

SBBFP Committee Report for Senate 16 March 2017

Report on Charge 4 - Gather information regarding faculty experiences with respect to benefits administration.

The Committee designed and administered a 19-item Likert scale based survey covering all aspects of faculty benefits. The response rate for the survey was 51.4% with 275 of 535 Faculty surveyed responding to the survey and 100 comments provided. Likert-scale results and a summary of comments are included with the attached report. The results were generally positive.

Likert Scale Results: The clear majority of responses on Medical, Dental, Retirement, Tuition Benefit, Wellness, Season tickets were satisfied or very satisfied. Vision benefit response was mixed. Respondents indicated a lack of awareness or experience with the other categories.

Comment Summary:

Benefit	Positive comment	Negative comments	Comment Summary
Dental		6	Consider covering regular cleanings 100%
Vision		2	Better explanation at Open Enrollment
Employee and Life Assistance (EAP)		2	Dissatisfaction with the interaction (Blomquist Hale) - follow up with the outside provider - HR
Wellness	5	3	Look at streamlining the process (assumed for rebates)
Season tickets	3	2	Program appreciated, choice and quality of tickets as well as administration were brought up
Tuition benefits	3		Include student fees as well as tuition discount
Home and auto insurance discounts		2	May not be needed as a benefit if there are institutional cost for the provision
Primary/secondary health insurance through PEHP		2	Make reimbursement with double coverage easier (Express Script)
Other Comments	20		Consider providing more/different information about the benefits package - HR website? Balance of positive comments about health insurance package and a few very specific complaints in dealing with PEHP

Total Comments = 100			
----------------------	--	--	--

Report on Charge 6 - Develop a strategic approach to address compression and inversion in salaries.

Salary inversion can be defined in many ways and findings about the severity of salary inversion will depend on the chosen definition. The committee chose a simplistic definition of salary inversion as a starting point for its investigation. Under this definition, salary inversion exists when the nine-month FTE salary of a faculty member of lower rank is higher than the nine-month FTE salary of a faculty member of higher rank. Note that this basic definition does not take into account differences in academic degree, years of service, etc.

Using data from the 2017 equity model available through the eWeber Portal (Faculty Dashboard), the committee finds that 74 faculty members in 16 departments experience salary inversion (14.3% of all faculty members). The total amount of salary inversion measured under the basic definition is \$807,729.

Since faculty members of higher rank are more likely to experience salary inversion as new faculty members are hired at current market rates, the committee also looked at salary inversion by rank. Currently, there are 13 full professors who make less than faculty of lower rank in their respective departments. The amount of this salary inversion is \$243,872.

The recommendation of the Salary, Budget, Benefits, and Fiscal Planning Committee is to use the simple definition describe above to measure salary inversion over a period of several years to determine if inversion is increasing or decreasing, particularly among full professors. The Committee recommends that instances where apparent inversion exists be shared with the Provost's office for review with the corresponding deans and department chairs to determine if those instances are merited by specific circumstances or if they should be addressed by salary adjustments of those individuals that are inverted. More sophisticated definitions of salary inversion and compression may also be considered in the future if warranted.

Report on Charge 8 - Review impact of low support staff salaries on faculty productivity.

We find that there is little or no evidence that staff salaries are low, thus negating the premise of this charge.

In 2015, Weber State engaged Sibson Consulting to examine the compensation program for exempt and non-exempt staff. They produced two findings that suggest that compensation for staff is consistent with our peer and competitor institutions.

First, while salaries are somewhat low, Weber State benefits are among the better packages offered among competitors and peers. When taking into account the value of those benefits, compensation is very competitive. Often, benefits are the dominant attraction for potential employees to Weber State.

Second, as part of their engagement, Sibson assisted in the establishment of a monitoring and assessment program for compensation and benefits for Weber State. This program is a detailed means by which Human Resources can monitor effectiveness of the university in attracting, hiring, and retaining employees.

Finally, we examined salary data of non-exempt staff for irregular differences among colleges. We specifically conducted this examination on behalf of the Dumke College of Health Professions in response to their belief that their staff salaries were low, resulting in an inability to retain staff. Again, we found no evidence that this is the case when comparing staff across colleges.

Report on Charge 1 – Examine salary options for compensation increases and prioritize recommendations.

and

Report on Charge 2 – Examine the dollar amounts of equity and merit adjustments each year.

The Faculty Senate Salary, Benefits, Budget, and Fiscal Planning Committee, SBBFP, met yesterday to review and adopt a recommendation for the distribution of the 2% Market Adjustment Distribution provided for in the recently completed state legislative session. The recommendation of the SBBFP regarding the disposition of the 2% increase in money allocated by the state for base salaries is:

- 1) The full 2% increase in salary funding shall be applied as a labor market adjustment to all faculty as a percentage of their current salaries. This will not be regarded as a merit increase; however, Deans may exclude faculty with documented unsatisfactory performance.
- 2) None of the 2% base salary increase funding will be assigned for merit increases.

It is noted that funding of the state's portion of the increase in medical coverage cost for 2017-18 was also provided for in the legislative budget. This increase in amounts paid for benefits represents approximately 1% in additional compensation.

It is further noted that the Performance Salary Increase addresses merit increases at some level. The Performance Salary Increase along with the increases related to advancement in rank among faculty represent a further approximately 1% increase in average faculty salary.

Base Salary Distribution Models

Faculty 2016 Base Salary Total:	\$35,798,386						
Number of Faculty:	519						
Total Faculty FTE:	531						
New Funding (2% of Base):	\$715,968						
	2% Labor Market Adjustment				1.5% Labor Market Adjustment + 0.5% Merit/Equity		
	Current	2%	2% Flat	Effective %	1.50%	1.5% Flat	Effective %
Top:	\$194,933.00	\$3,898.66	\$1,379.51	0.71%	\$2,924.00	\$1,034.64	0.53%
Average:	\$68,975.70	\$1,379.51	\$1,379.51	2.00%	\$1,034.64	\$1,034.64	1.50%
Median:	\$64,260.00	\$1,285.20	\$1,379.51	2.15%	\$963.90	\$1,034.64	1.61%
Bottom:	\$32,252.00	\$645.04	\$1,379.51	4.28%	\$483.78	\$1,034.64	3.21%