



12-2-1976

December 2, 1976

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "December 2, 1976" (1976). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 116.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/116>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING

December 2, 1976

1.

The December meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, December 2, 1976, in room 7, Gamble Hall. Mr. Markovich presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Apanian, Ronald	Kinghorn, Norton	Penn, John
Bolonchuk, William	Kolstoe, Ralph	Perrone, Vito
Brown, Russell	Kulas, Ludwik	Phillips, Monte
Brumleve, Stanley	Larson, Omer	Pynn, Ronald
Bzoch, Ronald	Lewis, Robert	Ramsett, David
Caldwell, Mary	Loendorf, Lawrence	Rogers, John
Christy, Neil	Lovell, Faith	Russell, Lavonne
Crail, Erick	Lykken, Glenn	Selbyg, Arne
Curry, Mabel	Markovich, Stephen	Stenberg, Virgil
Dobesh, Larry	McElroy, Jacquelyn	Strobel, Jon
Facey, Vera	Medalen, Rodney	Uherka, David
Fletcher, Alan G.	Naismith, Donald	Ulven, Milford
Grinde, Jacquelyn	Nelson, Edward	Vukelic, Jim
Guy, Daniel	Norman, Ernest	Wrenn, William
Heyse, Margaret	Owens, Thomas	
Kannowski, Paul	Palenberg, John	

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Clifford, Thomas	Krenz, Mike	Raymond, Art
Bryan, William	Langemo, E. Mark	Robertson, Donald
Clark, Alice	McDonald, Bonnie	Rowe, Clair
Dahl, I.J.K.	Nelson, Conny	Skogley, Gerald
Dolan, Mike	Nicoli, Dave	Sundre, Orlo
Eickhoff, Luvern	O'Kelly, Bernard	Swanson, Loren
Flynn, Gerald	O'Kelly, Marcia	Thomford, Neil
Johnson, Rose	Pantig, Marcelo	Tomasek, Henry
Kemper, Gene	Peterson, Russell	Tweton, D. Jerome
Kilgore, Kevin	Polovitz, Michael	Warner, Edward
Koenig, Walter	Poykko, Brian	
Kraft, Larry	Ray, Paul	

3.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the meeting of November 4, 1976, be approved as distributed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

4.

Mr. Bzoch, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, presented the list of candidates for election to the Administrative Procedures Committee, the Codification Committee and the Committee on Committees. The Chair announced that a ballot would be cast now and that the secretary would tally the results and report them in the minutes and in the next issue of the University Letter.

Those nominated for election to the Administrative Procedures Committee were: Mabel Curry, Vera Facey, Glenn Lykken, Thomas Owens, Ronald Pynn and William Wrenn. The Chair called for additional nominations from the floor. Since there were none, a ballot was taken and Ms. Curry, Mr. Lykken, Mr. Pynn, and Mr. Wrenn were declared elected as members of the Administrative Procedures Committee.

The nominees for election to the Codification Committee were Daniel Guy and Ralph Kolstoe. The Chair called for additional nominations from the floor. There were no additional nominations and a ballot was taken and Mr. Kolstoe was elected.

The nominees for election to the Committee on Committees were Ludwik Kulas, Omer Larson, Edward Nelson, Marcia O'Kelly, Monte Phillips and Lavonne Russell. The Chair called for additional nominations from the floor. Since there were no further nominations, a ballot was taken and Mr. Kulas, Mr. Larson, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Phillips were elected to serve as members of the Committee on Committees.

5.

Mr. Ulven presented the tentative list of Candidates for Degrees in December, 1976, and moved that the list be approved for recommendation to the State Board of Higher Education for the awarding of the degrees indicated, upon satisfactory completion of the work of the present semester. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See attachment #1.)

6.

Mr. John Williams, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee to Study Salary Schedules of UND Faculty, presented the Committee's report. Mr. Stenberg moved that the Senate receive the report. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried. (See attachment #2.)

7.

Ms. McElroy reported in regard to the directive from the Senate to its Executive Committee to appoint a committee to conduct administrator evaluations beginning with the fall semester, 1976. She stated that because of the change in the

composition of the Executive Committee, the appointment has been delayed; however, representatives from the Executive Committee are meeting with the Committee on Committees to select a committee which would be charged with sharpening the policy of the final report on administrator evaluation and implementing the evaluation during the spring of 1977.

8.

It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion was voted upon and carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Milford Ulven
Secretary

TENTATIVE

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

University of North Dakota
Office of Admissions and Records

LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

December 17, 1976

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Dean Bernard O'Kelly

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Bradley Jay Anderson
Susan Beth Anderson
Carla B. Ault
Carol Lynn Bach
Pamela Lillian Bach
Richard Adrian Bailey
David Brian Barker
Rodney Ernest Bischoff
Diane Lynn Botsford
Randall Craig Carlson
Lynn Michelle Casey
Carmen Francia Courtney

Rodney Allen Danielson
Deborah Natelia Dewalt
Jane Loreen Dewing
Robert Edward Differ
RoseAnn Fahsholz

