were. So I did ask all the chairs and deans to participate. Seventeen chairs and four deans participated. This was also a time of a lot of change, so there were new chairs coming in, lots of new deans at the same time. So if they hadn't done salary negotiations, they would have said that, like I just haven't done that here.

And then the next step after doing this was to look at promotion, because promotion to full professor is a major way that faculty can affect their salaries once they are here. And so we did focus groups with associate professors who have been at rank for more than six years. You're not eligible to be promoted earlier than that. And we recruited people through chairs. Only 13 people responded, and ten people came. So this maybe more anecdotal. But we did learn some interesting things about the dynamics of the faculty feel like they're experiencing.

So I can talk about this more in the Q&A, but we had an external firm transcribe all the interviews so they are confidential. And then we used NVivo, which is a software, to code data and form patterns. And we followed Charmaz as another grounded theory approaches to generating codes and generating themes. And then we find relationships among the codes and can make kind of so-what statements.

This is also an overview slide. But basically, faculty salaries can be impacted at three places, three major places. When you're hired, during the hiring process, so before you're hired, salaries are determined. During the hiring process, you can negotiate. And then once you're here, you can also negotiate your salary again under some circumstances. The negotiation, itself, is affected by things that have nothing to do with the candidate in some ways, and Virginia will talk about that a lot. Market data for the position, the candidate's portfolio and skills, so what do they bring to the table is important in their leverage in negotiation. The culture of the college and the unit, that's that fun qualitative stuff we can look at, like: What are the meaning systems in this department? Do they value bringing people in at the highest possible salary? Do they value keeping a gap between the people who've been here for a while and the new people, salary-wise? And that is pre-variable. Is there money? We know there is not. And then the negotiation skills of the faculty. But also the expertise among the chairs, like how much experience they have doing that.

And so, as you know, one of the things we've been asked to look at is patterns. Are there gendered patterns? Are there race patterns? And we will try to speak to some of that. But it's important to note that there is no one way to do this. It is pretty contextual.

A lot of starting salary is outside of the candidate's hands. And if any of you – and I know some of you have been involved in this side of the process, the salary range gets pre-approved when the position is advertised. And the chair or the personnel committee or whoever is charged with this works with providing market data to the provost, to the dean, to try to say: This is what the going rate is for a person with these skills. The range is not usually advertised, and the range is pretty narrow. It's still negotiable, though, and so, once people are coming in and trying to be hired, they can make arguments. And sometimes they go above the range.

Start-up package – let me make sure I'm hitting everything. This is what I do, I just like talk, you know, I'm a professor. So hang on, just make sure. I know you have all of this. I just want to make sure I'm not missing anything. The kinds of things that people can affect that range with, are how much experience they have, is there a lot of demand for their specialization, and what is the chair's philosophy; and that goes back to that culture issue.

Start-up packages are typically more negotiable, and a range may also be set by a college. Liberal Arts and Sciences in the humanities and social sciences has about an \$8,000 start-up package typically, but even that can be negotiated. Workload can be negotiated. Lots of things there, that's kind of soft of what Dean McCord, now Provost McCord, would call non-perm, things that aren't permanent, can be much more easily negotiated. And that's hard to measure.

So workload can be measured. What's your teaching load? And people ask for all sorts of teaching loads, but that may be responded to in different ways by the culture of the department and: No, everyone here teaches a whatever it is. You know, we see this as the mission of our department. Or conversely: No, we want to do everything we can to protect you in your first year and to get you acclimated, so you're going to have the lowest load possible. The APPM does guarantee a load differential at year 3, I believe, but departments can do more than that.

Okay, partnership accommodations became something really interesting, and I think really important, and we talk about it a lot in the recommendations section. But one dean said that partnership accommodations are almost like in every hire now, so that more people who are going to graduate school are meeting someone to live with for the rest of their lives in graduate school. And so when they go on the market, this expectation of a partnership accommodation is an expectation. And other universities have policies and have systems for recognizing that both faculty are faculty, and they're both qualified. And the fact that NIU doesn't have an established policy leaves a lot of discretion and a lot of onus on the part of the chair to negotiate and to network. And it's challenging and not always successful. And there's a lot of baggage that comes with that, so there's a lot of judgment of what we call – and this is what people repeatedly refer to in the interviews as – trailing spouses. So the trailing spouse is the person who is kind of the bargaining chip. We hired you because we hired your partner, and there is a lot of evidence in the interviews that sometimes that means that partner is paid less, that partner has less respect in the department. And again, that partner is a member of the department so that it's complicated and gendered, which



I'll talk about in a little bit. But that's a big deal. The partnership accommodations is a way to recruit people nowadays and retain them.

Not everybody negotiates the same way. And so your ability to get what you want when you negotiate is affected by things that Virginia will measure, these things. And she will show you that they're important. The department culture, you can't really measure, right? Or training as a negotiator. So I'll talk about those.

So training as a negotiator, the people I interviewed talked about kind of three major ways that people have been trained to negotiate. So some people come in, they use market data. They talk about their skills as evidence that they deserve more. They know what the market looks like for them. And they ground their arguments in the evidence that the chairs get. They understand that. The deans understand that language.

There's also folks who don't negotiate at all. They just take the first offer and say, "thank you." And oftentimes, the chairs go back and say, "You need to ask for more; it's not how we do this." And also it's important to note that some chairs will make the offer at the top of the range, because that's their philosophy. They know that faculty may not get raises for a long time. And so this first hire is the most important way to give that salary. But other folks will start at the low end of the range. And they really do expect to negotiate with the faculty member. And if that person says, "Oh great, thank you." Then the chair usually says, "You should ask for more." But they don't have to, right? They don't have to at all.

And then there is this category they call coached. These were people who come in and ask for things that were perceived as unreasonable, outlandish, like "I don't want to teach for three years," or something like that. Something that the chair had to maintain a straight face and say, "We don't do that sort of thing." They don't use data. They've just been told by their mentors or something, "Ask for everything." And they do. And these folks are talked about as not being very savvy; however, sometimes they're successful. So that's interesting.

Okay and then the department culture norms I think I've talked about enough, like it really does depend on what the department expects. And also the chair, the dean may be brand new and not done this before. And a lot of times, chairs and deans, "You know, when I first did these negotiations, I did them differently than I do now. And I wish I would have known now what I knew then." But it's hard and there's not a lot of coaching for them on how to do this sort of thing.

Okay, once you're here, there are other ways to get more money. Raises and off-cycle increments, which no longer exist, I mean except for this past year, we all had a merit raise – not a merit, what am I talking about – a cost of living raise. But these raises are very important, and they have been absent. And you probably all know people, and you might be one of these people who's been here during the time period when there have been no raises, and people have leap-frogged you. And it's hard.

Promotion is a major way to get raises. So with promotion and tenure, we tend to try to hire people who are going to be tenured, so that's usually happens, and then people can get raises then. But promotion to full is more less guaranteed. So there's that leap from getting tenure to becoming full,

Virginia will talk about, there's a lot of disparity there. And I also have the focus group that I'll talk about. Maybe I should talk about it now.

So in the focus groups about promotion, we find that there's a variety of reasons why people don't go from associate to full. Some are structural, which means that's something the university should pay attention to. And some are personal, which is not something the university needs to pay attention to. So the focus groups revealed that the associates perceive there's a heavy service burden placed on them, that a lot of departments work really hard to protect junior people, which is great; but then the associates do all of the work. A lot of times, fulls may opt out of work, because it's a privilege. Associates may opt out of the service, but the university will not run without the service being accomplished, and therefore, associates are feeling that the need to be doing it. They want their department to run smoothly. And this work is not valued. It's not valued in the merit process if there were raises. It's not valued maybe in the culture of many departments, and yet it's completely important and needs to happen.

Also the bureaucratic demands on departments has increased, so the folks who do agree to do service are doing more service than they've done in the past. And they find that, once they agree to do service once, they are called on again and again. So it's one of those problems of being good at your job, that you get asked to do it again and again. And it's harder and harder to say no, because typically these folks do care about the work.

