

Faculty Salary Review Committee
Annual Report
2025 – 2026



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

Faculty Salary Review Committee

Charge

Examine and study faculty salary, merit, and equity on an ongoing basis. Make periodic adjustments to the Salary Adjustment Allocation Model. Engage in ongoing dialogue with faculty by making reports electronically available to all faculty, responding to faculty queries, and, if necessary, conducting open forums for the discussion of issues and concerns of individual faculty members.

Members

Kurt Boniecki (chair, provost designee, ex-officio, non-voting), Liz DiPrince (Torreyson Library), Kim Eskola (CHBS), Kaye McKinzie (COB), John Parrack (CAHSS), Erin Shaw (COE), Azida Walker (COSE), and Amber Hall (OIR, ex-officio, non-voting)

Meeting Dates

October 6, 2025; November 3, 2025; December 1, 2025; February 2, 2026; February 23, 2026 (see Appendix A for the minutes of each meeting)

Recommendations

The 2025-2026 Faculty Salary Review Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate that

- The salaries of all full-time continuing faculty members should be at least 90% of the target salary indicated by the current faculty pay structure.
- The university will pay a faculty member a faculty longevity bonus to those full-time continuing faculty members who are on the August 16 to August 31 payroll each year. The amount of the bonus will be determined by their continuous years in service as of August 16. The bonus will be paid on the September 15 payroll and the amount of the bonus will be determined by the following table:

Years in Service	Lower Ranks	Terminal Ranks
13 – 16	\$400	\$800
17 – 20	\$500	\$1,000
21 – 24	\$600	\$1,200
25 +	\$750	\$1,500

- A review of the faculty pay structure should occur no later than every five years.
- In cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a non-administrative standard plus (10-, 11-, or 12-month) faculty member, the target salary should be extrapolated from the current faculty pay structure by multiplying the 9-month target salary by the number of months of the appointment and then dividing by nine.
- The administration should fund the following in priority order:
 1. Equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries (Recommendation 1 above)
 2. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
 3. A faculty longevity bonus that includes the lower ranks (Recommendation 2 above).

A summary of the committee's work and deliberations that led to the above recommendations follows.

Summary

During the 2025-2026 academic year, the Faculty Salary Review Committee set an agenda based on unresolved priorities from last year and new concerns brought to the committee. The committee considered the following issues.

1. Equity Adjustments Relative to Target Salaries

Last year, the FSRC recommended that “the UCA administration use the pay structures in [last year’s] report to make decisions on any market equity adjustments to faculty salaries for the coming fiscal year.” The current committee considered the administration’s stated goal to increase all faculty salaries below 90% of the target salary indicated by the pay structure to 90%.

A motion and second were made to recommend that the salaries of all full-time continuing faculty members should be at least 90% of the target salary indicated by the current faculty pay structure. Discussion followed about including 10-, 11-, and 12-month faculty (called “standard plus” faculty) given that the pay structure provides 9-month target salaries. The committee agreed that the motion includes standard plus faculty, and that their target salaries would be extrapolated according to the recommendation in Section 4 of this report. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

2. Revision of the New Longevity Bonus

Last year, the FSRC recommended that “the UCA administration consider providing a career service award to Senior Lecturers/Senior Clinical Instructor and Professors who have been in the rank for more than six years consistent with promotion timelines.” The UCA administration responded by implementing an annual “longevity bonus” paid to faculty who have achieved the highest rank (Senior Lecturer, Senior Clinical Instructor, and Professor). The amount of the bonus depends on years in rank as follows: \$800 for 1 – 4 years, \$1,000 for 5 – 9 years, \$1,200 for 10 – 14 years, and \$1,500 for 15 or more years.

A concern was raised in this year’s committee that the longevity bonus disenfranchised long-serving faculty at the lower ranks. This issue was discussed by the committee last year and the committee decided to limit the recommendation to faculty in the highest rank because faculty in the lower ranks still have the opportunity to increase their salary through promotion. Last year’s committee was concerned that a bonus might decrease the incentive to apply for promotion. However, this year’s committee considered the argument that long-serving faculty at the lower-ranks still make positive contributions to UCA even though they may not meet their department’s or school’s criteria for promotion. For example, an Associate Professor may intentionally direct time away from scholarly activity

to excel at teaching or service, and as a result, fall short of their department’s benchmark for scholarship to be promoted to Professor. Their disqualification from a longevity bonus appears to devalue their contributions and might lead to lowered morale.

