## Goal 4, Rec 4.4

Develop a five-year HR plan which addresses the need to continue working toward raising faculty salaries, while addressing the recruitment, hiring, and retention of a quality, diverse faculty and staff

## Project Model

## METHODOLOGY



## Where are we now?

CIP /
HEGIS / IPEDS

SU
Discipline Rank

## MARKET <br> Sources?

Comparison Points?

HEGIS/CIP Mapping

Faculty HEGIS/CIP Codes by Department


|  |  |  | resot | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ara | Associate Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
|  | 111910 | Kim, Jinchul | Associate Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Amtuepartment | 111910 | Peterson, Dean | Associate Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 111910 | Rogers, William | Associate Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 111910 | Chism, Alison | Assistant Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 111910 | Kauffman, Elizabeth | Assistant Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 111910 | Poe, Preston | Assistant Professor | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Anderton, Jeanne | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Brotman, Gary | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Davis, Jessica | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Goldhagen, Carl | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Hill, Marjorie | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Lattimore, Somiah | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Molenda, Sally | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Art Department | 110190 | Olszewski, Pamela | FTNTT - Lecturer | 10.01 | 50.07 | Fine \& Studio Art |
| Biological Sciences | 111310 | Briand, Christopher | Professor | 04.01 | 26.01 | Biology, General |
| Biological Sciences | 111310 | Frana, Mark | Professor | 04.01 | 26.01 | Biology, General |
| Biological Sciences | 111310 | Gehnrich, Stephen | Professor | 04.01 | 26.01 | Biology, General |
| Biological Sciences | 111310 | Grecay, Paul | Professor | 04.01 | 26.01 | Biology, General |

Market Sources

- Reviewed 14 Studies, looking for:
- Reliable Data

Adequate \& Appropriate Study Sample

- Comparable Institutions

Public, Master's, Enrollment, Budget, Funding, etc.

- Level of Detail Available?

Discipline, Rank, Tenure, Percentiles, Region, etc.

- Data Collection Methodology
- Survey Limitations


## Surveys Broken Down by Discipline

- National Faculty Salary Survey for Four-Year Institutions by College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA)
- From 1,256 higher education institutions
- 48\% Public, 28\% Private Independent, and 24\% Private Religious
- 345 Faculty positions (by CIP codes)
- Faculty Salary Survey by Oklahoma State University
- But limited to Doctoral and Research Universities
- National Compensation Survey by U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
- 2010 Data, Limited Disciplines but NOT broken down by Rank


## Salisbury <br> Market Sources: What we found

## Other Surveys

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
- Average Salaries only; NOT by discipline or size (funding, enrollment, etc.)
- Chronicle of Higher Education
- Uses data from AAUP
- IPEDS
- Good data, but not by discipline
- Delaware Study
- Only offers: Sample size \& budget allocation (= average for instruction)
- SOME Discipline specific surveys (AACTE; NCATE; AACN; ALA; AACSB; CSWE, etc.): vary greatly in what/ how they offer data/ where it comes from


## Market Sources

- Reviewed 14 Studies, looking for:
- Reliable Data

Adequate \& Appropriate Study Sample

Finalized the Market Sources: (Phase 1) CUPA
(Phase 2) AAUP/Chronicle, IPEDs, \& Oklahoma
woptrne, Rank, Tenure, Percentiles, Region, etc.

- Data Collection Methodology
- Survey Limitations


# Salisbury Market Comparison Points (MCP) 

## CUPA Survey Comparison Groups

- USM Stretch Point
- 10 institutions
- Funding Peers MHEC-defined within same Carnegie Class
- 52 institutions
- Similar Operating Budgets Quartile 3
- 308 institutions
- Similar Enrollment - Quartile 3
- 308 institutions
- Regional East Coast, Master's-Large, Public
- 32 institutions


# Market Comparison Points (MCP) 

## CUPA Survey Comparison Groups

- USM Stretch Point
- 10 institutions

Finalized the CUPA Market Comparison Points: Finalized the CUPA Market Compariso/Enrollment Q3
USM/East Coast/Funding Peers/Budget Q3/Enre

- Similar Operating Budgets Quartile 3
- 308 institutions
- Similar Enrollment Quartile 3
- 308 institutions
- Regional East Coast, Master's-Large, Public
- 32 institutions


## Position Analysis Options

## 2012 Faculty Pay Plan - Position Analysis



Academic Rank:
Professor
Job Code:
9111
45.11

|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Description: |
| CIP CODE |
| SPECIFIC |

