Faculty Compensation Task Force  
Meeting #6  
December 13, 2016 Brink Lounge, 11:00 am to 12:30 pm

Attendance:  Eric Aston, Don Crowley, Brian Foisy, Kristin Henrich, Patrick Hrdlicka (co-chair), Anne Marshall, Wes Matthews (co-chair), Scott Metlen, Michael Murphy, Dale Pietrzak, John Rumel, Jeanne Stevenson (ex officio), Mary Stout, Chantal Vella, Katt Wolf  

Absent:  Brian Dennis  

Notes by:  Joana Espinoza (ex officio)  

Call to order  

Business  

i.  Michael Murphy requested a recap from the 12/6 meeting as minutes were not available at the time meeting #6 was convened. Co-chair Hrdlicka provided a recap of Bob Smith’s presentation on how the Carnegie classification works.  

ii.  Next, VP Foisy and co-chair Wes Matthews gave a presentation on the CUPA-HR survey, making a pitch that it could serve as a reliable and very convenient primary data source for market salary determination. Wes reminded the group that even though CUPA-HR only is available via subscription, any interested UI faculty member could request data from HR for internal use. One major advantage of CUPA-HR over the OSU survey is its well-developed web interface, which enables highly customized search queries. In contrast, the OSU survey has no such web interface (note added by Patrick: the OSU survey is also a purchase-only product and data are only provided in PDF-format). CUPA-HR queries can be run that take specific requirements regarding rank, discipline, geography, Carnegie classification, CIP code granularity, and so on into account. Michael Murphy pointed out that the attractiveness of the OSU survey is that it provides data points for disciplines at a high CIP code granularity (i.e., 6-digit CIP codes). Can the CUPA data drill down to six digits? Yes, the CUPA data can go to six digits out which rolls up to four digits, which rolls up to two. Using his own position as an example, Michael noted that when he looks at CUPA, his title and position are not specified in the CUPA dataset, whereas they are in the OSU survey. He had also presented the information to colleagues in his department, who also felt that CUPA did not provide information at the necessary level of CIP code granularity. VP Foisy reaffirmed that we can use both data sources but CUPA could be the primary. Michael Murphy wanted to clarify if we can use a primary and secondary database. In VP Foisy’s opinion, the answer is yes. Co-chair Matthews noted that more than one dataset was used to determine staff salaries, i.e., BLS is used as the primary source, with CUPA-HR as the back-up. However, Wes noted that CUPA can provide data at a greater level of detail than the committee thought we could. Moreover, Wes pointed out that it sometimes is a question of hunting for the right code as different institutions report a given discipline differently.  

iii.  This opened the door to one of the philosophical discussions...how far do we really want to drill down in identifying CIP codes? Maybe it’s better not to drill down too far if there is a lack of reliable data. Anne Marshall felt the nomenclature in CUPA doesn’t seem to really encompass the
professions. Dale Pietrzak pointed out that the titles for a given CIP code are short hand for a detailed definition. Mary Stout informed the group that we currently report CIP codes for our academic programs on the National Center for Education Statistics surveys…but that we don’t use them for individual positions and salary determinations yet. Co-chair Hrdlicka felt that we were getting away from the task at hand. The discussion how each person’s position will be categorized needs to happen but that is a separate discussion for a later date. Co-chair Matthews reiterated that the CIP code titles only are abbreviations and that there are specific definitions for each job title. Mary Stout pointed out that if we are going to rely on CUPA in the future we will have to pay greater attention how we assign CIP codes to people. Don Crowley asked how to handle interdisciplinary programs and people. Co-chair Matthews stated that would be something that we would need to look at on an individual level. In an attempt to circle the discussion back to the matter at hand, VP Foisy stressed the robustness of the tool in this presentation to the group. CUPA has data not just on our faculty and staff but it has institutional metrics (budget size, Carnegie class, number of FTE’s, etc.)

