

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
2:30 – 4:15  
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Kathryn Hanna (chair), Ben Bornsztein, Marilyn Bruin, Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Dann Chapman, Tom Clayton, Randy Croce, Jayne Fulkerson, Holly Littlefield, Theodor Litman, Jessica Reinitz, Joe Ritter, George Sheets, Roderick Squires, Elizabeth Stallman, James Wojtaszek

Absent: Vladimir Cherkassky, Luis Ramos-Garcia

Guests: James Meland (Employee Assistance Program); Nan Wilhelmson, Susan Cable (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources); Drs. Leonard Goldfine and Richard Howard (Office of Institutional Research)

[In these minutes: (1) faculty exit survey; (2) Regents Scholarship changes; (3) faculty salary data]

**1. Faculty Exit Survey**

Professor Hanna convened the meeting at 2:30 and welcomed Mr. Meland to discuss the results of his most recent exit survey of faculty. She noted that the point is to obtain feedback from faculty who are leaving to learn how the University might prevent the loss of good faculty. When Mr. Meland reported last year on his work, the Committee and the administration agreed that the survey would be continued at least one more year to see what is learned.

Vice President Carrier agreed that they would do the survey one additional year, and would contact tenured and tenure-track faculty who were not leaving the University due to retirement.

When asked to brief the Committee on his overall responsibilities, Mr. Meland noted that he had joined Human Resources about the same time as Vice President Carrier, and that she had helped him establish a new support program for faculty and academic staff to provide counsel to individuals dealing with personal or work-related challenges. Vice President Carrier commented that the letters she has received have said things such as "Jim saved my life" and told the Committee he has added a lot of value to the University community. (An outside firm handles similar problems for Bargaining Unit and Civil Service staff.)

The idea for the exit surveys came up in 2006, Mr. Meland recalled; the Committee told Vice President Carrier it was interested in faculty morale and wanted information about faculty departures. The first survey in 2007 looked at PeopleSoft data and compared the characteristics of those who left with the faculty as a whole. In short summary, the leavers were in proportion to the racial, gender, and full-professor representation; associate professors left at a lower rate than in the population as a whole while assistant professors left at a greater rate.

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Mr. Meland's notes for his comments to the Committee follow.

\* \* \*

The 2008 report to the Committee was based on 26 interviews (39% response rate) and included the following results for tenured faculty who left the U for reasons other than retirement:

- **Better career opportunities** was the most recited (**50%**) **strongest reason for leaving** the U.
- **Colleagues** was the most recited (**57%**) **best part** of their U experience.
- **Poor management** was the most recited (**36%**) **worst part** of their U experience.
- **Quality and related reputation** was the most recited (**71%**) **best thing that the U has going for itself**.
- **Administrative relations with faculty** was the most recited (**29%**) **most important area where the U needs to improve**.

## **2009 REPORT**

This 2009 report to the Committee was based on interviews with nine (9) Professors, seven (7) Associate Professors, and two (2) Assistant Professors; eleven (11) were male and seven (7) were female; and one (1) was minority. These were Twin Cities campus faculty who left the U for reasons other than retirement. The overall **response rate** of **37%** (18 of 49) was based on an e-mail only solicitation and, as expected, was still similar to the previous year's response rate. Fourteen (14) went to an academic institution, two (2) to a private nonprofit, one (1) to a commercial health organization, and one (1) to a government position. For this presentation the interview responses were combined into a single reporting category. The numbers in subgroups would have been small and no notable differences across appointment level, gender, or race were evident.

It needs to be recognized that this sample includes a subsample of those who left the U because they were to some extent unhappy. One would need to survey all faculty at the U to understand areas and extent of dissatisfaction. And one would need similar information from other institutions to know what is the normative experience in the marketplace.

But if there were circumstances of having been influenced by dissatisfaction it did not stop the interviewed faculty from expressing their overall respect and appreciation for the University of Minnesota. They were happy to talk and wanted to provide helpful information. For some the experience seemed to provide an element of closure and a rationalizing of their decision.

## **OPEN-ENDED QUESTION FINDINGS:**

### **1) Strongest reason for leaving the U:**

- 33% Better career opportunities,
- 28% Unhappy with administration,
- 11% Better career opportunities for partner,
- 6% Better compensation and/or benefits,
- 6% Better colleagues,
- 6% Geographic reasons,
- 6% Family matters,
- 6% For half-time work.