## Salary Survey Data:

| CUPA | $\boldsymbol{n}$ | Average | Median |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East Coast | 76 | 94,437 | 89,802 |
| USM | 22 | 102,324 | $\mathbf{8 9 , 8 0 2}$ |
| Fund Peers 09 | 73 | 83,955 | 83,153 |
| Op Budget Q3 $^{\text {a }}$ | 254 | 86,718 | 82,024 |
| Enroll Q3 $^{\text {b }}$ | 278 | 85,947 | 83,425 |


| Min | Lower Mid | Midpoint | Higher Mid | Max | Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66,545 | 84,786 | 103,028 | 121,269 | 139,510 | 72,965 |
| 70,888 | 102,871 | 134,854 | 166,836 | 198,819 | 127,931 |
| 61,700 | 81,153 | 100,605 | 120,058 | 139,510 | 77,810 |
| 58,532 | 81,124 | 103,716 | 126,308 | 148,900 | 90,368 |
| 49,780 | 74,560 | 99,340 | 124,120 | 148,900 | 99,120 |

Average

|  | 90,676 | 85,641 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


a. Op Budget Q3 $=$ National Faculty Survey 2012 Participants with Operating Budgets in Quartile $3(\$ 83,500,001-\$ 189,512,935$ )
b. Enroll Q3 = National Faculty Survey 2012 Participants with Enrollment in Quartile 3 (3,541-8,292)

| Reference Data | $n$ | Average | Median | Min | Lower Mid Midpoint Higher Mid |  |  | Max | Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oklahoma Study ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | XX | XX, XXX |  | XX, XXX | XX, XXX | XX, XXX | XXX,XXX | XXX, XXX | XX, XXX |
| AAUP/Chronicle ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Unknown | 91,998 | 86,761 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IPEDS ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Unknown | 90,448 | 86,761 | 61,491 | 77,777 | 94,063 | 110,349 | 126,635 | 65,144 |

c. Research/Doctoral Universities Only. Adjusted to Master's Universities COMPA of 0.72 .
d. 2010/2011 Average for all Master's Universities by Rank (Not by Discipline, Region or Affiliation).
e. 2010/2011 Average for Master's Large, Public, East by Rank (Not by Discipline).

$n=$ Number of Faculty who Submitted Data.

## Position Analysis Options

2012 Faculty Pay Plan - Position Analysis
DRAET
Academic Rank:
Job Code:
Professor
CIP Code: 45.11 Department: HEGIS:

Finalized Position Analysis Data with CUPA: Specific Four-Digit CIP Codes (Discipline) BY RANK

| Opbuaget Q3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | , |  |  | $61,700$ | 81,153 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 134,854 \\ \hline 100,605 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 166,836 \\ & \hline 120,058 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 198,819 \\ & \hline 139,510 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 127,931 \\ \hline 77,810 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 254 | 86,718 | 82,024 | 58,532 | 81,124 | 103,716 | 126,308 | 148,900 | 90,368 |
| Enroll Q3 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 278 | 85,947 | 83,425 | 49,780 | 74,560 | 99,340 | 124,120 | 148,900 | 99,120 |
| Average |  | 90,676 | 85,641 | 61,489 | 84,899 | 108,308 | 131,718 | 155,128 | 93,639 |
| a. Op Budget Q3 = National Faculty Survey 2012 Participants with Operating Budgets in Quartile $3(\$ 83,500,001-\$ 189,512,935)$ <br> b. Enroll Q3 = National Faculty Survey 2012 Participants with Enrollment in Quartile $3(3,541-8,292)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference Data | $n$ | Average | Median | Min | Lower Mid | Midpoint | Higher Mid | Max | Range |
| Oklahoma Study ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | XX | XX, XXX |  | XX, XXX | XX, XXX | XX, XXX | XXX, XXX | XXX,XXX | XX, XXX |
| AAUP/Chronicle ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Unknown | 91,998 | 86,761 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IPEDS ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Unknown | 90,448 | 86,761 | 61,491 | 77,777 | 94,063 | 110,349 | 126,635 | 65,144 |

c. Research/Doctoral Universities Only. Adjusted to Master's Universities COMPA of 0.72
d. 2010/2011 Average for all Master's Universities by Rank (Not by Discipline, Region or Affiliation),
e. 2010/2011 Average for Master's Large, Public, East by Rank (Not by Discipline).


