College of Charleston
Faculty Compensation Committee End of Year Meeting

April 21, 2017 / 3:00 PM / 212 ECTR

Attendees
Committee members: Keonya Booker (Chair), Edward Chauca (new), Michael Giuliano (incumbent), Kathleen Janech (incumbent), Joshua Minor (new), Luci Moreira (incumbent)

Other attendees: Deanna Caveny-Noecker

Minutes

● There was not a quorum, so the minutes from the last meeting on 11/4/16 could not be approved.

● Keonya noted that she has been the chair of the committee for this past year, but will be moving to the Faculty Welfare Committee next year, so this committee will need to select a new chair as soon as possible. She noted that much of the work of the committee chair is behind the scenes. Since not all of the new members were present, this transition plan could not be carried out today so she will attempt to find some consensus on email.

● Keonya summarized the work of the Faculty Compensation Committee this past year. She started with the fact that the committee’s main focus was the Faculty Senate Salary Resolution from March of 2013, which mandated that the College of Charleston wanted to reach the salary mean of our peer institutions in 5 years. This means that we need to present data and an update next March.

● To that end, Keonya has been meeting with Deanna, as well as Jim Posey, to try to obtain those data.

● The CUPA-HR data are in, and show that while the pay for assistant professors is ahead of both the mean and the median compared to our peer institutions, the pay for associate professor and professor have fallen behind those of peer institutions. It was noted that this is still highly variable across disciplines as well, due somewhat to market demands (languages vs. computer science, for example). Keonya also included data showing the cost to the College to be able to reach the mean of our peers. The Senate resolution from 2013 specifically mandates the reporting of the mean, but the committee has determined that the median is also helpful to have.

● Edward asked if we have specific data for salary amounts here at CofC, and Deanna replied that yes, we do, but they are for use only within the committee and are not to be shared outside of it.

● Another item of importance to the committee that came up last year was the potential of gender inequities in salary at CofC. Michael has done some research into this on behalf of the committee, and has put forward an analytical proposal, where the salary data would be
normalized based on the most recent year’s index report from CUPA-HR. This means that certain disciplines with higher market-directed pay scales, or with fewer men or women in their ranks, would have a less biased influence on the analysis, but would still be included.

- The analytical proposal from the office of IRP is a little different. They propose using an analysis similar to a study performed by Washington and Lee University, which compares individual salary data to the market median, and accounts for differences in salaries affected by time in rank as well as rank differences within disciplines. This method uses a compa-ratio.

- **Recommendations for next year’s committee:**
  - Decide which path the committee wants to focus on - Gender pay discrepancies, compression, adjunct pay, PTR compensation or other priorities
  - Continue working closely with staff in IRP to analyze long-standing salary compression and inequity matters
  - Partner with other committees, such as Faculty Welfare and Budget, to study issues affecting the compensation of the College’s instructional faculty

- Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.
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.
Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) Meeting Minutes
First Meeting of the Fall 2016 Semester
Sept. 23, 2016, 1 p.m., MYBK 319

**Attendance:** Zeff Bjerken, Keonya Booker, Barbara Duval, Michael Giuliano, Kathleen Janech, Sorinel Oprisan, Mark Pyles

---Keonya adjourned the meeting at 1:03 p.m., and asked members to introduce themselves. The first item was to approve the meeting minutes from the April 25, 2016 meeting.

---Kathleen motioned to accept the April 25 minutes, this was seconded by all members.

---Keonya asked if anyone wanted to fill the position of recording secretary. No one volunteered, so she asked Kathleen to fill the position for this meeting to get us started.

---Keonya told all members that there is a committee Dropbox available, and that everyone could look at documents from previous years to get up to speed.

---She then gave a background review of the committee’s work last year. In keeping with our charge from the Faculty Senate Resolution in 2013, we are trying to bring faculty salaries at the College of Charleston up equal to that of our peers. Our peers are those found in the CUPA-HR data, and we will need to ask Jim Posey about the latest data from 2015-16.

---Zeff stated that he believed there was a 5 year window in which the committee was to address the resolution.

---Keonya stated that one of the committee’s accomplishments that was presented at the final senate meeting last year was that instead of there being a different pay rate for adjuncts teaching 1 or 2 courses, compared to those teaching 3 or 4, the committee called for the same pay scale per course, regardless of how many were taught. It is believed that this is still on the radar of the Faculty Senate this year, but the minutes were not yet available.

---She also stated that last year’s committee had decided not to pursue an increase in summer teaching salary since the data did not support the effort.

---One of the issues that was still a major concern, however, was faculty compression and PTR. This is not only a concern for senior faculty, as demonstrated by Meg’s letter, but also is a factor for the recruitment and retention of all faculty. The bump from assistant to associate professor is much larger than that from associate professor to full professor. This is also believed to be on the radar of the administration this year. Keonya will ask Deanna if it was discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting.

---Another major concern of the committee was that of gender inequality – data still needs to be studied more to determine exactly what is going on with this. Distinctions need to be made between what is
affected by differences in hiring processes by departments, and individual negotiating skills, and what the committee or College can actually control.

---Action items for this year: 1. 2013 salary resolution must continue, more data needed from Jim Posey, Librarians should be included as well.

2. Gender inequality issues – more data need to be obtained from Jim Posey. Discussion occurred regarding the committee actually meeting with the Provost or President, or speaking to the Board of Trustees.

---Keonya will talk to Deanna to see what light she can shed on these issues. She will also invite Jim Posey to our next meeting. We will try to meet on a Friday at 2pm so that all committee members would be able to attend.

---Zeff said that one issue we could ask Jim would be, is CUPA-HR still an accurate comparison group? Should we try to compare to our fellow CAA schools more instead?

Meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.