AAUP Report to Faculty Senate, June 5, 2024: Questions for Segal for the meeting

Date: 3 June 2024

To: Segal Consultant Team: Jason Adwin, Diana Sobczynski, Lauren Price, Carolyn Cowper, Greg Saylor
jadwin@segalco.com, dsobczynski@segalco.com, lprice@segalco.com, ccowper@segalco, gsaylor@segalco

From: Michael Cunningham, Ph.D. AAUP Chapter President, University of Louisville; W3 Faculty Advisory Committee

Re: Six Questions about the UofL Faculty Compensation Study

Several AAUP constituents, fellow members of the UofL W3 Compensation Study Faculty Advisory Committee, and other colleagues have questions about the Faculty Compensation Study. We understand that Segal will be making a presentation about this study to the Faculty Senate at our upcoming June 5th meeting.

We thought it would be helpful to all concerned to provide our questions in advance, so you are well-prepared with in-depth answers.

1) Why does the Segal faculty compensation sample exclude 14 schools that are an excellent match to UofL but include 26 schools that are a poor match?

Before asking these questions, we consulted the UofL Compensation website FAQ page (https://louisville.edu/facultycompstudy/faq#faq-methodology), which states:

What was the methodology for selecting peer groups?

> The W3 Committee, along with the Steering Committee, approved peer groups for the study that reflect sources and destinations of talent, both regionally and nationally. The peer group selection process was criteria-based to establish objective guidance and then finalized through qualitative review. Criteria included Carnegie classification, enrollment, geographic location, expenses, research, faculty/staff FTE, etc.). CPE benchmarks that participate in the CUPA-HR salary surveys were also included.

Actually, the W3 Faculty Advisory Committee never voted to approve the Faculty Peer Group, because we had many unanswered questions about it.

Specifically, we wondered: why are there 14 schools included in the Staff peer group that match UofL on 5, 6 or 7 Segal filters that are not included in the Faculty Peer group? These include some of UofL's official Ky Council on Post Secondary Education (CPE) Benchmarks (Alabama, Chapel Hill, Cincinnati), Atlantic Coast Conference competitors (Virginia, Florida State), and Segal Presidential core peer group (Mississippi).

Conversely, why does the Faculty Peer group include 26 schools that are poor matches to UofL, meeting only 4, 3, 2 or 0 Segal filters? These include schools like Buffalo State, Idaho State and Augusta (GA) University? If needed for comparisons on specific departments, the 26 low-match schools can be used

on a quarantine basis, and not included in the general Faculty peer group. Why include 26 poorly matched schools in the 58 school Faculty Peer Group when better matched schools are readily available?

Is it a coincidence that the 14 high-match schools that were excluded from the Faculty sample have average faculty salaries that are $14,363 higher, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education, than the 26 low-match schools that are inexplicably included? A table of the 14 excluded high-match and 26 inappropriate low-match schools is presented in the Appendix. [1]

2) How will unit differences in pay for the same discipline, and subdiscipline pay differences, be handled?

- Most fields have subdisciplines that vary in their rarity, popularity and starting salaries. In Arts & Sciences, there are salary differences between Clinical vs. Experimental in Psychology, Rhetoric vs. Literature in English, and Digital vs. Oral in Communication, to name a few. In some universities, those several subdisciplines are grouped in one department, in other universities the subdisciplines are housed in different departments and in still others, the subdisciplines are in different departments within a separate college (e.g., College of Behavioral Science, School of Communication, etc.)

- In addition, courses in some subdisciplines are in such high demand that faculty members in those subdisciplines are found outside of their college or school of origin, filling positions in multiple schools. For example, faculty members trained in statistics, digital communication, psychology, and law, can be found in colleges of Business, Medicine, Nursing, Public Health, Social Work and Education, and receive substantially different salaries in each. Schools and colleges at UofL with bigger budgets continue to hire highly talented faculty and staff members away from under-funded schools and colleges.

