Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) Meeting

January 20, 2016

2:00 p.m.

Attendance: Abuhakema, Ghazi; Booker, Keonya; Caveny-Noecker, Deanna; Ivey, Thomas; Janech, Kathleen; May, Cindi; Milner, Ryan; Oprisan, Ana

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cindi May at 2:02 p.m.

Old Business

Chair May moved that the minutes from the October 2015 meeting be accepted with revisions. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Summer Teaching

Chair May moved to table summer teaching pay to a later date. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Chair Compensation

Chair May will ask about the progress of the chair compensation working group through the Council of Chairs. If the Faculty Compensation Committee needs to act, she will let the group know at a later date.

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Compensation

Chair May raised the issue of PTR raises and highlighted the letter from Meg Cormack as a compelling argument for equal pay for equal work. In response to Dr. Cormack’s letter, the Provost and President said they would seriously consider the issue. Points of discussion included: (1) PTR is merit-based and, thus, not as expensive across the board, and (2) giving a bump to all disciplines, not just the ones that need it the most, may not be equitable. Discussion from the group highlighted that focusing on the PTR issue will not affect those at the Associate level at all, only those at the Professor rank.

Chair May asked the group if requesting a pot of money and then developing a system that would speak to both merit and market allocation could be a viable solution. Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker said the Provost and President are prioritizing promotion pay increments over
PTR increments. As a former department chair she feels there is a benefit in implementing both market and merit allocations. Due to data constraints, it is hard to conduct a strong market analysis, so it was suggested to project a model of yearly raises over time for those immediately affected during every interval.

To re-focus the committee’s charge moving forward, Chair May asked the group if they wanted to focus primarily on: (1) the 2013 Faculty Senate resolution, (2) smaller projects like salary compression and PTR, which are ongoing and pressing issues. There was a brief discussion but no final decision.

Adjunct Compensation

Committee Member Janech presented annual pay data for adjunct faculty. Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker explained that the pay rate is based on the number of courses taught, degree qualifications, specialized training considerations, and campus location (e.g., BPS courses pay higher). The trend in the data shows that there is not a multiplication effect of each course taught at a flat rate, but that those who teach three and four classes receive higher compensation per course than those teaching one or two classes. Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker explained this by relaying that adjuncts who taught higher loads were categorized with full-time temporary staff who were the focus of a pay increase.

The issue presented to the group was whether to focus on getting those teaching one or two courses better compensation, or raising the overall pay for adjuncts to be in line with peer institutions. Committee Member Ivey said that adjuncting tends to be a local issue with people who are already in the area seeking employment, so comparing pay here to another peer institution in a different locale may not be useful. Committee Member Abuhakema responded that we already use peer institution data for other comparisons, so adjunct pay should be no different.

Before proceeding with a plan, Chair May suggested requesting data on: (1) the distribution of adjuncts across the fall and spring semesters, (2) what it would cost to get a flat course rate across the board regardless of how many courses being taught, (3) adjunct turnover rates, and (4) course evaluations for adjuncts to see if an argument can be made for increasing pay to retain higher-quality contingent faculty. Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker agreed to compile the data on adjuncts available through the institution. She warned that the data are not robust, but they may give a bit of context for the issue. She also mentioned that the committee could argue the better the compensation for adjuncts, the less of a gap you have to fill when a full-time line becomes available.
Salary Resolution

The CUPA-HR data will be available in February. In years past there was an issue with index reports. After a discussion about the benefits of weighting the data, the group agreed that there needs to be a written agreement from IRP and Jim Posey as to the specific types of data needed moving forward. If necessary, the Provost could be asked to provide his support to this effort.

Gender Salary Gap

The committee briefly discussed the gender pay disparities at the College. Committee Member Milner asked if this was indicative of a larger societal and systemic problem. More data are needed to understand the source of the inequity (i.e., discipline-specific and self-selection issues).

New Business

Prioritizing the Agenda

Chair May said the group needs to focus its efforts moving forward and listed the current challenges facing the committee: (1) establishing progress toward the 2013 Faculty Senate resolution, (2) PTR raises, (3) adjunct pay, (4) the benefit of using market and/or merit-based allocations in compensation decisions, and (5) data requests from IRP that will provide clarity on particular pay issues. Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker will provide her method for analyzing CUPA-HR data in years past.

Call for Additional Data

The next meeting will be on February 3, 2016. Those who agreed to collect additional data will need to have that information ready by that time.

Adjourn

With all of the agenda items being discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Keonya Booker

Committee Member and Recorder