Sometimes associates will take on roles like director of undergraduate studies, director of graduate studies, partly because they care about it, but also it supplements their income. And in an environment when there are no raises and no other ways to supplement your income, they take on this labor and the labor again is important and yet it may detract from their ability to publish, which most departments rate most highly in the assessment of whether people are ready or not to be promoted.

Some of the people in the focus groups said that the standards for promotion have changed over time and become harder. Workloads are increasing, as I said. Salaries are compressed, which Virginia will talk about. And I thought an interesting thing they talked about is the institutional support for research for associates, it's harder to get, than the institutional support for assistants. So the research and artistry grants tend to favor the assistants, which, of course, we want our assistants to do well. But the associates sometimes don't get the same support, they feel. And there's not mentorship of associates. People tell junior folks, "Don't take on work. Do what matters." Also that says that what matters is not all this other work that people do to support the university. But associates need that mentorship too, and this is something that came out of the 2005 study is that we need more systems of mentorship for people who want to go into leadership. We need a different value system. What I don't mean to say is that we don't value scholarship. What I want to say is that leadership should also be seen as a valuable aspect of one's portfolio.

The personal reasons are not as many, but they may be that people got burned out in the tenure process and need a break. Sometimes people have decided to invest in teaching and service, and that's important to them. But, because it's not valued in promotion, then that is an obstacle. And also sometimes they just say, "I'm going to invest in other things." You know, "I'm going to have different goals." So there's a variety of reasons why people don't progress, and there is a gap in

people's progression that is important for the university to think about. And Virginia has lots of stuff on that.

Awards and grants are the ways to get increased funding. And then the next thing I want to spend a little more time on is the competing offers; that everyone has been told, you all have been told, that if you want to increase your salary, the best thing you need to do is have an offer in hand. Right – I've been told, I've heard that expression, offer in hand, so many times. It was very interesting that deans problematized this. The chairs problematized this strategy. They said this offer-in-hand approach diverts faculties' attention from NIU. It tells them we'll only value you if somebody else values you. And they spend this time being externally focused. And then when they do get the offer, now they're thinking, "Well, why am I here?" And so it's unhealthy, possibly, psychologically for people to be outwardly focused. It also creates a crisis situation when they do get an outside offer. So everyone has to stop what they're doing. One of the subjects called it a 24-hour hamster wheel, that everybody has to stop what they're doing and just scramble to retain this person – if they want to retain them, and they don't have to. But if they want to, they have to drop what they're doing. And this stops everybody's work flow. And what several of the chairs and one of the deans said is, maybe we should pay people more and keep them here, and keep them internally focused – radical, it's a radical idea.

Does gender matter? It's hard to tell. There's a variety of ways we can look at this. So the literature says it does, that lots and lots – this is just a tiny little what-would-fit-on-the-slide sample of the literature that shows that gender negotiations is really important. Gender and salary disparity is very important. Wage gap is a real thing. But it's hard to measure, and Virginia will talk about that a lot, so I'll let her handle that.

But the training and negotiation may be gendered, and so we asked about that in the interviews. And a lot of the chairs and deans – three of the four deans said, "Yes, absolutely. Women negotiate differently than the men do." And differently doesn't mean like equally, so that the women don't ask for the same things as men and, when they do ask for things, they ask for things that are called personal issue-related so that means families. Having a life, a work-life balance or something like that. And also that women felt the need to ground their requests for more – they had to justify it. So they didn't maybe – who knows – be seen as greedy or coached or whatever it is that was pejorative. And men didn't seem to need to do that.

Now other subjects said nope, I don't see it at all. The women negotiate just as hard as the men and, in fact, they're pretty fierce. That's good to hear too, right? So this was particularly true in the STEM fields, and one of the chairs – let's go to the next slide – that STEM fields are aware that there's a gender gap, and they have been for many years. For example, I don't know if you know the NSF Advance Funds – this is an organization that gives funding to research on how to diversity the STEM pipeline by gender and also race. And since 2001 they have given \$270 million worth of funds to try to get this pipeline diversified. The problem is recognized, prioritized and addressed. It's not fixed. It's not fixed at all. But one thing that may have happened is that women and people of color in these pipelines know they better fight hard for what they get. And so this person referred to the negotiators as battle hardened, which they meant as a compliment, that this is a skill that has been taught to these faculty as like necessary. And it may be working, we don't know.

Do you mind going back one slide? I just want to make sure I didn't miss anything. Okay, no, I'm good. Thank you. One more, awesome.

Okay, and then there's the issue of like people who don't perceive gender difference in women-dominated fields, which I thought was also very interesting and fits the literature really well too. That when you look at wage disparities in field where men dominate, you can see it really easily. And then when you look in women-dominated fields, you say, "oh, everybody makes kind of the same." Yes, but they make less, right? So that, sure, if you compare the different positions in there, people make about the same, but if you compare a women-dominated field to a field dominated by men, the salaries are statistically significantly different. And so there's literature that shows that this means is that when things become feminized or overly associated with women, then the salaries become compressed or what's a word, deflated, I don't know, math.

So that could be happening here. So a dean who is in a college where the faculty are predominantly women said, "No, we don't see it at all in women. I have people who come in here and negotiate hard and people who don't, and it's not about gender." And that may be, but it also is true that we do know that fields dominated by women are depressed.

We looked at race. It's very difficult to look at race at NIU, and that's because the faculty is overwhelmingly White. So when I interviewed the chairs and the deans about their negotiations with faculty color, almost none of them had hired a faculty of color. And if they had, it was probably an international person. So I wasn't able to get much information there at all. And that's a sign, right? So thinking back to that STEM issue, about the money and the resources invested in diversifying the pipeline for STEM, there's a patter, I mean there's a model here that we probably could adopt.

Okay, does gender matter? Does race matter? Maybe.

So again, just to start to wrap this up, salaries are the product of discretion, and I think that's kind of the most important take-away point that I would like you to have, is that there's a lot of discretion used, particularly in the non-perm, in the soft stuff, which can work for us, and it can also possibly work against us, we don't know. Because it doesn't create precedence when these negotiations occur, you might have heard something in your department. Say so-and-so got this much travel money when they said they were going on the market. And then you go and say, "Well, I heard so-and-so got this." And you'd be told "no." So there's no mechanism for solidifying these processes, which again may work for you and it may work against you. But it makes this – this is where gender and race might really matter. And it's very hard to know that's happening. In other fields, like the criminal justice system, we know discretion is used to enforce racial tropes and gender tropes. So we know that it's possibly pernicious. I also know from the interviews that the chairs and deans bend over backwards to do what they can for faculty, given the constraints that they have. And they have a lot of constraints.

Oh gosh, okay, I think I've talked about all of this. We do need better partnership hiring practices. That's really important. We need to think about the service of our associate professors and what we're putting on them. We need to definitely diversity the faculty in any way possible. We need to look at models, possibly grow our own. We have a very diverse institution, and we could grow our

own future faculty. And we need to think about what in sociology we call a sex ratio, so if there's large proportion of women compared to men, what is that doing to the salaries. Virginia can answer that question, though, so it's probably time to hand it over to you. Pat, what do we have next?

All of our recommendations are in the report. One thing I'll point out is we could just change our language, so stop saying trailing spouse. Start saying partnership hire. There's a lot of evidence that the folks who are hired as partners are full-fledged members of our university and are valuable and doing the same work as everybody else. And they are easy to retain that way, because they've developed roots.

I do think we need to be more transparent with regard to the add-pay, the other negotiations. And I think I've talked about all these things. And then I have this line in here that apparently Provost McCord wants to know more about. I'm not wedded to it, but based on the interviews it seemed clear to me that faculty are doing so much more with less and less and less and more and more. And the lack of raises is bad. And so I think that – and this is the last one – that until raises are brought back, we need to – some of these departments, let me just say, are hiring every year because they lose people right away. They hire them and then they lose them. And hires are extremely expensive. And they're bringing somebody in – one department had nine hires in, I think, four years. And they lost them all. And they're hiring them and losing them, because they're not giving marketable rates. And once they get here, they don't have the resources that they need. So my argument, which McCord seized on, and I'm probably have to dial it back, he wants to know what you think, is to only hire in a complete emergency, which I know we have, and reinvest those funds in the folks who are already here and working very hard with less. But I don't know if you agree, and you don't have to agree. I really just, that was kind of like me being snarky.