Donald Emerson Foley
Virginia Lynn Fosberg
John Michael Freborg

Douglas A. Goulding
Jacqueline R. Schuette Gullingsrud
Loubelle Frances Halas

Thomas Jon Haugen
Joseph Allen Hausauer
Patrick James Healey
Marlys Lynn Hetland
Karen Kay Hintz
Terance Blaine Ilse
Dennis Edward Johnson

Susan Rutherford Knox
Dale Roy Kotowski

Cheryl Marie Lacher
William John Lechner
Richard Bruce Leibold

Dale Mead McCabe

Michael Joseph Miller
Jacky Lynn Miller
Wayne Jeffery Nelson
Lucy Anne Nordgaard
Terrance Lynn Paulson
Kenneth John Polovitz
Daniel Jon Quandt
Timothy Lee Rasmussen
Christine Ann Reiter
Joseph William Renville
Jameson John Rodenbiker
Bradley Craig Roecker
Jenise Katherine Rowekamp
Phillip James Schroeder
Patricia Marie Siebert
Robin Leigh Sjaastad

Craig Elliott Stenslie
Dave R. Stinson
Ronald Bruce Stolzenburg
Kay Frances Swenson
Timothy James Swenson
Constance Lee Triplett
Scott E. Wahlstrand

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 2 -

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Laurence Dean Johnson

Theodore Charles Klevay

Sandra Jean Walby

David C. Weiss

Phillip Andrew Willman

Jenny Ann Wolfert

Delore Delmar Zimmerman

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

Mark D. Ackerman

Ralph Howard Armentrout

Jon Lynn Barron

Brent J. Beattie

John Vernon Botsford

William Eugene Cornatzer, Jr.

Gerald John Dorsher

Eugene Earl Evans

Wayne Allen Grandalen

Michael Joseph Hammerschmidt

Charles E. Hurley

Gary Alan Jorde

Jerome Frederick Kvidt

Diana Kwok-Dai Leung

Dean Edward Manning

Patricia Ann McMahon

Daniel James Mundfrom

Robert Dale Roppel

Mitchell Dean Saure

Carla Ann Schatz

Grant Leslie Schelkoph

Kari Lynn Scheresky

Susan Elizabeth Sieh

Paul Abraham Skaff

Bruce Douglas Teigen

Ryan Jeffrey Thompson

Ryan Elliott Westling

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN FISHERY AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Michael Paige Luger

Marc Jeffery Schulz

CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

Dean Vito Perrone

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

Jeffrey Paul Anderson

Joan Marie Arntz

Sandra L. Baumgartner

David Bernard Benson

Mary Lucia Bertelsen

Debra Anne Bohlman

Aime Casavant

Deborah Lynn Cole

Peggy Ann Dahl

Timothy Patrick Delmore

Carol Ann Ekberg

Janel Fleuret Fine

JoDee Ann Meldahl

Larry Allen Metzger

Victoria Sutton Mills

Patricia Ann Moos

Debra Jean Neitzke

Debra Ann Nelson

Jean Louise Nielsen

Bette Jean Nilson

Dennis Allen Nordgaard

Mark David Nordtvedt

Susan Jayne Reed

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 3 -

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION (CONT)

Sara Louise Hagen
 Clark Eugene Hill
 John Michael Huerth
 Mary Jane Hutchison
 Patricia J. Idler
 Geraldine K. Jasmer
 Vicki Lynn Johnson
 Jan Virginia Kirby
 Lyle Duane Langton
 Jennifer Gwynn Knudson
 David Scott Lee

Kathleen Charlotte Lynch
 Janice R. Marzolf
 Karen Patricia McConachie
 Susan Marie McMenamy

Barbara Ellen Roehrich
 Janell Elaine Schnackenberg
 Donna Jane Schubert
 Julie Caye Schuler
 Donald Paul Schultz
 Jill C. Skarvold
 Julie Hoberg Smith
 Deborah Ann Steen
 Cheri Lynn Stoltenow
 Barbara Lynn Stovern
 Franklin Warren Strom
 Cheryl Ann Thompson
 Anne Morrow Towne
 James Lee Tracey
 Beverly Annette Vettel
 Jerry Marvin Zimprich

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND MINES

Dean Alan G. Fletcher

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

Dean Kenneth Little

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Gregory Lane Davis
 Rebecca Anne Fischer
 Alan Lee Hedberg

Warren John Hintz
 Terry John Langowski

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Bernard James Arntz

Anthony R. Misslin

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN GEOLOGICAL ENGINEERING

Dana Lawrence Barbie
 Jeffrey Walter Garske

Gerald Lynn Olson

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING

Sherri Vaughn Etestad

Wayne Allen Koop

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Barry Ronald Blair
 Douglas Richard Hajicek

Michael Dugdale Owens

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 4 -

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS
Dean John H. Rogers

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF FINE ARTS

Morris Blair McKnight
AnnMarie Bollinger Smith

Joel E. Vig

COLLEGE FOR HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
Dean Henry J. Tomasek

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION

Patti Gale Carlson
Sherry Ann Cooper

Janice Lynn Jebsen

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS

Amy Louise Bobbe
Leann Fay Bjerke Bowman
Barbara Ann Danner
Wendy Gayle Hagen
Bonita Susan Hoverson
Deborah Ann Matero

