

Annual Report of the Faculty Salary Review Committee, 2015-2016

I. Membership of the Faculty Salary Review Committee

Faculty Senate Appointments:

Dwayne Coleman (CLA)	2017
David McCalman (COB)	2017
Ben Rowley (CNSM)	2016
Kevin Stoltz (COE)	2018
Kevin Browne (CFAC)	2018
MaryAnn Campbell (CHBS)	2017
Elizabeth DiPrince (LIB, At-Large)	2017

Provost Office Appointment:

Laura Young

Representative from Office of Institutional Research:

Amber Hall

II Summary of activities during the Academic year 2014-2015

A. Faculty Salary Survey

The committee conducted a survey of UCA faculty views on salary between September 22nd and 29th, 2015. The ten-question online survey was sent to all UCA faculty via email and had 295 responses. The responses indicated that COLA adjustment was the most important consideration, among faculty, for the next year and over the next five years. The second highest priority was a pool representing both merit and equity adjustments. Part-time pay was also represented as a concern, with 13.9% considering it the most important concern for the next year (Table 1 and 2).

Table 1: When considering distribution of possible faculty salary raises, which one of the following is MOST important for the next fiscal year?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Cost of living adjustment	50.3%	148
Equity pool	9.9%	29
Merit pool	6.5%	19
Pool representing both equity and merit	19.4%	57
Part-time/adjunct and overload pay	13.9%	41
<i>answered question</i>		294
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Table 2: When considering distribution of possible faculty salary raises, which one of the following is MOST important over the next 5 years?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Cost of living adjustment	35.5%	104
Equity pool	14.7%	43
Merit pool	7.2%	21
Pool representing both equity and merit	31.4%	92
Part-time/adjunct and overload pay	11.3%	33
<i>answered question</i>		293
<i>skipped question</i>		2

On the question of how funding should be allocated, respondents were closely divided on how funding should be split between a COLA adjustment, equity/merit pool, and a part-time pay increase (Table 3).

Table 3: If a pool of funds is allocated for salary increases, which of the following distribution scenarios would you favor?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1: All available funds allocated to cost of living adjustment (COLA)	13.0%	38
2: Most available funds allocated towards a COLA with some going to equity/merit adjustments	29.0%	85
3: Available funds split between COLA and equity/merit adjustments	25.3%	74
4: Available funds split between a COLA, equity/merit adjustments, and a part-time pay increase	20.1%	59
5: Available funds split between COLA and part-time pay increase	12.6%	37
<i>answered question</i>		293
<i>skipped question</i>		2

The survey also provided faculty the opportunity to comment on their salary concerns. The survey received over one hundred comments. Those comments covered a wide range of issues but communicated common concerns over COLAs, salary compression, merit pay, and part-time pay.

B. Recommendation to the Strategic Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC)

With the continued goals of keeping faculty salaries in line with the higher cost of living and ensuring faculty salaries are equitable and competitive, the committee submitted and presented a salary funding recommendation for the 2016-2017 budget. For full-time faculty, this recommendation included a 2.5% cost-of-living adjustment and a 1.5% pool to address equity and merit issues. For part-time/adjunct faculty, a \$300 per 3-credit class increase was recommended with an additional increase of \$200 per 3-credit class each year for 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 years. These recommendations were based on the results of the 2015 Faculty Salary Review Committee Survey. Also considered was the continued disparity between faculty pay levels at UCA as compared with those at institutions of the same Carnegie classification as seen in the CUPA (College and University Professional Association) average (Table 4 and 5).

