

Faculty Salary Review Committee's Salary Funding Recommendation for the 2016-2017 Year

In accordance with the goals and objectives of the UCA Strategic Plan, the Faculty Salary Review Committee respectfully submits the following requests for new funding.

Priority 1: Cost-of-Living Adjustment for Full-Time Faculty

We recommend funding equal to or greater than 2.5% of the salary values for full-time teaching faculty to be made available for the 2016-2017 year as a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). The estimated cost of this increase is \$1,065,000. Continuation of this funding is also recommended for the next five budget years.

Priority 2: Equity and Merit for Full-Time Faculty

To address issues of equity and merit among full-time faculty salaries, we recommend funding equal to or greater than 1.5% of the salary values for full-time teaching faculty to be made available for the 2016-2017 year. The estimated cost of this funding is \$639,000 and continuation of this funding is also recommended for the next five budget years. This funding would be used to address the following issues:

- inequity due to salary compression
- raising full-time faculty salaries so they are nearer to the CUPA (College and University Professional Association) average for Master's (larger) institutions
- recognizing deserving faculty

Priority 3: Part-Time/Adjunct Pay

We recommend a \$300 increase in part-time pay values from \$2,600 to \$2,900 per 3-credit hour course for the 2016-2017 year. The estimated cost of this increase is \$436,700. An additional increase of \$200 is recommended for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 years. This would raise part-time pay to \$3,300 by 2018-2019.

These recommendations are based on the following:

- Continued disparity between faculty pay levels at UCA as compared to the CUPA (College and University Professional Association) average for institutions of the same Carnegie classification, Master's (larger) (Table 1).
- The Faculty Salary Review Committee Survey conducted in the fall of 2015. Results from the survey indicate faculty members have strong views on the need for COLA, equity, and merit adjustments. Also, the survey showed continued concern over part-time faculty pay.
- Lack of a part-time pay increase since 2000.

Salary Rankings

To compare UCA faculty salaries to other institutions, the committee used CUPA values of faculty salaries at institutions with the Master's (larger) Carnegie classification. This comparison demonstrates that UCA faculty salaries continue to lag behind the salaries at similar institutions. The greatest disparity exists in the Professor rank where UCA's average salary is \$10,500 less than the CUPA average for the same rank (Table 1). While the percentage of UCA salaries compared to the CUPA average has increased over the last three years, the change remains small. This is true especially with regard to the rank of Professor which has only received a 1% increase over the three year period (Table 2).

Table 1: 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 2: 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%

Faculty Salary Survey

This year the committee conducted a survey of UCA faculty views on salary. A ten question online survey was sent to all UCA faculty. The survey had 295 responses between September

22nd and 29th, 2015. The responses indicated that COLA adjustment was the most important consideration 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 3 and 4).

Table 3: 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 4: 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 5).

Table 5: 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.

Discussion

The committee continues to view a COLA as a top priority. An increase of 2.5% is in line with the current increase of in the cost of living. Also, it would assist in recovering increases that were lost when, in past years, faculty did not receive a full COLA. Without continued focus on COLAs, UCA salaries will continue to be lower than the CUPA average and salary compression will increase. The years of insufficient COLA funding are apparent in the lower average pay rate for faculty with higher ranks and higher years of service at UCA (Table 1). Equity funding can assist in adjusting this salary compression and bring the UCA salary average up when compared to CUPA. While some progress has been made over the past few years, the committee believes that this year a greater commitment is needed to adjust these long-standing equity issues. The 1.5% pool of funding can start to address these equity issues and allow funding in the form of merit to recognize the work of deserving faculty. The combination of COLA and equity/merit increases will assist in making UCA more competitive at recruiting and retaining quality faculty.

Similarly, in order to recruit and retain quality part-time faculty, part-time pay must also be addressed. Part-time faculty have not been included in COLA increases or equity/merit funding given to full-time faculty in the past few years. The funding for a part-time pay increase was not

approved last year, and there has not been an increase to part-time pay since 2000. The committee views an increase of \$300 per 3-credit course as a reasonable start in addressing the part-time pay issue. The committee suggests a continued increase of \$200 per 3-credit course each year until \$3,300 is reached in 2018-2019. This increase would make the UCA's part-time pay rate in line with the part-time pay of UCA's peer and aspirant institutions.

Committee Members

Elizabeth DiPrince (Chair), Kevin Browne, MaryAnn Campbell, Dwayne Coleman, David McCalman, Ben Rowley, Kevin Stoltz, Laura Young and Amber Hall.

References:

The College and University Professionals Association for Human Resources (www.cupahr.org)

Faculty Salary Review Committee Fall 2015 Salary Survey