Karen Marie Miller
Anne Michael Nail

Pamela Jean Pifer
Carol Lynne Severson

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

Donald James Miller
Daniel Dean Ova

Sheldon L. Swenson

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE AND AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION

Wayne Franklin Keil

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

Constance Allmaras
James Gerard Diemert
Pamela Michele Hansen
Jeanne Linda Hewett
Roberta Louise Johnson

Nora Jane Knudson
Patricia Ann Moen
Audrey Marie Omdahl
Connie Lorraine Werner
Melody Wai-Chu Wong

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN SOCIAL WORK

Barbara Jane Dahlgren
Pamela Renee Houdek
Jennifer Lee Jenzer
Faith Louise Lovell

Mary E. McConnell
Karen S. Sondag
Rochelle Perius Warner

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 5 -

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Dean Clair D. Rowe

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

David Brian Aas
Steven Bernard Allmaras
Timothy R. Atkinson

Bruce Rodney Bale
Stephen F. Blumer
Glenn C. Boldenow
James A. Braaten
Dan Michael Carey
Thomas Robert Chapman
Michael Richard Collins
Karen S. Coyle
Clark D. Crawford
Gary Michael Cummings
Dennis Leonard Daigle
Conrad Arthur Deeter
Paul L. Dempsey
Lori Linne Dietrich
Steven Craig Dobler
Dennis James Domagala
Rodney Joseph Ebertowski

Martin E. Fisher
Myles A. Flateland
Dean Fossum
Miles W. Fredenburg
Yvan Jacques Giralte
Douglas Brian Goodman
Marvadean LaVonne Grueneich
Gale Evan Haisley

Lee H. Haugen
Timothy Lee Haugen
Duane M. Hillerson
Todd Charles Hogan
Thomas Joseph Hoverson
James David Jestrab
Theodore James Johnson
David Arthur Kath
Thomas Philip Kays
Bradley Wayne Kennedy
Randall Dean Kiefel
Donald James Killick
Jana L. Kirkeby

John Clifford Mahoney
Michael Paul Mattson
John D. McCoy
Marsha Rae McGillivray
Rodney Allan Mittleider
Douglas Lee Moen
Paul Curtis Mondeel
James A. Muller
Debra Lynn Myhre
Veronica Elizabeth Ness
Wayne H. Newberger
Scott Wayne Nielsen
Linda Marie Olson
Peter Oliver Opheim
Nicholas Alfonso Pagerly
Lonnie Dale Parsons
David Claire Paulson
Gerald Ray Peeler
David Arvin Pierson
Stephen Frederick Pine

Kim Joel Reiswig
Ronald C. Reiswig
Thomas James Robinson
Leslie Paul Roos
Dan Albert Ruebke
Ronald James Sailer
Susanne K. Saylor
Mark Alan Schroeder
Garth Hans Sjue
James Willis Smith
John Robert Solberg
Rodney Lee Spies
Michael Dale Steffan
Deane Rodney Stinar
Sidney Kurt Stine

W. Allen Streightiff II
Jean Marie Thielges
Michael James Thomas
William Kratz Thomas
Michael Edward Thon
Ralph Lee Tinjum

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 6 -

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (CONT)

Michael E. Klier
 Pamela Kay Knutson
 James Anthony Koslosky
 Stephen William Leibold
 David John Lizakowski
 Lynn Renae Lizakowski
 Thomas Robert Lundberg

Steve Allen Tongen
 Leslie Oris Urvand
 Patrick Stanley Webber

Stephen L. Wong
 Christopher James Zilson
 Ramona Ann Zimmerman

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Douglas Mark Hjelmhaug
 Richard Steven Kuppich

Conrad R. Steinhaus

COLLEGE OF NURSING
 Dean Margaret Heyse

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

Judy Ann Anderson
 Debra Ann Blaske
 Susan Kay Coles
 Lois Jeanette Davidson
 Judith Newman Flynn
 Jill Marion Hauser
 Jeanette Marie Klier
 Deborah Lynn Kosmatka
 Margaret Susan Lee
 Susan G. Marquart
 Pamela Jean Martin
 Lee A. Meier

JoAnn Mork Meisner
 Mary Colleen Mulligan
 Charlotte Ellen Nelson
 Barbara Ann Newman
 Rebecca Alice Oberlander
 Sheila Marie Riffe
 Patricia Susan Schauer
 A. Robert Schuette
 Kathy Jean Seeley
 Elaine Irene Thurn
 Shelley Kay Wilson

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
 Acting Dean Neil R. Thomford

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Donna Rae Severson

GRADUATE SCHOOL
 Dean Alice T. Clark

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

Ali Mohammed Bahaj
 Barbara J. Benner
 Walter Norman Blevins
 Kornelis Johannes Boot

John Gerard O'Rourke
 Roderic Lawrence Perkins
 Thomas Roger Phinnemore
 Stephen Podrygula

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 7 -

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (CONT)

Carl Bryant
 Peggy Connolly
 David Roger Connor
 Gary Gordon Crump
 Becky Ann Crusoe
 Sharon Louise Davis
 Robin Foster
 Katherine Anna Freeman
 Barbara Ann Gletne
 Charles Eugene Keller
 Sally Ellen Keller
 Theodore Robert Kissel
 Vera Grace Miller
 Marlee Mooney
 Albert George Nelson
 John Newman Olsgaard