So I'm going to hand it over to Virginia now.

**V. Wilcox:** I'm going to move over there so I can see the slide I'm talking about. Now I can see, and I can see Pat. So I'm Virginia Wilcox, and I wanted to thank a couple people. One is George Slotsve, who I guess I should thank. He came by my office and said, "Oh, I told Greg Long you'd be the right person to do this study." I was like, "Thanks a lot." But you know what, I'm a labor economist. This is bread-and-butter stuff to labor economists. So if not me, then who? George, next time, George. The other thing is, we gave this presentation the beginning of the month to the task force and, seriously, as much as I would like everybody to just say, "Oh, what a perfect study you did," you know, we got really nice feedback from a half a dozen people who carefully read the reports and asked questions. And it didn't really change the report, but it made me think about some aspects of it that I wouldn't think of before where I was just sort of glossing over. So I do appreciate that they took the time and made some comments that were helpful.

So when I talked to Greg Long, he said, "We should conduct a comprehensive, transparent and replicable salary study," with real emphasis on those words. He felt that prior reports people had complained they were too short and they weren't explained. They were a bunch of tables, and people didn't know where it came from and what was going on. So he wanted me to literally do lots of pages of tables and explain everything, both the fancy regressions and the not-so-fancy, just cross-tabulated tables. So I said, okay, will do. He wanted it to be transparent so you could see where I got the conclusions I got. So everything is posted in an appendix on the Faculty Senate

website. That is all of my output files in Stata. So I don't know how well you are into Stata, but the output looks the same as any regression software. And replicable. It's an 83-page study I think someone could replicate it. They could see exactly how we constructed things and then look at the programs we have posted and see how it could be replicated. So hopefully, we've done that.

It's obviously a systematic salary inequity study, so I was told to focus on sex, female vs. male, race, I'll talk about that in a moment, and ethnicity. So I'll talk about our definitions of those, because obviously, they're limited by the number of faculty we have.

And then finally, almost thrown in at the end was talking about salary compression and inversion. But it's important and so we've done a section here describing it.

So here's my organization. So first are – I'm not going to show you all the tables. In fact, I don't think I have any tables. I'm just going to describe some of the findings from the tables. But first is what I call the descriptive information. That is, I compare some of the variables, some of the sorts of factors you might think would be important in determining salary. But they're only descriptive because we're not controlling for anything else. So that's when we have to move to regression. But before just throwing my regression findings at you in the report – I'm not going to put anything up here – I went very carefully. I thought about the methods that go into getting those results, and I want to explain them a little bit here. And then I'll jump to the important findings, and then finally the compression and inversion.

If you have just a question about clarity, you can feel free to ask that, but otherwise, please save your questions until the end.

So the data came from – and this is where I told Greg Long, “Oh sure, I can have this done by next May, because the data's going to be given to me, right?” So it came from mostly Human Resource Services. I had to hunt around to figure out who was going to give me the data first. Also from the Provost's Office, and then I actually had to contact all the deans of all the colleges and the library to get data from them. And then I actually spent quite a bit of time on LinkedIn and looking at people's CVs trying to fill in so I didn't have to drop data points, you know, I could keep observations.

There were some 600+ faculty when I started, and I ended up with 575. The biggest variable that caused me to drop observations was the merit information. The College of Law is not represented in this study, because the dean's office said they simply didn't have merit information. And then just smatterings from across the university, there wasn't merit information, but I'll describe that. It does only consider tenured and tenure-track faculty members, so not instructors, not any clinical professors or anything like that.

So anyway, instead of just quickly putting it together in one semester, it took me literally a year. The other thing was that I promised Greg and the provost that, when I was dealing with any of the data that had faculty names on it, I would deal with that, not my research assistant. He did give me a research assistant. And so I had the research assistant busy doing something else, and I had to, on the side, because we did not ask for courses releases. We didn't negotiate well. Nor a raise. Anyway

it did take me a year really to put the data together. But I managed to get it done last summer and then did the analyses last fall.

So this is, for anybody who's – is anybody looking at the tables as we go – if you are, I'll name them. Okay, so this is table 3-1. Oh I did tell you I wasn't going to do a table and here's a table, I'm sorry. But it's just a little part. You can see that theirs is almost the same number of White males and females who are tenured and tenure-track faculty members. And I should mention, I keep using White male right from the front, because this is going to be the reference group against which female, Asian, Hispanic and Black salaries are going to be compared. I'm not breaking down women into White vs. Other, and I'm not doing that for Hispanic either, just because of cell size. But White male is a large group, and I can certainly separate them out. So White males and females are about equally represented. You can see Asians 15 percent. The double asterisk next to the female average monthly salary, this is from 2015-16, indicates that it's significantly lower than that of White males. You'll notice that the others are lower as well. The Black salary is only weakly significant. That's only a P-value of 10.1. And the others, although they're lower, there's no statistical significance. But you can see the pattern here, and it's statistically significant in some groups.

You can also see that there are relatively few, well definitely few Black and Hispanic faculty members, 7.5 percent adding them together. And that's exactly what I had to do for some of the analyses.

So in prior studies, actually, they simply used a minority variable, a zero-one variable for minority, which I think is not a good idea. You can see right there that Asians and Black and Hispanic are not similar in terms of their salaries. And so I did break out Asians, they're enough to have Asian faculty members separate. And in some instances, I put Black and Hispanic together as needed. That was table 3-1.

So this is from table 3-2. And in that table, I report a number of average monthly salaries. I should go back. I am using your average monthly salary. So if you have 10-month or a 12-month appointment, it shouldn't make a difference, because it's on a monthly basis. And it is the base salary. And I have learned since using it that there are many adjustments to base that are paid to people, but again, those are temporary, so they're not added into the base salary that I was given by HR. So this is just your base salary.

The base salaries average range on average from a low at the libraries, you can see, to a high at the College of Business. And you can see the second thing I reported there was just to give you an idea of the ratios for the target groups, female, Asian and Black or Hispanic, compared to that White male reference group. And they range from .75, I think that's in the humanities, in Arts and Sciences, to a high ratio of 1.08 where they're actually paid more on average than White males, and that is in engineering. But they vary pretty similarly across the groups, and we'll look at that more later.

I should mention also that I, well here I guess I could mention that I've looked at colleges, I've looked at departments. And you'll see sometimes I control for departments. I also created something in between, which I called a discipline group, because CLAS is so big, I broke it into

sciences, behavioral and social sciences and then humanities. So I broke it into three groups, because they seemed like they might be good groups. It didn't really make much difference, but I tried.

Again I'm just kind of whizzing through some of the early tables. These are tables 3-3 and 3-4. You're welcome to peruse them at your leisure. Looking at rank, the differences that are observed are at the full level. And in general, even when I controlled for things in regression analyses, I found that we're fairly competitive and fairly equal in terms of hiring across groups at the assistant professor level. It's only over time that we start seeing the differences emerging more and more. So it's in the higher ranks. So for full professors, you can see averages for female and that's my Black and Hispanic group put together, are significantly lower than for White males. The second point is that there's a whole table about it, but really there's not much in it. White males are more likely to be hired at associate or full, but we don't see a statistically significant difference in terms of salary.

Some of these factors that I'm looking at are those that I'm going to then turn around and talk about how I defined them for doing the regressions, but this is just a little overview to start with. Experience, of course, is very important, so here we have two types of experience: years spent here at NIU and you can see that White male faculty members have greater years than some in the target groups. And I also collected information for academic experience at prior institutions. So I tried to ask – and this is where I was contacting the deans at the colleges, and they were talking to their chairs trying to get this information. We tried to limit to what would be considered important for tenure and tenure-track, etc. so if you had a job that wasn't related to that, it wouldn't be included in the prior institution. And, indeed, that's one thing I think in a future study. You know I didn't think of it until much too late, but in some colleges and some departments, non-academic prior experience could be really important and perhaps we should collect that information.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Very, very high on that.

**V. Wilcox:** Right. And I think Health and Human Sciences had the same comment, etc. So that's just not included. It's omitted here, because I didn't collect it and, indeed, I would have had to go back and collect it for everybody. It was complicated so I confess I didn't.

