

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Doris Geide-Stevenson, Chair – Salary, Benefits, Budget, and Fiscal Planning Committee
Date: May 10, 2022
Subject: 2021 - 2022 Report of the Salary, Benefits, Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee

Accomplishments of the Committee

The full committee met seven times during the 2021 - 2022 school year, with additional meetings of subcommittees tasked with addressing various charges. A table with committee meeting dates and attendance is attached with this report. Further discussion and committee action were accomplished through email within subcommittees and among the full committee.

The SBBFP charges for 2021 – 2022 are listed below.

1. Examine salary options for compensation increases and prioritize recommendations. (Spring) (*Ongoing*)
2. Review the dollar amounts of equity and merit adjustments from the previous year. (Fall) (*Ongoing*)
3. Review campus salary levels using CUPA data, turnover data, and data from regional peer institutions. (Spring) (*Ongoing*)
4. Review equity issues
 - a. Review compression and inversion in salaries.
 - b. Review gender equity in faculty salary
 - c. Review race/ethnicity/other equity in faculty salary (Spring) (*Ongoing*)
5. Review faculty hiring process in conjunction with HR. (Fall) (*Ongoing*)
6. Work with the VP of Administrative Services to explore budgetary processes and trends. (Fall and Spring) (*Ongoing*)
7. Review faculty feedback regarding specific benefits (e.g. nursing and changing facilities).
8. Review the structure of online/adjunct/overload pay across all academic units and CE (in conjunction with Provost Ravi Krovi)
9. Coordinate with APAFT to recommend changes to PPM 8.6 to create a new rank that supports promotion of instructors. (*Continuing*)
10. Ensure that the language of new or updated documents are inclusive. Review those documents to see how they may inadvertently impact particular communities in an adverse manner. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance (*Ongoing*)

Charge 1: Examine salary options for compensation increases and prioritize recommendations.

This charge was addressed by the full committee.

As per policy, the full committee nominated a negotiating committee that was composed of committee members Laine Berghout (Chair of Faculty Senate), Doris Geide-Stevenson (Chair of SBBFP), and Valerie Herzog (representative from Health Professions). Faculty senate approved the nomination. This negotiating committee met with Brad Mortensen (President) and Ravi Krovi (Provost) on March 14th, 2022.

The full committee examined the options for distribution of this year's 5.75% market adjustment increase approved by the Utah legislature. The committee designed a survey of all full-time faculty that was distributed by Human Resources and then analyzed by the SBBFP committee. The survey had a response rate of 62% (355/570) with 39% of full-time faculty identifying as underrepresented in higher education. According to the survey, almost 70% of faculty prefer to have a merit component as part of their salary adjustment (and this number is identical for those faculty who identify as underrepresented in higher education). The highest ranked faculty concern, with close to 40% of respondents ranking this as their first priority, are individual salaries that fall below CUPA. Based on those survey responses, and an economic environment characterized by high inflation, the committee's recommendations regarding the market increase of salaries was:

1. 3.75 % of the increase in salary funding should be applied to all faculty as a percentage of their current salaries.
2. 1.00 % of the increase in salary funding will be assigned for merit increases, as determined by the Deans in consultation with the Provost.
3. 1.00% of the increase in salary funding will be assigned for equity increases, as determined by the Provost in consultation with the Deans.

The final salary adjustment model announced by the President closely mirrored the committee recommendations.

Charge 2: Review the dollar amounts of equity and merit adjustments from the previous year.

Each faculty representative communicated with the Dean of their academic college to find out how last year's salary adjustments were made. As in past years, most colleges allocated merit adjustments as a percentage of a faculty's salary – with higher percentage increases for higher performance rankings. However, three colleges allocated merit pay as a flat dollar amount based on the performance ranking of the faculty member. All academic colleges reported a range of percentage increases for their faculty members which indicates that all colleges implemented merit pay increases. It is an ongoing effort to create transparency around the process

of salary adjustments so that faculty members understand their individual adjustments and performance rankings.

Charges 3 and 4 : Review campus salary levels using CUPA data, turnover data, and data from regional peer institutions. Review equity issues regarding compression and inversion in salaries; gender equity in faculty salary; and race/ethnicity/other equity in faculty salary.

This charge was assigned to a subcommittee: Loisanne Kattelman (representative from Business), Andrea Easter-Pilcher (Dean of the College of Science), Bob Fudge (representative from Social and Behavioral Sciences), Valerie Herzog (representative from Health), and Marek Matyjasik (representative from Science).

This subcommittee did the bulk of the work of the SBBFP committee over the course of the academic year. They continued the work of the committee from previous years.

First, the subcommittee continued the recommendation of last year's committee to use 100% of CUPA (instead of 94% as in the past) to determine CUPA comparisons for individual faculty members. This year the University is at 94.58% of CUPA overall (up from 93.7% last year), with Business & Economics at 111.6%, EAST at 101.3% and all other units below 100%. This year's analysis adds additional detail by college and rank. Notably, 34.9% of faculty salaries in the College of Education fall below 90% of CUPA, and 80% of the Library faculty salaries fall below 80%, compared to 4.8% of salaries in Business and Economics. It is this data that has fostered a more detailed discussion of equity issues within the committee.