iv. At this point VP Foisy handed out datasets that compare average CUPA-salaries at the 2-digit CIP code level for R2 institutions relative to all institutions (i.e., R1+R2+R3). As Brian noted, the average salary levels are very similar between these two datasets, but the number of reporting institutions is significantly higher in the latter case. Similar observations are made when comparing average salaries of select disciplines specified at a 4-digit CIP code level for R2 institutions relative to all institutions (i.e., R1+R2+R3). Thus, a compelling case can be made to use national salary averages (i.e., R1+R2+R3) rather than, e.g., averages for R2 institutions, as a massive increase in the sample size ("N") is realized, presumably translating to a more reliable dataset. Moreover, Brian noted that our ability to drill down is greatly expanded by using the R1+R2+R3 reference group. Motivated by this finding, Brian proclaimed that he would like to use CUPA-HR system and the R1+R2+R3 dataset as the comparison group. Katt Wolf asked why we don’t focus on an R1/R2 comparison...why include R3 data? VP Foisy said his rationale is that inclusion of R3 institutions results in similar salary averages as the R2 peer group, yet the number of participants goes up. Co-chair Hrdlicka suggested that we should focus on reaching national salary average first rather than focusing on a presumably higher R1/R2 average. Once this initial goal is realized and new Carnegie data is obtained suggesting that UI is closer to attaining R1 status, nothing would prevent the UI from multiplying the R1+R2+R3 salary averages by an appropriate factor. VP Foisy agreed with this, stating that if inclusion of data from R3 institutions lower the salary averages below a level the group is comfortable with, we can multiply the average salaries by a suitable factor and define that as our target salary. The key thing is to increase the number of N. We will have to use a multiplication factor anyway as we march towards R1 status. Scott Metlen said the reason that the mean didn’t change is that we added a low end and high end...one concern of the faculty on campus is that they don’t want to have everyone’s salary reflect the average...maybe we look at the spread and adopt a spread for our campus, that might be a more practical approach. VP Foisy said that right now we are just trying to determine what our market average is...how we progress to the average is a completely different discussion that the F-CTF needs to address quickly. If we want to use 4- or even 6-digit CIP codes then we need large sample sizes. Co-chair Matthews assured the group that if we climb this mountain and attain R1 classification, we would make adjustments to the market salary definition. It would be a new mountain to climb. VP Foisy restated the desire to use the CUPA-HR survey, define the market as
the average of R1/R2/R3 institutions nationwide both public and private, and then reevaluate when new Carnegie data becomes available. Chantal Vella said she would really like to see the comparison with the OSU data. VP Foisy said he would be happy to provide that but expected that the CUPA-data would prove more reliable. Kristin Henrich felt that we should go with the survey that has the most data points and thus the better option for the majority of UI faculty, but that an option should remain to use, e.g., OSU as the secondary database for those disciplines that are not adequately represented in the CUHA-HR survey. Michael Murphy felt that OSU has a regional influence unlike CUPA. Co-chair Matthews and VP Foisy said that a regional report could be run in CUPA. Anne Marshall expressed concern that her college and her disciplines are not represented in today’s CUPA-HR presentation. VP Foisy confirmed that the presentation today was just an example and that we are happy to send data for every discipline. Anne Marshall felt that she is representing her college and that she cannot make an informed decision without being able to see how her college would be affected. Katt Wolf, in the meantime had looked up the National Center for Education Statistics website as well as the OSU survey. She thinks that it would be beneficial for this group to see the NCES site, which provides definitions of the various CIP codes. Chantal Vella felt we need a side by side comparison of OSU and CUPA. Michael Murphy asked why was VP Foisy emphasizing the need for the highest number of group size? VP Foisy’s response was for statistical validity and specialized programs. Ultimately this will have to go to the state board and VP Foisy will need to ensure that the board understands we used statistically valid data. Co-chair Hrdlicka proposed a previously mentioned idea...would the committee agree that we use the database that has the largest number of N for each discipline? With many people talking, the meeting had already gone over time and a resolution seemed unlikely. There was a consensus that everyone would like time to review VP Foisy’s handout, they would also like the link to the NCES website, and that they need to be able to compare the two surveys side by side. With that being the consensus, Co-chair Hrdlicka adjourned the meeting.