A related open-ended question asking why they left the U provided answers that could be clustered into the following three categories:

- 50% Pull of new professional experiences/Better opportunities/Financial gain,
- 39% Dissatisfaction with department climate or administrative behavior,
- 11% Excessive work/teaching load.

**2) Best parts of the faculty experience** (respondent could have multiple responses):

- 72% Good colleagues,
- 17% Good students,
- 17% Well run department,
- 11% Strong intellectual climate,
- 11% Opportunities to advance one's field,
- 11% Administrative/committee governance experiences.

**3) Worst parts of the faculty experience** (respondent could have multiple responses):

- 50% Poor administrative behavior/performance,
- 17% Poor behavior of colleagues,
- 17% Excessive work load,
- 11% Poor dual hiring practices,
- 6% Favoritism practices by chairs/heads,
- 6% Poor State and administrative support.

**4) Best thing the U has going for itself** (respondent could have multiple responses):

- 44% Creative, innovative, dedicated colleagues,
- 28% State of Minnesota,
- 17% Good research-supporting physical infrastructure,
- 17% Good students, and
- 17% Good reputation.

**5) Most important area where U needs to improve** (respondent could have multiple responses):

- 22% Hiring/retaining good faculty,
- 22% Salaries, resources, support,
- 11% Improved respect/support/kindness from administrators,
- 11% Ways to connect with and be reflective of the State's culture,
- 11% Need for more intellectual experimentation,

**6) Gender based barriers to success for women:**

- 57% Disparities in workload, respect, and/or pay.

**7) Negative bias based on racial or ethnic status:**

- 0%

**2009 IMPRESSIONS/COMMENTARY**

**1) The Process of Leaving – “In the middle of a bad moment I got a call from another university.”**

The exit interviews indicate that many faculty who leave for another academic institution do so following a confluence of events, none dispositive by themselves, but resulting in an intersecting moment of accumulated dissatisfaction and the realization of a more attractive opportunity. Although some University administrators were felt to have responded well, others were felt to have responded poorly.

Decisions to consider, negotiate, and leave often remain in a formative state until an unpredictable determining moment. Faculty perceptions suggest that retention strategies and styles may be as varied as administrator personalities. Given consensus on the importance of retaining valuable faculty, it would seem advantageous to prepare administrators on effective retention practices.

For example, when to take statements about being recruited literally and when not to take them literally.

Circumstances to be taken literally.

There were reported examples of perceived tentativeness and aloofness from chairs/heads responding to indications that a faculty member was being recruited. One chair was reported to have said that he didn't respond to rumors. Absence of response can leave the recruited faculty member feeling devalued and can give the recruitment activity momentum. Momentum is important given that some faculty explore offers even when they have limited initial interest – sometimes only a curiosity.

Circumstances not to be taken literally.

Faculty may tell a chair/head that they are not interested in a retention offer or say they don't play the retention game. However, some of these faculty are then disappointed they weren't asked to stay, feel they have been treated with disinterest, and conclude that this perceived disinterest now makes it easier to leave. Although some said they did not want to be subject to persuasion from the U, their interview commentary suggested that they did.

**2) Sensitivity of some faculty.**

It should be recognized that some faculty decide to leave the U because they feel beaten up. Even though faculty have extraordinary capabilities, some are tender and not resilient in respect to the demands of the system and difficult support staff. An administrator's style can be experienced by some as harsh and unforgiving. There could be two ways to address this: soften the administrator or toughen the faculty member. Or, some kind of counsel could be offered to both. Faculty want to feel supported. Some also want to feel nurtured. Support and nurture may slip down the priority list given the daily pressures.

**3) Leadership training**

Some faculty thrive when exposed to administrative and high level committee assignments. These experiences can fulfill a desire to perform community service. Leadership development programs like the President's Emerging Leaders program could represent an example of how to groom faculty who have the interest and temperament to be effective administrative leaders. Such opportunities could play a retention function and enhance leadership at the U.

**4) AHC – Can be a different faculty experience.**

For many of the units within the Academic Health Center, different financial and market factors drive career demands, options, and decisions.

**5) Dual hiring practices**

Both affected and unaffected interviewed faculty refer to the challenging issue of dual hiring practices. The process can leave candidates (and faculty partners) reacting in a highly negative and personal way to the actions of administrators. Again, administrators may benefit from preparation on dual hiring practices.

