

# Northern Marianas College Faculty Senate Meeting

**Agenda**

**Place:** M1

**Time:** 9:00-12:00

**Date:** September 16th, 2016

**Attendance : Faculty**

<b>Faculty Senate Members</b>	<b>attended</b>	<b>excused</b>	<b>absent</b>	<b>Proxy replacement</b>
Amanda Diaz- President/At Large	√			
Johnny Alda - Vice President	√			
Kimberly Bunts-Anderson- Secretary/At Large	√			
Ajani Burrell – Senator/At Large	√			
Rosaline Cepeda – Senator/SOE		0	√	
Richard Waldo-Senator/ At Large	√			
Cherrie Lovejoy /At Large	√	E		

**Other Attendees:** None

**II Review/Adoption of Agenda**

**Amanda Diaz:** Reminded members to review minutes and initial once approved.

**III. Old Business**

- **Updates-** summaries/notes of discussion outcomes and all surveys or materials collected from last Spring's PD session so that we can move forward with actions regarding each. - **Tabled**
- Update on Faculty Ranking Proposals - Carried Forward

**Amanda Diaz:** Explained that the Faculty Ranking proposal had been presented to the Management Team, and had been brought forward to the College Council for first reading. Suggestions from College Council had been provided.

#### **IV. New Business**

- Report on meetings with MT, IP and CC on proposal

**Amanda Diaz:** Reported on the outcomes of Faculty Ranking proposal.

- A. The proposal had gone through Management Team. Although there was some dissention there were no written suggestions to implement. However Amanda mentioned that some on the Management Team felt that criteria other than “time employed at NMC” should be included. Draft ranking proposal from CREES was mentioned as a model.
- B. **Amanda Diaz:**stated that the proposal was only on “first reading” by the College Council however suggestions had been given to implement criteria and to compare ranking with Peer Institutions. Also Dean Merfalin had stated concern that the highest ranked would not be much lower than management which performed many more duties and had more responsibilities.

- Future PD CPR Training

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Stated that the CPR Training had been approved by Dean Merfalin and that it should be popular with the faculty. She referred to Johnny Alda stating that he had felt the price was reasonable and that it would be a good idea to provide a two day training in CPR.

**Amanda Diaz:** Stated that the CPR training was tentatively scheduled to be done during our December PD.

## **V. Old Business: Carried Forward after process updates.**

**Faculty Ranking-** Due to recent actions, suggestions and budget cuts the previous week the faculty met to revised the current proposal faculty ranking draft.

Considerations:

1. Management wanted “stiffer criteria” for the highest ranks.
2. College Council Representative - suggested that faculty meet criteria to move up rather than basing the system solely on work at NMC and that the proposed system be compared with our peer institutions.
3. IP David Attao had confirmed with Faculty President that the budget for faculty ranking system had been cut from 200k to 100k (Appendix C).
4. Ajani Burrell had found and highlighted some discrepancies in current system he felt should be addressed (Appendix A).
5. Kimberly Bunts-Anderson had written that Step 1 “equalization” would go through but that we would need to argue strongly for Step 2 of our proposal (Appendix B).
6. Amanda Diaz had written that we should not try to complicate matters by changing the system but should focus on Step 1 and 2. She had also asked Richard Waldo to work on an adjusted budget (Appendix C).

## **VII. Faculty Ranking Amendments**

### **A. Change in Titles**

After much discussion the consensus was that other college members did not want to see “Professors” as a rank if it only required a doctorate. So additional ranks were added. Assistant Professor I and Assistant Professor II. Those with a doctorate were moved down to Associate I.

**Cherrie Lovejoy:** Stated that she thought it was unfair to place only the rank of doctor as requiring a set criterium to achieve the title of

“Professor”. Also that in achieving a doctorate one incurred a lot of debt.

## **B. Adding Criteria**

A long discussion where criteria was felt to be unfair if only asked of faculty. Various criteria was suggested such as annual assessments and student evaluations.

**Richard Waldo:** Stated that annual assessments were not fair as some supervisors were stricter than others so one employee could be penalized while another was not. . Also that some gave assessments regularly and others did not.

