**Faculty Compensation Task Force – Summary May 2017**

**Origin**: The Faculty Compensation Task Force (F-CTF) was established by Faculty Senate in the second half of 2016.

**Charge**: The F-CTF will work with the Division of Finance and the Human Resources (HR) department to develop and implement a market-based approach for faculty compensation at the University of Idaho.

**Structure:** The F-CTF is comprised of 17 members, 13 voting and 4 ex officio members, as follows: one faculty member from each academic college and one from faculty-at-large (10); Faculty Secretary; Vice President of Finance; Executive Director of Human Resources; Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ex officio); Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation (ex officio); a representative from the Provost’s office (ex officio); a staff member from Provost’s office providing administrative support (ex officio). The F-CTF is co-chaired by Patrick Hrdlicka (Department of Chemistry; vice chair of Faculty Senate) and Wesley Matthews (Executive Director of Human Resources).

**Status:** The F-CTF met 13 times during October 2016 – May 2017 to define UI’s institutional peer group, identify and select suitable salary databases, and establish guiding principles. The F-CTF has made the following preliminary recommendations regarding the development and implementation of a market-based compensation model for faculty at the University of Idaho:

1. Use a market group that encompasses all U.S. 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 above-mentioned group.
3. Annually reevaluate and adjust, if appropriate, the market group definition and UI’s overall salary goals 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 periodically reevaluate the assignments as appropriate. For a definition of CIP codes, see: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55>
5. In cooperation with the provost, deans, chairs and faculty members, HR will assign a corresponding market rate using CUPA-HR as the primary data source and the Oklahoma State University survey as a secondary data source. Whenever feasible the market rate should be based on 6-digit CIP code salary data.
6. Longevity shall be defined as years in rank plus total years at UI.
7. The longevity component of the compensation model should avoid salary compression between ranks at the time of promotion.
8. Only faculty members who “meet expectations” on annual evaluations should be eligible for progression in the longevity component.
9. The target salary of assistant professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary very close to their market average (~95%); shallow salary progression; end-in-rank salary slightly above their market average (~105%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
10. The target salary of associate professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary very close to their market average (~95%); shallow salary progression; end-in-rank salary slightly above their market average (~105%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
11. The target salary of full professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary close to their market average (~90%); moderate salary progression; end-in-rank salary somewhat above their market average (~110%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
12. The salary progression of assistant professors should be constant throughout rank.
13. The salary progression of associate professors should be steeper until approximate rank midpoint, then shallower.
14. The salary progression of full professors should be steeper until approximate rank midpoint, then shallower.
15. Assuming an equitable merit system, there should be a merit component to the compensation model.
16. Promotion raises should remain in place.
17. Promotion raises should be adjusted relative to current levels to reflect the predicted increases in target salary according to the compensation model, with a minimum promotion raise of no less than the current levels.
18. In the immediate future, funds available for salary increases should be distributed to progressively adjust the actual/target ratio. In other words, provide increases for most faculty, but give larger relative salary adjustments to those with lowest actual/target salary ratios.
19. Faculty members should not see salary decreases even if market rates dictate this.

**Going forward**: The F-CTF has not yet discussed how clinical faculty and instructor salaries will be integrated into this compensation model. The F-CTF will reconvene at the beginning of the upcoming fall semester to determine this and to provide input on a draft compensation model that will be developed by HR this summer. The first version of the compensation model (to be used for mid-year CEC adjustments) will, in all likelihood, only include a longevity component. The F-CTF will initiate deliberations to determine how to add a merit component to the compensation model later in the fall of 2017.