Faculty Compensation Task Force  
Meeting #9  
Mar 27, 2017 IRIC 105, 10:00 to 11:30 AM

Attendance: Don Crowley, Brian Dennis, Brian Foisy, Patrick Hrdlicka (co-chair), Anne Marshall, Scott Metlen, John Rumel (via Zoom), Dale Pietrzak (ex-officio), Jeanne Stevenson (ex-officio), Chantal Vella, Katt Wolf

Absent: Eric Aston, Kristin Henrich, Michael Murphy, Mary Stout (ex-officio), Wes Mathews (co-chair)

Minutes by: Patricia Tilden substituting for Joana Espinoza

Call to Order: A quorum being present, Chair Hrdlicka called the meeting to order at 10:04am.

Business:

i. Approval of the minutes: Scott Metlen moved that the minutes of meetings #7 and 8 be approved. Brian Dennis seconded. Motion carried.

Dale Pietrzak and Katt Wolf joined meeting 10:08

ii. Current motion on the floor: Chair Hrdlicka read the motion on floor for consideration of the committee. Patricia Tilden emailed the motion to John Rumel as the agenda was printed out rather than emailed.

Chair Hrdlicka informed the committee that both Michael Murphy and Katt Wolf had indicated to him their willingness to withdraw the motion on the floor in favor of a clearer, more complete version. Don Crowley indicated Michael had communicated that desire to him as well. Anne Marshall asked for clarification on the history of the motion and amendment. Chair Hrdlicka stated the motion originated two meetings ago. That motion is included here:

Motion from Michael Murphy (tabled from Mtg #7, Feb 23): CUPA will be used as the primary data source, with the flexibility to use OSU as the second source, and use R2 across both sources.

Amendment from Katt Wolf: CIP codes would be at least four and up to six digits.

Katt recommended that the committee vote down the motion on the floor or that it be withdrawn so the committee can move on to consider the “clean” motion emailed to the committee by Chair Hrdlicka last Friday. Don Crowley pointed out that Michael Murphy was not present to withdraw his motion, and that the committee ought to take a vote instead. Discussion continued with Brian Foisy noting that each department on campus currently has a 6-digit CIP code assigned to it for purposes of reporting to the SBOE. There could be many majors each with their own CIP under that departmental umbrella. We are not starting with a blank slate for assigning CIP codes.
Chair Hrdlicka asked if there was any additional discussion regarding the motion on the floor. Brian Foisy called the question and a vote was taken. The motion was voted down 8-1 with Brian Dennis in dissent.

iii. Brian Foisy moved the committee take up the motion as sent by Patrick via email on Friday. The motion was seconded. Chair Hrdlicka read the entire motion. Discussion will be taken up point by point.

**Motion:** The faculty compensation task force (F-CTF) makes the following recommendations concerning development and implementation of a market-based approach for faculty compensation at the University of Idaho:

1. Use a market group that encompasses all UI public and private doctorate-granting institutions. (i.e., R1, R2, R3 institutions according to the Carnegie classification).
2. Define the salary average of the abovementioned market group as UI’s initial overall salary goal.
3. Annually reevaluate and adjust if appropriate the market group definition and UI’s overall salary goal as the institution moves closer to attaining its aspirational R1 Carnegie goal.
4. In cooperation with the provost, deans and chairs, HR will assign every member a 6-digit CIP code whenever possible. Otherwise, 4-digit CIP codes will be assigned.
5. In cooperation with the Provost, deans and chairs, HR will assign a corresponding market rate using CUPA-HR as the primary data source and OSU as a secondary data source (after applying a suitable scaling factor to account for database differences). Whenever feasible, the market rate should be based on 6-digit CIP code salary data. If this approach is not warranted (e.g., too few survey responses), the market rate should be based on 4-digit CIP code salary data.

**Discussion follows:**

1. Use a market group that encompasses all UI public and private doctorate-granting institutions. (i.e., R1, R2, R3 institutions according to the Carnegie classification).

Anne Marshall asked Brian Foisy how SBOE might receive the use of R1, R2 and R3 data vs the use of R2 only. Brian responded that using R1, R2 and R3 can be defended based upon the increased data points. Either approach is expected to be received by SBOE favorably. Brian reiterated that HR wants to be in an advocacy role for faculty and made a plea for including as much data as possible to allow for greater flexibility.

Chantal Vella commented it will be difficult to get rid of R3 data in the future. She would like to use R1 and R2 only. Brian Dennis asked about the mechanism for faculty input in the assignment of CIP process. Chair Hrdlicka noted that could fall under point 4 or 5 and will be addressed when we reach those points. Brian Foisy responded to Chantal’s statement that if R3 data adds value to only one person but we eliminate the availability of that data, it is a tool that has been removed. Also, use of R1 and R2 without R3 data is less defensible to the SBOE. Scott Metlen noted that after that average is established, there is still room for longevity, excellence and other factors to be taken into account when determining the wage. Katt Wolf stated there is the hope and expectation that HR will find an appropriate CIP code for each faculty member. Brian Foisy noted that this is far less of an exact science than the F-CTF might like. President Staben, Provost Wiencek, HR Director Wes Matthews and other top administrators all desire to establish salary equity for faculty and staff at this time - we need to strike while the iron is hot. As Wes Matthews is working through the staff piece, he is adjusting market rates based on discussion with employees, supervisors, chairs etc. This is not dictatorial process from the top
A similar process is envisioned for faculty compensation. Our goal is nationally competitive salaries.

Chair Hrdlicka asked for any additional discussion regarding point 1. There being none, the committee moved to point 2.