**Amanda Diaz:** Stated that student evaluations were also unfair because a strict teacher would typically get lower evaluations than a teacher that students viewed to be an “Easy A”.

After much discussion the senate agreed to develop a list of “descriptive criteria” that fit peer institutions’ ranking systems that were based on degree + Employer Institution’s experience.

## **C. Adjusting Faculty Ranking Budget from 200k-100k**

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Stated that she had re-added all the faculty raises with the adjustment to Step 1 and over to step 2 and she had also found some discrepancies. However if each person was placed only by degree and then moved over to step 2 the total amount was only 113,705.35 (Appendix D).

**Ajani Burrell:** Stated that if we adjusted the Steps and moved differently the total could be as low as \_\_\_\_\_.

Faculty Senate began considering Ajani’s adjusted proposal (Appendix E).

**Ajani Burrell:** Proceeded to present a proposal that allowed for quicker movement through the scale arguing that the current system took too long for people to make a decent wage.

**Richard Waldo:** Argued that the proposal did not address or make allowances for those who had been at NMC for a long time.

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Argued that the proposal had no way for instructors with specialty qualifications or those with doctorates to move up.

**Richard Waldo-** Claimed that doctors already started at Step 3 so that was sufficient.

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Stated that , the movement to Step 3 for instructors with specialty licences such as RN's or CPA's and for those with doctorates was a "terminal" step which was unfair as people with masters were able to move significantly through the chart.

**Ajani Burrell:** Argued that the current system provided raises too slowly for those with Master's degrees and that the difference between a Masters and a Doctorate was not that significant.

**Richard Waldo:** Stated that just as there was a significant difference between a bachelor's degree and a master's degree there should be a significant difference between a master's degree and a doctorate's degree.

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Stated that if you put the ranking for a doctors just slightly above a masters there would be no incentive for people to pursue higher degrees.

**Amanda Diaz:** Agreed. Stating that to achieve a doctorate someone had to spend a lot of time and in turn would owe a lot of money. Thus if the top range for masters and doctorates were similar there would be a poor financial investment to pursue a higher degree.

**Richard Waldo:** Stated that he was happy with 51K but that he would need to add up the numbers to see how the budget would fit within the 100K limit.

**Amanda Diaz:** Stated that she wished the ranking system was disconnected from any salary increase.

#### **VIII. Other Matters/ Open Comment Period:**

**Richard Waldo:** Stated that we needed a 1 page justification that was easy to read and that could be presented to the board.

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Stated that she had previously justified the raises based on lowest paid degrees, by region lowest salary, by degree lowest salary and by similar ranking system with 2 and 4 year institutions. She saw no need to compare NMC to only those that offered associate degrees as we are offering bachelor degrees in some areas. And no matter how it was compared we were being very conservative and were proposing the lowest salary scale found except at 1 institution's starting salary for ranking with masters degrees.

In summary, discussion centered around three issues 1) the need to adjust salary raises to meet the lowered budget 2) the need to develop criteria that would be respected by non-faculty but would also not be unfairly limiting to faculty 3) The need to develop a single sheet justification for the upcoming Board of Regents meeting.

## **IX: Adjournment**

### **X. Future Actions:**

**Richard Waldo:** Would make a 1 page justification for Board of Regents. He would also adjust pay scale to fit closer with the current allotted amount.

**Kimberly Bunts-Anderson:** Said that if she could find some data for him to use she would send it.

**Amanda Diaz:** Stated that she wished the ranking system was disconnected from any salary increase. She went on to say that she would make adjustments on the proposal and procedure already under consideration with College Council to reflect the amendments.

## Appendix A.

### Interim Communication: Ajani Burrell

Sep 10

Ajani Burrell - To Amanda and Faculty

Hello Fellow Senators,

Thanks to those who have continued to work on this to get it done and ready for various governance bodies/meetings in hopes of getting it approved, in particular Senators Waldo, Bunts-Anderson, and our esteemed President, Mrs. Diaz. A few thoughts on the latest version of the ranking/payscale:

- 1) The latest version of the ranking seems fairer (and simpler) than earlier iterations.
  
