Faculty Compensation Task Force  
Meeting #1  
October 11, 2016 Brink Faculty Lounge, 12:00 to 1:30 pm

Attendance: Eric Aston, Don Crowley, Brian Dennis, Brian Foisy, Kristin Henrich, Patrick Hrdlicka (co-chair), Anne Marshall, Wes Matthews (co-chair), Scott Metlen, Dale Pietrzak (ex officio), Jeanne Stevenson (ex officio), Mary Stout (ex officio), Katt Wolf  
Absent: Michael Murphy, John Rumel, Sharon Stoll  
Notes by: Joana Espinoza (ex officio) 

Call to order

Business  

i. Co-chair Hrdlicka thanked everyone for their willingness to serve on this important committee. Introductions were made. 

ii. Composition - The group reviewed the composition of the task force. The committee will be comprised of one faculty member from each college and one from faculty-at-large, the Faculty Secretary, the VP of Finance, the Executive Director of Human Resources, the Vice Provost for Faculty (ex officio), the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation (ex officio), a representative from the Provost Office (ex officio), and administrative support (ex officio). The goal was to provide broad representation of faculty and administration. The floor was opened to discuss inclusion of additional members to the task force. Anne Marshall suggested that we might want to consider someone from Diversity or Human Rights to ensure that salary matters related to under-represented minorities are given adequate attention. Equal opportunity is now under HR which is represented on the task force by Co-Chair Matthews. Nonetheless, we might need to include those folks as the process develops. The group is open to expanding or inviting guests as needed. We are not sure what we will cover in the course of discussion so it’s important to keep in mind additional people who might need to be at the table as we progress. Katt Wolf suggested that we could add a dean since deans will be rolling out market-based salary models in their colleges. Mary Stout commented that the fiscal officers of the colleges will be more directly involved in the implementation of any plan the f-CTF produces. Don Crowley suggested that we should differentiate between salary model development and implementation; once a model has been developed, the group could consider bringing in implementers to the table. The corresponding staff task force ran its results by supervisors before launching anything to get their feedback. Scott Metlen mentioned that the committee members should also be soliciting feedback from their colleges as we move along in this process. This should be transparent and committee members should be getting feedback along the way. 

iii. The Charge - the task force will work with the Office of the VP for Finance and Human Resources on the development and implementation of a market-based approach for faculty compensation at the University of Idaho. Market-based is the key phrase. This task force needs to define what constitutes our market, determine what the market salaries are for faculty, and develop models
that describe how we bring salaries up to market level. President Staben has made it a key institutional priority that employee salaries, on average, will match market by 2025. Brian Dennis asked: proposals that come out of the task force may impact policies (P&T as an example) so at what point will faculty senate be involved in the proposals submitted by this task force? Don Crowley responded that this is one of the reasons that he is a member of this task force. If the task force proposes something that seems to be in conflict with the FSH Don Crowley will monitor that and we can discuss as we run into that issue. There is very little in the FSH that talks about salary and we are not talking about changing ranks. Additionally Co-Chair Hrdlicka is the Vice Chair of Faculty Senate and there are Senators on the committee so as we move along the process and have information to report, Faculty Senate will be kept in the loop.

Co-chair Hrdlicka pointed out that VP Foisy and Co-Chair Matthews are on the f-CTF to pre-vet and pass along our recommendations to the provost and the president. Additionally, they recently went through this process with the Staff Compensation Task Force. VP Foisy assured the group that this is a top priority for this administration.

iv. The Problem – the Great Colleges survey (found here: http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/iea/surveys) highlights that employees, and faculty in particular, have a considerably less favorable view of various job factors that employees at comparable Carnegie R2 institutions. For example, the scores for the Compensation, Benefits and Work/Life balance metric are 14 percentage points below those of other R2 institutions. An even larger concern are the scores for the “shared governance”, “senior leadership”, “faculty, administration and staff relationship”, and “communication” metrics, which are ~20 percentage points below the R2 standard. Clearly, there is dissatisfaction with the process of how things have been decided at this university. Co-Chair Hrdlicka feels this committee has an outstanding opportunity to serve as a role model how to develop a process for dealing with complex matters. Administration and faculty have a shared interest in resolving these concerns.

v. Proposed timeline and the work flow – Since the staff task force has gone through this recently Co-Chair Hrdlicka modeled the timeline on a similar work flow. Goal is to have something implemented by Fall 2018. There were some concerns from committee members that since the staff task force was created earlier that their initiative was “ahead” of the faculty. VP Foisy assured everyone that the time frame would not negatively impact the faculty group. The staff task force was formed out of an existing faculty senate task force that was put together to update the FSH after the class/comp changes. We started with staff because there was already movement towards changing policies but the reality was that we needed a new system for paying staff and faculty. Although the faculty task force is being formed a year after the staff task force, the faculty will not be penalized. We will make sure that there is a fair distribution of the funds.

Co-Chair Hrdlicka reviewed the topics of the upcoming meetings. We may need many meetings just to define the markets to use. Then we will need to start drilling down into the data. Then the more philosophical discussion...what should our compensation policy be? How are we going to address longevity, merit, rank compression? Then there will be a discussion of exactly how to achieve the salary goal in line with the compensation philosophy. Finally the committee will need to put together a draft report.

Commented [PJH1]: Clarifying note from co-chair Hrdlicka: the f-CTF hopes to have recommendations ready by Spring 2017, with the hope that implementation of recommendation will begin with the spring 2018 Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) cycle.
Scott Metlen asked: how do we finance this? VP Foisy discussed 5 different ways to go about it:

1) Compensation funding – each year the state provides money for compensation. Currently state law says that the state will provide compensation funding based on market salaries; 2) Proceeds from tuition; 3) Program prioritization that might mean some form of internal reallocation. If we are focused on salaries we need to make them a priority. There is some flexibility in the Gen Ed budget; 4) Special initiatives from the legislature. They are currently working on an outcomes based funding initiative. With this initiative we would no longer receive funding based on student/credit hour funding but rather by degree completion (Bachelors and Associates, etc. Graduate degrees are not in this initial proposal but may be added later.) Bachelors trigger a bigger bonus. We stand to benefit about 2 to 2.5 million from this initiative. That money could go towards salaries. 5) Growth. Even a small amount of growth will help fund this plan. Senior leadership is on board for this compensation problem. We want people to know what they should be making. We want this process to be transparent. Several members thanked VP Foisy for his commitment to this process.

A couple of committee members reminded the committee that it is not up to us to determine how to fund this. We do want to make sure that our proposals our realistic but we have to have faith that VP Foisy and his team will figure out how to fund this. Many committee members were optimistic, however some mentioned that the faculty of their colleges need some comfort that this will actually happen since many initiatives in the past have not been successful. Co-Chair Matthews reminded everyone that this is a journey and we need to celebrate small successes along the way. If we can identify a problem and then fix it, it builds confidence. We fix what we can each year. The issue for many people is that they are being treated unfairly in the system and as they see changes to that, they will start to feel more confident.

vi. Logistics – The group would like to meet 4 to 6 times this semester. Consensus that meeting should be 90 minutes long. Co-Chair Hrdlicka suggested that the next meeting be a condensed overview of the Staff Compensation Task Force (presented by Co-Chair Matthews) so that this committee can see how the staff committee approached their charge.

A website will be launched to post minutes and provide updates. HR will host the website but a link will be provide on the Faculty Senate page. Administrative support will handle getting a distribution list out to the group and also setting up a way to solicit feedback. The committee felt strongly that this process be transparent and also open to feedback from the campus community so options will be presented at the next meeting to determine how to best gather that feedback.