Date:   September 16 2011; 1:00pm
Place: Cooklock room- Library
From : Joe O’Kroy, Chair, Compensation Committee
Subject: Agenda, Faculty Compensation Committee

1. Pass Minutes from Sept. 9, 2011

2. Review and discuss time in rank formula for salary adjustment plan

Minutes of the Faculty Compensation Committee

September 9, 2011

Cooklock Rom, Library

Meeting was called to order at 1:01 by Chair Joe O’Kroy

Members present were: Brenda Boetel, Brad Mogen, Wes Chapin, Hossein Eftekari, Pam Weller, Andriel Dees, Blake Fry, Hamid Tabesh, Bill Anderson, Donna Robole, Fernando Delgado, Joe O’Kroy

1. Discussion of specific charge from Faculty senate regarding inclusion of years of service in compression salary adjustment plan.
2. Hossein Eftekari presented a numerical example of the Superior model and the effects of including an experience premium to the compression formula.
3. Discussion of the effects of how much the experience premium will change the percentages used to distribute the $100K.
4. Discussion of opinions from colleagues in colleges regarding the inclusion in the compression formula.
5. Discussion of what the problem is that we are trying to solve with this motion? Are we trying to solve loyalty to UWRF problems, compression problems, market valuation problems, or interdepartmental compression issues?
6. Joe O’Kroy will get experience premium data from Superior analysis. Brenda Boetel will get CUPA data to see if regression analysis can be completed to develop experience premiums for Agricultural disciplines.
7. Move to adjourn by Mogen. Seconded by Eftekari. Meeting adjourned at 1:53 pm.
UWRF Faculty Salary Adjustment Plan
Implementing UWRF Motion 2009/2010/25 – Section 5

Motion as Originally Passed/Amended

UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2009/2010/25 bullet 5 states:

5. That beginning with the 2010-2011 academic year, salary adjustments (other than the pay plan percentage increase) for faculty of all ranks will be made on the basis of a model to be determined that would include, but not be limited to, 1) Post Tenure Review; 2) the difference between the faculty member's salary and the salaries of faculty at peer institutions adjusted for academic discipline; and 3) years of service at UWRF. A minimum of $100,000 shall be allocated to this adjustment fund annually. These monies are separate from the RRF program or its UW System institutional successor. Other compensation adjustment programs currently in existence at UW-RF will continue to exist. This allocation shall continue at least until UWRF faculty (tenured and tenure track) salaries at all ranks reach the average of our peer institutions as determined by the AAUP Faculty Salary Survey. This salary adjustment may be delayed for one year in the event of a significant UW System lapse and only after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate.

Guidelines to Implement the Motion:

1. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members at UWRF will be in the initial pool for salary analysis.

2. Distributions are to address disparities between UWRF faculty salaries and those of peer institutions as determined by the College and University Professional Association’s (CUPA) National Faculty Salary Survey for Four-Year Institutions (NFSS) and by the AAUP Faculty Salary Survey as stated in UWRF Motion 2009/2010/25 – Section 5.

3. Distributions should be in the $2,000 to $5,000 range. Exceptions to grant more than $5,000 may be made by the Deans’ Council in egregious cases.

4. A faculty member receiving a distribution will be eligible for consideration again three years after receiving the distribution.

5. In any given year, each college (CAFES, CAS, CBE, CEPS) will have a minimum of one recipient.

6. The data source for salary analysis will come from the College and University Professional Association’s (CUPA) National Faculty Salary Survey for Four-Year Institutions (NFSS). The base for each year will be the academic year that was just completed or the most recent data available from CUPA.

7. Peer Institutions are the schools listed in Table 1 -- ACCRA Cost of Living Index of UW-River Falls Self-Identified Peer Institutions.
Procedure:

1. At the beginning of a new fiscal year, the UWRF Budget Office will prepare a list of all faculty members including:

   A. Name

   B. Academic discipline determination (CIP code)

      1. The UWRF Budget Office will prepare a list of faculty members by department and a list of majors and the corresponding 4-digit CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes for each major.

      2. The list of all faculty members and the list of 4-digit CIP codes for each major will be sent to the chair of each department and the Dean of each college.

      3. The chair, in consultation with each individual faculty member in his/her department will determine an appropriate CIP code and CUPA data designation for each faculty member prior to forwarding to the dean.

      4. The list of faculty and their corresponding CIP code and CUPA data designation will then be sent to the appropriate college Dean for review and then to the Provost for review.

   5. The list will then be sent to the Budget Office.

   6. When a department or program is not identified specifically in CUPA categories or the member’s academic responsibilities may involve multiple disciplines, a comparative discipline/program will be identified by the faculty member and the faculty member’s department/program chair and forwarded to the College Dean for recommendation to the Provost for his/her review.