- 2) Sheets 3 and 4 seem to differentiate between giving credit for all years at NMC and giving a minimum of credit for those who have been employed for one full contract (reflected in rank/step).
  
- 3) With sheets three and four, there seems to be some misplacement in rank or step. Here are a few examples (all taken from sheet 4):
  - a) Why is instructor #7 granted a step 4 on the Spec scale, while while #16 is granted only a step 1 (when in fact based on the ranking they should be step 2)? (see red font)
  - b) Why are some people who should be Assistant rank left with instructor ranks, while other people do have that Assistant rank? (see yellow highlights)
  - c) Why are some people who should be Associate rank left with Assistant rank? (see orange highlights)
  - d) Why are some people being given Ranks/Scales in accordance with their total years experience while others are not? (see blue font)

The inconsistencies indicated above seem to be consistently under-ranking people based on years experience. The consistency of this circumstance suggests that the problem is merely one of interpretation and application of the years-steps relationship (rather than intentional placement at those ranks/scales). For example, for people with 2 years and X months years at NMC, they should all be at the next rank/step beyond the lowest one for their position. That 2 years X months indicates that those people are in their third contractual year, which means the next rank/step up from the lowest one according to the latest version of the ranking/payscale. So, an "Instructor 1" with 2 years and 9 months would actually be an "Assistant 1", not Instructor 1. The same goes for the demarcations between Asst and Assoc. Anyone with a 4 years and X months service should be at Assoc rank as this indicates they are in their 5th contractual year (they've already completed two two-year contracts). The same would go for step placements at these various ranks. If a Prof has 6

years X months, they should be at step 4, because they've already completed 6 years (three contracts at NMC).

The same inconsistency can be seen in the figures on Sheet 3 as well I believe, though to a lesser extent since it only differentiates between people who've been employed for one full contract or more and those who haven't.

We should fix these inconsistencies, and/or have them clarified, before the proposed ranking goes before the IP or any other governing entities.

4) In the interest of accuracy, we may also want to clarify or otherwise adjust the years of experience numbers based on when this is hypothetically supposed to take place. I don't know if it would actually impact anyone, but there maybe be some people who are going from one rank/step to another between now and when the scale would take effect.

5) What is the proposed plan with the information in sheets 3 and 4? Are we going to ask for the adjustments in sheet 4 and see what happens? Or are we going with sheet 3 as has been discussed all along? Given that the final figure in sheet 4 is "only" \$16,000 over (and would likely rise to \$30,000 or so over once the inconsistencies have been addressed) what was supposedly earmarked for this change, while sheet 3 is is \$80,000 UNDER (and probably close to \$70,000 after adjustments) what was supposedly earmarked for this, it seems that we might want to look at how we might find a middle ground between sheet 3 and 4, or, alternatively, push for sheet 4. Why leave \$80,000 in increases on the table?

6) Out of curiosity, I still haven't heard any discussions about whether this will be a one-time increase, or whether this increase will happen and then regular movement up the scales/ranks will continue after this change. That should certainly be discussed, both amongst ourselves and with the IP and other bodies.

7) (in reference to Kimberly's thorough justification document) I think the cost of living increase consideration should be a separate issue from what's discussed in #5 above, and should it be adopted should impact all ranks and steps the same. It should also be made clear that this is a distinct issue #5 above, not a replacement or substitute for it.

Anyway, sorry for the long email on the very precious weekend. I wanted to get it out there, however, because we probably won't have time to meet prior to the meeting with the IP on Tuesday, and I won't be able to make the meeting with the IP because I have class. But I think we need to have everything as tight and accurate as possible before we walk into any meetings with other entities.

Let's bring this home! Keep up the good work.