Darrell Lee Roll
 Ramon Joseph Rude
 Stephen John Schilling
 James Thomas Simmons
 Craig Michael Sinks
 Laurel Rae Sterioti
 Gail Louise Thomas
 Sarita Baggett Turner
 Stuart John Waltonen
 Kirby Franz Wiese
 Ray Angelo Yagher, Jr.
 Roberta Julette Zahradka

DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

Gary Edward Allard
 Mary Frances Anthony
 Richard H. Bares
 Donald Francis Berger
 Jeffrey Jonathan Brown
 Threese Anne Clark
 John Andrew Dignan
 Diane Kay Engstrom
 Clark Steven Fulton
 Gregory Keith Gibbens
 Glenn Milton Gill
 David L. Griebel
 Henry Almy Howe III
 Craig Aldon Jensen
 John Carl Jurgens
 Pareshkumar J. Kothari

Soo-siang Lim-Spiker
 Raymond Stanley Majkrzak
 Michael Robert Maleske
 Fair Alexandra Meeks
 Roger L. Nelson
 Russell Dale Ober
 Kenneth Cornell Olson
 Mark Christen Peterson
 Richard Henry Pilatzke
 Lillian Ann Repesh
 Floyd Leonard Rollefstad
 Joan Shulind
 Leland Grant Sorenson
 Peggy Jane Stupca
 Daniel Robert Sutherland
 David Craig Sutton
 Robert James Thibedeau
 David Paul Volk

DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Francis Joseph Baker
 James Michael Bellan II
 Stephen Ray Blevins
 Conley Anthony Byrnes
 Richard Cali
 Kenneth Arnold Collins

Richard David Mael
 Raleigh Hunter Macklin, Jr.
 Michaei Britt Miller
 Andrew Jacob Moss
 James Alfred Preston
 David Pearce Radcliffe

TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED - 8 -

DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (CONT)

Curtis Alfred Davis
 Louis Calvin Diehl
 Donald Lee Gatlin
 Eddie Charles Hollins
 Gary Keith Jacobs
 Stanley Eugene Jones
 Vincent Joseph Landry, Jr.

Donald William Shields
 Alan Robert Tawse, Jr.
 Robert William Teeter
 Peter William Tkacs
 Homer Ernest White

DEGREE OF MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Ronald Glynn Allen
 John Walter Clevesy
 John Young Cleveland

Dawn Atwood Doyle
 Stephen Michael Stolicny
 Lawrence Ray Wright

DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

Kathleen Marie Jerke
 Greg Steven Johnson
 Robert James Magowan

Mary Patricia Martin
 Paul Randall Plume
 Bruce Anthony Tollerud

SPECIALIST DIPLOMA

Hazel Marie Geier

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Kenneth Harry Swenson

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dale Robert Bergren
 Linda Jane Harness
 William Thomas Johnson
 Keith Thomas Killingbeck

Larry Lavoe Litke
 Charles F. Lochow, Jr.
 Richard Lawrence Metzger

On Salary Scales for the University (ies) and/or the Entire State System

The following scales that are the results of the committee's deliberations are presented with mixed feelings. On the one hand, salary schedules do allow an individual some modicum of projecting future income bereft of the vagaries and idiosyncrosies of the present methods used in the University. On the other hand, coming up with a salary schedule scheme that pleases everyone (or even anyone) is problematical. While we have labored over (to varying degrees) the accompanying schedules, fault can easily be found from several points of view with each of them. If we are to go on some type of salary schedule, the following questions need to be addressed:

1. What happens when the schedule gets "too far" from market conditions wherein some faculty are rewarded well beyond their marketability (and thus remain at UND) and other faculty are paid too far below their "market worth" (and thus leave UND)?
2. Is any tie being sought to the State classification system together with its vagaries (e.g. the farther one removes oneself from the actual work of the institution (i.e. become an administrator) the more one is rewarded)?
3. Will a single system be adopted for the entire state without regard for institutional mission or cost of living differences? That is, will some measure be taken to provide differentials for the universities vis-a-vis the state colleges?
4. If collective bargaining becomes a reality with whom will we bargain? The apparant sieve now operating appears to be institutional budgeting, state board, governor, legislature, with UND apparently losing something at almost every step. If we bargain with the state board, the governor and/or legislature could presumably undercut the bargaining process.
5. Should provisions be built into the agreement to define exactly what a "financial exigency" is in regard to dropping student enrollment? In all likelihood, we are only a few years (or less) away from a probable decline in student enrollment due to birth rates in the 60's. If faculty must be dropped, the process for this to occur should be spelled out in an agreement.
6. Some process for faculty redevelopment should be made. That is, projections of future enrollment patterns might well leave at least some faculty with an unacceptably low number of students. In at least some cases, many faculty could "re-train" in an area wherein they could make a more substantial contribution. The university could provide sufficient support for up to a two-year period for faculty redevelopment for a given faculty member.
7. In addition to the salary aspect of employment, additional concern is focused on improvement of fringe benefits. The following list is by no means exhaustive, but suggests needed improvement:

Fringe Benefits

- a. Free tuition at any state supported institution for faculty dependents.
- b. For those faculty whose employment is dependent upon obtaining child care facilities, the university day care center should be available at no charge.
- c. Realistic sabbatical leave arrangements such that any faculty member may take a sabbatical once in a seven year period.
- d. Full funding (transportation and per diem) for each faculty member to attend a professional meeting or convention of his or her choice (and relevant to their teaching/research specialty) within the continental limits of the United States.
- e. Providing full medical, dental, and legal coverage for all faculty and their dependents.
- f. Provide permanent or semi-permanent faculty housing with the first choice being given to new and/or lower paid full time faculty.