Therefore, the committee considered several models that included long-serving faculty at the lower ranks in the longevity bonus pool. Instead of basing the longevity bonus on years in rank, the committee considered basing the bonus on years in service. The minimum number of years required to achieve the highest faculty ranks is 12. Therefore, the committee discussed eligibility starting in the 13th year of continuous service with the amount increasing every four years: 13 – 16 years, 17 – 20, 21 – 24, and 25 or more years. To address the concern over disincentivizing promotion, the committee considered a bonus structure in which faculty in the lower ranks are paid half of what is paid to faculty in the terminal ranks. After much discussion, the following proposed revision to the longevity bonus was presented to the committee.

The university will pay a faculty member a faculty longevity bonus to those **full-time continuing** faculty members who are on the August 16 to August 31 payroll each year ~~and have achieved the highest rank: senior lecturer, senior clinical instructor, and professor~~. The amount of the bonus will be determined by their **continuous** years in rank **of service** as of August 16. The bonus will be paid on the September 15 payroll and the amount of the bonus will be determined by the following table:

Years in Service	Lower Ranks	Terminal Ranks
13 – 16	\$400	\$800
17 – 20	\$500	\$1,000
21 – 24	\$600	\$1,200
25 +	\$750	\$1,500

The Office of Institutional Research analyzed the impact of the proposal. Based on currently available data¹, 74 additional faculty members would receive a bonus, and 5 faculty members who met the years-in-rank criteria but not the years-in-service criteria would not receive a bonus. The total cost of the proposed bonus structure is \$257,928, including benefits, compared to \$188,496 under the current model (an additional \$69,432).

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above revision to the faculty longevity bonus. Discussion followed and focused on whether faculty in the lower ranks

¹ At the time of the analysis, the years in service of 10 faculty members were not readily available and the data that was available would require additional validation.

deserve bonuses when they have a pathway to salary increases by promotion. The motion carried, 5 in favor, 1 opposed.

3. Review of the Faculty Pay Structure

Last year, the FSCR recommended that “the Office of Institutional Research work with the Faculty Salary Review Committee to review annually and appropriately update the faculty pay structures as needed, including the peer group and CIP code groupings, and communicate the revised faculty pay structures to the UCA administration.” A concern was raised that this task requires an extensive amount of work and is not feasible on an annual basis. Gallagher, the company that was hired to assist with the university salary study last year, recommended revising the pay structure every three to five years.

A motion and a second were made to recommend a review of the faculty pay structure occur no later than every five years. Discussion followed and focused on whether a review should occur every three years instead of five. The committee agreed that the recommendation is for a review to occur *no later* than every five years, but the university could decide to review faculty and staff pay structures earlier. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

4. Methodology for Determining Target Salaries for “Standard Plus” Faculty

Last year, the university salary study established a faculty pay structure based on market data for nine-month faculty according to rank, years in rank, and CIP code groupings. However, a methodology for determining the target salaries for non-administrative standard plus faculty members (i.e., faculty members on 10-, 11-, and 12-month non-administrative appointments) was not finalized. In some cases, the department, college, or university has extant market data to determine an appropriate target salary for certain standard plus faculty. For example, CUPA provides market data for various library roles that can be used to determine target salaries for faculty librarians. In cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a standard plus faculty member, the committee considered a proposal to extrapolate the appropriate target salary from the nine-month faculty pay structure by the number of months of the appointment. For example, a 10-month faculty member’s target salary would be the nine-month salary from the pay structure based on CIP code, rank, and years in rank multiplied by $10/9^{\text{th}}$.

A motion and a second were made to recommend that, in cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a non-administrative standard plus faculty member, the target salary should be extrapolated from the current faculty pay structure by multiplying the 9-month target salary by the number of months of the appointment and then dividing by nine. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

5. Standard Methodology for Converting Salaries of Faculty Administrators

A concern was brought to the committee that there is no standard university policy for converting the salary of a nine-month faculty member when they are appointed to 12-month administrative positions. As a result, practices have varied over the years. Most recently, nine-month salaries have been multiplied by 1.25 plus a negotiated stipend to reach an agreed upon 12-month salary in the letter of appointment. The committee considered 1.25 to be too low because 12 divided by 9 is 1.33. After discussion, the following proposal was made:

- When existing nine-month faculty are appointed to 12-month administrative positions, the minimum 12-month administrative salary will be 1.33 times the nine-month salary. An additional stipend may be negotiated. The nine-month salary and any negotiated stipend must be stated in the letter of appointment.
- When hiring external candidates into 12-month administrative positions that include a faculty appointment, the initial nine-month salary must be clearly stated in the letter of appointment and will not be less than 90% of the target salary from the current faculty pay structure.
- Any changes to the nine-month salary due to cost-of-living adjustments, market-equity adjustments, promotion raises, or other university approved salary adjustments must be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above proposal. Discussion followed. Several committee members expressed concern that we did not have time to research the policies of other institutions or ask the administration to justify the 1.25 multiplier over 1.33. A motion and a second were made to table the proposal until the next academic year. The motion carried, 4 in favor, 1 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