2. Define the salary average of the above mentioned market group as UI’s initial overall salary goal.

Katt said she has heard the staff salaries have been frozen and wonders if it is appropriate for this task force to continue work under those circumstances. Brian Foisy responded that budget cuts are not under discussion at this time even though we will be over budget. For staff, 80% of market rate has been established as the minimum starting wage for a new employee barring moderating circumstances such as prior work experience etc. On the staff side, Wes Matthews has preliminary data on every staff member on campus. The only hiccup in the process is that he has not had opportunity to meet with all supervisors yet. The work is progressing and there is a 3% CEC from the legislature this year. The salary adjustment process is NOT on hold for staff. There was a friendly amendment to change the word “salary” to “market” to make statement #2 clearer. The amendment was accepted by consensus. Chair Hrdlicka reiterated that we are establishing the basis for market rates at this time, not addressing adjustments for longevity and other factors.

There being no further discussion on point 2, the committee moved to point 3.

3. Annually reevaluate and adjust if appropriate the market group definition and UI’s overall salary goal as the institution moves closer to attaining its aspirational R1 Carnegie goal.

No discussion.

4. In cooperation with the provost, deans and chairs, HR will assign every member a 6-digit CIP code whenever possible. Otherwise, 4-digit CIP codes will be assigned.

Don Crowley noted this might be the proper place to insert wording about faculty participation. Brian Dennis moved to amend the wording to include “faculty members” in sentence one. Brian Foisy cautioned that there is a difference between self-identification and involvement. Faculty will be involved but will not self-identify. He then put forward a friendly amendment to strike “whenever possible...Otherwise, 4-digit CIP codes will be assigned” from the statement. – this was accepted by consensus. Chantal questioned the phrase “HR will assign”. Should HR be the decision maker or should it be the chairs? Brian Foisy responded that it is a UI compensation system - the administration will not simply release the process of compensation, all at the same time there is no interest in being dictatorial. HR assigns the compensation in collaboration but retains the final decision responsibility. Analysis of staff positions has revealed instances of disparity between what a person might be hired to do, what they are qualified to do, and what their current job duties are. Similar disparities may be identified with faculty as well. Chair Hrdlicka expressed appreciation that faculty will be consulted this time. In the past there has been little direct input from the faculty members. However, faculty members will not get to decide what they are hired to do. Scott Metlen noted that discussions of CIP code already are part of the hiring process for all new hires. Thus, most of this discussion concerns assigning CIP codes to existing faculty. The committee turned their attention to point 5.
5. In cooperation with the Provost, deans and chairs, HR will assign a corresponding market rate using CUPA-HR as the primary data source and OSE as a secondary data source (after applying a suitable scaling factor to account for database differences). Whenever feasible, the market rate should be based on 6-digit CIP code salary data. If this approach is not warranted (e.g., too few survey responses), the market rate should be based on 4-digit CIP code salary data.

Katt Wolf stated she would like to eliminate the last sentence and use the same language in the first sentence as was used in point 4. She would like the committee to get beyond this motion to the next step. Scott Metlen noted the last sentence constrains data use to 4-digit data. Brian Foisy stated that almost all 6-digit data is R1 data. Chantal Vella asked how the parenthetical phrase regarding scaling factors will be addressed. Chair Hrdlicka noted this committee does not have the background to come up with a factor for scaling in an equitable fashion. Don Crowley stated the parenthesis does not need to be included; it presents potential for contention without a resolution. Scott Metlen proposed a friendly amendment to remove the parenthetical phrase, which was accepted. Brian Foisy noted that Wes Matthews will capture both CUPA and OSU data and both data sets will be available to deans, chairs and the faculty member. Chair Hrdlicka asked Don Crowley if this committee will be making recommendations/revisions to the APM. Don responded that this is a Faculty Senate Tack Force. Faculty Senate will take their findings under advisement, however APM and FSH changes to policy require other processes. Brian Foisy noted our goal is more philosophical and we should avoid drilling down too far into the weeds in terms of policies and procedures.

Anne Marshall called the question. Katt Wolf objected and asked for a restatement of the motion. Chair Hrdlicka re-read the amended motion in its entirety. There was additional discussion on point #2: “market” is now used twice in the same sentence. A friendly amendment was made to replace the second “market” with “comparison”, which was accepted. Anne Marshall recommended re-ordering the sentence putting the last part first. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The motion now reads:

**Motion:** The faculty compensation task force (F-CTF) makes the following recommendations concerning development and implementation of a market-based approach for faculty compensation at the University of Idaho:

1. Use a market group that encompasses all US public and private doctorate-granting institutions (i.e., R1, R2 and R3 institutions according to the Carnegie classification).
2. Define UI’s initial overall salary goal as the market average of the abovementioned compensation group.
3. Annually reevaluate and adjust if appropriate the market group definition and UI’s overall salary goal as the institution moves closer to attaining its aspirational R1 Carnegie goal.
4. In cooperation with the provost, deans, chairs and faculty members, HR will assign every faculty member a 6-digit CIP code and reevaluate periodically as appropriate.
5. In cooperation with the provost, deans, chairs and faculty members, HR will assign a corresponding market rate based upon CUPA-HR as the primary data source and OSU as a secondary data source. Whenever feasible the market rate should be based on the 6-digit CIP code salary data.

Katt Wolff’s objection being satisfied, the vote was now taken on the motion as amended. The motion carried unanimously. The motion will be circulated among the entire F-CTF group for the benefit of those absent.

iv. Meeting was adjourned at 11.29.

Next meeting April 5: the committee will address the actual compensation philosophy -factors that will determine an individual faculty member’s compensation level.