

Faculty Council Committee on Finance, Faculty Compensation, and Work-Related Issues  
(abbreviated as “The Committee” in this report)

October Report (for November 2 Faculty Council meeting)

The committee met this month to discuss the Salary Proposal and to prepare for departmental visits that were set to begin in late October.

1. Salary Proposal

The administrative response to the salary proposal that this committee submitted in the previous academic year was discussed. Agreement was reached on some issues related to the process and some points that were generally true in the past (but we are not sure that these agreements were anything more than an understanding between parties instead of being formal agreements). The administration agreed to the following (salary proposal language in italics, administrative response in plain text, my comments in bold):

Item 2. *Salary notifications must inform faculty of the amounts represented in their raise, broken down by the amounts represented by the cost of living increase, merit, and market adjustment (salary benchmark adjustment).*

Yes, this can be done immediately. We will ask the deans to implement this policy in AY 2016-2017 for the raises that will be made for AY 2017-2018.

Item 3. *Faculty members may request to be notified in writing by their dean of their performance evaluation.*

Yes. We will ask the deans to make this process known in AY 2016-2017, again for the raises that will be effective in AY 2017-2018.

Item 4. *Standards for performance should be consistent and transparent at every level -- university, college, and department. The academic deans should inform the faculty of standards used to assess performance. Any changes in policies or standards for evaluating performance (teaching, scholarship, service) must be made in consultation with the faculty.*

Yes. We will ask the deans to work on this point in consultation with the faculty.

**This is a critical point as it speaks to the faculty self-evaluation and transparent guidelines for faculty work expectations. There appears to be a standard for publication (1 pub/3 years), but the standards for teaching and service are unclear at best.**

Item 8. *This policy applies to all full-time faculty members at John Carroll University, including visitors.*

Compensation for full-time faculty and visitors are in different pools. Usually, the raises are commensurate. However, we cannot agree to this principle at this time because at this time the visitors do not submit an annual performance evaluation, there would need to be a separate performance evaluation instrument developed for visitors and because, in times of budget constraint, the University may not be able to fulfill this promise.

Item 9. *In no case will the use of comparator salary data be used to reduce the salaries of faculty members.*

Yes, we agree.

There is hesitancy to commit to other parts of the proposal, especially in relation to the impacts of a cost-of-living increase and the absence of acceptance of the University Salary Group. The University Salary Group is required as the small size of the University Comparator Group will lead to the absence or paucity of salary data for some disciplines. For example, there may not be enough universities with a certain department or that the number of faculty at a given rank are too small to be reported. This could leave us with unreliable-to-limited data and would be a problem for setting salary standards. The administration is yet to see this as a problem, but we will attempt to illustrate it with data (see below). The administration had concerns about the following (salary proposal language in italics, administrative response in plain text, my comments in bold):

Item 1. *All full-time faculty members should receive each year a cost-of-living increase computed using the latest federal Consumer Price Index.*

Immediate Goals

Response: John Carroll has never operated on an across-the-board cost-of-living increase. The system in both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Boler School of Business has been one of merit increases based on performance. To commit to this change, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the Boler School of Business must be consulted as well as the Provost and CFO. The Provost will begin these conversations with the deans and CFO by October 1, 2016, and she will invite the chair of the Compensation Committee to join the consultation.

Item 5. *Mandatory promotion increases (minimums as of this writing: \$1500 for tenure without promotion; \$2500 for tenure and promotion to associate professor; \$5000 for promotion to full professor) will be increased each year by the cost of living. If a faculty member earns tenure*

*without promotion to associate professor and subsequently is promoted to that rank, he or she will receive \$1000.*

The response to this proposal about increases on top of cost of living is dependent upon the conclusions reached around point 1. It is not clear that we will reach agreement on point 1.

However, the recommendation on the \$1000 promotion amount is acceptable.

*Item 6. Faculty members tenured or promoted to the next rank will receive at least the mandatory increase. Independent of that increase, commensurate with that year's salary adjustments, they will also receive the merit increase and/or market adjustment they have earned for that year.*

This has not been past practice, but the principle is acceptable. However, as stated above, the impact on the yearly budget needs to be examined. Since this amount fluctuates each year, we may need to examine a 5 year time span to determine averages. We would also want to understand what the practice of our peers is.

*Item 7. New assistant professors should be hired at least at the 50th percentile for new assistant professors in their own discipline as established by the University Salary Group.*

The current practice is to hire new faculty at least the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in their discipline according to the CUPA special study. Since the Administration has not accepted the proposed University Salary Group, we will commission a comparison of peer group salaries against the General CUPA data until that time when a salary group has been accepted. Please note the invitation to examine the peer group and make suggested additions. It is not the intention of the Administration to lower the beginning salaries of our new assistant professors.

Finally, the long-term goals of the Salary Proposal have not been agreed to at all. Both the administration and our committee agree that an analysis of salary data is important to have any understanding of salary differences between JCU and our comparators. The Committee Chair met with administrators (Colleran, Mausser, Hareza, Farrar, and Miciak) to discuss the administrative response. **The Chair requested that an analysis of faculty salaries to be undertaken.** The ad hoc committee responsible for this work should include two faculty and two administrators. The Compensation Committee and Dr. Jim Krukones should be two the members with another member of the Compensation Committee to serve as the second faculty member. **The Chair was asked to write up the goals of the data analysis and share it with the Provost.** There was hesitancy to commit to the ad hoc committee establishment in part due to demands on Dr. Krukones' time.

I will push to have this analysis down with the University Comparator Group, University Salary Group, and the CUPA Special Study data that has been used in the past. It is imperative that we

know where we are in relation to other universities if we are to make informed decisions about faculty salaries.

### Faculty Self-evaluation

The Committee also discussed the annual faculty self-evaluation. We need to determine if the Committee has ever been charged with putting forth a new self-evaluation. The Deans strongly feel that the current document does not align well with our current merit raise structures, and they would welcome a new document. There would need to be collaborative work with the Deans to get this done as it must be a document that could be used by them. We will be gathering information related to this topic when we visit academic departments in the fall.

### Department visits

These meetings have begun and will continue through this academic year. One or two Committee members will attend a department meeting and gather information related to issues that could be undertaken by our Committee. We will summarize and report out on these conversations, but we expect the majority of the conversation to cover the salary proposal and faculty self-evaluations. A list of questions related to the self-evaluation was generated to be sure that we collect faculty opinions at this early stage. These include:

1. What role should faculty play in changing the self-evaluation?
2. What should the instrument be used for? What should be in it?
3. How often should it be administered?
4. What stays? What goes?
5. How much should the document be “planning” in nature?