Meeting Minutes
Faculty Compensation Committee
March 8, 2019, 3:00 pm

In attendance: Antonio Perez-Nunez, chair; Deanna Caveny; Angela Flenner; Mark Long; Janine McCabe; Sorinel Oprisan; Kate Owens; Kelly Ann Wiechman; Chris Starr (via Skype).

- The minutes from the Feb. 1st meeting were approved.
- Kelly Ann Wiechman shared a report on comparing adjunct pay to the county’s poverty line and income limit for SNAP (Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program)
- Next, the committee reviewed the analysis of the faculty survey on morale and the merit-based raise.
  - Questions 2 and 3 of the survey showed morale low across the schools, but highest in the Library and lowest in the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs. The results also showed that faculty who were here the longest, had the lowest level of morale.
  - Question 4 and 5 asked faculty to report how their morale had been before the merit-based raise, and after. On average, morale decreased after the raise process. One possible explanation for this is that expectations were high, but many faculty were disappointed by either not receiving a raise, or in the small amount of increase.
  - Question 6 asked about how well-informed faculty felt they were about the process. 50% said information was scarce. There was variety between the schools: Faculty in the Library felt most informed, while the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs felt the least-informed.
  - Question 7 was a free text field, and Kate Owens felt the sentiments were summed up by the comment “More information, more money, more frequency.” Antonio Perez-Nunez said that he would share the sentiment analysis Chris Starr performed, and the committee discussed how to select comments for inclusion in the final report. Chris reported that the keyword analysis was not overly helpful, since the most common words were all pretty neutral – merit, faculty, raise, etc. He also reported that the comments were perceived by sentiment analysis as quite negative, even by those people who rated their morale as high. Deanna Caveny suggested separating comments by rating or sentiment, then choosing representative comments from each.
  - Antonio said that he wants to have the report ready for meeting with President Hsu in April, and he plans to finish writing it over Spring Break.
- Next, the committee discussed the issue of work faculty do without extra compensation.
  - The committee contributed suggestions to a Google Doc. Antonio proposed surveying faculty on how much time they spend doing these tasks. Janine wondered whether to ask about very department-specific tasks like serving as artistic director of the theater season. She knows that the chair of the Music department has a similar role, but there could be others. Sorinel Oprisan asked if grant-writing should be included. Antonio asks whether faculty should be compensated for grants they have written, or only grants that were awarded. Deanna pointed out that there are different types of grants – some serve the department, like the purchase of shared equipment, but some serve only the faculty who receive them. She said that there are institutions that award a small stipend for
having written a grant in a certain year. Mark Long asked whether Letters of Recommendation should be included, and Janine asked about non-course mentoring, which she pointed out is hard to quantify. Mark suggests that we might have more success in getting compensation for these activities if we focus on tasks that affect more faculty members.

- Antonio suggests that the tasks included in the survey should have the following attributes: cannot anticipate the time they will take, don’t count as teaching, research, or service, and not required by the job.

- Deanna says that she has a few comments about Kelly Ann Weichman’s adjunct pay report, including that it is better to report the pay data by semester rather than year. She will discuss other edits with Kelly Ann.

- The meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.
Meeting Minutes  
Faculty Compensation Committee  
February 1, 2019, 3:00 pm  

In attendance: Antonio Perez-Nunez, chair; Deanna Caveny; Angela Flenner; Mark Long; Janine McCabe; Sorinel Oprisan; Chris Starr.

• The minutes from the January 18th meeting were approved, with one amendment – Deanna Caveny clarified that cost of living can be extrapolated from the IPEDS data, not that the IPEDS data includes cost of living.

• Antonio Perez-Nunez reported that he met with the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the President said that he would report merit increase data to Institutional Research. He also acknowledged that salary inversion is a problem. Antonio brought up the question of other ways to compensate faculty outside of their salary, particularly for extra work they do such as grants, bachelor essay work, independent study, assessment. An action item for the committee is to come up with a full list of this type of extra work that could be eligible for extra compensation.

• Another action item is to compare full time adjunct pay with food stamp eligibility level, to illustrate the low rate of pay for adjuncts. One issue is that the adjuncts are considered temporary, even if they have worked in that capacity for many years. Janine McCabe mentioned that the senior lecturer title exists, but there is no extra pay for the title. Deanna Caveny reported that adjunct pay is gradually increasing as funds are added to the adjunct pool. The goal of the increase is to get a flat per-course rate. Currently, adjuncts who teach 3 courses make more per course than those who teach 1-2. Over the next several years, the idea is to raise the per-course rate gradually for all instructors, but more for those who teach 1-2 courses, so that eventually there is a flat per-course rate. Deanna estimated that this would take 5 years or more to get there, depending on how much the adjunct pool increases each year. She stated that administration would rather complete this leveling before making any other changes like extra compensation for senior lecturers. Chris Starr asked about turnover for adjuncts each year, and Deanna estimated it was about 25%.

• Antonio also asked at the Faculty Advisory Committee about when the next raise was expected, and the President said that the state is considering a mandatory raise of 3% for all employees this year. The President said that if the 3% doesn’t get passed, he would want to allot some money for faculty compression instead.

• Also at the Faculty Advisory Committee, Antonio learned that incoming President Hsu would want to meet with them in March, and Antonio would like to present the results of the committee’s survey on faculty merit increases at that time.

