

M E M O R A N D U M

**TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**FROM: Faculty Senate Office**  
**DATE: May 30, 1994**  
**SUBJECT: Minutes of Fac. Sen. Steering Meeting of May 19, 1994**

=====

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Naval Modani, Chair, at 4:06 p.m. The roll was passed. The minutes of April 21, 1994 Steering Committee meeting were unanimously approved. Members present were Drs. Armstrong, Cunningham, Hosni, Koons, Rungeling, Wink, and Wood. Provost Gary Whitehouse and Dr. Frank Juge were also in attendance.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Dr. Modani asked Dr. Juge to provide an overview of the model to address faculty salary compression. The minutes from the Salary Compression/ Inversion Committee and a tentative schedule were shared with the Steering Committee. Dr. Juge outlined the requirements of the model contained in the BOR/UFF agreement: (1) Each college or equivalent unit is to receive approximately 1.1 percent of the base salary rate. (2) Each college Dean is to develop a model in consultation with the departments. (3) Each college model must be based on (a) comparison of faculty salaries with a national norm by rank and discipline, (b) evaluation of performance over past ten years, and (c) years of service in the SUS. (4) Compression awards are grievable for unlawful discrimination and for arbitrary and capricious application of the model. (5) Awards are effective November 1, 1994 with no provision for retroactivity. Additional guidelines from BOR are expected shortly.

Dr. Juge indicated that he would like UCF to develop a broad framework of a single model in consultation with the Steering Committee and others. Individual colleges will follow this model and have the flexibility to use different national norms, if appropriate, and to use different weights for the parameters of the model. Faculty performance would be based on existing annual faculty evaluations. Two models are being reviewed. Both models consider the required variables. One of the models is based on regression analysis and the other proposed by Dr. McHone of the College of Business Administration is based on less complex yet intuitive analysis. Both models have their strengths and weaknesses.

In the regression model, the ratios of faculty salaries to the national norms for the same discipline and rank are fit against years in rank and additional years in the SUS to determine the residuals, and therefore, the degree of compression for individual faculty. Quality of faculty performance is used to calculate the compression salary adjustment. In the McHone model, the percent deviation (positive or negative) of a faculty salary from the national median for the same discipline and rank is calculated. This is adjusted up or down by the average faculty performance (over or under the department average) weighted by the years of service. A negative value for the adjusted compression index indicates salary compression after performance and years of service have been considered. The size of the adjusted compression index indicates the degree of compression and is used to calculate the compression salary adjustment.

Dr. Juge indicated that both models generated considerable discussion at the Salary Compression/Inversion Committee meeting. There was considerable interest and support for the McHone model. He was asked to show the details of how salary increases would be distributed and how years in rank might be considered in the model. Dr. McHone has met with Provost Whitehouse to discuss some of the refinements to the model and other issues. Dr. Juge also indicated that regardless of the model adopted by UCF, trial runs would be made to ensure that the model works properly.

Several questions were raised in regard to specific situations. Dr. Modani asked if the 1.1 percent of base rate distribution would be done at the department level. Dr. Juge responded that this is yet to be determined noting that wide variations in salary compression, faculty performance based on annual evaluations, and similar factors need to be considered. He felt that college Deans may be given this flexibility. The main goal is to have a fair and equitable system for all departments and all faculty. There was considerable discussion on annual evaluations and standards across departments. All agreed that there is no choice but to use existing annual evaluations to measure faculty performance.

Dr. Wood asked if the level of teaching (graduate versus undergraduate) can be considered in the model as only graduate teaching is done in some departments. The response was that the national salary norms by discipline and rank would reflect this. Dr. Rungeling asked if the administration has been in touch with other institutions in the SUS. Dr. Juge mentioned a model being used at USF for past few years. There was considerable discussion on the various national norms. The OSU salary study, AACSB salary survey for business, AAUP data, and others were mentioned. All agreed that the choice of national norms should be made with considerable amount of caution.

A question was raised concerning faculty with one or two years of service at UCF. First, they came to UCF with a negotiated salary, presumably the best deal they could get. Second, there is not enough evaluative data for these faculty, and therefore, quality would wash out. A suggestion was made to limit compression raises to faculty with at least three years of UCF service. A question was raised whether faculty who are at or slightly above the national norm would be eligible for compression raises. Some members felt that if a faculty salary is at or above norm, by definition it is not compressed. Other members, however, felt that the national norms are for an average faculty. If a UCF faculty has sustained outstanding performance over a long period but their salary is at the national average, they are compressed and should be eligible for compression adjustment. Dr. Wink pointed out that in some departments, most faculty may be above the national norm, yet have a compression problem. Dr. Juge felt that a specific model would be available soon and the Steering Committee scheduled a meeting on June 2, to discuss this further.

Dr. Rungeling asked about the TIP awards for 1994-95. Provost Whitehouse said that UCF has 98 awards next year compared to 95 awards for 1993-94. Dr. Juge said that guidelines from BOR on 1994-95 awards should come to UCF soon. He outlined the following elements of the program: (1) instructors are eligible, (2) graduate teaching is included in SCH computations, (3) four out of six semesters are to be used for measuring productivity, and

(4) no more than 10 percent of the awards may go to faculty teaching exclusively at the graduate level. The last element was not expected to pose a problem at UCF as very few faculty teach exclusively at the graduate level. Further, these awards are retroactive to the start of the 1994-95 academic year.

The time line for TIP awards has to be speeded up as the BOR has asked for a final report by January 1, 1995. Concern was expressed that the selection committees for some of the colleges may not get enough time to review the portfolios. A suggestion was made to identify the eligible faculty as soon as possible and for the criteria committees to meet early. If faculty are notified early, they may assemble their portfolios by about October 1. Suggestion was made to limit the size of the portfolio. There was a consensus to define eligible faculty as being "at or above" the SCH median. Dr. Modani asked if a faculty member may be given the option to substitute summer SCH for a regular semester. Dr. Wink stated that in some cases there are programmatic needs to do more teaching in summer than in a regular semester. Dr. Juge would check into this. Another suggestion was to use two separate medians - one for lower level UG courses and the other for upper level UG course. This may unnecessarily complicate the process without any tangible benefits.

Provost Whitehouse said that he is considering a proposal to start Spring 1995 classes at an earlier hour. Dr. Cunningham commented that not enough faculty and chairs are aware of this proposal. Provost Whitehouse responded that the Deans were asked to comment on it but no responses were sent. The Steering Committee urged the Provost to postpone a decision on this to permit more discussion and debate. Scheduling of final exams, cheating, and multiple section exams were raised as topics for future discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.