Okay, years at NIU, you can see are correlated with monthly salary. But notice the very last line there that, as soon as you put rank, as soon as you divide it into the rank of the professors, that pretty much drops out, because rank is such an important determinate of your current salary. I mean that's our biggest raise comes from that. And I'll talk about that a little bit later. Okay, so that was table 3-5 if you're following along.

This is table 3-6. Besides experience and rank, those things which we kind of take as experience measures, I wanted to try to include some performance measures. And these are not very sophisticated performance measures. We've talked about this with the task force. The first one is somehow I wanted to use merit scores, because that's our main productivity measure that we have. So I created various sorts of merit scores to try to control for between college, between department differences, and I'll talk about that in a little bit when I get there, but mostly this is a five-year, I took the five-year average of a person's merit scores prior to 2015-16. If it was a person who'd only been here three years, then I used the three-year average, etc. And then I, by college, looked at the



highest quintile across the college. So were you a high performer within your college, and tried to relate that to your salary. And then I looked at the second quintile and the third quintile, etc., thinking that the most productive workers. Again it's somewhat crude, but at least the most productive faculty members should be in the top quintiles. This is assuming that merit scores work the way merit scores are supposed to work. And the task force had quite a discussion about that, and we'll come back to that in a little bit. Because I think it is true that it needs to be carefully examined.

I also did it at the suggestion of one of the task force members, I also did at the department level. And it didn't turn out to make a difference, but it was good to consider that, and I'll talk about that more a little bit later too.

So this has a really interesting result as you'll see up there that female and Hispanic faculty members having average merit scores in the top quintile of their colleges have lower average monthly salaries. But of course, that's because they can be in departments and professions where they're relatively low paid. So they can be high paid among their peers, but when you compare them to people in other colleges, even the lower quintiles in those colleges are better paid, etc. So we need to control for the field and the department and the college that you're in to really get a better grasp of that, and we'll do that.

The other two things I did were, I created simple variables, just zero-one indicators of whether you'd been awarded a professorship, one of the five university professorships, presidential professorships or a Board of Trustees professorships. I didn't try to quantify how much it changed your salary, because it varies between at least the two kinds, but I wanted it to be a productivity indicator. Presumably, the people that are awarded, nominated, screened, etc. are productive. So I wanted it to be an indicator of productivity.

And then finally there's two kind of salary adjustments, as were explained to me by then-Dean McCord, one that originates in the college and one that originates at the provost level more, or at least is processed at the provost level. The first includes the salary matches if you had an outside offer. And the second included critical retentions. So they're a little different. One you have an outside offer. The other you don't, but someone's going to bat for you saying you might. So I kept them separate and created simple dichotomous variables indicating you got one or the other salary adjustment. So, hopefully, these are going to capture some of the productivity difference across faculty members.

Okay, table 3-7, I haven't even gotten to the interesting stuff, the regressions yet. This was finally what Kristen was referring to and everybody knows, is that NIU is underpaid compared to the national average. I remember even when I came here decades ago, taking a pay cut to come here, because I was at an East coast university. So no surprise there. The thing that was interesting is the second bullet point there, and I think that's encouraging. The average monthly salaries of Hispanic assistant and associate professors and Black assistant professors are not lower than the national average. So it suggests at least for the few people we have at those ranks, the university has gone after them and, to get them, has paid a market rate. At least suggests it, I'm not testing that hypothesis, but there you go. The rest of us are all getting paid less than the national average.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Clarification – are any of them above the CUPA [College and University Professional Association]?

**V. Wilcox:** I do not believe so. Nope.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** That's the regression issue, right?

**V. Wilcox:** Right. So once we control for things, yeah. So I call this CUPA, by the way, I have to remember what this is. I have it somewhere in here. It's an organization that NIU belongs to where they conduct a national survey every year of member universities all over the country, and then they make available to all the members of the institutions, all the HR departments basically, what the average salaries are, by CIP [Classification of Instructional Programs] program code and by rank, so it's pretty nice data. I don't know that it's exactly representative, but it's a fairly big survey and it covers lots of different universities. So that's what this CUPA organization is. So I keep calling it my CUPA variable. It's the national discipline salary.

All right, now we get to talk about interesting stuff. This is where she was laughing at me last time, because I got all excited, because I was going to start talking about the regressions. Sorry. Okay, so I'm going to do earning regressions, and as I said, this is kind of bread-and-butter stuff we teach our grad students. Where we tried to relate your salary on the left-hand side to some causal measures on the right-hand side and, obviously, there are issues as there are in all regressions of doing this. But we do our best.

Now because monthly salary – and this is again really typical of any kind of earnings regression – monthly salary is skewed with a long-tail to the right, all those high-paid faculty members on the right end of the salary distribution to – and we want to do regression, right, we're going to start out with regular OLS regression, and we want to pull that tail in. So the first thing we do is we use a log instead, and that makes it look like a normal distribution. That means that, when I interpret some of the numbers in the regression, which I'm actually not going to show you the table here, it means that I have to think of them as percentage effects. It's the only effect of doing that. It's better, because if I violate the OLS, I don't get reliable estimates.

Now I want to talk about the variables. So you've already heard about these. So years, how are we going to measure experience, years at NIU, years at prior institutions, and current rank. And typical of labor economics – I'm looking at George – we do experience squared. This is from the 1970s maybe Jacob Mincer first looked at it and said: The age earning profile or experience earnings profile isn't just a simple linear relationship; it's a non-linear relationship. And so having a squared variable in there will capture that. It rises highly at first and then it tapers off.

So I do years at NIU, years at NIU squared, years of prior experience, and prior experience squared. For current rank, I put in dummy variables for full and associate so that assistant becomes the reference group. I don't know why I'm explaining all this, because I'm not going to show you this table, but it's in the report, so do take a look.

Okay, then performance measures. Well I talked about the merit quintile. In the tables that I show in the report, I actually do three zero-one variables for being in the top quintile, the second and the

third, with the expectation that I should see a compared to the people that I'm not including in the regression – those are in the bottom part – I should see a positive, a larger positive, and a largest positive effect on salary. Fulls should be earning more compared to assistants or associates. Or I'm sorry, people in the top quintile should be paid more than those in the next two. And that is what I observe when I do the OLS. And the professorship variable I told you about and the adjustments. These were tables 3-8 and 3-9 if you're following along. I defined all the variables and then showed all the descriptive statistics in there.

So here's that CUPA variable I kept talking about, the average national monthly salary by discipline. I did, while I was working on getting the basic data set up with all the names of the faculty in it, which I couldn't show to my RA, I had him, he probably hates this variable, he spent months working on the CUPA variable, because we went back. We had some data from the earlier studies where it was supposed to show us how they were constructed, how they constructed the comparison wage and the ones I could tell how they did it, I didn't think was done correctly. So I made him do some, a lot of acrobatics with figuring it out so that we actually now have a national monthly salary by discipline. So we used that national data, but we re-weighted it to represent NIU. So if the national survey had equal numbers of fulls, associates and assistants in some CIP program, and yet NIU has mostly assistants and a couple fulls and associates, then we re-weighted it to represent that, and I think that's how it should be done. So he spent a lot of time on that all for a variable that we don't want to talk about very much.

And then the personal characteristics. So we have a dummy variable for female. We have a dummy variable for Asian, I'm sorry, dummy variables are zero-one variables to economists. Okay zero-one variable for Asian and for Black, and another one for Hispanic. So we have four target variables as I call them. And then finally, we have 42 departments. And I explained the discipline group where we split up CLAS into three, and we did that and so on and so forth.

Now finally, before I go on and basically skip the OLS stuff, I should mention that we threw out the OLS regressions, which I'll kind of explain the process if not the regressions. At each step estimated them with controls for the department the faculty member was in, and then also estimated it for without those controls. And the reason is the following: It looks like departments are highly significant and they really make the r-square go up quite a bit, so they're good predictors in that sense. But on the other hand, it occurred to us, although they may capture specific information about departments that are important in terms of predicting wages, explaining wages, they also could be the bed of discrimination. That could be – if discrimination is happening – it could be happening there. So just controlling for that willy nilly and ignoring whether that's an issue is something we didn't want to do. So we did it with and without so you can see it both ways.

