

Faculty Affairs Committee

February 5, 2013

Attendance: Jim Carper (chair), Tambra Jackson, Christine Lotter, Eva Monsma, Jeremy Searson, Joe Flora, Diane Monrad, Bethany Bell,

Minutes from January 30 approved and seconded

College of Education Salary Enhancement Proposal

Bethany put forward the following email for us to discuss:

Mike:

Thank you for talking with us last week about the COE Faculty Salary Enhancement Proposal. We plan to meet again in the next week or two to finalize any recommendations; however, there is one area of concern/suggestion that we felt we needed to share with you sooner, rather than later. Hence, the purpose of this email.

After learning of the very different approaches that departments are taking to rate their faculty, per the requirements stated in the current proposal (i.e., to have a mean of 3), we feel strongly that more guidance be offered to department chairs on how to complete this task. Whereas it would be nice to see one approach used across departments, we are not sure that is feasible given the different structures of the departments (i.e., those with a lot of non-tenure track positions might need multiple approaches to avoid comparing apples to oranges) and/or the different data that may or may not exist in each department. However, we feel that you, or someone you appoint, should work with the department chairs to find out the nature of the data they each have available to complete the requested ratings and then provide them with what you see is the best and most equitable method that should be used for rating their faculty. Given this is a college-wide initiative, we feel that having guidance from the dean's office in how to accomplish these ratings would help prevent later concerns from faculty that different standards were applied to different departments and that perhaps those types of variations were unjust.

Please let us know if you have questions about the nature of this request. Again, we feel that something needs to be done to help ensure that no injustices occur in the approaches that departments use to generate the ratings that are required to help guide the nature of the salary enhancements.

Respectfully,

FWC Members

Meeting Discussion:

Mike wanted departments to be able to determine who is average vs. not average

Maybe first deal with gaps not based on merit this time around

If we are focused on inequities, look at inequities and if the person has performed on recent APR, then they should get the raise

Mike needs to guide each department in rating faculty on 1-5 scale.

First stage, priority goes to faculty with productivity scores of 4 to 5 along with the largest salary discrepancy. Each department ranks in own department and these members get priority.

Difficulty? How are departments coming up with ranks? How can we avoid rankings being equivalent to favorites? Are Clinical faculty being evaluated by people who do not know their positions or loads?

Retention as a goal: Full faculty with large discrepancies (~20 thousand), but not in risk of leaving

How can we solve this problem at this hour and put forward best practices.

Are there discrepancies across departments for Full professors? What is our area (foundations vs. science) and does that have an influence?

How did the last 3 years of APR get decided? Why not 5 years?

What do we want to communicate?

1. APR committees need to share best practices and coming up with an “objective” way to rank faculty and providing equal access to all faculty, due process due to rigor, specificity, objectivity, etc.
2. Recommend the use of z scores in standardizing rankings, which will force departments to be transparent with the process
3. Some spreading of money across Clinical and Tenure and gender (females underpaid?)

After this discussion—the committee decided 2 recommendations to share with Mike Seaman and 2 Requests

**Final Recommendations:**

1. We recommend departments report faculty productivity using standard scores (e.g., z-scores) as aligned with percentiles
  - a. Rationale: Because this accounts for relative performance within the group
2. Collect and share best practices for APR that contribute to reliability and validity of the process
  - a. Rationale: There is a lack of consistent quality across departments which lends itself to inequity

### **Requests from Committee**

1. We would appreciate additional information for target salaries for Clinical faculty
2. We request a report with information on how the raises were distributed across departments