Faculty Compensation Task Force
Meeting #3
November 8, 2016 Brink Faculty Lounge, 11:00 am to 12:30 pm

Attendance: 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), Chantal Vella, Katt Wolf

Absent: John Rumel

Notes by: Joana Espinoza (ex officio)

Call to order

Business

i. Minutes from 10.17.16 meeting were approved.

ii. Dale Pietrzak gave an overview of the Oklahoma State University Survey. The UI has participated in this survey for several years. Salaries are listed broken down by discipline (more precisely, Classification of Instructional Programs [CIP] codes), rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, new assistant professor, other faculty), Carnegie classification, geographic region, among others.

Co-chair Hrdlicka asked if it also lists average salaries for graduate assistants. That data is in a separate report and IEA has a subscription.

The survey features salary data from 44 out of 107 universities in the Carnegie “high research” or “R2” classification (UI is in the R2 category). Average salaries are based on academic year, not fiscal year. Idaho belongs to region 1, which, moreover, consists of WA, OR, CA, AL, AZ, NV, UT, MT, WY, ND, and SD.

The CIP codes are not based on the individual but by the program. The use of more specialized CIP codes, results in a smaller number of survey respondents and, accordingly, less reliable the salary data. Using his position as an example, co-chair Hrdlicka pointed out that in the 2014-2015 version of the survey there were 225 data points in the category “Associate Professor, Chemistry [40.05], R2 institutions”, but only 5 data points when the query was changed to “Associate Professor, Organic Chemistry [40.0504], R2 institutions”.

A member further asked, who decides the CIP codes for the faculty? For existing faculty, is there a possibility to review their CIP code every five years or review period? Co-chair Matthews felt that perhaps it’s the dean who ultimately decides. Currently we have CIP codes by program, not by individual. This turned the discussion to how far down to drill when it comes to assigning CIP codes. Chantal Vella pointed out that there is substantial diversity within certain programs and that getting accurate CIP codes will be critical. Michael Murphy agreed using the Department of Music as an example. He felt that faculty would prefer to drill down deeper rather than keeping it too general. However, then the data is less reliable. Brian Dennis said that the sciences are getting a lot more interdisciplinary and colleges are hiring more interdisciplinary faculty...perhaps the CIP code for each faculty member would be a negotiable item during the hire?
Several members brought the conversation back to “what is the goal of this process?” Agreement in the group was that the goal of this is to recruit and retain high quality faculty....to be more competitive. What level of detail in the CIP codes do we need in order to be competitive? The group felt finite data should be available but that we need to consider the issue that there may not be enough salary data as you drill down.

There was additional discussion about whether someone’s market rate is based on the job that they are hired to do or the qualifications that they bring to the job. If a faculty member brings additional specialties to the position, shouldn’t their market rate reflect that? Anne Marshall made a comment that faculty who bring additional qualifications such as degrees, certifications, and professional licenses have the potential to contribute more to the university value. Co-chair Matthews said that we are looking at a two-step process, the first is a market comparator, determining what data will be used. The second step will be creating a philosophy on how do we go from that benchmark to what someone would actually make. We are on the first step now, figuring out the benchmark. Co-chair Hrdlicka reaffirmed that but also encouraged the group to have these philosophical conversations now because we need to identify which database we should be using and what the limitations might be. The OK State Survey gives us salaries broken down by discipline, rank and Carnegie classification. Michael Murphy felt this tool will be helpful for some departments but will not be fully applicable to others. There was some discussion on whether or not deans and/or department chairs should weigh in on what data they think will be helpful. The issue of professional organizations came up but the problem is that the surveys are done differently and we need to be able to implement this...the professional organizations aren’t streamlined enough. OK and CUPA are regulated national surveys.

This system should be flexible enough that we can make changes. Co-chair Hrdlicka said that we should have an annual evaluation of where we are at as an institution. The whole concept of the market based compensation is that it changes with the market annually. This is a journey, not a destination. Anne Marshall felt that a good way to determine that we have met our destination, is when we get to hire the top candidate in the pool and they want to come here because the salary is competitive and they stay because it is a good place to work.

Discussion moved to whether to use R2 or R1 as the benchmark. Anne Marshall felt that we should document in our recommendations that we are aiming for R2+ in the short term but that over time, that R1 becomes the goal. We need to have a goal where we are heading and that should be documented. Several members agreed with her. Scott Metlen did note that not all programs might be moving toward R1 at the same rate. Don Crowley asked – where do we really sit with the R2 averages? Dale Pietrzak said that UI faculty salaries are about 90% of market salary at R2. The range is anywhere from 74% to 118% of market salary of R2 comparisons by department. Chantal Vella wondered if the committee has considered looking at a more general number as the start? Co-chair Matthews said that disciplines that have lower market rates may not be as impacted...there are different numbers based on disciplines and rank. He also said that the CUPA data is similar to the OK State data, the CIP codes are there and you can organize by discipline and rank. Maybe we use both? Brian Dennis wanted to be able to share both data options with his department. Co-chair Matthews will present the CUPA data at the next meeting.
Logistics – Committee decided to streamline the feedback process with a direct email to the 
group. Co-chairs Hrdlicka, Matthews and Brian Foisy will work together to provide responses. 
Joana will send out the feedback from the anonymous survey to the group weekly.