So my next slide is about variable selection. And I basically had four things in mind here. I mean, obviously, I'm an economist and I did not write a calculus model for the predictions here, but I could have. But this, as I said, is kind of bread-and-butter stuff for labor economics, so I know the underlying theoretical framework, and I want the experience and the productivity variables. What else? I mean, obviously, we want the models to be a good predictor. We want it to have good performance, and that's usually measured by the r-square or the F statistic. So I paid attention to that. I had to pay attention particularly to two other things, though, that you might not normally think of if you just kind of want to plug everything in and do a regression. And that is, it needed to

be a fairly parsimonious model, because, remember, there aren't very many Black and Hispanic faculty members. And I know down the road, I'm going to do some analyses that are going to separate them out from everybody else, and I want to compare them to White males. And I better not have a model that's two feet long, because I'm not going to have any power in that model. So I want it to be a good model. I want it to be performing well. I want it to predict well. But I want it to be as parsimonious as is wise. So there's trade-offs here.

The trade-offs are in the final bullet point. And that is, in the first models I do, I literally have these variables at the top of the table that say female, Asian, Black, and Hispanic. And I want to get reliable estimators for those variables, because that's what, if I stopped right there, that's what you would think would indicate whether there was discrimination.

But there's two kinds of statistical issues, and I won't go into it anymore than to mention them. And that is, if I include variables in the model that are highly correlated with those target variables, they can steal some of the statistical explanatory power and make our target variables insignificant. Okay, so then I come up and I see nothing significant, that's the end of the picture. So I don't want to do that. I want to be careful. On the other hand, I don't want to omit variables that are good explainers, that should be in the model. So there's always this trade-off. This is typical in doing this and, for those of you who do it, I apologize for dwelling on the issue. But I just want it to be clear, it's not a simple, throw everything in and get the highest r-square. It's more sophisticated than that.

So I did omit some variables, and the task force didn't always like it when they talked to me about it. Those variables were the following four: One was starting salary. So I tried starting salary. I included it in several specifications, but honestly, as soon as you add experience – and experience squared using that non-linear form – rank, and that national salary – that CUPA value – if you add any one of those to the model, starting salary becomes statistically insignificant. They just have more power in explaining your current salary than does. But think of it, your starting salary depended a lot on, as Kristen said, what field you were in, what prior experience you had, what rank you were coming in at, so that's all, it's just taking that.

The second point I would make about that is that it doesn't negate what Kristen said about negotiating skills, because even my best model I think has an r-square of .9. It's not 1.0. So there's individual variation that we're not accounting for, and I bet, if you're a good negotiator, you ate some of that in a variation. You got some of it. So there's room there for negotiating skills to be important. I don't know if that makes sense, but I hope it does. I will come back later, because I did do a little test of robustness by adding all of those variables in at the end. And that again was due to suggestions from the task force.

Okay, so I said I wouldn't put up all the results, and I'm not going to. I'm just going to explain my logic in terms of the models I went through and then give you the results and we're done. So I started out the way anyone would start out and, indeed, prior studies started out, looking at just pooled OLS models where you put everything together and then you put in those dummy variables I was talking about, so the four target variables. But the problem with doing that – and I also did quantile regression, so I didn't just do estimation at the mean, I also did estimation at the lower parts, quantiles of the distribution, and the higher parts, the higher quantiles of the distribution. But

what I found is if I went to Step B and I did what I call a fully-interacted model. I took all of the independent variables in the model and I interacted them so I had, oh I don't know, too many variables. If I had eight originally, I now had eight times, etc. But I looked for statistically significant interactions, because those indicate that some of those other explanatory variables in the model were actually picking up the effects of the target variables. So maybe women are less likely to be predicted for full. If you put full in the model, it might make the statistic, it might make women or female less significant. So you had to be careful about that. I did find, when I did that, that this was important. So it's not okay to stop with the simple OLS model at Step A. You needed to check Part B, look at those intermediate factors and ask whether they're important. Given that they were important, I moved on to D, oops D – well forget that – C, which is I realized that given that discrimination could act through all of these other variables, we needed to do separate regressions for each of the groups.

And so that's what I ended up doing. I did them at the mean, I did them at the quantile. Again you probably don't want to know all about that stuff. But what I finally did is having separate regressions for each of them, I did these decomposition analyses. And I don't know if labor economics is the only one who does this, but we talk about it all the time. I learned them as Oaxaca decompositions, but I guess Alan Blinder, a Princeton economist did them at the same time, so now they're called Blinder Oaxaca decompositions. And he did them in what, 1970-ish, George, back in the 70s. And now people have done all sorts of variations of them over the years, of course. And so, of course, there's a subroutine for Stat that does quantile decompositions, so I did that as well.

So now we're at tables 3-14 and 3-15. This is the bottom line, this part here that I marked D instead of C, I apologize. It decomposes any salary gap between two groups. So now I've got the White males over here and then I've got each group separately, regressed. And you look at the differences in terms of the salary gap between them. And you look at what part of that difference, any salary gap that's due to their measured characteristics. So maybe more women are associate professors. Indeed, they are, compared to White males. Well we know that associate professors aren't paid as well as full professors, so that's one instance where part of the salary gap is explained by a characteristic of a women.

Now there's a whole other issue about, should there be more women who are full professors, but we'll get to that too. So any time there was a difference like that that could be explained by the variables in the model, that goes into the first part, a component attributed to productive characteristics. And that's not discrimination. What we want to see is there anything left over that is consistent with discrimination, and that's the real test. That's the real thing. So if you look at the tables in the report, you'll see that I'm really only interested in the bottom line, which is the one where we get unexplained differences, and it shows like women or Blacks or Hispanics getting less than White males. That's where it doesn't prove, of course, empirical work can't prove anything, but it's consistent with potential discrimination.

Okay, so just two pages of findings, number 1 and number 2, we're almost at the end. When I just look at the mean, when I do this kind of decomposition and I just look at the mean of the salary distribution, I find nothing. I find that the gap between any of the target groups and White males is not statistically significant. And that's kind of good news, because if you think about the salary distribution, most of the density of it is in the middle. It's a pretty normal distribution, and so a lot

of people are there in the middle. And there doesn't seem to be a statistically significant difference there. So that's good news.

The not-so-good news is when we go to the next page and we start looking at the quantiles other than the mean. So at the mean, we're okay, and maybe in prior studies we wouldn't have been okay at the mean. Maybe we've actually improved. I can't say. But what I did is I looked at – okay so think of a salary distribution and think about the tenth quantile way at the bottom, low-paid people, the 25<sup>th</sup>. Then come up to the 50<sup>th</sup> or the mean, and then the 75<sup>th</sup> and the 90<sup>th</sup>. So I looked at these tails of the salary distribution, and what I found there is that there are several statistically significant differences. And those are the ones that I've listed here.

In the lowest decile of the salary distribution, you can see un – I tried to be really careful about how I said it – unexplained factors consistent with discrimination are statistically significant between White males and Asian and Black or Hispanic – that's the Black and Hispanic together. At the 25<sup>th</sup>, we see differences between female and Black or Hispanic and White male. And then at the top of the salary distribution, way up at the 90<sup>th</sup>, we see unexplained factors mattering between White males and Asians, Asian faculty members. So there we do see again some differences that aren't explained by the productive characteristics. And all I say in my recommendations is that we should be looking at that.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**V. Wilcox:** There may be some instances where they're higher, but I'm not calling that discrimination. I have to go back and look. I can't answer that off-hand.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**V. Wilcox:** Oh yeah, those ones that I listed, they're all lower, yes, all a salary gap. Sorry I didn't understand your question. I've done a whole lot of different analyses, so I get a little bit confused sometimes trying to remember. The other thing I wanted to mention is just again thinking about what Kristen talked about and discretion. Discretion of administrators in terms of discrimination occurring kind of makes sense. If you're at the top of the distribution or in the mean of the distribution, you're fairly productive and you get a fairly competitive market wage, let's say. And maybe you can threaten to leave if you don't. But probably the people who are most vulnerable to any discretionary effects – you know, at least it's consistent with that argument – would be the people nearer the bottom, because they can't very well threaten to leave, etc. At least something to look at.