-Ajani

Best Regards, Ajani

5 'Ub]GYUghUb'6i ffY''



~bglfi Wrcf'!'@ub[ i U[ YUbX'<i a Ub]fYg'8 YdUfha Ybhi''

Bcfh Yfb'A Uf]ubUg'7c''Y[ Y'

GUjdUbžA D' - \* - ) \$

Faculty Pay Scale Discrepancies highlighted

					Assignment of Rank & Starting of Annual Pay			
					Equalization Payraise			
					Current	Adjusted Pay	Annual Pay adjusted for	Total Amount of Raise
Current Position	New Rank	Degree	Years at NMC	Months	Current Pay	after Equalization	New Rank	for Adj Rank
Instructor	Spec 4	BSN/RN	7	9	44,916.50	44,916.50	51,294.92	6,378.42
Instructor	Assoc 9	MA	21	8	41,527.83	43,188.95	61,512.31	18,323.36
Instructor	Assoc 1	MSW	5	6	42,981.30	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21
Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	6	0	43,188.95	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21
Instructor	Instruct 1	MA/MS	2	6	42,981.30	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
Instructor	Prof 1	PH. D., M. Ed.	2	11	44,916.50	44,916.50	50,040.31	5,123.81
Instructor	Instruct 1	MFA	2	11	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	5	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21
Instructor	Instruct 1	M. Ed.	2	9	44,916.50	44,916.50	44,916.50	-
Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MBA	2	11	44,916.50	44,916.50	50,040.31	5,123.81
Instructor	Spec 1	BSN/RN	2	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	46,265.08	3,076.13
Instructor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	6	8	41,527.83	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21
Instructor	Instruct 1				41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
Instructor	Asst 1	MA	4	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	44,916.50	1,727.56
Instructor	Assoc 7	MA	17	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	57,442.40	14,253.45
Instructor	Asst 1	MA	3	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	44,916.50	1,727.55
Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MA	2	11	43,188.94	43,188.94	50,040.31	6,851.37
Instructor	Assoc 5	BS/MA	13	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	53,604.43	10,415.48
Instructor	Asst 1	MA	3	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	44,916.50	1,727.56

27	Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MS	0	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	50,040.31	6,851.37
28	Instructor	Asst 1	MS	4	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	44,916.50	1,727.56
29	Instructor	Assoc 5	MA	14	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	53,604.43	10,415.49
30	Instructor	Asst 1	MS	3	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	44,916.50	1,727.55
31	Instructor	Instruct 1	MS	2	11	42,981.30	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
32	Instructor	Prof 7	Ph. D., M. Ed.	13	1	44,916.50	44,916.50	61,512.31	16,595.81
33	Instructor	Instruct 1	MFA	2	11	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
34	Instructor	Prof 5	MBA/DBA	10	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	57,442.40	14,233.46
35	Instructor	Instruct 1	MFA	1	7	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
36	Instructor	Assoc 6	MA	16	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	55,480.58	12,291.63
37	Instructor	Instruct 1	MA	0	1	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
38	Instructor	Instruct 1	M. Ed.	1	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-
39	Instructor	Spec 12	M. Ed.	24	9	41,527.83	43,188.95	63,054.55	19,865.60
40	Instructor	Assoc 12	M. Ed.	28	1	37,506.58	43,188.95	68,199.80	25,010.85
41	Academic Librarian	Instruct 1	MLIS	0	7	45,632.48	45,632.48	45,632.48	-
42	Program Coordinator	Prof 3	Ph. D. M. Sc.	6	9	51,330.34	51,330.34	53,604.43	2,274.09
43	Program Coordinator	Assoc 2	M. Ed.	8	0	45,632.49	45,632.49	48,348.12	2,715.63
44	Department Chair	Asst 1	MBA	4	0	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-
45	Department Chair	Instruct 1	M. Ed., MA	2	11	53,126.90	53,126.90	53,126.90	-
46	Instructor/Counselor	Assoc 2	M. Ed.	14	1	39,006.85	43,188.95	53,604.43	10,415.48
47	Department Chair	Assoc 2	M. Ed.	7	0	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-
48	Instructor/Coordinator	Asst 1	MA	3	11	45,632.49	45,632.49	45,632.49	-
49	Counselor	Asst 1	M. Ed.	4	9	37,506.58	43,188.95	44,916.50	1,727.55
50	Department Chair	Assoc 1	MSN	5	10	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-
51	Counselor	Asst 1	MA	4	7	45,632.48	45,632.48	45,632.48	-