Based on those considerations, faculty raised the following questions:

a) Will the market equity of salaries be assessed in terms of the salary in that faculty member's home department, or in terms of the faculty member's subdiscipline?

---

[1] The FAQ also states: Is the same peer group being used for both the faculty and staff?

> ....The compensation of staff whose roles were not classified as senior-level professional or managerial was compared with a separate peer group which had to incorporate a higher number of regional peer institutions due to the lack of robust national data for those staff positions. Again, this peer group development approach was agreed upon by both the W3 Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee.

Thus, the FAQ explains why some local and regional non-matching schools, like Bellarmine, were included in the Staff Peer Group but it does not address why some regional schools that are highly matched to UofL were excluded. For example, why was the University of Cincinnati, which matches UofL on all 7 of Segal's criteria and is a CPE Benchmark, not part of the Faculty Peer Group? We have the same question for the other 13 well-matched but excluded schools.

b) How will the market equity of salaries be assessed for faculty members in multi-disciplinary departments that vary dramatically in composition from one university to the next, such as Modern Languages and Comparative Humanities?

c) The UofL Compensation study website FAQ sections states:

> ## Will faculty salaries be compared only against other salaries in their department regardless of discipline, or others in their academic discipline regardless of department? "Our study is evaluating compensation by rank and discipline. We are using classification of instructional programs (CIP) codes for discipline comparisons, which is the same framework peer institutions use to classify their faculty.

Will you kindly explain how the use of CIP codes answers the aforementioned questions?

3) Given that members of protected groups often differ in their numbers, disciplinary affiliation and tenure status from traditional groups, what procedures will be used to evaluate equal pay equity at UofL?

We understand that UofL faculty salaries will not only be evaluated in terms of market equity, but in terms of nondiscrimination/equal pay equity.

Such evaluations are often a challenge in universities, because most have a relatively small number of professors from protected groups (female, minority, disabled, LGBTQ+, etc.) especially in some STEM disciplines. Because they were regrettably later in gaining admittance to the academy, there are fewer colleagues from protected groups in the ranks of full professors with decades of seniority and pay raises.

For example, data comparing the average salary of male and female professors, as is presented in the Chronicle salary database (https://www.chronicle.com/article/explore-faculty-salaries-at-3-500-colleges-2012-20), can be misleading. Thus, we respectfully ask for the procedures and formula that will be used to evaluate equal pay equity.

4) Precisely how is time-in-rank going to be addressed in calculating salary market equity?

What will be the intervals for time-in-rank salary comparisons?

Five years intervals of years of service in rank seem appropriate (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59), with longer intervals having the potential to devalue seniority.

Brief mention was made that Segal will use multiple regression analyses to calculate faculty salary, using time-in-rank as a linear variable. Information is requested on the parameters used in each such calculation, including the extent to which each discipline, rank, and time-in-rank data set meets the criteria for MRA, such as normal distribution and linearity. The many well-trained PhDs on the UofL faculty with experience in statistics, accounting, HR and mathematical modeling can handle the complexity of a technical description.

5) What statistical procedures will be used to "age" the salary data?

Segal started work on the Staff and Faculty salaries at UofL in 2022 and will be entering faculty salary data in mid-2024 from benchmark schools that presumably contributed AY 2023-24 salary data. By the time that the comparison school data are entered, they will be out of date.

Many of the benchmark schools are now in the process of raising salaries for AY2024-25. Those new salaries will be going into effect in the benchmark schools this summer, while UofL salaries remain frozen.

There is a prospect that UofL 2024-25 salaries will be set based on comparison with other schools' 2023-24, or earlier, salaries. There was, however, brief mention by Segal that the benchmark salary data will be "aged" to bring it up to date and make it more appropriate for comparison.

Precisely what is the formula that will be used for data aging?

6) When will the full Segal-UofL report on the methodology, formula, and data from the Faculty compensation study be available?

