Faculty Compensation Task Force
Meeting #7
February 23, 2017 Admin 207, 2:00 to 3:30 pm

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

**Notes by:** Joana Espinoza (ex officio)

**Call to order**

**Business**

i. Minutes from meeting 6 were approved with one change regarding the CUPA data.

ii. Overview of progress thus far:
   a. Co-chair Hrdlicka provided an overview of where we are and what we still need to do. Grey box on slide 1 is where the committee has focused its efforts so far. The items outside of the box is the list of things the committee still needs to accomplish. He pointed out that there appears to be committee agreement that the market should be national, include public and private institutions, and be tied to a Carnegie classification.
   b. Slide 2, CIP code overview – CIP codes are currently assigned to programs but not individual faculty members. Many committee members have expressed that they would like their jobs defined at the four or – preferably – six digit level when possible.
   c. There is still debate within the group which peer group to use.

      i. John Rumel noted that he had done some research on law schools and found that the Carnegie classification did not seem to correlate strongly law school compensation. Anne Marshall wanted to clarify her previous comments on R1 versus R2. She would like us to put in the report that we are an R2 institution right now but that the salaries need to move in lockstep with UI’s progress towards R1 status. Co-chair Hrdlicka agreed and suggested that the F-CTF include language that encourages the administration to evaluate salaries on a regular basis.

      ii. Some committee members expressed concern how to properly reward faculty already performing at an R1 level, but it was noted that we will be having this discussion at a later point.

      iii. VP Foisy pointed out that the use of an aspirational peer group (e.g., R1+R2) is problematic as it gives the impression that we are trying to game the system to secure higher salaries. We want to have a plan that the state board will perceive as reasonable and that we can execute. Since we are R2, he anticipates that the use of a R2 would be acceptable.

      iv. The committee was curious how the state board had reacted to the information about the staff compensation plan. VP Foisy stated that additional details had been requested and that he was reasonably optimistic that the proposal would find support.
v. The discussion then turned to whether to include salary data from R3 institutions. Brian Dennis felt that inclusion of these data points does not enhance the quality of the dataset as it is a different and irrelevant population. A committee asked if by that reasoning we also should exclude R1 institutions from the data set. In Brian Dennis’ view this is a different issue, inasmuch we are losing faculty to R1 institutions. He noted that we may need to start at the R2 level but move towards R1-level salaries in the not-so-distant future. VP Foisy pointed out that there is faculty migration between all three institution classes because compensation is more strongly tied to institution size than the Carnegie status. Moreover, the idea behind using a peer group comprised of R1, R2 and R3 institutions is to maximize the number of data points. Co-chair Matthews pointed out that average salaries – on a global level – are similar irrespective whether R2 or R1/R2/R3 are used as peer groups, but the former provides a larger data pool. Scott Metlen suggested that we would see a lot more variability if the R1/R2/R3 group was to be used. A large dataset is nice to have when determining the average salary but might not be particularly helpful in determining how to compensate high achieving faculty. Co-chair Matthews pointed out that we can determine how to reward high-performers irrespective of the peer group used.

vi. Many members felt that inclusion of R3 is acceptable but other members feel that data from R3 should not be included. Michael Murphy agreed with VP Foisy that there are several reasons why people change jobs and they are not always linked to a desire to be at a higher Carnegie class institution. Don Crowley pointed out that inclusion of R3 institutions did not change the average salary much but provided more data points. Kat Wolf asked how many responses are needed to have a robust data set? She noted that she only has about 50 peers – is that enough? Co-chair Hrdlicka indicated that he arbitrarily operated with an assumption of 100 responses as the minimum response number. Michael Murphy noted that his college has expressed a desire to use both CUPA-HR and OSU as they desire the flexibility to attract high-end faculty members for very specific jobs. Brian Dennis urged the group pick the population that best reflects our philosophy and noted that we cannot discount that our competition for faculty is only 7 miles away. Co-chair Hrdlicka wanted to explore the sample size question in more detail. Is a sample size of 50 enough? Michael Murphy’s impression was that the use of a larger data set likely is to result in a more robust model, which would be an easier sell to the state board. Noting that we already are 10% behind our R2 peers, he wondered exactly how much we would be behind if we were to use R1/R2/R3 as the peer group? According to co-chair Matthews, we would be slightly more behind. Using R1+R2 institutions as a peer group, we are about 13% behind based on CUPA data. Kat Wolf reiterated an earlier sentiment that we cannot be expected to get to an R1 level if we do not attract and retain the kind of faculty we need to achieve that level. Michael Murphy had some concerns about making sure we have achievable goals. If we already know that we are 10% behind an R2 peer group, why use peer groups that result in even more unattainable salary goals? He continued by pointing out that many faculty have
heard the promise of future compensation for many years – we need to get the market compensation model right. Brian Dennis looped this to the strategic plan. Our colleges are telling us how much we have to do in our strategic/cascading plan in order to get tenure and become R1, etc.

vii. Anne Marshall pointed out that she had received a lot of questions and comments from her college indicating that neither CUPA nor OSU are a perfect fit. However, rather than to nitpick she urged the F-CTF to produce a proposal that could move forward and get through SBOE quickly. We need to have the larger picture in mind. Many committee members were encouraged by her comments.

viii. VP Foisy urged the committee to pick a primary salary data source and, in those cases where the primary source is inadequate for a particular discipline, use a secondary data source.

ix. Brian Dennis hoped that the process would evolve in such a way that colleges, deans and department heads would come up with a target salary. VP Foisy stressed that participation of individual units to help define the appropriate CIP code for faculty members would be an essential component of the process. However, there is a need for some centralization to ensure that guidelines are administered consistently and fairly across different units.

x. Michael Murphy made a motion that CUPA is as the primary data source but have the flexibility to use OSU as the second source, and use R2 across both sources. Kat Wolf amended the motion to include that the CIP codes would be at least four digits and up to six digits out for the assignment of CIP codes.

xi. Co-chair Hrdlicka expressed concern that the R2 data set is too small. Brian Dennis said he would support using R2 as a peer group and increasingly include data from R1 institutions as we progress towards R1 level. He would not support the use of peer groups that include R3 institutions. VP Foisy pointed out that the R2 data in the OSU survey has a very small response rate.

d. With the hour growing late, the motion and the amendment were approved to be on the table for voting at the next meeting and the meeting was adjourned.