And then finally, I should mention with respect to these results is that a couple of people on the task force did ask questions. They asked why I didn't do the merit quintiles at the department level, because it turns out that's what CLAS does. And so I did. I went back and re-estimated it all at the department level using those kinds of quintiles. In other words, when I say top quintile, right now it's are you in the top of your college quintile. I re-estimated it and did it are you in the top of your department quintile. It made no difference. The point estimates were very similar and the results were similar.

More interesting, though, was not really suggested by one of the task force members, but they asked a question. They said, “What about starting salary. I can’t believe it shouldn’t be in there.” And I said, “Well, you know, I can go sort of back in if you want and see what happens.” And then when I was doing that, I thought, well why don’t I take all the omitted variables that I hadn’t included, because I was trying to be parsimonious, put them back in and see what happens. And the answer is nothing. So we get this same results here. Again the point estimates move a little bit because the r-squares are going to be a little bit higher, you packed the regression. But it didn’t change anything with respect to this. But I thought that was a great way to test how robust, how reliable these estimates were. And they seem to be reliable to whether we included those variables or not. So I like that we did that.

Okay, I’m done talking about regressions. Let’s talk about salary compression. So this is how – I looked at the literature and these equations at the bottom are how we usually do salary compression or inversion. You just look at the average monthly salaries of fulls or associates and compare them to assistants. And compression, of course, is when the assistants are actually learning less, but it starts to approach the level of the higher rank. And it’s inversion when the assistants’ salaries actually overtake the higher-ranked faculty members.

So what I found, and again there’s a long table by department in the study, but what I found in the next slide is we do have, not surprisingly, compression. The ratios range between 1.10 in the College of Business and 1.62 in the College of Visual and Performing Arts. So that means there the fulls, if we’re talking about fulls, are actually earning more than the assistants. But 1.10 is not a great deal, it means only 10 percent more. But notice at the low ratio in the College of Business means, as I just said, ten percent more.

And if you look at departments, which I’ll talk about on the next slide, but let’s not go there yet, it’s worse than that. For associate professors, compression ranges from 1 in the physical sciences group in CLAS to 1.2 in Visual and Performing Arts. And the 1 means that the new assistants we’re hiring are paid as well as associates, that’s all, there’s no difference between the two. So there’s definite, it’s not quite inversion yet, but it’s definitely serious compression.

Okay, the next page is when I then looked at departments. And that’s where looking at it at the college level hides some of the variations. So there’s some departments where it’s really serious. Salary compression is pretty wide-spread, not universal, not every department. But you can see I mentioned two departments in the College of Business, Accountancy and Management, and one in CEET where there’s really serious problems. But several other departments have compression ratio for associates that are close to 1. So there’s some pretty serious salary compression. And you can go look up your own department, it’s the last table in the report.

As far as findings go about – now let’s go to recommendations – I’ll talk about the findings for that, the recommendation for that in a moment. I have just three, keep it sweet. So obviously, I found some potential discrimination. I don’t mean – when we say discrimination in labor economics, we’re not talking about intentional overt discrimination. What we mean is literally, statistically, there’s a difference that’s not explained. So I should be careful. I’m not trying to say anything pejorative, although other people in the room might want to.

So there are differences. They seem to be insensitive to changes in the model. They're very robust is what we would call it. And, therefore, I think the university needs to address them. So I believe that lots of universities, they simply identify the people in that particular, at that particular point, and they remediate by giving them a salary increase. So that might be something that we want to do, rectify salary inequities, that's number one.

Let me do the third bullet point first, next, because it's easiest, and that is looking through the compression literature out there. I was impressed that some universities have policies that undertake systematic effort to fix compression and inversion. And I don't know, maybe I'm uninformed, but I don't know of such a policy here. And I have a feeling it's more of a "we have compression, take care of us in this department, in this college" sort of piecemeal. So I was impressed by some universities' policies and suggest that we have that sort of policy.

I might also point out that this compression issue is probably related to the salary inequity issue. Because remember the salary inequities are people at the lower end of the salary distribution. And who's being affected by compression are people at the lower end of the salary distribution, right? It's the assistant professors earning the low salaries that are getting higher and higher, and that's where the compression's occurring. So the two are not independent, at least potentially not.

And then finally, the second point took some of the things that we had both talked about and the discussion from the task force to kind of put this all together, and that is merit rankings are really important. It looks like women are less likely to be full professors. It looks like the same thing is true for some of the other target groups. And so we think that, at least the task force suggested that, the Faculty Senate may want to undertake to look at this merit system, how it works, and how well it's applied to promotions. And I'm sure other people who are on the task force might want to speak to that here. But merit should be consistently assessed and consistently applied. And it's clear to me looking just at the numbers that I had, that it's not consistently assessed. I see lots of variation, and I heard lots of stories from department chairs about how their department did it. And so I realize that there's a lot of variation, and so that consistency could really improve everyone's lot.

Thank you. [applause]

**L. Saborío:** Thank you. [applause] Okay so now let's start with the questions. And as I see your hands, I will call out. So we've got John Novak and then Kendall Thu.

**J. Novak:** This is really fascinating. Thank you for all your work. I guess what I thought your charge was something that it wasn't, because, although you mention that librarians are the worst paid in business or the best paid, that was all I heard about that. I was expecting to hear what I get as a [inaudible] against people in nursing or whatever. Maybe you know where I can find that information. Secondly, I thought I'd find what a

**V. Wilcox:** Have you read the report? There are long tables about departments [inaudible]

**J. Novak:** Oh, so that's in the report that you didn't present today.

**V. Wilcox:** Today I just skimmed because it's over 80 pages.



**J. Novak:** Okay. All right, no this is the first I've gotten the report. I look forward to reading that. My other comment is different. I was very amazed at the whole idea of negotiation, because when I came here in '96, Dean Harold Kafer said, "Your salary's not negotiable and, while you're working here, if you get a better offer, take it, because my job is to get people as they're going up. That's what our school's about." Which really freaked me out, because I thought that meant that, if you want to make a career at staying at NIU, you're either incapable or you've risen to your level of competence. Or you're lazy and don't want to try for another one. That's what I was taught being here. Right away, being in my 30's and gay, being from Austin, Texas, and all of a sudden in DeKalb, Illinois, I hated the place. But \$30,000, I couldn't live in Cook County or DuPage County, so I did look for other jobs. I got first runner-up in places, but I ended up, I said, "I can't keep working for finding another job and working for tenure at the same time." So I worked for tenure. I'm here, and I did get full professorship last year. But his approach when I first came, I thought was. I think the approaches are different now. Maybe he lied to me. Maybe that was just something you tell somebody so they don't try to get more money. But I just wanted to include that.

**K. Myers:** I think that's part of that culture thing. And there were some people who did say – like College of Business is very upfront by saying, "We have data on what the market looks like. We're going to offer all of our incoming people the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile only. We will not negotiate with them. They're going to get paid more than anybody else at NIU anyway. And we're okay paying our new people more than our senior people, because there's other ways senior people can make money through named professorships and things like that." But they're totally upfront about it, and it's part of their identity as being super-competitive. So it very well could have been the culture of your program, which will change with people and things like that.

**J. Novak:** Thank you.

**L. Saborío:** Okay, Kendall, I saw your hand next.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Virginia, very much. This sounds like a labor of love for you, right? Just a comment/question and then a comment about what Kristen represented. All of your data are in the post-Ray Alden era, right? So it was Provost Alden who changed the increment changes for moving from assistant to associate to professor. So when I became an associate professor, the increment base salary increase was \$2,000. And then Ray raised those both for associate professors and full professors. So if you were to go back and include data from the pre-Ray Alden era, I would suspect that it would show that salary compression is intensified by the changes that Ray Alden implemented. Would you not agree that that would be.

**V. Wilcox:** That would be really interesting to look at.

**K. Thu:** I think it would be. The other thing I wanted to comment on is again, thank you, Kristen, for all your work as well. You know I've said to Dean McCord that chairs are sort of like salespeople in a car dealership, right?

**K. Myers:** Yes.

**K. Thu:** You're trying to negotiate a price with the candidate or the car buyer. And then you run to the back room to talk to the manager.

