

UCCS Personnel and Benefits Committee Meeting November 5, 2013

Gail Katz, Tom Zwirlein, Don Morley, Pam Carter, Carla Myers and Guest Robyn Marschke

Minutes from October approved (unanimous)

The issue of uncompensated merit has not been examined for several years due to the low level of the salary merit pool in the recent past. Members of the P&B committee have received a number of inquiries about compensation and uncompensated merit. In addition, cases of an inability to competitively attract and hire new faculty because of low salary offers have been reported. Thus, the time is appropriate to delve into salary once again.

Robyn Marschke was invited to the meeting to discuss faculty salaries. Robyn uses peer College and University Professional Association (CUPA) salary reports to generate a consistent database to make comparisons with the UCCS peer institutions. The benefit of this data is it is a single source and consistent database of information. The downside is there may be discrepancies between this data and the data provided by professional organizations or accrediting organizations for colleges and specific disciplines.

UCCS has 31 approved peer institutions. Many of these are located on the east coast which might distort the data if there are cost of living differences in other parts of the country. The peer institutions are selected based on many factors including type of institution, Carnegie level, programs, degree offerings, size and other relevant factors. There is no perfect peer institution for comparison given the unique characteristics of either UCCS or of the peers. None-the-less the aggregation of 31 peers is expected to dampen the idiosyncratic "noise" of individual institutions. In other words, this may be as good as it gets.

Robyn reported this is a good time to pull the information for a salary study since most institutions have reported their information for the year. Some of the CUPA information is available on the Institutional Research web site: <http://www.uccs.edu/ir/data/employees.html>

The committee intends to look at the most recent uncompensated merit model to determine whether it will be used again and what tweaks should be made in the model.

The committee may look at a simpler method to make salary comparisons to peer institutions. After all, we might expect that other institutions have the same internal problems with the data as UCCS has with its salary information. Moreover, it we can expect that other institutions have faculty in different stages of their careers, different levels of merit, years of service, time in ranks and other similar characteristics of the faculty. To the extent peer institution data contains similar distinctive characteristics, it might be expected that the uncompensated regressions UCCS has run in the past would be incapable of explaining variation or predicting a faculty salary. A simpler approach of comparing mean or median salaries of UCCS faculty to peer salaries by discipline and rank may be as powerful and appropriate.

Some of the issues brought out at the meeting regarding past uncompensated models include:

1. We should determine whether a problem exists in salaries and an estimate of the size of the problem if it exists.

2. Higher paid disciplines receive a larger proportion of the uncompensated merit simply because the variation in salaries between UCCS faculty and the peers is larger. There are methods to resolve this problem.
3. How do we deal with the problem of attracting high demand disciplines when the initial salary offer is low compared to national norms?
4. Can we determine the areas where salaries are inverted?
5. Many faculty members receive additional salary for performing additional work (department chairs, directors, grants, course overloads, etc). Should we concentrate on the contracted salary (typical 9-month or line item salary) or should the total salary for each member of the faculty be included in the analysis? CUPA data is based on contracted salary.
6. A problem with the current uncompensated salary model is it is difficult to explain. Perhaps a simpler model is warranted.
7. Look at TT and NTT faculty.
8. Structural problems with faculty salaries will never be "fixed" at UCCS until there is a concerted effort to substantially increase the salary pool. Trying to fix the problem with typically modest salary merit increase pools will never get the job done.
9. The committee requested IR to gather salary information. The information will be used to see whether a salary problem exists at UCCS, an estimate of the magnitude of the problem if a problem exists, where inversion and compression occurs, where low salaries exist from past uncompensated merit and how might these issues be addressed.
10. Any faculty wishing to submit other peer comparison data may provide this information to the Chair of P&B or Robyn Marschke of Institutional Research in machine readable form. This data will be used for confirmatory purposes only. The CUPA data will be used for any other analysis.

The Demise of the University Benefits Advisory Committee (UBAB)

Gail reported that President Benson, on the advice of E. Jill Pollack, Vice President, Employee and Information Services has decided to discontinue UBAB. UBAB was established in 1999 and serves at the pleasure of the President. Evidently, the pleasure has gone out of the relationship. The meeting where this was reported was held on the UCCS campus on Friday, November 1, 2013. Tom, Mandi Elder, Gail Katz and Ida Dilwood from UCCS attended the meeting. As Tom stated, "it was the strangest meeting I've ever attended in all my years at UCCS."

UBAB was a faculty and staff committee that monitored activities associated with the benefits provided by the University to staff and faculty. The committee was originally assembled after the University's self-funded health insurance program found itself in deficit to the tune of more than \$11 million. Since its inception the committee has monitored health care benefits at CU, reviewed RFP when plans changed, worked to improve customer relations with University Physicians Inc (UPI), fostered HMO plans outside the Denver metro area, eliminated double billing and other co-pay issues with UPI, served as the sounding board for faculty and staff to PBS and other organizations providing services to these two groups and

provided advice and guidance. In other words, UBAB was the watchdog that monitored the activities in benefit delivery to thousands of faculty and staff at CU. This watch dog is dead.

The new watch dog is the University of Colorado Health and Welfare Trust. The trustees include without naming names: 1) the CFO for the University of Colorado Hospital Authority, 2) the Vice President and CFO at the University of Colorado, 3) Director of Health Plan Development at University Physicians, Inc, 4) the Vice President for Employee and Information Services at the University of Colorado, Chief Human Resources Officer for University of Colorado Hospital's University of Colorado Health, 5) a Professor from the School of Medicine (and former Chair of Faculty Council). More information can be found at: <https://www.cusys.edu/trust/>.

P&B discussed the UBAB situation after much angst, gnashing of teeth, incredulity, disbelief, and sorrow decided to wait and see if there is any response from Faculty Council. Recourse for faculty is to strengthen the Faculty Council Personnel Committee so that it becomes the new watch dog and sounding board for faculty concerns regarding University provided benefits. P&B is very concerned that University staff and the retired faculty of the University may not have any recourse and may be left out in the cold, cold winter of Colorado.

Next meeting Tuesday, December 3rd 3:00 - 4:30, Dwire 205