#### **6) Life and career stages**

Lives evolve. Career stages can determine what is important. Established (versus establishing) faculty would tend to progressively have job choices based on personal preferences. For retention of valued faculty it may be important to consider how the institution can contribute to making the faculty experience fulfilling throughout the stages of personal and professional development.

#### **7) Mentoring**

Interviewed faculty continue to indicate that guidance, support, and mentoring are highly variable across the institution. And, of course, the need is less variable.

#### **8) Work-life balance**

Many interviewed faculty have difficulty identifying with the traditional work-life balance language. They see the U as highly work focused, notably during the tenure track period. What would seem practical is operationalizing work-life balance for faculty not so much in the common sense but in terms of flexibility needed to take care of family matters given long work hours – for example minimizing early morning and late afternoon meetings.

Results of the survey responses are appended to these minutes.

\* \* \*

Retention was the highlighted issue resulting from this year's faculty exit interviews, Mr. Meland said, with his sample showing mostly tenured versus tenure-track faculty interviewed.

Professor Ritter asked if they had given any thought to doing a similar survey of faculty who had been successfully retained. That would help one understand the data, Mr. Meland commented. Vice Provost Carney reported that the Provost had asked for information from the colleges on retentions; it appears the University retained 60-70% of those who were recruited to go elsewhere. She agreed it would be useful to survey the group of faculty who were retained.

Professor Bornstein said he was impressed with the results. He asked about the "poor management" factor that showed up in the surveys. Does that refer to the individual who decided to leave or to the system or culture? It is at the level closest to home for the faculty member, the department chair or head, and sometimes the dean, Mr. Meland said. These are bright people who have a lot of ideas about how the institution or department should be run. It is his sense that even though there are different views on the directions the University should be going, they did not affect individual satisfaction. When they were frustrated with the administration or local administrators most often they felt they were not receiving fair treatment (for example, promises about support were not being kept). Professor Bornstein asked if there are not mechanisms to achieve higher-quality management. There are, Mr. Meland said, given that perceived treatment and fairness is seen as subpar.

More tenured faculty left this year, Professor Hanna commented, which is a change from last year. It shines a light on the retention issue, Mr. Meland said. Most were recruited away; even most of

those who were not said that the retention efforts were poor. Professor Hanna said the sometimes-perceived point about the quality of administration by department heads/chairs points out the need for good training and development of chairs/heads—and for making good choices. In some cases, she observed, people are chosen because they are good researchers, not because they are good psychologists. Anyone can make an unreasonable-for-the-circumstances request, Mr. Meland said; the issue is the effectiveness of the chair/head responses. Almost all are probably appropriate, but the issue could be how they are communicated. Style may make a difference.

Professor Sheets inquired if Mr. Meland encountered any results that were contrary to what he expected. And if so, why? He did, Mr. Meland said. He could not decide if he was surprised by the level of people's sensitivity to their retention-related treatment or if on reflection it should be not be surprising. Some people's sensitivity seems to get superheated at these times. Two-thirds of the faculty with whom he spoke said that the behavior and efforts at retention were unsatisfactory. That was surprising. That was the reaction among those who left, Dr. Carney observed. Mr. Meland concurred; retention efforts obviously worked for those who stayed.

It would be interesting to hear what the chairs had to say, Professor Clayton commented. Mr. Meland agreed. It is an occupational hazard to conclude things are really terrible, he said; one can forget that only one side of the story has been heard. Professor Squires commented that faculty colleagues of the individual who received a retention offer might have important opinions on the retention offer that could be important for the future health of the unit. There always seems to be a presumption that faculty are glad that a particular individual will stay with them (perhaps indefinitely or perhaps only until the next retention offer) after threatening to leave for greener pastures. It may be that some faculty are not happy when a colleague holds the department essentially ransom, and may also not be pleased with a knee-jerk reaction on the part of the college. Some may see the retention process as a professional discourtesy: the colleague who has threatened to leave is rejecting them, although there will be a variety of reasons for making a move. Mr. Meland agreed and related the story of one faculty member who had a good retention offer and thought he could ask for even more money and more time away from regular faculty responsibilities, but who realized that if he did, there would be resentment from his colleagues.

What about gender problems, Dr. Carney asked. Mr. Meland reported that over half of the female interviewees felt there was gender bias, mostly related to additional responsibilities. But he had a sense that they were also not bothered by it that much, that it is a waning legacy that they don't let upset them.