**K. Myers:** That's right.

**K. Thu:** So most of the time chairs, at least in my experience, what I've been involved in hiring, you're championing the candidate.

**K. Myers:** That's right.

**K. Thu:** You're trying to get them to make their best case possible and get the highest salary possible, and you're trying to coach them.

**K. Myers:** Right.

**K. Thu:** You're coaching them in the process of the negotiation, and I think that's a very important part of the culture of negotiations that you were talking about, Kristen.

**K. Myers:** Yeah, and I think that car dealer metaphor is used by a lot of people. But it's also kind of – I mean car deal has a lot of negative connotations – so even though I'm critical of the ways that discretion can be used, I really don't want to imply that the chairs doing these negotiations are trying to win something over on the faculty. Because you're absolutely right, Kendall, they want, they've invested months in trying to recruit this person, they want to keep them. So the chairs are on the side of the faculty. And actually the deans are too.

Another thing that happened with this context is that we don't have a budget, so we kind of laughed a lot about doing a salary study when there are no raises and no budget, but that's important too.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** To add to Kendall, different colleges had different increments even before Alden, because we had pretty much the increment you guys have now was when I got my first promotion. But say if you were in sociology, you may have gotten a \$2,000 increment and I would have gotten a \$9,000 increment. But I'm just saying that there's a differential back before that, because I would have gotten my first promotion probably before Alden was here.

The other one was a question I had. I'm not sure, I'm going to have to dig deeper in the piles of data, but how many fractional full professors are female in the group, I mean, versus, I'm curious about that, because I think that is part of the problem, is that jump to full. And then once you get the full, dead-ending you into the bottom of the distribution, at least what I've seen.

**V. Wilcox:** Actually, when I first wrote my recommendations, I said that I want people to look at women's promotion to full, because it looked like there was such a large disparity there. But I tried to work it into the recommendation that we look at the merit system and see whether it's working correctly, because maybe that's where the problem is, because of the things that Kristen was talking about. Are women not pushing, etc.? Or are various target members not pushing? So I definitely

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Well, I just went through our process to full, and one of the things I observed about just the whole process to full is that it's arbitrary and variable. And it depends on your colleges, your department. And it can even depend on the phase of the moon when you go up. I mean, so there is no written procedure if you take a look at the bylaws of the university, they are awful when it comes to promotion and deciding what is a promotable case. And then a lot of the tendency of faculty, your point of associate professors, a lot of associate professors do most of the work of the department. And there may be a tendency that's a gender differential where some of the women faculty feel they have to do more committee work. And then that scoops up all their research time doing committee work. So a lot of those things could play into this. So just that's my observations, since I just went through all this process and realize that the variability of what is considered promotable, I mean even to the point where we had one dean decide to change the time period between papers to try to make it harder to get full promotion.

**K. Myers:** So you need documents. Work on getting documents in your units.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** No, I mean I'm just saying, I'm pointing out I fought that one, but the problem I'm telling you is it may feed into this whole

**L. Saborío:** Well we need to look at process. We need to look at criteria. And then also how that merit score translate into salary increase. Okay, Keith, go ahead.

**K. Millis:** I had three of my constituents on your committee, and they were vocal on some things and so I said I would bring them up. And I do have a couple questions. One is that they felt the opportunities for feedback were limited and that the product was mostly from the leaders. And one thing that they commented on was that they were not able to get the data file. And so that's one question I have is whether the data file would be available. So that's one thing.

**V. Wilcox:** I don't know. So I was given it by permission, I guess, from the provost through the Faculty Senate. I don't consider it to be my data. So I think it's a good question, but I guess it would need to be directed back to the Provost's Office?

**K. Millis:** So I could have

**V. Wilcox:** It's not public data.

**K. Millis:** them write the provost.

**V. Wilcox:** I believe that's correct, because that's where I was given the permission. The provost told HR to give it to me, etc. I wanted to even use it for some other research, and I had to ask the provost and get permission and all that.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**K. Millis:** I don't know.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible] and ask for it? Can the Faculty Senate ask that it be made public [inaudible] analysis.

**K. Millis:** I think that's, I think that's a, yeah, I would like to make that motion to ask for the data.

**K. Thu:** I'll second that motion.

**L. Saborío:** We need a second, okay.

**V. Wilcox:** Good luck with it, by the way.

**L. Saborío:** We're just asking, though, we're just asking.

**V. Wilcox:** [inaudible] how many hours [inaudible].

**L. Saborío:** We have a motion and a second, so any discussion? All right, all in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**L. Saborío:** Any opposed? Abstentions? Okay, motion passes.

**K. Myers:** So, Keith, let me follow up on the task force involvement. So the task force structure probably was ambitious to do this. And that was Greg's [Long] idea, and I think it was great. But I knew after my first interview that only I could do the interviews, because people were being named. And I honestly would have loved to share that labor doing 25 interviews by myself was not fun. Actually, it was awesome, I liked it, but it was about confidentiality for me. I could do focus groups with other people, so, yeah, it was ambitious and didn't work out.

**K. Millis:** Can I ask you a quick question about the regression analyses? I've learned that you have to have for each predictor variable so many observations. I learned, for example, years ago

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**K. Millis:** Yes, for example, for each predictor, you might have ten observations, sometimes maybe five. And so on the decompositional analysis, did you keep all those predictors in there and would that bias the results and cause uncertainty in interpretation?

**V. Wilcox:** Right. Well, of course, that's why I was worried about parsimonious, right? Because I was worried that I would have low power when I got to the end, and I knew I was going to do a deep

**K. Millis:** Yes, so it's mostly on the quintile analysis I'm asking about.

**V. Wilcox:** Yeah, exactly. So actually I was really pleased, I mean, even for – and I think I say this in the report if you look at that part of it.

**K. Millis:** I did read the book – report.

**V. Wilcox:** You read the book? [laughter]

**K. Millis:** I did read it, and I thought I could see all the work that you guys put into it.

**V. Wilcox:** Yeah, but it's like doing a puzzle; it's fun. But so actually I was surprised. I thought I would find nothing for Black and Hispanic because there are so few faculty members in that group. But the model actually, the parsimonious model actually predicted pretty well. So if you look at the regression results. And when you go to the decomp, you're not going to see that unless you go look at the appendix tables and stuff, the output, because I just showed you the results of the decomp. But yes, those are statistically significant and even for the Black and Hispanic group. And yes, it includes the parsimonious model.

And then I think was David Valentiner who suggested – no it wasn't, it was somebody in, James Burton, yeah, it was somebody else, who suggested that we go back. And he wanted me to add starting salary and I thought, well heck, let me throw everything in. So I added all four variables and still got the same results. So I expected it to be a problem, and it may have been a problem. I mean maybe I should have found results for Black and Hispanic in other quintiles, other quantiles, right? And I didn't, but I found some, despite the low numbers and the possibly low power of the test. It's a good question. You're right in asking it.

**D. Valentiner:** I've been something of a thorn in the side of Virginia through this process, and I hope that doesn't undercut my appreciation for the huge amount of work that you've done. This is leaps-and-bounds better than anything that we've had. That being said, I don't want to also neglect the fact that I do have some concerns, and I put those into three categories. I think one came up, it had to do with the process. The committee, I don't feel, really participated in a meaningful way. And I realize that kind of has to do with the structure and the pressures that are outside the committee. I certainly don't fault you for that. But I think that we should be candid about the fact that the salary study is a product of your work. It's not a product of the committee's work, and the committee, I mean, I've probably read it closer than most people on the committee. And I've had access to the original report for about a month now. And I don't feel a month, less than a month was adequate to be able to review a very dense, technical 83-page report. When I do journal reviews, we certainly expect more than that.

And I would encourage you too, as the process that the Faculty Senate is now going through, you have a report that's 83 pages, and I hope that your review of the salary study isn't limited to listening to a presentation and some discussion. I think that, at some point, I don't know whether it's the economic committee, Economic Status of the Profession subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, might take this up and try to drill down into, not only the report, but hopefully the data, and think deeply. I think that the roster of the people on the committee are a good group to consult, because there's a tremendous amount of expertise that was put there. Unfortunately, it just wasn't leveraged to produce this particular report. So that's my first set of concerns.

