University of Idaho

2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #19

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 20, 2018
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #18, February 13, 2018 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • F-CTF Report (Hrdlicka)

VI. Committee Reports.

   Benefits Advisory Board (Brandt)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #18
Handouts
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2017-2018 Meeting #18, Tuesday, February 13, 2018

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Foster, Ellison, Howard, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Sisodiya (for Grieb, w/o vote), Tibbals, Vella, Watson. Absent: Baird, De Angelis, Grieb, Leonor, Panttaja, Wiencek, Zhao (Idaho Falls). Guests: 7

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Vella/Brown) to approve the minutes passed.

Chair’s Report:

1. The General Policy Report #65 is available. Petitions seeking further consideration of any item in the report are due to the chair of Faculty Senate, hrdlicka@uidaho.edu, by February 15, 2018;
2. Sabbatical applications for academic year academic year 2019-20 must be received by the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee by March 30, 2018. More information is available in the Sabbatical Section of the Provost’s web page.
3. Nominations for Honorary Degrees for the December 2018 commencement ceremony are due by April 15, 2018. More information is available here.

Provost Report: Vice Provost for Faculty Jeanne Stevenson explained that Provost Wiencek is travelling to attend the State Board of Education meeting. She did not have any announcements.

FS-18-047 (UCC-18-014a) – Family Consumer Science Restructure. The chair asked for a motion to change the order of the agenda to consider one of the items on the University Curriculum Committee report regarding changes to the major in Child Family and Consumer Sciences. A motion (Seamon/Watson) to change the order of the agenda was approved unanimously. Prof. Beth Price presented the change on behalf of the School of Family and Consumer Sciences. She explained that the major has had three options that have had varying levels of success meeting student needs. As a result of the proposed re-organization, all students in the major will be required to take a series of core classes. They will then be able to choose one of three emphasis areas. The proposal passed unanimously.

Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives Cher Hendricks. Vice Provost Hendricks updated senate on a new directive from the State Board of Education (SBOE) regarding general education. The SBOE wishes to implement common course numbers and names for general education courses to facilitate student transfer between Idaho institutions. Some of the changes that will result from this directive are relatively simple to implement. For example, the name of our English 101 course will have to change to English Composition 101. Some of the changes are not simple and will require us to examine the content of certain general education courses to determine whether they should align with the common courses. Hendricks explained that the directive does not require the university to change course names and numbers if the content of our courses is significantly different than that identified by the SBOE. In addition, we are not required to add courses identified in this process that are not currently part of our curriculum. Hendricks indicated that faculty can give feedback to the SBOE about this process, but that the directive is unlikely to change. Required changes need to be part of our 2019-20 catalog.

A senator asked whether this is something that other states are doing. Hendricks responded that many states are implementing similar changes. She added that some have taken a more aggressive approach by developing a common state core curriculum for all higher education institutions. She also explained that the directive affects our 100-200 level general education courses. There is some discussion at the board level about whether all general education courses should be offered at the 100-200 level.
A senator asked if Hendricks could give more background on the reasons for the directive. She indicated that the registrars at the eight Idaho institutions have been working on the transferability of credits within the Idaho higher education system for some time. Detailed articulation agreements exist and are available online. We have requested, but have not been able to see, data regarding the number and nature of problems transfer students experience. We are suggesting that a state-wide website be created where students can report and describe problems they experience when trying to transfer between Idaho institutions.

A senator asked how this directive relates to the UI core requirements. Hendricks explained that the directive does not require the university to change its core requirements, but rather only requires parallel naming and numbering of the courses that are identified as common to most Idaho institutions. Hendricks also explained that concern has been expressed that students will focus on these “transfer courses” to the exclusion of other courses that are part of our core.

Dean Jerry McMurtry, College of Graduate Studies (COGS). Dean McMurtry updated senate on the new TA compensation system. The new system reflects a complete reorganization of the way we support TAs across campus along with a significant infusion of resources to provide in-state and out-of-state tuition waivers as well as market compensation to TAs. The new system creates a central fund to support TAs that is comprised of resources made available through the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) process ($2.3 million), resources from COGS ($0.9 million), and resources from individual colleges that were previously used to fund TAs ($2.3 million). The tuition numbers in the proposed TA budget reflect an estimated 4% increase in tuition for the 2018-19 academic year. Under the new system TA compensation will increase from approximately the 9th percentile of the national average to near 50th percentile, in-state fees will be covered, and resources for out-of-state tuition will be available. Compensation levels are based on the Oklahoma State Salary Survey and applicable CIP codes. In order to establish a baseline for the program, the number of TA packages in 2018-19 will be based on the number of TAs used in 2017-18. 280 TA packages were distributed to colleges in 2017.

Dean McMurtry provided a document to senators that shows by college and, sometimes, department, the prior average TA compensation, the new TA compensation, the value of the compensation package considering both in-state and out-of-state tuition, as well as other information. McMurtry also stated that in the future, TA compensation will be eligible for change in employee compensation (CEC). The Graduate Council is developing ways to evaluate requests for new TAs.

A senator commented that it appears that the TA budget for some colleges is less under the new system than it was under the prior system. McMurtry explained that some units were artificially inflating the hourly rate for TAs to allow students to pay in-state fees. He worked to identify these units and separate out the inflated amount from the actual compensation levels for the TA. No college will see a decrease in the value of the TA compensation packages. A senator from one of the colleges commented that even though their new TA budget appears to be lower, the new proposal will actually result in a substantial increase in compensation to TAs.