6. Review of Promotion Increases

Increases in faculty salaries as a result of promotion to a higher rank have not changed in 12 years. Currently, the salary increases for promotion are set at \$2,500 for Lecturer I to Lecturer II, \$4,000 for Lecturer II to Senior Lecturer and for Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and \$5,500 for Associate Professor to Professor. The committee did not have time to fully investigate the promotion increases of peer institutions. However, the committee noted that the faculty pay structure provides insight into the minimum and midpoint market salaries for each rank. Therefore, a proposal was made to recommend that promotion increases should be the greater of (1) the current fixed amounts, or (2) a percentage of the minimum market salary for the next highest rank equal to the faculty

member's percentage of their target salary at the current rank. For example, if a faculty member's current salary is 90% of the target salary based on the faculty pay structure, then their salary when promoted to the next rank would be 90% of the minimum salary for that rank in the faculty pay structure *if* that amount exceeds the current fixed promotion increases.

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above proposal. Discussion followed. Several committee members expressed concern that we did not have time to research the promotion increases of other institutions or the financial impact of the proposal. A motion and a second were made to table the proposal until the next academic year. The motion carried, 5 in favor, 0 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

7. Peer Group Methodology

The committee recognized that standard criteria should be established for selecting institutions to include in the peer group used to establish market salaries and the faculty pay structure. However, the committee did not deem this task to be a priority for this year given the recommendation that the faculty pay structure be reviewed every five years. Therefore, no proposal was made by the committee.

8. Faculty Salary Funding Priorities

The FSCR recognizes that there is a limited amount of funds available to adjust faculty salaries and pay. A motion and a second was made to recommend that the administration fund the following in priority order:

1. Market equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries (see Section 1 above)
2. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
3. A faculty longevity bonus that includes the lower ranks (see Section 2 above)

The motion carried, 5 in favor, 0 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Salary Review Committee

March 4, 2026

Appendix A

Minutes of the Faculty Salary Review Committee

Faculty Salary Review Committee

October 6, 2025 @ 2:00 pm

Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Amber Hall, Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Liz DiPrince, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, and Azida Walker

1. Action Item:
 - a. K. Boniecki will serve as the committee chair by assent of the committee.

2. Discussion Items:
 - a. K. Boniecki presented the charge of the committee to produce a report on the agenda findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate by March, 2026.
 - b. K. Boniecki presented potential agenda topics to address this year and asked for input. Discussion included:
 - i. What criteria will be used to select institutions for our Peer Group?
 - ii. Does the current faculty pay structure make sense with new data? Review of the pay structure should be an annual responsibility.
 - iii. Should we reconsider a Longevity Bonus for faculty who have not been promoted to a terminal rank?
 - iv. How do we determine the market salary for faculty in administrative leadership roles and for faculty in 10, 11, and 12-month positions?
 - v. How do our step increases for promotion compare to other peer institutions?
 - c. The committee considered that some agenda items will be easier and thus quicker to address than other items. The committee re-prioritized the agenda list due to the limited number of meetings and the Faculty Senate report deadline as follows: (1) Reconsider the Faculty Longevity Bonus (2) Review of Faculty Pay Structure (3) Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries (4) Standard Plus (10, 11, 12-month) Faculty Salaries (5) Peer Group Methodology and (6) Promotion Step Increases.

Monthly meetings will be extended to two hours. The next meeting is November 3, 2025, from 2:00 – 4:00 pm in Wingo Hall 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee

November 3, 2025

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Amber Hall, Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker and Jessica Riedmueller as proxy for Liz DiPrince.

1. No action items.

- a. Minutes from the October 6, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on October 8, 2025. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second by Erin Shaw. No changes or corrections were noted. Motion passed, all in favor.