The following two salary schemes are two that have "survived" this committee's deliberation among a much larger group of salary scale types. It should not be inferred that we find both schedules or even either schedule to be acceptable. Following the salary schedules are several selected individual comments of the several members of the committee.

Schedule A

Salary Schedule Patterned After Oakland (Mich.) Universities Schedule

Highlights of Schedule:

Salaries from the accompanying schedule would have a mean of \$20,000 (not including merit). If the mean merit rating is 1.1, then the estimated mean for the complete schedule is \$22,000. To find a faculty member's salary, the product of three numbers is found: (minimum salary by rank and years) X (departmental index) X (personal factor). When the proportions of salaries is compared to the existing salary structure, Schedule A is considerably more egalitarian in regard to departmental variations. Presently the typical law school faculty member receives 75% more than the typical theater arts faculty member. Schedule A would reduce this to 25%. All departments are fitted into the structure of Schedule A so that their relative position is unchanged.

Salary Compensation:

1. Regular Annual Salary. Each full-time faculty member's regular annual salary shall be the product of the University salary minimum for his current level multiplied by his assigned department-school factor multiplied by his personal factor.
2. University Salary Levels. Every full-time faculty member shall at all times be assigned a salary level. New full-time faculty members shall be assigned a salary level. New full-time faculty members shall be assigned that level that most nearly approximates the initial salary offered and paid to said full-time faculty member. For the purpose of this level assignment, said new full-time faculty member shall be assumed to have a mid-range personal factor.
3. On August 15th during this Agreement each full-time faculty member below the highest level within his rank shall automatically advance one level from that level which he held the previous December 31, provided that a person first assigned a level or a full-time faculty member who receives a change in level assignment after December 31 of any year shall not receive the automatic advance in level hereinabove provided.
4. UND may, upon the recommendation of the appropriate department or school, advance a full-time faculty member by a level or more that one level at any time, provided any full-time faculty member shall be entitled to maintain at least the level so granted at all times thereafter.
5. No full-time faculty member shall be assigned a level below his academic rank.

6. When a full-time faculty member is promoted to a higher rank he will be assigned that level whose mid-range salary most closely approximates 3.0% more than his previous salary, with both of these salaries computed on the basis of the Agreement in effect during the academic year preceding the effective date of promotion. For the initial appointment at a higher rank the personal factor shall be at least that which represents a 3.0% salary increase unless this occurs during the first year of employment.

7. These paragraphs, 1 through 7, shall apply fully to all full-time faculty members exercising any leave provisions of this Agreement and receiving at least fifty (50) percent of their annual salary. It shall equally apply to any full-time faculty member receiving less than fifty (50) percent of his annual salary and exercising any leave which UND, at the time of leave application, has approved for professional and scholarly purposes.

8. The University salary minimum for each level shall be as shown in Appendix A, "University Salary Levels."

9. Special Instructors. Full-time faculty members with the rank of special instructor shall be assigned an equivalency rank and level by UND after consultation with the appropriate department or school. This equivalency rank and level may fall within any of the ranks and levels of the "University Salary Levels."

10. Department-School Factors. Unless altered by UND during subsequent negotiations, the department-school factors for the duration of this Agreement shall not be grievable and shall be as shown in Appendix B, "Department-School Factors."

11. Each full-time faculty member shall have applied in computing his compensation the department-school factor of the department or school in which he holds his primary appointment.

12. Personal Factors. The full-time faculty members in each department or school shall assign for each academic year, through its own procedures, a personal factor to each full-time faculty member (including the department chairman) in the department or school. The possible personal factors range from 1.0000 to the maximum personal factor for the rank and level. The personal factor for a full-time faculty member at a particular rank and level may not exceed the maximum personal factor specified in Appendix C, "Personal Factors."

13. The total of the salaries in a department or school must equal the total of the mid-range salaries for the rank and level of the full-time faculty members in the department or school. The mid-range salaries are calculated from the mid-range personal factors as shown in Appendix C. For the purpose of the calculations of this paragraph, only full-time continuing faculty members who are not on a full year unpaid leave are to be included.

14. Each individual personal factor shall be subject to the approval of UND. Disapproval of any personal factor shall operate to permit the recalculation of all personal factors by the department. The personal factor assigned to a faculty member is not grievable.
15. Initial assignments of personal factors shall be concluded each academic year within thirty (30) days after the conclusion of negotiations.
16. Disapproval by UND shall be delivered to the department chairman within ten (10) days after receipt by UND of initial assignment or said disapproval shall be void.
17. Values in Appendix B updated every two years.
18. Values in Appendix A can be updated by simple multiplication by a constant.

APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY SALARY SCHEDULES

<u>RANK</u>	<u>LEVEL</u>	<u>MINIMUM SALARY</u>
Instructor	1	\$ 12,213
	2	12,354
	3	12,494
	4	12,633
	5	12,774
	6	12,918
Assistant Professor	11	13,743
	12	13,989
	13	14,239
	14	14,496
	15	14,754
	16	15,018
	17	15,286
	18	15,556
	19	16,010
	20	16,431
	21	16,862
	22	17,157
Associate Professor	31	16,423
	32	16,619
	33	16,815
	34	17,011
	35	17,209
	36	17,400
	37	17,593
	38	17,782
	39	17,971
	40	18,155
	41	18,280
	42	18,364
Professor	51	19,953
	52	20,199
	53	20,447
	54	20,692
	55	20,938
	56	21,177
	57	21,417
	58	21,655
	59	21,888
	60	22,122

61	22,349
62	22,574
63	22,766
64	22,924
65	23,042
66	23,230
67	23,388
68	23,546
69	23,704
70	23,862
71	24,020
72	24,178
73	24,336
74	24,494
75	24,652

APPENDIX B

Arts and Sciences	
Anthropology and Sociology	1.046
Sciences	
Biology, Mathematics, Physics	1.118
Chemistry, Geology, Geography	
Humanities (Group One)	
Religious Studies, Philosophy, Indian Studies, Humanities	1.066
Humanities (Group Two)	
Journalism, Speech, Language, Speech and Audiology	1.063
Humanities (Group Three)	
English, History	1.089
Psychology	1.091
Business (Group One)	
Accounting, Management, Marketing Business Education	1.125
Business (Group Two)	
Economics, Political Science	1.079
Business (Group Three)	
Aviation	1.031
Human Relations (Group One)	
HPER, IT, OT, Home Ec, Media, Social Work	1.047
Human Relations (Group Two)	
Counseling and Guidance	1.139
CTL	1.105
Fine Arts	1.018
Engineering	1.120
Law	1.250
UND MEAN	1.083

APPENDIX C

Personal Factors are found as the sum of three figures (a) teaching personal index (b) service personal index and (c) research personal index. The first two of these will be arrived at in a departmental meeting (or meetings) in which all members will be a party to the decision making. It is preferable for a unit to have an objective method for arriving at a value for (a) and (b). One premise is that the sum of (a) + (b) for all faculty members in a unit will be $8N$ where N is the number of faculty members in the unit. Further, the range of both (a) and (b) is to be 0 to 8 for each faculty member. Thus for a given faculty member, the range of (a) + (b) is 0 to 16. One additional proviso that will limit flexibility is that in no case will a faculty member have his salary reduced. The personal factor for (c) research is to be found from the following schedule:

First a point index is scaled from the following:

Scaled Scores

a) Refereed article in a national or international journal—single author	10 points
b) Same as a except co-author	5 points
c) Refereed regional journal	6 points
d) Same as c except co-author	3 points
e) Other article	1 point
f) Presentation at a national or Regional Convention	1 point
g) Research Report	1 point
h) Book (single author)	50 points
i) Book (co-author)	25 points
j) Monograph (single author)	30 points
k) Monograph (co-author)	15 points
l) Monograph—Locally or regionally produced—single author	15 points
m) Same as l but co-author	8 points

Totals are found for each faculty member from their report forms for the present year and for the prior five years. Then a research index is arrived at the scaled scores as follows:

Present Research

Scaled Scores Research Personal Index

0-4	0
5-19	1
20-69	2
70 up	3

Previous Five Years

0-19	0
20-79	1
80-279	2
280 up	3

Then for each faculty member a sum for (a) teaching personal index, (b) service personal index and (c) research personal index is made. The sum then becomes a decimal form by the following process: $\text{Personal index} = 1 + \frac{(a) + (b) + (c)}{100}$.

For example, if a faculty member was rated as 4 on teaching, 3.5 on service, and 1 on research, the total is 8.5. This becomes an index of 1.085.

As an example of arriving at a person's salary, suppose a person is an associate professor at step 34 in the English department with a total personal index of 1.085. Then this faculty member's salary would be $(17011) \times (1.089) \times (1.085) = 20100$.

A PROTOTYPE SALARY STRUCTURE FOR UND FACULTY

by Milton Winger

The objective of this proposal is to create a simple but definitive vehicle with which to function in making budgetary decisions regarding faculty salaries. While indicating to the individual faculty member some prospects of reasonable future progress salary-wise, it would also allow a more objective argument in defense of a particular individual's salary figure by those responsible in the decision making process.

There is the legitimate argument that a strictly percentage type of increase will cause the salary "spreads" to be greater and exaggerate any existing inequities between colleges, departments, individuals or whatever. It is equally valid to argue that a fixed amount type of increase benefits the lower paid person disproportionately greater since it is assumed he is of less value to the institution than the higher paid person. The crux of this proposal is to attempt to reconcile these and other points such as the "across the board" type of increase versus the "merit only" approach.