Professor Fulkerson noted that Vice Provost Carney runs a program for new chairs. If it targets new chairs, it does not get to sitting chairs who may be involved in unsuccessful retention efforts. Dr. Carney said a chair never knows when the issue might come up. She keeps adding material to the new-chair program, and some chairs say that the one-year program is not enough. Mr. Meland is generous with his time and comes each year to the program. But she agreed there may be a need for advanced chair instruction and cases that they can work on. Attendance is not perfect at the sessions, she said, and some do not come very much. She said they do not invite chairs who have been in their position a number of years but has thought about advanced-chair topics.

Professor Hanna asked what happens next. Dr. Carrier pointed out that Mr. Meland's service to the University is through one-on-one sessions; the question is how to value the exit survey against the counseling function. Dr. Littlefield inquired about exit interviews; Dr. Carrier responded that such interviews are not done routinely, although colleges may do so; the Committee wanted a more neutral

interview. These are touchy to do, Dr. Carney added, because even if the individual is unhappy, he or she may need letters of recommendation or have colleagues who he or she likes and does not want to hurt. She said she has left institutions with serious problems but did not set off a bomb when she left. Some decline to participate in an interview at all while others may worry about long-term retaliation. For many faculty, their fields are actually quite small and people know one another. These interviews are more complex than corporate exit interviews.

Professor Hanna said this is important information that should be incorporated in chair training. Dr. Carney agreed and said it suggests why it is important for chairs to participate in the discussions; they are not just learning procedures but also how to interact with colleagues and staff. Professor Hanna said that comparing people who left with people who stayed could be a Ph.D. dissertation; Dr. Carney said that someone other than Mr. Meland should be asked to gather such information.

Professor Hanna thanked Mr. Meland for his report.

## **2. Regents Scholarship Policy Changes**

Professor Hanna turned now to Mss. Cable and Wilhelmson for a report on proposed changes to the Regents Scholarship program.

Ms. Wilhelmson introduced Ms. Cable, who manages the program, and then noted that the proposal is to change the program to reduce the tuition benefit. The President originally proposed that the employee pay 25% of the tuition cost and the University pay the other 75%, but since that time there has been a lot of comment on the policy. There has been an adjustment in the proposal, which is still under discussion, so that the employee would pay 10% of the tuition charges when enrolled in courses for a first undergraduate degree and would pay 25% for all other courses.

Several other elements of the policy are also being reviewed, Ms. Wilhelmson said. For example, it is proposed that the employee be billed for all or part of the Regents Scholarship cost when he or she does not complete a course (unless the employee leaves, voluntarily or not, in which case other provisions would be made).

The policy requires that the courses taken be for credit, and that has been the rule for as far back as they can determine, Ms. Wilhelmson reported, with the exception of a few 0-xxx math courses. As far as they can tell, this exception was permitted because the math proficiency test result may require an individual to take a no-credit math course. She asked if the Committee believed that exception should remain in place. They have looked at other developmental courses (e.g., in writing) and have not been able to identify a similar need in other fields.

Professor Sheets said he believed the program should continue to cover the 0-xxx math courses. A deficiency in math could be a problem for a lot of working adults who want to pursue a degree; if the courses continue to be covered, that will help achieve the stated purpose of the policy. Professor Hanna agreed that proficiency in math is a prerequisite—and the number of employees who need the courses is not large. Mr. Croce also agreed that math proficiency is important, and observed that taking those classes could help employees in their work for the University.

Professor Hanna said that her colleagues were pleased by the change from what the President first proposed, with the reduced charge for first-degree courses, a change that will surely mostly affect the lowest-paid employees. She said that she was still unhappy that the program does not cover auditing courses, and one could be required to document attendance were such courses to be covered, because auditing courses could help faculty development. Is it required, Professor Bruin asked, that employees work toward a degree? It is not, Ms. Wilhelmson said. Then why not allow auditing, she inquired? Originally the program did require working toward a degree or that courses be related to the employee's work, Ms. Wilhelmson said, and there is the question of commitment by employees: If they are not in the course doing the work for a grade, what is the commitment? Dr. Carrier said she understood both sides of the argument but said the University will not do anything right now that would increase the cost of the program.