2. Discussion Items:

a. Reconsideration of the Faculty Longevity Bonus

- i. The current faculty longevity bonus was paid out on September 15, 2025 to faculty who have achieved a terminal rank (Full Professor, Senior Clinical Instructor, Senior Lecturer).
- ii. The committee discussed alternative proposals to include faculty who hold lower ranks, including one that awarded differential bonuses based on years in service and rank.
- iii. The committee agreed that eligible faculty must have full-time, consecutive, continuing service to the university. Time worked as an visiting or adjunct should not count towards eligible service.
- iv. Amber Hall will present data on the number and cost of the draft proposals and discussion will continue at the next FSRC meeting in December.

b. Review Faculty Pay Structure

- i. The committee discussed how often to revise this data. How can the university address market equity if the targets are constantly changing?
- ii. The committee agreed to recommend that the pay structure be revised every five years.

c. Standard Plus Faculty Salaries

- i. There are currently 21 Standard Plus (10, 11, 12-month) faculty who do not have a determined market salary.
- ii. The committee discussed how to calculate a 9-month market salary for 10, 11, and 12-month faculty. The following formula was proposed: Standard Plus market salary = (9-month market salary / 9) x

number of contract months. Thus, a Standard Plus faculty salary can be converted to a 9-month standard salary by dividing the salary by the number of contract months and multiplying by 9.

iii. Discussion will continue.

d. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries

i. The salaries of faculty in academic leadership positions (chairs, school directors, associate deans, deans, etc.) depend on their negotiated contracts. For internal hires, salaries were often calculated by multiplying the 9-month salary by 1.25 plus a negotiated stipend. For external hires, their contract should include a “walk back” to a 9-month faculty salary plus and COLA and market increases since being hired.

ii. Amber Hall works with Lori Hudspeth to maintain a 9-month “walk back” for all faculty in academic leadership positions that is adjusted annually based on COLA and market.

iii. A proposal was made to recommend that academic leadership salaries use a standard conversion equal to the 9-month salary x 1.33 + a negotiated stipend because 12 months is 1.33 times more than 9 months. The committee wondered if 1.25 was used as the multiplier because academic leadership positions accrue leave, whereas faculty positions due not.

iv. Discussion will continue.

e. Promotion Step Increases

i. Amber Hall did some preliminary investigation of the promotion increases at other peer institutions and will present that information at a later date.

The next meeting is Monday, December 1, 2025, from 2:00-4:00 pm in Wingo Hall, room 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee
December 1, 2025 @ 2:00 pm
Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, Liz DiPrince

Absent: Amber Hall

1. No action items.
 - a. Minutes from the November 3, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on November 19, 2025. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second from Kim Eskola. One change was made to the minutes. Motion passed, five in favor and one abstention. The approved minutes were sent to the Faculty Senate president.
2. Discussion Items:
 - a. Faculty Longevity Bonus
 - i. The committee examined revised drafts and data provided by Amber Hall.
 - ii. Amber will provide updated data including faculty at the Assistant Professor, Clinical Instructor I, and Lecturer I ranks who meet the years-in-service.
 - iii. The committee was asked to obtain feedback from their constituents.
 - iv. The committee will vote on a final recommendation at the conclusion of the committee's work this academic year.
 - b. Faculty Pay Structure
 - i. Completed. The recommendation is to reevaluate every five years.
 - c. Standard-Plus Faculty
 - i. The committee agreed on using the following formula to calculate a 9-month equivalence for market comparison: divide salary by the number of months worked x 9
 - ii. Any nine-month market adjustment would be proportionally adjusted by dividing by 9 and multiplying by the number of months worked.
 - iii. Librarians are not included as standard-plus faculty. They have their own pay structure based on data from CUPA.
 - d. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries

- i. The committee agreed on using the following formula to convert a 9-month faculty salary to a 12-month administrative leadership salary:
9-month salary x 1.33 + stipend
 - ii. Should there be a minimum stipend?
 - iii. The calculation will only apply to internal hires. External hires must have an initial 9-month walk-back salary stipulated in their offer letter.
 - iv. The 9-month salary should be adjusted annually based on COLA and market.
 - v. The adjusted 9-month walk-back salary should be stated in a letter every year.
- e. Promotion Step Increases
 - i. Amber will provide information at the next meeting.
- f. Peer Group Methodology
 - i. The committee agree they will not examine the peer group methodology at this time, but it may be considered next academic year.

The next FSRC meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2026 at 2:00 pm in Wingo Hall 214

Faculty Salary Review Committee
February 2, 2026 @ 2:30 pm
Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, Liz DiPrince, Amber Hall

1. No action items.
 - a. Minutes from the December 1, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on January 8, 2026. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second from Erin Shaw. Motion passed, all in favor. The approved minutes were sent to the Faculty Senate president.

