

RECOMMENDATIONS  
Regarding Faculty Compensation

Submitted to Drake University Faculty Senate  
March 8, 2017

By the  
Faculty Senate Committee *ad hoc*  
on Faculty Compensation

**Members**

Todd Evans (Journalism and Mass Communication)  
Anisa Fornoff (Pharmacy and Health Sciences)  
Stephen Gara (Business and Public Administration)  
Matthew Hayden (Education)  
Mary Beth Holtey (Arts and Sciences)  
Shontavia Johnson (Law)  
Craig N. Owens, Chair (Faculty Senator at Large)  
Andrew Welch (Cowles Library)

**Introduction**

The *ad hoc* Senate committee on Faculty Compensation is pleased to offer the following recommendations, arrived at by consensus during our deliberations in Fall, 2016, and Spring, 2017.

These recommendations present themselves in two parts.

The first part focuses on recommendations the implementation of which may require new resources or the reallocation of existing resources to achieve. Recommendations in this section are listed according to the Committee's sense of their urgency and importance. For instance, as reported in December, 2016, the Committee prioritized issues pertaining to equity and justice in its deliberation; accordingly, we present as top priorities recommendations that address the greatest and most pervasive disparities in faculty compensation, both in absolute and relative terms.

The second part focuses mainly on processes and practices around salary determinations. While addressing these recommendations will take time and energy, doing so, in and of itself, should not require additional financial resources. Naturally, acting on the outcomes of these recommendations for process and policy revisions may have resource implications; however undertaking the analysis, revision, and crafting of consistent, equitable, and collaboratively developed policies itself will not.

Recommendations speak primarily to internal issues the committee identified: internal inequities, inconsistencies in policy, or discrepancies in the relationship of practice to policy. Accordingly, the committee did not see value in examining policies and practices at other institutions in making its recommendations. Instead, the committee consulted mainly with internal stakeholders, including the provost, chief business officer, director of institutional research, and director of human resources. Should Faculty Senate endorse recommendations pertaining to the revision of policies and practices presented in the second part, individuals and groups charged with carrying out those recommendations may find consultation with colleagues at other institutions to be a valuable component of work going forward.

We do offer one overarching Recommendation for immediate consideration: Namely, that the administration put aside all considerations regarding faculty salary increases for FY 18 until the following have been reviewed by faculty senate and final recommendations made by Senate to the administration. The timeline proposed by the President's office for such considerations, which would implement any changes in faculty salary no earlier than October, 2017, allows opportunity for Senate to recommend immediate action with regard to compensation without disrupting plans already in place.

The committee views these recommendations, presented as a single slate of recommendations, do not, in the committee's view, constitute a motion or motions for approval. Rather, the committee presents them to guide future action Faculty Senate might take. Accordingly, the committee sees them as severable and actionable on an individual basis.

**A. Recommendations that may require additional funds or the reallocation of existing funds.**

**1. Pay equity across gender and race categories:**

- a. To the extent that discrepancies in pay between men's and women's salaries and the salaries of minority to majority individuals within disciplines are not accounted for by differences in annual performance evaluations, adjust salaries to achieve parity.
  - i. Note: This will require a rigorous analysis of the past performance of those earning under the cohort/discipline average to determine whether discrepancies are related to performance, and will necessarily involve input from supervisors and deans on an individual case basis.
- b. To the extent that discrepancies in benchmark salaries between disciplines correlate to the percentage of faculty who are women and/or members of minority groups in that discipline nationwide, adjust market benchmarks for the effects of gender and race disparity.
- c. To the extent that discrepancies in workload for women and faculty of color are due, in part, to the "silent labor" performed by these individuals—such as mentoring, recruiting, outreach, and other work they are often expected to perform as representative of women's and minority issues on campus—adjustments to achieve equity should account for the additional labor represented by these expectations.

2. **Administrative staff teaching courses should be paid as adjunct faculty through a contract separate from regularly assigned duties associated with the administrative position.**
3. **Adjunct faculty salary**
  - a. Reaffirm prior resolution
4. **Revise salary market benchmark timelines according to the customary time to promotion, relying on input from Deans derived from input from department chairs and program directors and timelines established by college/school P&T guidelines:**
  - a. Six years to tenure and/or promotion to associate from assistant.
  - b. Seven years (average) from promotion to associate to promotion to full, with the median being achieved by the beginning of year four in rank.
5. **Create consistent policies for per-credit-hour compensation for courses taught outside of contracted periods or above contracted teaching obligations.**
  - a. Set a per-course minimum that aligns with 3 above.
  - b. Same policy for on-campus and online May- and summer-term courses.
  - c. Courses assigned as overloads to faculty of instruction
  - d. Compensation through future course reduction, with approval of the department chair or program director.
  - e. Independent-study assignments and other individualized learning experiences regardless of when they are conducted (including through “banking” against future course reductions).
6. **Fund sabbaticals more fully: 100% for a semester sabbatical; 85% for a year sabbatical (within a given 7-year period)**
7. **Analyze the actual costs associated with attending two professional conferences per year, and adjust faculty development allocations to deans accordingly.**
  - a. Allow for differentiation among allocations on a disciplinary basis based on differences in registration fees and other costs customarily associated with conference attendance in particular fields.
  - b. Adjust faculty development funding annually according to CPI
8. **Adjust parking registration fees for instructors.**
  - a. Ideally, free parking for all instructors.
  - b. As an alternative, a progressive parking fee structure tied to annual salary.

**B. Recommendations that do not require additional funding or the reallocation of funds.**

- **Conduct a comprehensive, faculty-of-instruction-wide workload audit, and adjust workload, course scheduling, and promotion-and-tenure/reappointment expectations accordingly.**
- **Per the Academic Charter, require colleges and schools to have established a process for faculty input into articulating and put in practice a process for determining faculty salary increases at the college/school level, with the expectation that...**
  - c. faculty input mechanisms represent all faculty of instruction in a college or school.

- d. that what qualifies for a merit increase should indicate satisfactory and timely progress toward promotion for faculty at promotion-eligible rank.
  - e. that salary adjustments account for salary inversion and compression and changes in cost-of-living.
  - f. that market benchmarks be understood to represent the *minimum salary for competent performance at n years in rank*.
  - g. Enhance transparency and awareness of, and faculty input into, the determination of benchmark institutions and programs.
- **Empanel a task force to analyze and make recommendations about staff salaries and explore the potential for alternate forms of compensation, workload, work environment, and related issues.**
  - **Establish a standing Senate Compensation committee, chaired by a faculty senator, charged with monitoring and reviewing progress on these recommendations, advising administration on implementation, and advocating for additional measures as necessary.**

### C. The “Blow up the System” Recommendation

The committee has chosen not to recommend the following plan of action, seeing it as somewhat beyond its scope, but has also decided to include it to provide some context as to the range of its deliberations. Accordingly, it is presented ~~under erasure~~.

~~Establish a uniform base salary for each rank in every discipline, adjusted annually according to changes in the CPI, with faculty eligible for large, merit bonuses every three years based on the past 3-year performance. Funds annually would be set aside to create and sustain an escrow account out of which these bonuses would be funded, so that no single year's enrollments would have a large effect on the funds available for these bonuses. Also, a single year of excellence or a single poor year of performance would not have a large or long-term effect on compensation. Also, the bonuses could be quite generous, because the Board would not have to budget for long-term commitments. Finally, base salaries could be relatively high at every rank, because future merit bonuses would not be based on base salary and would not affect them. This plan may be especially attractive to newly hired faculty, who would come in at a higher salary than usual, and thus it would, one assumes, help attract and retain quality colleagues.~~