

Personnel and Benefits Committee Meeting

September 16, 2014

Attending: Tom Zwirlein , Carla Myers, Gail Katz, Don Morley, Pam Carter Guests: Michele Companion, Robyn Marschke, Monique Dooley, and Rick Dukes

I. Salary Analysis

Per an agreement with the Regents, an additional 1% merit compensation pool is available for distribution in January, 2015. Some of the pool will be used for salary grievances and competitive offers. The remainder will be used to adjust salaries for deserving UCCS deserving faculty to get them competitively closer to the market.

P&B will work with Robyn Marscke to perform an analysis of salaries and a number of models which could be used to adjust eligible salaries. Any adjustments to salaries will be merit based. The committee will meet with the Chancellor on October 1, 2014 to begin the discussion of the models.

Robyn attended the meeting and distributed some preliminary results from several models she has been analyzing. The purpose of the analysis is to determine an appropriate model to be used in the distribution of a 1 percent salary adjustment. The four proposed models in the analysis are referred to as the:

1. CUPA Model: The model goal is to adjust salaries to a percent of peer comparison schools average CUPA salaries.
2. Delaware Model: This model makes adjustments based on rank and years of service to the salary of a new assistant professor. This preliminary salary is further adjusted by a merit factor. Final adjustments are made for several Delaware productivity measures. These include instructional expenditures per SCH and research expenditures per TT faculty in the department. Several departments have no peer data in this model which is problematic. The constructed salary is compared to the actual salary to determine the gap in salary.
3. Z Model: This model was advanced by Dean Peter Brazo and modified by Tom Zwirlein. This model constructs a comparison salary based on characteristics including a faculty member's years in rank, merit and the distance (differential) between the faculty member's salary and the actual salary.
4. Regression Model: This model attempts to identify the relevant predictor variables to be used to predict a comparison salary. The predicted salary is compared to an actual salary to determine the gap between the two. This gap forms the basis of a salary adjustment.

P&B will look at these four models in more detail at their next regular meeting and will determine the pros and cons of each. P&B must also determine whether the same model should be used for NTTF and TTF or if separate models should be used to analyze salaries for the two groups.

Michelle did ask whether two different models should be used, one for NTTF another for TTF. Perhaps correct salary issues with the NTTF at first. Will we create a new hole as we are trying to fix the current problems due to hiring new people at high salaries?

Tom asked Robyn to find out the total salaries at the CUPA comparison schools. We may not be allocating enough to salaries.

II. Report from Faculty Council Personnel Committee

Gail Katz provide a brief report from the system-wide personnel committee. John McDowel is the current chair and Gail Katz is vice-chair. Gail will chair next year.

Tuition Benefit Policy

The Committee asked for 15 credit hours (thinks the administration will settle for 12). Also, it should be usable at all campuses. Jill Pollack wanted 1% of the salary pool to fund the tuition benefit. The committee was resolute that this was not an option and thinks the administration will not implement the benefit using money from the salary pool.

III. NTTF Multi-Year Contract APS

Carla pointed out that the APS refers to a category of faculty with the job title of Librarian and that the University does not have any such category. Library faculty will have the same job titles as the rest of the faculty.

The P&B committee will review the NTTF-multi-year APS after it is rewritten to separate the policy for the procedures in the APS.