## **Appendix B.**

### **Interim Communication: Kimberly Bunts-Anderson**

Sep 11

Kimberly Bunts-Anderson to Ajani, Amanda, Faculty

Hi Everyone! First, I would like to echo the appreciation and thank everyone for their efforts on the ranking system in particular Richard's work on the math breakdowns, Amanda's work scheduling and organizing us plus attending countless meetings in support of the ranking system. Ajani, for his reflective and clear feedback and suggestions throughout the process and for his hard work developing the policies and procedures we are trying to pass. And the whole senate for working diligently over the last semester and probably for half of this current semester in attempt to see this through! Wow! I really hope this works out because it will be a first for us and a big achievement for everyone.

I wanted to address Ajani's well documented queries on the updated financial breakdowns. I agree there needs to be more work done on these and on any suggestions we give regarding:

- 1) Arguing for the college to commit to a standard/or cost of living increase(s) in the future
- 2) Arguing for compensation for past work and years of employee

As I understand it we are simply suggesting that these things need to be addressed in the future. I agree that these things need to be separate because they were not in the scope of what we were tasked "to develop a faculty ranking system" or the budget we were given "which may be dwindling".

I appreciate the time you took in highlighting some of the discrepancies you mentioned. I think these things definitely need to be ironed out before we propose those actions. We would also need to provide a clear justification for retroactive payments for past work. Clearly the administration would not agree to paying people current rates for work done long ago or pay people the rate for associate professor when 5 years ago they were an instructor for example. There needs to be some sort of scale developed that shows how past pay would be fair to the employers and employees.

However, I also think at the moment that our ranking system and our suggestion to move to Step 2 is under threat and needs to be argued strongly when we meet with the IP and to the college council next week. Here's the issues we are facing.

- 1) Time is running out if not already out for the current budget to get this through.
- 2) The college has received less budget than expected and our budget maybe cut in half for the rankings. In the case we can only afford the original suggestions.
- 3) Community support may be lacking in some areas because from some people's point of view we make more now than the general community does and we don't work for 12 months of the year. Clearly we can argue against that but it still seems to be the perception of some people.

4) At the college we have some strong support and some "naysayers" . Those opposed are generally long term employees that feel they deserve more. This maybe true but it may be a separate battle. Also some have commented that we should limit the number of people at the higher range as CREES has proposed. In other words, some people may have issues with having a large number of Associate Professors with masters based only on teaching.

I think what we have proposed is fair we are unique and primarily a teaching institution. If CREES is concurrently proposing a limited ranking system based on research and grant acquisition that fits their context not ours. The good thing is... we have a strong argument and support from people that count. Also, as I understand it the "nay-sayers" generally are not the people voting on our proposal so we have a good shot I think.

In regard to the points you have made I think they all things we should consider and perhaps focus on to strongly pursue in the future. But I also think from the feedback we've been getting in regard to budget availability it is unlikely at this point that we will get approval for much over 100k with the current initiatives. In that light it is possible that we be asked to limit ranking percentages, get approval for only Initiative 2or if we are lucky Initiative 2 and 3. It seems on all accounts Initiative 1 for all is already done.

Sorry this is a bit long.

Best K

**Appendix C.**  
**Interim Communication: Amanda Diaz**

Sep 13

Amanda Diaz to Ajani, Kimberly, Faculty

Good morning Ajani,

I spoke to the IP on Friday, and he had shared that the amount that was given for Faculty Ranking was reduced to 100k. Therefore, I reached out to Richard, and he will be making the necessary changes to reflect the proposal presented to the Assembly.

I have asked Richard to do the forth tab to show the cost of what it would be if we were to consider every faculty's # of years.

However, I think we should stick to our goal of Step 1 & Step 2. Adding on other layers will bring confusion and could delay the process.