   C. Budgeted base salary or nine-month equivalent for the current academic year

   D. Rank

   E. Time in rank at UWRF

   F. Time at UWRF

   G. The CUPA median salary for the discipline and rank

   H. Average time in rank at UWRF for each rank.
2. Inclusion into the distribution pool will be achieved by computation of the compression differential as described in appendix A and section 3 below.

3. The Dean of each college will examine a list of faculty in his/her college and prepare a distribution pool according to the procedures in appendix A. The primary factor for preparing the pool will be the data driven compression differential. In addition, the Dean will consider other factors such as years of service at UWRf, post tenure reviews for tenured faculty, renewal reports of probationary faculty, teacher evaluations, service to the University, and other factors consistent with Guideline 2 above.

4. The Deans’ Council will meet and agree on which faculty members will be given a salary adjustment and the amount of that adjustment. The University Auditor will attend that meeting.

5. All the money budgeted for this program will be spent each academic year.

6. Salary adjustments will be made retroactive to the beginning of the current academic year.

7. The University Auditor will verify that the procedures involved in that year’s decision complied with the guidelines and procedure detailed above. In accordance with the University of Wisconsin System Policy, the University Internal Auditor shall have full, free, and unrestricted access to all University records, properties, and personnel used to fulfill the requirements of this procedure. The University Auditor will meet with the chair of faculty senate, the chair of the faculty compensation committee, the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, and the provost to report his/her findings. The University Auditor will prepare a summary written report that will be sent to Faculty Senate that includes the names of the recipients and the amounts awarded.

8. Review Policy. This program will continue until the median salary of all UWRf faculty ranks (tenured and tenure-track) reaches the median salary of our peer institutions.

   A review, collaboratively undertaken by the Senate Faculty Compensation Committee and Administration, will be conducted following the second full year of implementation.

   This policy may be modified after the second year’s salary adjustment distributions following discussion between Administration and Faculty Governance which would provide a recommendation to the Chancellor for his/her decision.
Table 1
ACCRA Cost of Living Index of UW-River Falls Self-Identified Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area</th>
<th>Cost of Living vs St. Paul, MN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State University</td>
<td>San Angelo, TX</td>
<td>San Angelo, TX</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>Augusta, GA</td>
<td>Augusta, GA</td>
<td>0.84473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State University</td>
<td>Clarksville, TN</td>
<td>Clarksville, TN</td>
<td>0.78242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University-San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos, CA</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>1.26055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron University</td>
<td>Lawton, OK</td>
<td>Lawton, OK</td>
<td>0.84038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>0.88385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>0.85861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern State University</td>
<td>Wichita Falls, TX</td>
<td>Wichita Falls, TX</td>
<td>0.86221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Geneseo</td>
<td>Geneseo, NY</td>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>0.94352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.81832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Indiana</td>
<td>Evansville, IN</td>
<td>Evansville, IN</td>
<td>0.85667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire</td>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>0.86163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point</td>
<td>Stevens Point, WI</td>
<td>Stevens Point, WI</td>
<td>0.88853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>Petersburg, VA</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>0.95518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn University</td>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ACCRA) American Chamber of Commerce Research Association (now Council for Community and Economic Research)

The ACCRA Cost of Living Index is the most reliable source of city-to-city comparisons of key consumer costs. ACCRA COLI data is recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, CNN Money, and the President's Council of Economic Advisors.
Appendix A.

Calculation of the compression differential will be accomplished using the following formulas and procedures.

\[ ES = EP(YR - AYR) + ADS \]

Where:

- **ES** = Expected salary
- **EP** = Experience premium, at UWRF ($/year in rank), TBD
- **YR** = Years in rank, at UWRF
- **AYR** = Average years in rank, at UWRF (of all faculty)
- **ADS** = Average disciplinary salary, median CUPA data (by rank)

Once the expected salary (ES) is obtained, the compression differential is calculated using the following formula:

\[ CD = ES - S \]

Where:

- **CD** = Compression differential
- **ES** = Expected salary
- **S** = Salary (current faculty salary)

The compression pool will be composed of the top 20 faculty with the largest compression differentials. Faculty with a zero or negative CD value will not be eligible for the pool.

For those faculties who have a partial academic appointment, the following interim calculation is performed to arrive at an AES (adjusted expected salary):

\[ AES = \%AP \times ES \]

Where:

- **AES** = Adjusted expected salary
- **\%AP** = Percent academic appointment
- **ES** = Expected salary

In such cases, the CD would then be calculated using the following formula:

\[ CD = AES - S \]
The purpose of the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) is to provide a taxonomic scheme that will support the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, 2000 and 2010. The current edition identifies fifty-four broad instructional categories (2-digit series) and then lists (4-digit series) intermediate groupings of programs that have comparable content and objectives.