They also looked at excluding high-cost courses, Ms. Wilhelmson reported. The Carlson Executive MBA courses, for example, are very expensive. Ms. Cable reported that the Management of Technology two-year program has a flat rate; the nine employees participating in it each cost the Regents Scholarship program \$30,060 per year, or \$271,000 per year. The 67 employees in the part-time MBA program cost about \$444,000 per year. There is no cap on registration in these courses. As a guideline, the policy allows one course per semester, but allows the responsible administrator to decide how much coursework an employee may take. Ms. Wilhelmson said the question is whether there should be a cap on the cost of a program or classes that an employee may take. Many of these programs have been developed over the years and were not available when the Regents Scholarships were started, Dr. Carrier reflected, but now there are a number of high-cost programs that raise a question of fairness. Is it fair to contribute \$30,000 per year for one employee? Professor Ritter said that the course does not cost the University money; it is an internal arrangement and it could be set up like Medicare instead: the University could say to a college or department that "this is what the University will provide for an employee to take a course." The marginal cost of the course is probably not \$30,000, and it would be up to the department or college to decide if it wished to take what the University would pay. The courses, however, are not a cost to the University, they are a cost to the benefit program. The issue really comes up with graduate and professional courses and programs, the rates for which are all over the board, Professor Hanna pointed out. Because there is a uniform undergraduate tuition rate, there are no higher-cost undergraduate degrees. It might be appropriate to cap the reimbursement at the Graduate School rate.

Mr. Croce said he appreciated the willingness of the administration to compromise on the proposal by reducing the employee tuition cost to 10% for first undergraduate degrees. There are P&A staff who do not make a lot of money, however, and he said he would advocate the University charge the same 10% for graduate programs. Some employees have already begun programs; to impose this charge on them would create a hardship in the case of high-cost classes.

Dr. Carrier said that the tax laws allow a \$2500-per-year credit for undergraduate-degree coursework, and the University will be sure that all employees know how to apply for it. There is also a lifelong learning credit, Mr. Croce said. Professor Ritter said, apropos the tax credit, that it appears that few would be paying the 10%. They would if they have already used the credit in past years, Dr. Carrier said; it can only be used for four years. So employees would need to pay up front and then receive the tax credit, Mr. Chapman pointed out. So the tax credit would not be an option for people who need to take a long time to get their degree. Dr. Carrier agreed.



Ms. Stallman said the benefit is important for recruitment and retention and said she was sure it is taken into account when people consider positions at the University. There have been rumblings about who will or will not stay in graduate programs; this change could have an effect on those decisions. Ms. Wilhelmson agreed that it probably would, although she's not heard that. People will have to decide where they want to go to school. Some might think about other Big Ten/CIC schools, Ms. Stallman said; Dr. Carrier said that the decisions are all over the map.

For the higher-cost courses, the University could ask the colleges to share in the cost of the Regents Scholarship program, Mr. Croce suggested.

Ms. Wilhelmson said that they are still tweaking the proposal and will bring it back to the Committee for further review. Professor Hanna thanked her for joining the meeting.

### **3. Faculty Salary Data**

Professor Hanna now welcomed Drs. Goldfine and Howard from Institutional Research to provide data on faculty salaries.

Dr. Howard reported that Institutional Research had just received the official data from the AAUP the day before, as did the institutions with which the University usually compares itself. It is possible the data in today's report to this Committee may change slightly, as institutions make corrections, and his report to the Board of Regents in May will reflect any updates. He also noted that he provided the Committee with a similar report last year, but that the reports have become longer and more complex each year as they work with the compensation and salary system. At the same time, the report has become more accurate and reliable.

The data reflect a salary snapshot; they come from the ninth payroll of the year (for these data, the last payroll in October, 2008), so include only active faculty. (The report will be available on the Institutional Research website after the revised data are presented to the Board of Regents in early May.)

Dr. Goldfine walked Committee members through a series of slides. He began with an overview of which groups were included (the data are separate for each: tenured/tenure-track faculty, instructional P&A staff, all P&A staff, and all academic administrators). The faculty included are primarily tenured and tenure-track, full time (100%), non-medical, instruction or research, with full-year salaries equated to 9-month. The data do not include clinical or part-time faculty, administrators, those on leave or replacements, or those on phased retirement. Total compensation includes, in addition to salaries, the full range of fringe benefits (including, where applicable, a tuition benefit for faculty dependents, but not the Regents Scholarship at Minnesota). Dr. Goldfine also explained other definitions and different ways to measure and compare salaries.