**Appendix D.**

**Adjusted Faculty Proposal: Kimberly Bunts-Anderson**



# Adjusted Faculty Proposal: Ajani Burrell

*HA Y'k f]HhYb`ghYdg`bYMWggUfmihc`UddfcdF]UHy'miUbX'i b]Zfa`midYfZfa`UHJg`]b`WUfn]b[`ci`hdc`]VYg`  
 UbX'UW]j`]H]Yg`cZH`Y7c`Y[`Y"*

**Overview/procedure description** This procedure defines the formal process for awarding faculty rank pursuant to BOR Policy 5011.

**Areas of Responsibility** The Faculty Senate shall recommend rank be awarded in accordance with the following procedure. The President shall take the Faculty Senate's recommendation into consideration when recommending rank be awarded by the Board of Regents.

**Procedure details** OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC RANK SYSTEM

Table 1.

Rank	Grade	Step 1	Step 2
Professor Doctorate Degree	35.3	\$50,040 .31	\$51,791.72
Associate Professor Master's Degree 4 years (at NMC)	35.1	\$46,713 .16	\$48,348.12
Assistant Professor Master's Degree	34.1	\$44,916 .50	\$46,488.58

<b>2 years (at NMC)</b>			
<b>Instructor Master's Degree 0-1 years (at NMC)</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>\$43,188.94</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Specialty Instructor Bachelor's Degree &amp; License CPA, RN</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>\$46,265.08</b>	<b>\$47,884.35</b>
<b>Lecturer Specialty Experience</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>\$36,918.09</b>	<b>\$38,210.22</b>

**CRITERIA GOVERNING ACADEMIC RANK**

**Rank**

Faculty rank shall be conferred according to some or all of the following criteria:

- a) number of years of service as a full-time faculty member at NMC and/or
- b) highest academic degree awarded and/or
- c) relevant licensure and/or
- d) professional degrees awarded
- e) specialty experience

Each rank increase comes with a corresponding increase in the pay grade. The specific criteria for each rank can be found in the table above. The criteria are also summarized below:

Professor – faculty obtain the rank of professor solely by virtue of holding a Doctorate's degree.

Associate Professor – faculty obtain the rank of Associate Professor by virtue of holding a Master’s degree and providing 4 complete years of service to NMC.

Assistant Professor – faculty obtain the rank of Assistant Professor by virtue of holding a Master’s degree and providing 2 complete years of service to NMC.

Instructor - faculty obtain the rank of Instructor by virtue of holding a Master’s degree.

Specialty Instructor - faculty obtain the rank of Specialty Instructor by virtue of holding a Bachelor’s Degree and relevant licensure and the relevant professional degree (CPA, RN).

Lecturer – faculty obtain the rank of Lecturer by virtue of specialty experience in a field or discipline.

#### Step

The step designations are in place to distinguish current fulltime faculty who have been at NMC longer than two years from new faculty (0-2 years) and/or future faculty hires.

#### Current Faculty of 2+ years

Current faculty who have been employed as faculty at NMC for more than two years will obtain their appropriate rank at Step 2. He/She will advance in rank according to the stipulations of the above faculty ranking mechanism, but will do so exclusively in Step 2. Upon reaching his/her maximum rank as allowed by qualifications and years of service, each faculty member will then advance in steps according to the NMC pay scale for his/her grade (rank).

#### Current Faculty of 0-2 years and future faculty hires

Current faculty with less than 2 years faculty service at NMC, and any future faculty hired at NMC, will be placed at Step 1 of the appropriate rank. He/She will advance in rank according to the stipulations of the above faculty ranking mechanism, but will do so exclusively in Step 1. Upon reaching his/her maximum rank as allowed by qualifications and years of service, each faculty member will then advance in steps according to the NMC pay scale for his/her grade (rank).

#### Ranking and Advancement

Rank and advancement shall be determined and implemented by the Human Resources Office (HRO).

#### Terms and Definitions

“years of service” refers to the number of completed years employed at NMC as a fulltime faculty member.

“faculty” is defined as any fulltime employee whose employment contract designates as faculty.