Second, the subcommittee continued using the definition articulated by the SBBFP committee in 2016 and tracked inversions. There are 54 faculty members inverted this year, which is down from 55 and 62 in the previous years. The total amount of money needed to fix the inversions is \$657,715 (down from \$732, 940 the previous year).

Finally, the subcommittee addressed gender equity and added race/ethnicity, with the help of HR. With regard to gender equity, not much has changed since last year. Women faculty make \$0.87 (last year 0.86) to \$1.00 for male faculty. As in the previous year, this outcome is vastly improved when college and rank of faculty members are considered. With regard to race/ethnicity, the data varied by college, meaning there was no clear pattern across the university with respect to equity issues. In some colleges non-whites earned higher salaries compared to CUPA than whites and in other colleges the pattern was reversed.

This data was presented to the Committee in January, to the Executive Committee in February, and to the Faculty Senate in March. It was then given to the Provost to review with Deans.

Charge 5: Review faculty hiring process in conjunction with HR.

This charge was handled by the entire committee.

Former Assistant VP of Human Resource Jessica Oyler was an *ex officio* member of the committee and presented on faculty hiring processes. She provided data on failed searches for the last 4 academic years. While there seems to be an upward trend in failed searches for non-exempt staff, there is no discernible trend with faculty searches. The most recent data only covered the academic year through November 2021 and should be completed and monitored during the next year. The university has started a collaboration with an external entity that can help new faculty with a home purchase. It might be useful to evaluate this program in subsequent years as rising housing cost in Ogden are a major concern for newly hired faculty.

Other committee discussions of hiring processes focused on how diversity points are calculated, as well as a desire to add additional dimensions of diversity to the hiring system.

Charge 6: Work with the VP of Administrative Services to explore budgetary processes and trends.

This charge was handled by the entire committee. VP Norm Tarbox joined the committee to give a budgetary overview.

Charge 7: Review faculty feedback regarding specific benefits.

This charge was handled by the entire committee.

The committee received specific concerns about availability of nursing rooms and the payroll schedule for adjunct faculty members. Assistant VP of HR Jessica Oyler reported that the university website will contain a new searchable campus map that can be used to find a variety of facilities, including nursing rooms.

Adjunct payroll issues arose because the third week enrollment counts fell on a calendar day that pushed the first paycheck for adjuncts two weeks out. This created hardship for some adjuncts and should be monitored.

Charge 8: Review the structure of online/adjunct/overload pay across all academic units and CE (in conjunction with Provost Ravi Krovi)

This charge was handled by the entire committee.

Provost Ravi Krovi and Betty Kusnierz presented the current structure of online and adjunct pay. It was noted that the current pay structure incentivizes teaching online

classes compared to face-to-face classes. The committee recommended decreasing the online pay (\$35/SCH) gradually to better align the compensation of face-to-face and online classes. The committee also noted that adjunct and overload pay rates have not been adjusted in a long time. The committee recommended increasing the standard CE pay of \$970/SCH for the 2022-23 academic year. The Provost announced a roughly 3% increase in adjunct/overload pay for the upcoming academic year.

Charge 9: Coordinate with APAFT to recommend changes to PPM 8.6 to create a new rank that supports promotion of instructors.

APAFT has written policy to create a new senior instructor rank. This policy has been approved by faculty senate.

Charge 10: Ensure that the language of new or updated documents are inclusive. Review those documents to see how they may inadvertently impact particular communities in an adverse manner. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance.

The committee did not draft any documents other than the faculty survey. The committee discussed in detail how to add a question that allows faculty to identify as underrepresented in higher education. The survey results show that almost 40% of Weber State faculty identify as traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

Future Directions

Given that faculty and administration would like to allocate merit pay going forward, we recommend monitoring how various colleges allocate merit pay and whether faculty feel the decisions are fair and transparent.

We advise that the SBBFP committee continue its monitoring of equity issues and hiring issues. We advise that the SBBFP committee continue its relationships with HR and VP Norm Tarbox.

For next year, the committee might add a specific charge that monitors adjunct pay schedules. Also, with regards to benefits, some faculty have seen a problem with the dental insurance. Specifically that dentists seem to drop acceptance of EMI.

The faculty survey contained numerous open ended comments that should be used to identify specific issues that might be addressed by SBBFP.

All charges (except #9) could be treated as ongoing.

Committee Member Service

Every member worked well on this committee. We could not have functioned as well as we did without Patti Glover, who was invaluable in providing us with the meeting minutes. Every person on the committee was excellent – there was not a single

person who did not deliver. Marek Matyjasik had a scheduling conflict for many meetings, but found able substitutes. As in the year before, Loisanne Kattleman (with Valerie Herzog) did an outstanding job in analyzing and presenting the gender equity data. Bob Fudge added additional detail to the CUPA analysis and Andrea Easter-Pilcher analyzed the inversion issues across colleges and departments.