The official University comparison group includes: UC Berkeley, UCLA, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Texas, Washington, Ohio State, Florida, and Penn State (in all cases, the flagship campus). In that group of 11, for full professors Minnesota ranked #4 in **total compensation** in Fall 2006, 2007, and 2008. For associate professors it ranked 3, 3, and 3, and for assistant professors 2, 3, 2. In **salary** alone, Minnesota ranked #7 all three years at the full professor rank, 5, 5, and 6 for associate professors, and 7, 7, 8 for assistant professors. So in 2008 the University slipped one rank for associate and assistant professors. Dr. Goldfine also presented the actual salaries and total compensation for each institution; for

example, the average full professor **salary** at Minnesota in 2008 is \$127,400; at Berkeley it is \$142,400, at UCLA it is \$143,400, and at Michigan \$142,100. The total average value of the fringe benefits at Minnesota is \$39,792; the average fringe benefit values at the other 10 institutions range from \$24,378 to \$45,285.

Dr. Goldfine also presented data on salary increases and explained that the analysis included only those whose rank and position were unchanged (e.g., no one who was promoted was included) from 2007 to 2008 and who were in both cohorts. A bar graph illustrating the increases had a bell curve, with the median increase 3.0 to 3.49% (approximately 27-30% of the faculty, depending on rank). There was a slight jump at the far right, showing that about 7% of the faculty received increases of 10% or more.

For all faculty, 2007 to 2008, full-professor salaries increased an average of 4.3%, associate professors an average of 4.7%, and assistant professors an average of 4.2%. For men and women, the average salary increase by rank was this:

Full, Men: 4.2%  
Full, Women: 4.5%  
Assoc, Men: 4.9%  
Assoc, Women: 4.5%  
Asst, Men: 4.2%  
Asst, Women: 4.2%

Data on increases by college were also presented (but not discussed).

The average salary increase by rank, going back to 1999-2000, track closely; there were no dramatic shifts.

Dr. Goldfine also presented salary increase data for Academic Professionals and Academic Administrators. The AP category includes, among many titles, lecturers, advisors, attorneys, research associates, coaches, etc.; AA includes directors, department directors, deans, associate/assistant deans, vice presidents, etc. He presented a separate analysis for instructional P&A staff. The instructional P&A staff saw an average salary increase of 4.7%, total AP employees increased an average of 4.6%, and AA employees increased an average of 5.0%.

Committee members discussed the data. Dr. Goldfine affirmed that the analysis did not exclude faculty who received retention increases, which probably accounts for the spike on the bar graph for faculty who received increases of 10% or more. If the increase was included in the individual's base salary, it was included in the graph; if it was an augmentation, it was not. Dr. Carrier inquired if the definitions included research faculty, those who have a large percentage of their salary on a grant. They look at the source of the salary, Dr. Goldfine said. The data used for the rankings come from the AAUP, which only includes faculty who are at least 50% instructional, so those whose primary appointments are research or public service are excluded. The analysis of salary increases included all appointments.

Dr. Goldfine also affirmed that the comparative data excluded medical schools for all institutions that have them. They also exclude basic-science faculty who are in medical schools, Dr. Howard added. But they do include dentists and veterinarians. For College of Biological Sciences departments, those paid through CBS are included, those paid through the Medical School are not.

Professor Bornstein commented that the male and female (Minnesota) faculty salaries are striking: at the full professor rank, men are paid \$9000 more than women; at the other two ranks, men are paid about \$5000 more. Is that true only at Minnesota or a pattern at all universities? Dr. Howard said it is typical across institutions. Salaries are market-driven and women have tended to be in the lower-paid fields (although that is changing). Dr. Goldfine said their office is working with Vice Provost Carney and the Women's Faculty Cabinet to monitor salaries. When they do salary studies in order to look at equity, Dr. Howard said, discipline is a key variable.

Professor Hanna recalled that the salary memo in February, 2008, called for salary increases to average 3.25%. But these data demonstrate that the average increase, at all ranks and for both faculty and P&A staff, was greater than 3.25%, in some cases considerably greater. Dr. Goldfine said it is better to look at the medians, which are less affected by outliers.

Professor Hanna asked what the Committee would like to see and what it wished to do with the data. Mr. Croce commented that if the University ranks #7 or #8 on faculty salaries (out of the 11 in the comparison group), but ranks #3 or #4 when fringe benefits are included, the fringe benefits make all the difference in whether the University is above or below the average—but it is fringe benefits the University has considered cutting, which would take it below the average of its comparison group.