Perhaps more important even than the process is my concern about what happens to the report. My understanding is that the prior reports included z-scores for each faculty member that communicated

or embodied from the regression models how much, how underpaid was each person. And that there was selection of particular individuals to receive adjustments. And that those adjustments were calculated so that there would no longer be statistical significance. I think that that's what happened. I don't know. There's no transparency. We don't know whatever happened. Apparently, Kristen said that in 2005, there was a qualitative study done, and many of the same themes came up. My fear is that nothing was done with that information. Those themes have repeated and that this study will go into a drawer and that in another 13 years, we'll do another qualitative study [inaudible]

**K. Myers:** Or four years.

**D. Valentiner:** Yeah.

**K. Myers:** We like to do the studies.

**D. Valentiner:** Yeah. So I think

**K. Myers:** There's a website now, so it is public. So it's different than in the past and, in fact, all the past ones are up there as well. So I encourage you to look at them so you know what David's talking about.

**D. Valentiner:** So I think that the Faculty Senate has a very important role to play, and I think that we have the intelligence sophisticated, we have the competence and the will to carry it through if the Faculty Senate steps forward and has some good leadership to really address these very complicated issues.

The third group that, as I said, I have some kind of content issues, some of which I've shared prior to this. I'm not going to go into those now, but there are some concerns I have about the way some of the things were done. I'll just mention that I think that merit predicts is very differently associated with the disparities in different departments and in different colleges. I think that promotion means very different things in different colleges and departments. And I think that the analytic method did not allow for that. So that's just one of many concerns I have that could make this study better. I don't think it will change the point estimates. I think Virginia's right on that. My fear is that there's going to be some residuals are going to be used. I don't know how they're going to be used. And I think that the meaning of the size of those residuals would be affected for individual faculty members based upon some of these content considerations.

**V. Wilcox:** I don't know either. I have no information about how it was done in prior studies, and no one has approached me to give them the predicted values, etc. But I did, in reading the literature, I think that's a really typical process that universities use. They do the prediction, and then they ask what faculty members lie one standard deviation away from the prediction, and they fix their salaries a little, and that's it. And that would take care of any statistically significant differences. Whether that's appropriate.

**D. Valentiner:** [inaudible] systemic issues that created those discrepancies untouched in place.

**V. Wilcox:** I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that is a typical process.

**L. Saborío:** We've got a hand way in the back.

**J. Rheineck:** First question I have is: Do we have quorum to take a vote that we just took?

**L. Saborío:** Are we taking a vote on something?

**J. Rheineck:** Didn't we just take a vote? We do have quorum? I felt the motion was rushed, and the vote was rushed. I think we did it in 30 seconds. I feel real uncomfortable with that.

**F. Bryan:** It's not a policy question [inaudible]

**L. Saborío:** It was a recommendation.

**J. Rheineck:** It was a recommendation? Oh, okay. I misunderstood then.

**L. Saborío:** We're going to ask for the data [inaudible] from the Provost [inaudible]. It was a recommendation from the body to ask for the data that was used in the study from the Provost's Office.

**J. Rheineck:** Who would then look at that data, all of us? I'm just trying to understand the process, because I felt it was really rushed. It felt a little attacking over here. I'm not saying that it was, but I mean we were just given this information, I know it was sent to us ahead of time as well, at least the Power Points were. I just felt like this was a really fast process.

**L. Saborío:** So I'm going to have to ask the Provost and have a conversation with him to see, first, if he's willing to share the data; and if so, can we also include that on the Website.

**J. Rheineck:** Perfect. I just wanted clarification on that, because it just happened so quickly, that's all.

**L. Saborío:** Well also I just want you to be aware that this is the first time we're seeing this. This is the presentation. The discussion regarding this Faculty Salary Study will continue, and I'm sure it's going to continue into the fall semester as well. We only have one more meeting this semester.

**J. Rheineck:** Okay.

**L. Saborío:** Anybody else? Okay, Virginia and then Kendall.

**V. Naples:** First of all, I would like to express solidarity with another Virginia for doing this, someone else who also likes to do numbers. I have a couple of quick questions or comments. With regard to the website, I really like the idea that the data and the analyses are available. And you mentioned that the previous studies are available. For several of the studies and, if I recall correctly, the first one was done in 2004/2005, to my knowledge only the executive summary was available. And I was one of the people that worked with Steve Cunningham and kind of prodded him into

trying to do it in the first place. And I never got much more information than that. Are those data still extant, and would they be able to be put onto the website?

**K. Myers:** We were only given what you have.

**V. Naples:** Okay, I just wanted to know about that. The other thing that I wanted to add to what Virginia said was that I did a study from 2010 to 2015. I did the entire College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. And I discovered something that I don't recall exactly if you have talked about. But looking at the length of time in rank as associate professors, men were approximately six to six-and-a-half to seven years, and women were nine to ten years. And that is across, it's over 400 faculty members. And that was consistent for those 2010 to 2015 timeframe. So that is a very big concern. There were some years in that timeframe that there were no more than 12 full professor females in the entire College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. And I was unable to obtain data on ethnicity or any of the other characteristics, because 100 percent of my data came from Working Papers and the IBHE website. I did ask for those data and was told I would not be able to get them.

The other comment that I just wanted to say is I really applaud the idea that the Faculty Senate would initiate a study of merit, because merit methods vary from A to Q to Z to L to XC(m), and my major concern is that, if the bias begins in the meritorious process, whatever is going to be reality is hidden, because the bias has already been applied before the numbers are considered. So you could end up diminishing the effect of whatever form of discrimination it is, because it's already baked into the cake before the cake is cut and eaten. Thank you.

**L. Saborío:** A couple more questions? Are you guys hanging in there, okay. Kendall.

**K. Thu:** Just very briefly, I want to pick up on what Michael and Virginia are talking about in terms of not having a university-wide process for moving from associate professor to a full professor. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has adopted a new tenure and promotion policy in 2015 that provides units with guidance on how to – with a process for going from associate to full. But I've been here long enough where I know that in the past, this has been a vestige of the old boys network. And it is the old white boys network that is historically behind a lot of this stuff.

**K. Myers:** And I would just say as a member of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the way we evaluate the dean is not the same year after year. Like there is no stability at any, unless you decide there will be stability. Like in the Department of Sociology, we decided that there will be stability, and now there's a rubric, and things like that. But you have to make that change.

**K. Thu:** And I think this is another point where this senate, this body, can push the university to develop a university-wide policy for promotion from associate to full professor that is consistent.

**L. Saborío:** Or it's something that we can develop as a body.

**K. Thu:** Or we can develop it.

**L. Saborío:** And then propose it for the bylaws, right? We had one more, Richard?



**R. Siegesmund:** I would like to suggest once again, if it's a motion, I don't know if we have enough people here, if we don't have enough people, but that we actually do this, what Virginia and Kendall have been saying. And that that go into our record that the senate is going to actually create such a committee, and we're going to do this work.

**L. Saborío:** We don't have a quorum.

**R. Siegesmund:** Well, I don't know if we have a quorum.

**L. Saborío:** We don't.

**R. Siegesmund:** We don't, so in that sense

**L. Saborío:** We're going to continue to list this on our agenda under Unfinished Business, so we could

**R. Siegesmund:** So I would like for us to take that up next time.

**L. Saborío:** Next time, yeah.

**R. Siegesmund:** that we actually authorize the creation of such an action committee.

**L. Saborío:** Absolutely. So we'll continue to list it under Unfinished Business on the agenda, and that way we can take it up in April. The discussion is going to continue.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**L. Saborío:** I don't think we do, no – do we have a quorum? We shouldn't even be meeting at this point, is that what you're saying? We're not an Open Meetings Act, it's Faculty Senate. Any other questions? No? Thank you everyone for your participation. Thank you to Kristen and Virginia again. [applause]

## **XI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

## **XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee

- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- Q. NIU Libraries' Textbook Task Force [request for Fall 2018 purchase recommendations](#)

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**L. Saborío:** Motion from George [Slotsve], right, and a second, to adjourn.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Adjourn.

**L. Saborío:** Adjourn. Thank you, Michael. Thank you everyone, have a good afternoon.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.