President Ronald Regan often expressed the policy of "Trust but Verify." Sophisticated faculty will be convinced that their salary raise has been calculated appropriately if they can trace all steps in the derivation process, including:

(a) the specific schools used to provide benchmark data for their subdiscipline, rank, and tenure and the data provided by each,

(b) the specific subdivision calculation they were assigned, the tenure bracket they were assigned and other individual details;

(c) the formula used to age the data and calculate the difference between current and benchmark samples and other calculations.

This is a matter of concern because the initial Staff salary letters were distributed in July of 2023. Ten months later, Segal's Staff Study technical report still has not been posted. Approximately when will the full Faculty report be available?

Michael R. Cunningham, Ph.D.
Professor & Psychologist (he, him, his)
A & S Distinguished Researcher & Faculty Senator
President, UofL Chapter American Association of University Professors
Fellow and Past President, International Association for Relationship Research
Fellow, Society for Experimental Social Psychology
Department of Communication, 303 Strickler Hall, University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
OF (502) 852-5953; MO (502) 299-1863
Michael.Cunningham@Louisville.edu

Appendix

14 schools in Staff Peer Group that match on 5/6/7 filters that are not in Faculty Peer Group	2022 AVG 9-MONTH-EQUIV SALARY	2023 AVG 9-MONTH-EQUIV SALARY	Filters Met
Florida State University	$103,515	$110,317	6
Indiana University-Bloomington	$98,488	$101,858	6
Indiana Univ-Purdue Univ-Indianapolis	$78,101	$82,298	6
Michigan State University	$108,281	$116,379	5
University of Alabama at Birmingham	$104,003	$106,434	6
University of Arkansas	$90,406	$92,078	5
University of Cincinnati-Main Campus	$96,849	$99,797	7
University of Georgia	$106,774	$110,755	5
University of Iowa	$106,372	$114,064	6
University of Mississippi	$85,142	$87,066	6
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	$114,942	$125,543	6
University of Notre Dame	$136,509	$144,593	5
University of Virginia-Main Campus	$139,562	$145,554	6
Vanderbilt University	$134,547	$136,648	5
Average salary*	$107,392	$112,385	

26 schools in the Faculty Peer Group that match on only 0/2/3/4 filters, (12 of which are not in Staff Peer Group)	2022 AVG 9-MONTH-EQUIV SALARY	2023 AVG 9-MONTH-EQUIV SALARY	Filters Met	Not in Staff Sample
Augusta University	$79,150	$83,433	4	
Baylor University	$96,056	$99,296	4	x
Case Western University	$109,064	$114,598	4	
DePaul University	$105,376	$107,061	3	
Idaho State University	$71,459	$75,152	0	x
Loyola University Chicago	$99,734	$97,816	3	
Miami University-Oxford	$94,134	$97,839	4	
Montana State University	$83,173	$77,786	3	x
SUNY Buffalo State	$74,863	$79,863	0	x
The University of Texas at Arlington	$92,569	$96,436	4	x
The University of Texas at El Paso	$82,728	$85,253	3	x
The University of Texas at San Antonio	$88,732	$88,576	4	x
Thomas Jefferson University	$90,388	$92,710	3	x
Tulane University of Louisiana	$110,149	$111,737	4	
University of Colorado Denver/Anschutz	$97,017	$85,112	4	x
University of Dayton	$81,638	$83,209	3	
University of Florida	$112,102	$114,823	4	
University of Idaho	$88,712	$91,798	3	X
University of Maine	$91,510	$97,198	3	X
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	$113,587	$119,112	2	

University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	$112,620	$116,648	3	
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	$88,970	$97,294	4	
University of Rhode Island	$89,554	$96,353	3	X
University of Wisconsin-Madison	$123,803	$128,426	4	
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	$82,246	$83,070	3	
Western Michigan University	$92,796	$93,833	2	
Average Salary*	$94,313	$96,709		
Difference	$13,049	$15,676		