There are two basic ingredients to be determined:

- (a) Establish a minimum base salary for each rank.
- (b) Establish a fixed percentage.

These would be established in advance for each of the two years of the biennium but need not be the same for each year. When the minimum base salary for a rank is increased by \$200, for example, all persons in that rank would be increased by at least \$200 plus additional increments based on a percentage idea. One increment will be called a career merit increment and will be given to most faculty persons except in extreme cases. It is assumed that being promoted, tenured and devoting one's career to teaching at UND implies a certain amount of merit. If a person were not to receive this increment it would seem that a written statement of explanation from the administration should be in order.

The other increment would be given on the basis of a person having exceptional merit. We shall denote the first as the CMI and the second as the EMI for economy of words.

Another concept which does not presently have meaning at UND is to establish "levels" between ranks which would normally be based on years of satisfactory service. It would be possible to accelerate an exceptionally meritorious individual more than one level in one year. If promoted to a higher rank, the faculty person would assume the level in the new rank that would be at least equivalent salary-wise to two levels above the level held in the old rank. The rapidity of acceleration by levels could be influenced by such factors as attempting to remove inequities or retaining a qualified person in an area where such persons are scarce. However, all persons must progress at least one level for each year of service, except in unusual circumstances.

We have not been specific on any points regarding the division of the salary monies into the rank minimums or the CMI and EMI because this would have to be agreed upon by various groups, all having special interests in mind. Perhaps the best way to illustrate is to take a specific numerical example.

Suppose that during a year the base salaries by rank are \$12,000, \$13,000, \$16,000, and \$19,000 for instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor respectively. Now assume that the percent figure selected is 4.5%. We shall arbitrarily say that 3% will be used for the CMI which (almost) everyone will receive and that 1.5% will be allocated as the EMI which will be judiciously allotted to deserving individuals. It is understood that the EMI will be a variable increment and not forever a part of the base salary simply because of high productivity during a particular year. This is why it is suggested that the EMI percent be about half of the CMI percent and that the actual EMI value be no more than the CMI value for an individual. One may have a maximum EMI one year and a zero one the next which should not result in negative

increment overall. With this suggested restriction on the EMI the following table of salaries would result.

INSTRUCTOR

<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Salary</u>	<u>CMI</u>	<u>EMI</u>
1	12,000	360	0 to 360
2	12,360	371	0 to 371
3	12,731	382	0 to 382
4	13,113		

ASSISTANT
PROFESSOR

1	13,000	390	0 to 390
2	13,390	402	0 to 402
3	13,792	413	0 to 413
4	14,205	427	0 to 427
5	14,632	439	0 to 439
6	15,071	452	0 to 452
7	15,523	466	0 to 466
8	15,989	480	0 to 480
9	16,469	494	0 to 494
10	16,963	509	0 to 509
11	17,472	524	0 to 524
12	17,996	540	0 to 540
13	18,536		

ASSOCIATE
PROFESSOR

1	16,000	480	0 to 480
2	16,480	494	0 to 494
3	16,974	509	0 to 509
4	17,483	525	0 to 525
5	18,008	540	0 to 540
6	18,548	556	0 to 556
7	19,104	573	0 to 573
8	19,677	590	0 to 590
9	20,267	608	0 to 608
10	20,875	626	0 to 626
11	21,501	645	0 to 645
12	22,146	664	0 to 664
13	22,810		

PROFESSOR

<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Salary</u>	<u>CMI</u>	<u>EMI</u>
1	19,000	570	0 to 570
2	19,570	587	0 to 587
3	20,157	605	0 to 605
4	20,762	623	0 to 623
5	21,385	642	0 to 642
6	22,027	661	0 to 661
7	22,688	681	0 to 681
8	23,369	701	0 to 701
9	24,070	722	0 to 722
10	24,792	744	0 to 744
11	25,536	766	0 to 766
12	26,302	789	0 to 789
13	27,091		

This numerical example does not assume an upper limit on the number of levels at the amount indicated, but only illustrates that there is overlap between the higher salaries of a rank and the base minimum or more of the next higher rank. Neither does this numerical example suggest that the stated rank minimums or percentages are those which should be used at UND but it does give a realistic idea of possible "ballpark" figures.

It is instructive to note how different salary structure objectives can be achieved by the balance in selection of the rank minimums and the constant percentage. Suppose the previous numerical example of a salary scale is thought to be too prejudiced toward higher raises for higher salaries. One simple adjustment is to raise the rank minimum base salaries and decrease the percentage to be used. If we look only at some of the associate professor levels in the previous example and raise the rank minimum by \$300 while reducing the percentage to 2.5% the new partial table would become as follows:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Salary</u>	<u>CMI</u>	<u>EMI</u>
1	16,300	408	0 to 408
2	16,708	417	0 to 417
3	17,125	428	0 to 428
4	17,553	439	0 to 439
5	17,992	450	0 to 450
6	18,442	461	0 to 461
7	18,903		

Compared with the previous scale, an associate professor would now receive more during the first 4 levels, but from level 5 and on would receive a lower base salary. That is, an increase of the minimum base combined with a decrease in the percentage, tends to favor the lower levels and decrease the "spread" within the rank.