Professor Bornstein asked if it would be too complicated to control for cost of living; that could increase the University's rank. Dr. Howard said it might raise the University, but there was a study about ten years ago that looked at salaries and cost of living for public universities; there was no change in the relative rankings when cost of living was factored in. They have not done such a study. Dr. Goldfine pointed out that in the comparison of the actual salary and compensation numbers, there are wide disparities at the top (UCLA and Berkeley are considerably above the other nine, with Michigan somewhat below them at third) and the other eight institutions somewhat more closely grouped.

Dr. Carrier observed that the same data could be replicated by discipline. Dr. Howard said they could do an analysis of salaries but not total compensation; they are doing the study, in fact, but are not done with it. They have to do a complicated analysis to be sure the comparisons are correct because departments are configured differently at the 11 institutions. Dr. Carrier said that the Committee should know that Institutional Research is leading the pack on these studies in ensuring that comparisons are apples to apples.

Professor Ritter said it would be useful to have an employment cost index to go with the salary increases dating from 1999-2000 in order to look at what happened to salaries in general compared to University salaries. Dr. Howard agreed but said they would need help in constructing the comparisons.

Professor Hanna thanked Drs. Goldfine and Howard for the data and adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

\* \* \*

Responses to Exit Survey

**Multiple-choice question findings:**

Response options for the following questions were:

**Satisfactory (S), Unsatisfactory (U), Inconsequential (I), and Mixed (M)**

8) Your opportunity for scholarly pursuits?

S – 94%, U – 6%

9) Support in assisting you to become an authority in your field?

S – 78%, U – 17%, M – 6%

10) Your salary?

S – 39%, U – 44%, M – 17%

11) Your benefits?

S – 94%, U – 6%

12) Quality of your colleagues?

S – 72%, U – 17%, M – 11%

13) Quality of your students?

S – 83%, U – 6%, M – 11%

14) Level of civility?

S – 56%, U – 28%, M – 17%

15) Support for your research and scholarly pursuits?

S – 72%, U – 22%, M – 6%

16) Support for your teaching and advising?

S – 67%, U – 22%, M 11%

17) The U of M's prestige?

S – 83%, U – 11%, I – 6%

18) The geographic area in which your campus was located?

S – 94%, U – 6%

19) If applicable, career opportunities available to your spouse/partner within your campus' geographic area?

S – 61%, U – 17%, I – 22%

20) The U of M's efforts to promote work/life balance?

S – 33%, U – 28%, I – 28%, M – 11%

21) The U of M's leadership?

S – 50%, U – 22%, M – 28%

22) The U of M's efforts to retain you?

a) For those recruited – S – 33%, U – 67%

b) For those not recruited – S – 38%, U – 63%

Response options for the following questions were:

**Yes (Y), No (N), and Uncertain (U)**

23) Were you recruited away?

Y – 83%, N – 17%

24a) Do you believe you are *going to/left for* a more prestigious **position**?

Y – 61%, N – 39%

24b) To a more prestigious **organization**?

Y – 39%, N – 61%

25) If applicable, while at the U of M, did you seek another position to provide your spouse/partner with better career opportunities?

Y – 22%, N – 72%, NA – 6%

26) If you were to do it again, would you have accepted your position(s) at the U of M? Y – 72%, N – 11%, U – 17%

### **Tenure-Track Faculty Only**

27) At the U of M were you provided satisfactory research support by way of equipment, facilities, and/or assistance in procuring funds?

Y – 50%, N – 50%

28) Were you provided satisfactory opportunities to be mentored at the U of M?

Y – 50%, N – 50%

29) Were the duties assigned to you reasonable in the sense of allowing you to meet publication expectations at the U of M?

Y – 100%

30) Were you treated fairly during your tenure consideration at the U of M?

“Never evaluated.”

### **Women Faculty Only**

31) As a woman faculty member, did you experience gender-related barriers to success at the U of M?  
Y – 57%, N – 43%

**Faculty of Color Only**

32) As a faculty member of color, did you experience negative bias at the U of M based on your racial or ethnic status?  
N – 100%

33) If so, did such bias impair your career progress?

**Parents of Minor Children Only**

34) If applicable, did the U of M provide you with reasonable support as a parent raising children?  
Y – 31%, N – 23%, U – 15%, “Didn’t expect” – 31%