Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) Meeting Minutes
Second Meeting of the Fall 2016 Semester
Nov. 4, 2016, 2 p.m., ECTR 215

Attendance: Keonya Booker, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Barbara Duval, Michael Giuliano, Kathleen Janech, Luci Moreira, Sorinel Oprisan, Mark Pyles (Dr. Jim Posey, the Associate VP for Institutional Research, was invited to attend this meeting, but was unable to be there.)

---Keonya adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m. The first item was to approve the meeting minutes from the Sept. 23, 2016 meeting. Before that could take place, Mike requested that they be amended to state “raw data” instead of just “data” when speaking of what was needed for the committee to analyze moving forward. This was discussed, and there is now more information included in the committee Dropbox, thanks to Deanna, that will satisfy this requirement. The Sept. minutes were not amended.

---The motion was put forward to accept the Sept. 23 minutes, this was seconded by all members.

---Keonya said that the first order of business was that the committee needed a recording secretary. Kathleen volunteered to do this.

---Deanna was invited to explain the different data sources that the committee is trying to sort through. She prefaced her explanation by stating that although this data is distributed to and shared with Deans and committees as necessary, it cannot be shared with the campus as a whole because there is personal, individual salary information.

   -CUPA-HR is one group of peer institutions with which we compare salary data. Since we contribute to it and report our faculty salary data, we are allowed to purchase the data that they collect from other institutions. However, one limitation of this dataset is that we can only pull information on groups, in order to protect the privacy of individual institutions.

   -We are able to get the rank discipline cell median and mean, and the data are provided to CUPA-HR and then returned to us yearly, in Feb./March.

   -IPEDS data: this is another federally-mandated source of data, we receive the results in the spring for the previous year – longer processing time than CUPA-HR.

   -With IPEDS data, we cannot pull out rank/discipline, but can pull aggregated institutional data

   -The distribution of ranks must always be considered when examining the data, and information on the Instructor rank is not always useful because that rank is less well defined than Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor.

---Kathleen asked a question of Deanna as a follow-up to a question posed at the September meeting by Zeff. He had been curious if our peer group was still accurate, or if we should instead align more closely with other schools in the CAA?

---Deanna replied that our current cohort in CUPA-HR is still good because it gives us higher salary figures (if we want to look at the background on it, we could go back to the original ad hoc committee minutes). It provides us with the criteria used, and only public institutions. She said that she could pull the CAA data, but personally did not think it would be accurate. It seemed to be the general feeling of the committee that it would not be worth the time to try to redo our peer groups at this point.
Mark and Mike were interested in seeing the original criteria from the ad hoc committee, and Keonya said that was in the Faculty Salary Study in the Dropbox folder.

Keonya pulled up the data so that we could look at the 7 year trend, and the College has increased salaries over that time, but so have peers. We have rankings to work with now. In regards to the compression issue, it is hard to operationalize productivity and merit.

Deanna provided the tenure, promotion and PTR information. She and Jim Posey have different approaches.

Mike stated the need for both medians and means, since we can see bigger gaps when comparing medians than with comparing means, and this would allow us to see if our trend is moving in the right direction.

Keonya summarized that the committee is still in a fact-finding stage, and still getting reports. She asked if Mark and Mike would volunteer to look over the data with Deanna.

Yes, Mark and Mike agreed that they could plot medians.

Deanna walked the committee through the CUPA-HR data and in most categories, we are above 90%. Most of the information that we need is in there, except for gender. It would be best for the committee to really try to understand all that is in the CUPA-HR data first really well so that we would be able to articulate exactly what additional raw data we would want, due to the sensitive nature of more detailed datasets and the issues of trust involved. (The Office of Institutional Research usually does the analysis for us, instead of providing the raw data.)

Keonya encouraged the committee, for the next meeting, to think of the questions that we would want to ask.

Deanna stated that it could be valuable to have other CIP codes, in addition to those that we have, and a CSV file would have all of them.

Keonya said that she would work on the data to try to determine what specific questions there would be, and then we could follow up with looking at any potential gender discrepancies.

Kathleen mentioned in other business that she was curious as to what had happened to the idea put forward by the committee last year, that would raise the per-course pay of adjuncts who teach 1 or 2 courses to equal the per-course pay of those who teach 4 courses. Deanna had calculated the potential cost of this proposal at the time, and there seemed to be nowhere for this to go last year due to budgetary constraints.

Deanna suggested that if the committee were amenable, the chair could carry the committee’s agenda into a meeting with Provost McGee, and he may have plans of what might be able to be restored with the current budget.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.