To implement this type of plan at UND would require that each faculty person initially be placed at a career level agreeing with present rank and salary. While past inequities would be perpetuated, alleviation efforts could be made by accelerated movement through the levels and judicious application of the EMI during the initial years of operation.

Some advantages of this structure are:

1. Every faculty person would be assured of at least a one level CMI raise, except in unusual cases.
2. Instituting minimum salaries by rank will give somewhat more equal salary distribution across administrative units. It would decrease the demoralizing effects of being promoted and receive a salary less than the median of the rank previously held. (This is not unusual in past instances).
3. Instituting levels within ranks allows for "mini-promotions" in cases where promotion to the next rank might be unfeasible or inappropriate.
4. The EMI or exceptional merit increment is variable from year to year depending on present performance. Superior service during one year should not mean perpetual reward even though performance falls off.
5. The present system of promotion and/or salary determination need not be scrapped but rather it will be able to be more effective since it will deal only with EMI rather than CMI type increases.

6. The two independent increments constituting the salary increase are additive and easy to understand. Use of multiplicative factors applied repetitively create misleading impressions of the actual percentage increase and are less readily understood.

Some disadvantages are:

1. There is not enough departure from the existing procedures, i.e., control is still in hands of same persons and present inequities may be perpetuated.
2. A cost of living factor is not even mentioned.
3. Even this simple procedure may seem complicated when the "pie-slicing" operations are carried on.
4. Who decides the minimum base salaries for the ranks and who decides the percentage as well as the allocation into CMI and EMI?

CONCLUSIONS:

While it may in the past have been to some advantage to keep a cloak of secrecy surrounding salary matters for some persons, it is now a matter of concern to an increasing number of faculty as to how their salary increases are originated and finalized. If negotiating procedures become legal in the near future, we must be ready with a document of some sort which reflects the rationale behind the salary distribution at UND.

Comments by Members of the Faculty Salary Committee

Oakland Plan

Departmental factor - some factor such as this is a necessity. The factors shown in Appendix B are questionable:

1. Historical data is not a proper base.
2. Some relation to current supply/demand situation must be incorporated.
3. Grouping of departments appears arbitrary.

Unless #18 under "salary Compensation" is intended to cover it, no provision has been made for possible cost of living adjustments.

Winger Plan

This appears to be basically a minimum guaranteed raise plan. It starts with a base salary which is apparently discretionary (see page 2, para. 2 beginning "Another concept...") and provides for advancement of "at least one level for each year of service."

Depending upon what procedure is established for justifying acceleration of "an exceptionally meritorious individual more than one level in one year" and for determining the "EMI", it would appear that the possibility of discrimination on an individual, departmental and/or college basis exists.

Although the plan does not provide for any "departmental factor" and might be considered unrealistic by some as a result, perhaps it was Milt's thought that this could be overcome by initial level designation upon adoption or appointment.

The model for the three-part "factors" assumes that all faculty split their efforts pretty much equally among teaching, service, and research, or that if they do not succeed in doing so, they ought to. The model works in many instances, to be sure, especially in fairly large departments with a mix of undergraduate and graduate students, and with a largely PhD faculty. But the model does not fit well, and hence penalizes faculty in departments in which there is a high commitment to basic, skill-oriented teaching; where certain beginning skills have to be taught, often laboriously, in order to sustain an advanced program, let alone graduate work. The languages department is an example. There are also departments with minimal, if any undergraduate teaching, or teaching of services courses, or courses which students are not taking by choice. Numbers of students per class, and the effect of numbers on the kind of class taught, is not reflected in either scheme, nor is teaching load. Faculty are being judged qualitatively on teaching, yet quantitatively on service and research--more of a mixture would seem more just.

Another important feature should be an attempt to strive for cost-of-living increases on an automatic basis rather than wait for 2 years and have the legislature quash such ideas because of the immediate agricultural outlook, always bleak.

Fringe benefits should be constantly monitored and improved. For example, Blue Cross seems to always have the "inside track" for having the contractual health plan with the State Employees but has a poor "track record" for holding rates down and living up to their reputation as a nonprofit organization. They spend large sums for advertising alone.

A task force should be immediately appointed to obtain as much information about the benefits, detriments, procedures, etc., connected with collective bargaining so if the faculty is to make a decision in this matter it will be an informed one.

A salary schedule of some sort should remove some of the mysticism and distrust that often goes along with faculty salaries by more clearly spelling out at least some of the factors which determine a person's salary.

Hopefully, a schedule will lead to better salaries for most faculty members. This could occur if collective bargaining is adopted along with the schedule, and if a schedule curtails some of the unjustified high raises that a few influential faculty members receive at the expense of most others.

If the faculty adopt a schedule with the flexibility of the two that we have submitted, it will be of critical importance to the success of such a schedule that the faculty have as much input as possible in determining the procedures to be established for the assignment of personal factors (merit raises), departmental factors (if they exist), rate or level advancement, and promotions. This is a large question which could be investigated by a separate committee.

John Williams, Chairman
Mohan Wali
James Harrell
Elizabeth Hampsten
Michael Polovitz
Stuart Lundberg
Milton Winger