[^0]Deliverables \& Timeframes

- Preliminary Report due April 2012
- Additional Reports due September 2012

Agreed on (and Provided) April Deliverables:
Prof/Assoc Prof/Asst Prof
Analysis Forms by School/Dept/CIP/Rank Master Spreadsheet (Time Permitting)

- The highlighted dollar amount is where the SU Incumbent's compensation falls in the Market Percentile for that position.

For Example:


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mkt } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Market Title | Annual Salary | MN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LOWER } \\ & \text { MID } \end{aligned}$ | MEDIAN | HCHER MID | SU Start Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1234 | Assistant <br> Professor | 58,700 | 40,125 | 50,800 | 60,500 | 92,000 | 7/1/2001 |

## Color Coding and Rounding



RED BOX:
at or below the "lower mid"

YELLOW BOX: between "lower mid" and "median"

| Mkt <br> Code | Market Titile | Annual <br> Salary | MIN | LOWER | MID |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{9 0 1 2}$ | Professor Z | $\mathbf{6 8 , 7 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 , 8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 , 0 0 0}$ |

GREEN BOX: at or above the "median"

## Professor Salaries to Market

SO ......How does it look so far...??

## Professor Salaries to Market

## Associate Professor Salaries to Market

## Assistant

 Professor Salaries to Market
## Summary: Lower Mid

Breakdown of Cost by Rank for Faculty with Salaries Below "Lower Mid"

|  | Number of Faculty in Each Rank | Number of Faculty with Salaries Lower than "Lower Mid" | Percentage | Annual Cost to Bring Salaries to "Lower Mid" | Percent of Total Cost | Average Cost per Affected Faculty to Achieve "Lower Mid" Salaries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professors | 97 | 20 | 21\% | \$75,828 | 80\% | \$3,791 |
| Associates | 102 | 2 | 2\% | \$6,606 | 7\% | \$3,303 |
| Assistants | 99 | 2 | 2\% | \$5,670 | 6\% | \$2,835 |
| Librarians | 12 | 4 | 33\% | \$6,180 | 7\% | \$1,545 |
| Totals | 310 | 28 | 9\% | \$94,284 | 100\% | \$3,367 |

Summary: Median

Breakdown of Cost by Rank for Faculty with Salaries Below Median


| Number of <br> Faculty <br> with <br> Salaries <br> Lower than <br> Median | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: |
| 66 | $68 \%$ |
| 71 | $70 \%$ |
| 13 | $13 \%$ |
| 11 | $92 \%$ |


| Annual <br> Incremental <br> Cost to <br> Bring <br> Salaries <br> from <br> "Lower <br> Mid" to | Percent of |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Cost |  |
| $\$ 594,568$ | $61 \%$ |
| $\$ 249,472$ | $26 \%$ |
| $\$ 49,857$ | $5 \%$ |
| $\$ 82,385$ | $8 \%$ |


| Average <br> Incremental <br> Cost per <br> Affected <br> Faculty to <br> Move from <br> "Lower Mid" <br> to Median |
| :---: |
| $\$ 9,009$ |
| $\$ 3,514$ |
| $\$ 3,835$ |
| $\$ 7,490$ |

Totals

| $\$ 976,281$ | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |

\$6,064

## Financial Impact

Preliminary Cost to Adjust Faculty Salaries to "Lower Mid" and/or Median for Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Librarian

|  | Number <br> Affected | Annual Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cost to bring faculty below "Lower Mid" to "Lower Mid" | 28 | $\$ 94,284$ |
| Incremental cost to bring faculty from "Lower Mid" to "Median" | 161 | $\$ 976,281$ |
| Total Cost (Bring All Faculty below Median to Median) |  | $\$ \mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 7 0 , 5 6 5}$ |

## What's Next?

- Second Phase - Finish Individualized Reviews
- Add more detail and data points: AAUP/Chronicle, IPEDs, Oklahoma
- Discipline specific surveys
- Develop Compensation Philosophy
- Develop Strategic Plan (\$\$)
- Institutionalize Pay Practices

Compensation Philosophy?

- Focus?
- Overall Philosophy?
- For Example: "Average of all salaries should be at or above the median"
- By Prof Level? By Discipline? For Recruiting? For Retention? Equity considerations?
- By Longevity?
- For Example: "Years of Service/Rank/? should be reflected in the positioning of the job to market"
- What about "Strategic Positions/Departments"?
- Strategic Initiatives?


## Your thoughts??

- Compensation Philosophy?
- Timelines (Next Deliverable is September)
- Other?



[^0]:    $n=$ Number of Faculty who Submitted Data.

