Faculty Compensation Task Force  
Meeting #5  
December 6, 2016 Admin 207, 12:00 pm 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, John Rumel, Jeanne Stevenson (ex officio), Mary Stout, Chantal Vella, Katt Wolf

Absent: Michael Murphy

Notes by: Joana Espinoza (ex officio)

Business

i. Co-chair Hrdlicka expressed gratitude for the administrative support provided for this group. Minutes from 11.17.16 were reviewed. One grammatical change was noted. Moreover, the minutes were corrected to reflect the fact that the OK State and CUPA surveys list CIP codes by discipline, and not by department as originally stated. In connection herewith, Mary Stout clarified that we are not assigning CIP codes at the individual faculty level yet. We are using CIP codes to designate programs. Minutes were approved with these amendments.

ii. Next, Bob Smith from the Office of Research and Economic Development gave an overview of the Carnegie Classification system. There are 335 doctoral granting universities in the Carnegie classification system, 57 of which are land grant institutions. In order to qualify as a doctoral university, a university must graduate more than 20 PhDs per year. Universities are further subdivided into R1, R2 and R3 categories. The R1 designation is given to schools that rank in the top third according to Carnegie’s 2-dimensional scoring system, which plots a “per capita research activity index” as a function of “aggregate research activity index” (see slide Research Activity – Results). As new schools meet the Carnegie system’s definition of a doctoral university, schools that were on the border of two categories may move up or down. Foreshadowing, Bob cautioned that the R1 category doesn’t mean many of the things we think it means. For example, the Carnegie classification uses quantifiable metrics, but does not capture the quality or impact of research. The metrics used are the number of STEM, social science, humanities and other doctorates (each a separate category); science and engineering (S&E) and non-S&E research expenditures; and, number of Ph.D.-level S&E research staff. Co-chair Hrdlicka asked if only NSF-expenditures are used to determine research expenditures given that this data is provided by the NSF? Bob Smith: No, the NSF conducts the survey but it includes all research expenditures at an institution.

a. The Carnegie classification is based on relative ranking, not absolute numbers. Categories carry different weights. Co-chair Hrdlicka asked if the weighting factors are known? Bob Smith: That information is available on the survey website. Katt Wolf asked where the UI ranks on each of those criteria. See slide – Carnegie Summary – data listed in the R1 and R2 columns denote the median. UI is significantly above the R2 median with respect to number of S&E doctorates, S&E research expenditures, and number of S&E research staff,
and at or below the R2 median in the other categories. Many R1 institutions are substantially larger than us, which explains the higher absolute numbers. Interestingly, UI’s S&E research expenditures per capita are close to the R1 median. There are smaller schools who carry an R1 designation, but this likely reflects the fact that these schools have very high-quality programs and/or confer many non-STEM Ph.D. degrees. For UI to become an R1 institution, we will need to increase in size or fundamentally change our distribution of doctoral graduates (see slides, Land Grant Characteristics – we are the red dot). Many schools produce a lot of PhDs in the liberal arts but as a land grant institution we need to have a balance.

b. Being classified as a doctoral institution doesn’t mean the other degrees are not important - the Carnegie system just does not take other degrees into account. When we talk about growing PhD programs it doesn’t mean we are not going to grow other programs and degrees. As the number of Ph.D. degrees conferred increases, the total number of graduate degrees increases even more (See slide – Land Grant Characteristics – we are the red dot). Dale Pietrzak noted out that our ambition and prediction of becoming an R1 institution in 2025 is based on everyone else staying the same. Clearly, this is not the case and we are dealing with a moving target.

c. Anne Marshall asked about the advantages of the UI attaining R1 classification? Bob Smith – the goal is to increase UI’s impact in the state and beyond, and an R1 designation would serve as a measure that we have met this goal. Attaining the R1 designation should not be an end in itself – there are ways in which the system could be gamed, i.e., improvement in specific metrics. Brian Dennis asked why not measure the economic impact directly in the state of Idaho? CNR for example produces a lot of students that have a direct impact on the state but they don’t necessarily get their PhD. Dale Pietrzak clarified that those do count as impact and are part of our strategic plan, even though they are not formal Carnegie metrics. The Carnegie classification is just one factor that will allow us to measure impact. Scott Metlen said dollars spent on research doesn’t necessarily equate to high impact. There are different ways of counting impact.

d. The conversation turned to why the Carnegie classification and criteria are important for the compensation task force. Co-chair Hrdlicka pointed out that there is a correlation between perceived prestige, Carnegie classification, and salaries. On average, faculty at R1 institutions command a higher salary than R2 and R3 institutions and there is a reason for that. The surveys that the F-CTF is reviewing as options for salary guidelines (CUPA-HR and OSU) take into account Carnegie classification. John Rumel asked if an increase in salary for those who are very research active would have an impact on those with lower research activity? VP Foisy – the goal wouldn’t be to assign R1 versus R3 salaries to individual departments. If we identify R1 as our market salary, then that should be implemented institution wide. A few committee members asked if there was a way to quantify our location in the R2 landscape, i.e., belonging to the 85th percentile? Bob Smith and Dale Pietrzak – The Carnegie system strongly discourages these kind of comparisons.

e. Anne Marshall wanted to revisit a previous consideration that we can agree we are currently R2 but that we will aim for R1 over time in our salaries. Co-chair Hrdlicka agreed that there needs to be an understanding that market determination will need to be periodically updated in the future, i.e., as new Carnegie classifications are released (every
five years, next 2020) or at time points coinciding with waypoints in the UI Strategic Plan. VP Foisy reminded everyone that the market base is not static. If we put a process in place, we can make adjustments as the market changes. Scott Metlen brought up the concern that if we are looking at a goal to be R1 in 10 years we need to be paying R1 salaries in less than 10 years. We should be shooting for that level before we are expected to achieve it. Co-chair Hrdlicka would like to have a fixed model in place that specifies the process, as future administrations may have different approaches regarding employee compensations. VP Foisy agreed that the proposal coming from this group should have a list of goals. Many committee members agreed that it’s better to have a long-term goal to invest in the future of the university. Katt Wolf pointed out that the strategic plan already provides an approximate timeline and that we should follow that timeline. Some committee members noted that we lose our faculty to R1 institutions who pay more. Additionally many faculty members could make the case that they are performing and should be compensated at an R1 level. Chantal Vella also pointed out that many faculty are performing R1 level research with far lower resources than what other R1 institutions provide. Co-chair Matthews pointed out that we, in his very crude estimation, are about 15% behind the average R2 institution and 24% behind the average R1 institution. What is the cost of getting us to the 15%? He further made the plea that we ought to focus on reaching R2 average first. With no agreements made and continued conflicting opinions, co-chair Hrdlicka adjourned the meeting with a hope that survey selection would be finalized at the next meeting.