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“to recommend to me a multi-year plan to increase faculty compensation in order to keep us competitive with our peer group of colleges and universities. In order to do so it is important that we have a clear sense of the complexities involved in considerations of compensation and the ability to set priorities for addressing the major factors we confront, including but not limited to: benchmarking, equity, merit recognition, and disciplinary-based market pressures.”

“As I have mentioned in various venues over the past few months, we are undertaking this initiative during a time when we do not foresee any immediate increase in revenue to the University. So you have your work cut out for you: how to be fair, appropriately competitive, and prudent in the commitment of University resources.”
Goals Recommended by the Commission

- Bringing academically qualified & satisfactorily performing members of the faculty to the minimum of the established range (Raising to the Minimum - $600k invested in last two years);

- Addressing equity within rank in our colleges and schools;

- Addressing equity across colleges and schools;

- Raising the competitiveness of salaries at all ranks across schools/colleges to market standards
Commission’s Next Charge

With the salary framework and resulting minimum adjustments completed, the President’ Commission on Faculty Compensation needs to recommend the next Goal for faculty compensation analysis and adjustment.

- Addressing equity within rank in our colleges and schools;
- Addressing equity across colleges and schools;
- Raising the competitiveness of salaries at all ranks across schools/colleges to market standards.
Updates Since & Questions from Last Meeting

- Enrollment Update;
- Communication with Faculty, Board, etc.;
- Questions on Last Meeting or Posted Materials;
- Other
Survey Highlights

Please check all that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member, Ex-officio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Deans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Highlights

MOST IMPORTANT COMPRESSION

LEAST IMPORTANT INVERSION
### Survey Highlights

Please order the areas of focus below from (1) - the highest priority to (5) - the lowest priority for FY '16. You can drag and reorder the options below or select the appropriate number from the drop down box next to each of the following options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus 1 - Compression</td>
<td>15 10 8 6 2</td>
<td>2.27 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 2 - Inversion</td>
<td>3 9 5 9 14</td>
<td>3.55 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 3 - Competitiveness across Colleges</td>
<td>12 4 8 11 6</td>
<td>2.88 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 4 - Competitiveness within Colleges</td>
<td>3 9 15 8 6</td>
<td>3.12 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 5 - Maintaining the Minimum</td>
<td>8 9 4 7 13</td>
<td>3.20 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 41*  
*skipped question 6*
Survey Highlights

- COMPRESSION
  - INVERSION
- COMPETITIVENESS ACROSS COLLEGES
- COMPETITIVENESS WITHIN COLLEGES
- MINIMUM
Please allocate in 20% increments the amount of funding that should be spent on the focus areas in FY'16. Please make sure that the overall total across all five focus areas does not exceed 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus 1 - Compression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 2 - Inversion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 3 - Competitiveness across Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 4 - Competitiveness within Colleges</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus 5 - Maintaining the Minimum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 42
skipped question 5
Survey Highlights

MERIT

MARKET
Survey Highlights

In the event that resources are not available to fund both market competitiveness and merit, how do you think the available compensation should be distributed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% merit</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% merit / 25% market</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% merit / 50% market</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% market / 25% merit</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% market</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question* 41

*skipped question* 6
Survey Highlights

How important to future faculty compensation funding is finalizing an annual faculty evaluation process and instrument for adoption in 2015-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 41
skipped question 6
Survey Highlights

- Disciplines with unit (2)
- Process rushed to predetermined management conclusion
- Not enough $ for real merit
- Reward sustained performance
- Balance market, merit, & equity
- Compensation for KPI by unit
- Salary does different things at different points in career
- Maintaining minimum is critical
- Need more than $250k

- Faculty Evaluation
  - Okay if used properly
  - Requires honest input
  - Needs to be consistent across units
  - Needs to be quantifiable
  - Needs to be evaluative not descriptive
  - Must be fair
Shaping Recommendation

What for?
Compression first & foremost

How?
• Determine where compression is the greatest
• Determine relevant placement in range

New to Rank
Performing in Rank
Excelling in Rank
Next Steps

IMPLEMENTATION BY DEANS WITH PROVOST

FACULTY EVALUATION

COMMUNICATION, COMMUNICATION, COMMUNICATION, COMMUNICATION