5	Instructor	Asst 1	MA/MS	2	6	42,981.30	43,188.95	*****	1,727.55	Assoc 1	20	3,391.32	
6	Instructor	Prof 1	PH. D., M. Ed.	2	11	44,916.50	44,916.50	50,040.31	5,123.81				
7	Instructor	Asst 1	MFA	2	11	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	1,727.55				
8	Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	5	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21				\$Doesn't include people who were already at that rank
9	Instructor	Asst 1	M. Ed.	2	9	44,916.50	44,916.50	*****	-				
10	Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MBA	2	11	44,916.50	44,916.50	50,040.31	5,123.81				
11	Instructor	Spec 1	MSN/RN	2	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,076.13				
12	Instructor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	6	8	41,527.83	43,188.95	46,713.16	3,524.21				
13	Instructor	Instruct 1				41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-				
14	Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	4	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	*****	3,524.22				
15	Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	17	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
16	Instructor	Asst 1	MA	3	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	44,916.50	1,727.55				
17	Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MA	2	11	43,188.94	43,188.94	50,040.31	6,851.37				
18	Instructor	Assoc 1	BS/MA	13	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
19	Instructor	Asst 1	MA	3	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	44,916.50	1,727.56				
20	Instructor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	6	7	44,916.50	44,916.50	46,713.16	1,796.66				
21	Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., MS	0	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	50,040.31	6,851.37				
22	Instructor	Assoc 1	MS	4	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	*****	3,524.22				
23	Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	14	7	43,188.94	43,188.94	*****	3,524.22				
24	Instructor	Asst 1	MS	3	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	44,916.50	1,727.55				
25	Instructor	Asst 1	MS	2	11	42,981.30	43,188.95	*****	1,727.55				
26	Instructor	Prof 1	Ph. D., M. Ed.	13	1	44,916.50	44,916.50	*****	5,123.81				
27	Instructor	Asst 1	MFA	2	11	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	1,727.55				
28	Instructor	Prof 1	MBA/DBA	10	0	43,188.94	43,188.94	*****	6,851.37				
29	Instructor	Instruct 1	MFA	1	7	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-				
30	Instructor	Assoc 1	MA	16	0	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
31	Instructor	Instruct 1	MA	0	1	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-				
32	Instructor	Instruct 1	M. Ed.	1	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-				
33	Instructor	Spec 1	M. Ed.	24	9	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,076.13				
34	Instructor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	28	1	37,506.58	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
35	Academic Librarian	Instruct 1	MLIS	0	7	45,632.48	45,632.48	45,632.48	-				
36	Program Coordinator	Prof 1	Ph. D. M. Sc.	6	9	51,330.34	51,330.34	*****	-				
37	Program Coordinator	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	8	0	45,632.49	45,632.49	*****	1,080.67				
38	Department Chair	Assoc 1	MBA	4	0	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-				

32	Instructor	Instruct 1	M. Ed.	1	6	41,527.83	43,188.95	43,188.95	-				
33	Instructor	Spec 1	M. Ed.	24	9	41,527.83	43,188.95	*****	3,076.13				
34	Instructor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	28	1	37,506.58	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
35	Academic Librarian	Instruct 1	MLIS	0	7	45,632.48	45,632.48	45,632.48	-				
36	Program Coordinator	Prof 1	Ph. D. M. Sc.	6	9	51,330.34	51,330.34	*****	-				
37	Program Coordinator	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	8	0	45,632.49	45,632.49	*****	1,080.67				
38	Department Chair	Assoc 1	MBA	4	0	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-				
39	Department Chair	Instruct 1	M. Ed., MA	2	11	53,126.90	53,126.90	53,126.90	-				
40	Instructor/Counselor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	14	1	39,006.85	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
41	Department Chair	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	7	0	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-				
42	Instructor/Coordinator	Asst 1	MA	3	11	45,632.49	45,632.49	45,632.49	-				
43	Counselor	Assoc 1	M. Ed.	4	9	37,506.58	43,188.95	*****	3,524.21				
44	Department Chair	Assoc 1	MSN	5	10	49,356.10	49,356.10	49,356.10	-				
45	Counselor	Assoc 1	MA	4	7	45,632.48	45,632.48	*****	1,080.68				

Total Funding Required 108,816.22