Table 4: Average UCA Salaries by Rank Compared to Average CUPA Master’s (larger) Salaries

Faculty Rank	Average Salary at UCA	Average Salary at Master’s (larger)	UCA % of Master’s (larger) 2014-2015
Professor	\$83,017	\$93,553	88.7%
Associate Professor	\$67,439	\$72,745	92.7%
Assistant Professor	\$58,532	\$61,917	94.5%
New Assistant Professor	\$59,741	\$63,719	93.8%

Source: Office of Institutional Research

Table 5: UCA % of Master’s (larger) Three Year Comparison

Faculty Rank	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Professor	87.7%	87.7%	88.7%
Associate Professor	90.5%	91.2%	92.7%
Assistant Professor	92.8%	94.2%	94.5%

At the end of the fall semester, SBAC voted on all new funding proposals including the faculty salary recommendations. The recommendation for a 2.5% COLA and a 1.5% equity/merit pool were combined with staff requests and voted as the first and second priority respectfully. The part-time faculty salary increase of \$300 per 3-credit class was voted as the fourth priority. The

2016-2017 budget has not been completed, and it is unknown at this time if funds will be available for any of the funding priorities.

C. Faculty Salary Equity Analysis

The committee did not see the need for any changes to faculty salary equity analysis this year. As in years past, the equity review starts first with the verification of a faculty member's salary, years in rank (YIR), and years in service (YIS). The Office of Institutional Research collects data from the Human Resource department and then works with college deans and department chairs to verify that information. Faculty also will be able to comment on their employment history through the Faculty Salary Review Feedback form. The committee agreed to continue the policy for determining YIR and YIS, which does not count years negotiated and approved by a DPAC towards tenure, years before a break in service at UCA of more than a year, or years as a visiting or emergency hire.

With the faculty salary information collected, Institutional Research then conducts an equity analysis. As was done last year, two forms of analyses will be conducted: regression analysis and comparison to the CUPA median. Based on the analysis, the faculty member is given the ranking: none (N), moderate (M), or severe (S). Committee members will review this analysis for their respective college and make corrections as needed. The analysis is then sent on to Chairs, Deans, and the Provost who also provide input by ranking the faculty member's salary based their knowledge of the member's work history. As requested by the Provost Office, the committee members and department chairs and dean will review the analysis at the same time.

D. Determining Library Faculty Salary Equity

When the CUPA median was added the salary equity process last year, the committee understood that it could not be used as a comparison for library faculty salaries because it did not consider faculty rank when looking at the salaries of library professionals. No existing survey data was found as a good replacement for the CUPA median during the Spring 2015 equity review process. In the fall of 2015, the Faculty Senate charged the committee to find a comparison tool when it passed the resolution on a Viable Method for Determining Library Faculty Salary Equity. With no quality survey data on library faculty salaries already existing, the committee decided it was necessary to create our own survey.

Working with Amber Hall, Art Lichtenstein and Jonathan Glenn, the chair of the committee

created a survey and list of institutions to survey. The survey asked institutions for information about their library professionals' faculty status and rank, supervision responsibilities, work areas, contract length, and salary rates for the last three years. The committee approved the general concept of the survey and the initial draft of the survey. Minor changes asking for additional information were made to the survey before it was sent out in January 2016. The survey was sent to twenty-three institutions which were believed to have library professionals with faculty status and a Master's (larger) Carnegie classification. At the time of this report, nine institutions responded, providing information about 97 library professionals. The committee had concerns about the small sample size and are considering options to increase the sample size.

III. Planning for the Academic Year 2016-2017

A. Determination of faculty priorities

- a. The committee will continue to consider ways to seek feedback from faculty on all issues regarding faculty salaries.

B. Presentation of Priorities to SBAC, Fall 2016

- a. As part of the committee's responsibilities, a recommendation and presentation of faculty salary adjustments will be made to SBAC in Fall 2016. This recommendation will be based on feedback received from faculty.

C. Library Faculty Salary Survey, Fall 2016

- a. The committee will continue to work with Institutional Research and the library director to create and conduct viable survey of faculty librarian salaries at comparable institutions.

D. Equity Analysis, early Spring 2016

- a. As part of the committee's responsibilities, work will continue with the Provost's Office and Institutional Research to provide an inequity analysis of faculty salaries. The committee will continue to monitor the process and determine if any adjustments should be made.