

TO: University Governance, Molly Mulloy, Chris Crandall, Andrew Torrance
FROM: Faculty Compensation Committee
Chair: Mahbub Rashid, Architecture & Urban Planning, (2013)
Members: Cindy Colwell Dunn, Music (2014) , Ron Hui, EECS (2014) , Jeanne Klein, Theatre, (2013), Frances Devlin, Libraries, (2013), Michael Engel, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology (2013),
Ex-officio member, Mary Lee Hummert, Office of the Provost

DATE: 04/15/2013
RE: Annual Report of the Faculty Compensation Committee

On September 13, 2012, the committee received the following charges. On October 18, 2012, the committee held its first meeting on the charges. The Chair submitted the minutes of that meeting to University Governance on November 26, 2012 (**see attachment**). The second meeting of the committee was held on April 04, 2013. This report documents the issues discussed and the decisions taken by the committee in the two meetings.

Standing charges:

1. Continue to monitor the level and distribution of faculty salaries to identify issues and concerns. Report issues, problems, and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

In the first meeting on October 18, 2012, the committee discussed this issue and requested for a more recent Faculty Salary Equity Study from OIRP. The committee received the FY 2011 Faculty Salary Equity Study from Deb Teeter of OIRP (**see attachment**) and discussed the Study in the second meeting on April 04, 2013. Based on the review of the study, the committee did not find any issues and concerns regarding the level and distribution of faculty salaries.

2. Continue the cooperative communication between the Chairs of the Planning and Resources and Faculty Compensation committees to facilitate coordination on issues of mutual concern. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

Concerning this standing charge, the Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee contacted Chris Gamblin, the current Chair of the Planning and Resources Committee. Mr. Gamblin sent the following note to the committee:

I don't really have any real issues except for one that might interest your committee. Our committee was told that the Board of Regents has suggested that KU consider faculty salary increases. However, with government and research funding decreasing, it is likely that any salary increases would need to come from a tuition increase. This is a challenge because of the tuition compact that is in place for current students. Any increase for faculty salaries would be tied to incoming students. Additionally the Tuition Advisory Committee would need to endorse any increases in tuition and how it is used. A second possibility for increased funding that might be targeted toward faculty compensation is a larger emphasis placed on the first year experience for students and trying to increase the retention rate for first year students. If we can reduce the number of students that are leaving KU after their first semester or first year, it could represent a significant increase in revenue streams. So, it seems that all these issues could potentially complicate faculty salary increases.

In the second meeting on April 04, 2013, the Faculty Compensation committee discussed different mechanisms for faculty salary increases identified by Mr. Gamblin. Though these mechanisms were interesting, the committee felt that it did not know enough to make any recommendations on the matter.

Specific charges:

1. In order to make a recommendation about merit pay policies to accommodate periods without merit increases, review the following documents:

- a. The University Termination Study.

In the second meeting on April 04, 2013, the committee reviewed the University Termination Study made available by Mary Lee Hummert (**see attachment**), and found no issues or concerns that could inform merit pay policies.

- b. A representative sample of merit pay policies of individual departments/schools.

In the first meeting on October 18, 2012, the committee decided not to review merit pay policies of individual academic units based on the fact that they are difficult to get; that they are different for each academic unit; and that the implementation of these policies are likely to be driven by local issues of a unit at any given time.

- c. Comparative data on faculty salary and merit pay from other universities during the same period.

In the first meeting on October 18, 2012, the committee looked at faculty salary of AAUDE peer institutions provided by OIRP, and agreed that KU faculty salary was a concern. KU ranked 12th out of 16 on Professor's salary, 14th out of 16 on Associate Professor's salary, 15th out of 16 on Assistant Professor's salary, and overall it ranked 15th out of 16. KU's salary was about 10% below the mean of the peer institutions.

2. As faculty recruitment and retention is one of the strategies in the Provost's Bold Aspirations Strategic Plan, discuss the following issues:

- a. What criteria are the Provost/Deans using to retain faculty?
- b. How is any additional compensation for retention determined?
- c. To what extent are criteria for compensation fair and equitable across departments and schools?
- d. Under what circumstances, if any, would the Provost/Deans not seek to retain a faculty member and for what reasons?

In the first meeting on October 18, 2012, the committee discussed these issues and agreed that it would be difficult to make any policy recommendations concerning the criteria the Provost/Deans use to recruit and retain faculty. That is because faculty recruitment and retention are negotiated processes. Any compensation package would likely to be determined based on a candidate's demand and the ability of the provost and/or the dean to meet these demands.

In order to know more about under what circumstances, if any, the Provost/Deans would not seek to retain a faculty member and for what reasons, the committee reviewed the University Termination Study in the second meeting on April 04, 2013, and found no issues relevant to faculty salaries in the report. However, the committee felt that it would be important to review the University Termination Study on a regular basis.

3. Consider the implications of possible post-tenure review on faculty compensation. Report to FacEx and the FRPR Committee by November 15, 2012.

In the first meeting on October 18, 2012, the committee agreed that post-tenure review must not be used as a tool to punish faculty. Rather, any post-tenure review must be considered to promote faculty development with an aim to put faculty on a path to promotion and success. Incentives of any positive post-tenure review must not be limited to merit salary increase only. Other means to support and promote faculty productivity should also be considered including course release, GTAs, Post-docs, travel funding, and reduction of service load.