2. Discussion items:
 - a. Reconsider Faculty Longevity Bonus
 - i. The committee reviewed updated data provided by Amber Hall. To include the additional faculty (12) with first ranks that meet the years-in-service criteria would currently cost an additional \$9,174. The committee will consider a longevity bonus model that includes all full-time continuing faculty based on continuous years-in-service.
 - ii. The committee considered other recommendations for no changes to the faculty longevity bonus and / or to do the same pay out as last year.
 - iii. The committee discussed the difference between “continuous service” and “continuing faculty”.
 - b. Standard-Plus Faculty Salaries
 - i. Kurt Boniecki clarified that the target salary for faculty in 10-, 11-, and 12-month positions who do not have a nine-month salary defined in their letter of appointment should be determined by either (1) extrapolating the appropriate 9-month salary from the faculty pay structure to the number of months required of the position, or (2) a justified recommendation from the department chair or school director approved by the dean and provost.
 - c. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries
 - i. The committee is considering recommending that a minimum salary for 12-month academic administrators with 9-month faculty appointments be equal to their 9-month salary x 1.33. An additional stipend may be negotiated.

- ii. The committee discussed whether they had enough data to recommend a range for administrative stipends at this time.
 - iii. This recommendation would be for new administrative leadership. Existing leadership would be held to their current letters of appointment but may request to renegotiate.
 - iv. Academic administrators' 9-month salaries should be adjusted annually based on COLA, market equity, or other approved salary adjustments and recorded in their personnel files.
- d. Promotion Step Increases
- i. The committee discussed if they have enough data to make an informed recommendation.
 - ii. The committee is considering recommending the greater of (1) current fixed amount or (2) same percentage of target salary for next rank.
 - iii. Amber will provide a budget analysis of this recommendation for the next meeting.
3. Kurt Boniecki will draft a final report on all the recommendations and distribute the information to the committee members before the next meeting. The committee will vote on their final recommendations and priority order at the meeting on March 2, 2026.

The next FSRC meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 2, 2026, at 2:30 pm in Wingo Hall 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee

February 23, 2026 @ 2:30 pm

Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki, Kaye McKinzie (via Zoom), Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, and Amber Hall (NV)

Absent: Liz DiPrince (comments and votes on action items submitted prior to the meeting)

The committee discussed the draft annual report and took action on the following items:

1. Equity Adjustments Relative to Target Salaries
 - a. John Parrack made the motion to recommend the administration's stated goal to increase all faculty salaries below 90% of the target salary indicated by the pay structure to 90%. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. "All faculty" should explicitly state "full-time continuing" and include "Standard-Plus" faculty as outlined in subsequent sections of the report. Motion passed, all in favor.
2. Revision of the New Longevity Bonus
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend the revision as summarized in the draft report. John Parrack seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. The term "terminal rank" will be used instead of "higher rank". Motion passed, five in favor and one opposed.
3. Review of the Faculty Pay Structure
 - a. Kaye McKinzie made the motion to recommend a review of the faculty pay structure every five years. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Motion passed, all in favor.
4. Methodology for Determining Market Salaries for "Standard Plus" Faculty
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend in cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the market salary of a standard plus faculty member, to extrapolate the appropriate target salary from the nine-month faculty pay structure by the number of months of the appointment. Kaye McKinzie seconded the motion. Discussion followed. If data other than the pay structure are available, then a target salary will be determined in consultation with the Department Chair/School Director, Dean, and Provost. Standard Plus faculty do not include faculty administrators. Motion passed, all in favor.
5. Standard Methodology for Converting Salaries of Faculty Administrators

- a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend the proposal as outlined in the draft report. Kaye McKinzie seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Members expressed concern that there was not enough time to research and not enough data to support changing the 1.25 multiplier to 1.33. The committee would like to know what peer institutions are doing. John Parrack made the motion to table the proposal until next academic year. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Motion passed to table the proposal until next year, with four in favor and one opposed.
6. Review of Promotion Increases
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend that promotion increases should be the greater of (1) the current fixed amounts, or (2) a percentage of the minimum market salary for the next highest rank equal to the faculty member's percentage of their target salary at the current rank. Erin Shaw seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. Members expressed concern that there was not enough data to support the recommendation and would like to explore other models for promotion increases, especially since not everyone is at 90% of their target salary. Kim made the motion to table the proposal until next academic year. John Parrack seconded the motion. Motion passed, five in favor and none opposed.
7. Faculty Salary Funding Priorities
 - a. Kaye McKinzie made the motion to recommend that the administration fund the following in priority order:
 - i. Equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries.
 - ii. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
 - iii. A faculty longevity bonus that includes lower ranks.Erin Shaw seconded the motion. The motion passed, five in favor and none opposed.

Kurt Boniecki will draft a second revision of the FSRC annual report for committee review before submitting the final report to the Faculty Senate.

This concludes the work of the Faculty Salary Review Committee for this academic year. No further meetings are scheduled.