• Antonio reported that there has been 200 responses to the merit increase survey so far, and the committee decided to leave the survey open for about another week.

• The committee discussed how to analyze the results of the survey. Chris Starr brought some examples of how we could use a natural language tool from Watson to gauge sentiment and emotion from the qualitative responses. The committee was very interested in this type of analysis.

• Antonio and Chris decided to meet after the survey closed to analyze the responses, and then each member of the committee will write a part of the report. Antonio would split up the report by question and send out a Google doc for committee members to volunteer. Each part of the
report is due back to Antonio by February 25\textsuperscript{th}, and the committee’s next meeting will take place at 3 pm on March 8\textsuperscript{th}.

- The committee adjourned at 3:51.
Meeting Minutes
Faculty Compensation Committee
January 18, 2019, 3:00 pm

In attendance: Antonio Perez-Nunez, chair; Deanna Caveny; Angela Flennor; Mark Long; Janine McCabe; Sorinel Oprisan; Kate Owens; Chris Starr.

- Antonio Perez-Nunez called the meeting to order at 3:00, and suggested we begin the discussion of the merit increases that were disbursed in fall 2018.
- Deanna Caveny reported the details of the merit increase. The increase was 0.869% of the salary pool. The rules for awarding an increase were that no employee could receive more than a 5% increase or $2500, whichever was larger. She reported that the disbursement was very shallow, meaning that a large number of faculty received an increase, though they were not very large.
- Janine McCabe reported that as a department chair, she felt in a tough position since there were very few rules for awarding the raises, and each dean could make their own recommendations/rules, meaning each school has different results. In some schools, only a few faculty in each department could receive a merit increase. She also reported that it was difficult because the increase was so small, and that there is no telling when another merit increase will happen.
- Deanna Caveny responded to Janine’s comments by clarifying that the Provost’s instructions to deans did encourage fewer faculty raises to be awarded, so that each could be larger, but that was not an official requirement, which did result in differences among the schools.
- Janine McCabe also observed that the instruction to look at the most recent 3-year merit evaluation is unfair if merit increases are not awarded at least every year, because a faculty member’s best year could come in a time that is not eligible for merit pay increase.
- Antonio Perez-Nunez suggested the committee send out a survey to faculty to get their feedback on the exercise, so that the results could inform future merit exercises. He presented a draft of a faculty feedback survey, and the committee made suggestions and edits. A primary concern was to maintain the anonymity of the responses, so the committee discussed making the faculty member’s department either an optional response, or removing the question altogether. The committee also decided to make the “Years at the the college” question multiple choice with brackets of years (0-3 years, 4-6 years, etc.) instead of free text, also in the interest of preserving anonymity. We decided to keep the survey brief, so as to encourage as many responses as possible.
- Chris Starr had several questions about faculty pay in general. Deanna Caveny answered his question about our pay compared with cost of living by explaining the two databases of faculty salary we have access to: IPEDS has information about the cost of living of comparable institutions, but is not discipline-specific. CUPA-HR data is discipline-specific, but is not institution-specific, so cost-of-living is not available. Therefore it is difficult to get a direct apples-to-apples comparison of faculty salary compared to cost of living. She also answered a question about faculty turnover, stating that 40-50 faculty members leave each year, including retirements. That is out of a population of a little more than 500. Antonio Perez-Nunez said that he would bring several more of Chris Starr’s questions to the Advisory Committee to the President.
- The committee adjourned at 4:30.
Meeting Minutes
Faculty Compensation Committee
August 24, 2018, 1:00 pm

In attendance: Antonio Perez-Nunez, chair; Deanna Caveny; Angela Flenner; Mark Long; Janine McCabe.

- Antonio Perez-Nunez called the meeting to order and asked if we approved the meeting minutes from April 18, 2018. The minutes were approved unanimously.
- Antonio Perez-Nunez reviewed the background of the committee, beginning with the resolution offered in 2013 with the goal of meeting or exceeding peer institution’s median salaries as an institution and at each rank and discipline by September of 2018. He also discussed that Institutional Research performed a gender salary gap study last year. Deanna Caveny gave additional background, stating that since the committee doesn’t have access to individualized salary, so all studies are performed by the Office of Institutional Research, which does have access to that data. She suggested that a possible action item be to invite Jim Posey from IR to have him review the analyses their office has done, and perhaps the committee could have input into what type of analysis they do in the future.
- Next, the discussion moved to the merit pay increase that the College announced over the summer. Deanna Caveny stated that there is a desire in administration for relatively targeted pay increases, rather than across-the-board, but that as far as she knows, nothing has been firmly established yet. Janine McCabe weighed in with concerns that since this was the first merit increase in at least five years, and that there hasn’t been cost-of-living increases every year, there could be morale problems for those faculty who do not get any increase in pay. Mark Long asked if there was any indication of when the next merit exercise would occur, because morale could be improved if faculty felt that there was a commitment to future raises. Deanna Caveny said that the committee could take a position on the allocation of the merit increases, and there was a discussion of who to address the concerns, and at what point in the process. The committee decided that the first step would be emailing the Provost to inquire if the administration has codified any principles for disbursing the merit increases, and to be ready to attend a Dean’s meeting to discuss the concerns with them.
- The meeting concluded at 2:15.