A senator asked how the decisions about where to deploy TAs would be made in the new central system. McMurtry responded that deans would make the decisions about where to deploy TAs. It appears that most of the deans have decided to put the money back into existing TA positions. McMurtry has not seen reallocations under the new system so far.

Another senator asked how the need for a TA will be evaluated. McMurtry responded that he hopes to evaluate the allocation every semester, but particularly in fall. If a unit isn’t using its TAs, those resources will be redeployed. A subcommittee of Graduate Council will make decisions regarding such reallocations of funding. A senator commented that it will be important to make sure that counterproductive incentives are not created by such allocations. McMurtry responded that COGS is working to ensure that the university maintains the
quality of TAs. He added that COGS must approve the Employee Personnel Action Form (EPAF) for each TA that is hired.

A senator thanked McMurtry for his efforts and commented that the new system is “a game changer.” Another senator commented that currently we are very short of TAs in some disciplines. He asked whether departments should request new TAs. McMurtry acknowledged that both the College of Science and the College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences are short of TAs to adequately support their responsibilities in the general education curriculum. He indicated that COGS is working to develop proposals for additional monies to support TAs.

A senator asked whether there is an effort to improve the experience of TAs along with increasing their compensation. McMurtry stated that COGS is working to increase the professional development opportunities for TAs. It currently offers a support program for international TAs as well as a “TA boot camp.” The senator followed up by commenting that she had seen some documentation that appeared to impose minimum requirements for TAs. She asked McMurtry if he could explain these requirements. He responded that the university is working to embed new national standards into the TA appointment guidelines. In addition, he added that the goal of the program is to foster academic-year TA appointments. Departments may still offer one-semester TA appointments which are sometimes appropriate. TA awards must be either for one semester or a full academic year. A senator asked about the emphasis on awarding TA appointments to students in terminal degree programs? McMurtry confirmed that this is a preference and is aimed at increasing the number of terminal degree students. Departments may still award TA appointments to students who are not in a terminal degree program. A senator urged other faculty to consider committing to the continuation of TA appointments until a student completes his or her degree. McMurtry commented that some units start by offering a TA appointment and later move the student to an RA appointment.

A senator commented that in his college there is a historic inequity in the allocation of TAs. He asked for clarification on whether and how these historic imbalances would be corrected. McMurtry confirmed that he has observed such imbalances. He stressed that he relied on the current allocation of TAs in order to establish a baseline for the new program. He anticipates that changes in TA allocations will be made in the future and stated that the system will be continuously evaluated. He anticipates that allocation decisions will continue to be made by deans. A senator asked whether steps are being taken to ensure that TA compensation rates keep up with the market. McMurtry commented that TAs will be eligible for CEC. He realizes that this does not necessarily ensure that such salaries will keep up with market conditions. He added that the tuition aspects of the compensation will keep up with increases in tuition. In the end, increases in TA compensation will have to be included in our budgeting process. Finally, McMurtry pointed out that we have a cap on the number of out-of-state tuition waivers we can offer. We did not hit the cap this year, but he believes we will do so in the future. A senator asked whether “foundation dollars” could be used for TA compensation. McMurtry responded that some departments have monies for TAs from gifts. He encouraged units to think about TA compensations as a development priority.

Committee on Committees Report:

1. **FS-18-042 - FSH 1640.74** - Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Vice Chair Miranda Anderson presented the report for the Committee on Committees and the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Last semester senate approved revisions to the sabbatical leave application policy. The proposal aligns the committee process with the earlier changes. Under the proposal, a committee member would not be required to recuse themselves for a full semester if they are applying for a sabbatical. Rather, the policy now requires that the committee member need only recuse themselves from consideration of their own application. Anderson explained that sabbatical proposals are not in competition with each other. The recusal system caused disruptions while the Committee on Committees located an alternate committee member. The proposal passed unanimously.

2. **FS-18-043 - FSH 1640.54** - Institutional Review Board. Jenn Walker from the Office of Research and Economic Development presented the proposal. The changes in the proposal are minor and bring the Institutional Review Board into compliance with earlier changes in the university’s human participant
review policy (Faculty-Staff Handbook 5200) approved by senate earlier in the semester. A senator suggested the abbreviation for the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) be spelled out. The edited proposal was approved unanimously.

**University Curriculum Committee Report.**

1. **FS-18-044 (UCC-18-038a), FS-18-045 (UCC-18-038b) and FS-18-046 (UCC-18-038c):** Catalog Change J-3-c, J-3-f, J-3-g. Rebecca Frost from the Registrar’s Office presented the changes. These changes were approved by the University Committee on General Education this year using rubrics for this section of our general education requirement. The changes add two courses to science core offerings, deletes two courses from the diversity core offerings and adds two courses to the international core offerings. The proposal was approved unanimously.

2. **FS-18-048 (UCC-18-014b):** Plant Sciences - new Crop Management minor. Professor Joe Kuhl presented the proposal. He explained that since the major in crop management was created in 2017, a number of students have expressed interest in a minor. The proposal was approved unanimously.

**Andrew Brewick, Executive Director, Global Student Success Program.** Director Brewick provided an overview of the Global Student Success Program (GSSP). The program is a partnership between UI and Navitas. Their goal is to put the Navitas name in the background. GSSP is a UI program relying on UI courses, and UI faculty. The program includes courses that are the equivalent to the first year of a bachelor’s degree program. In addition, it includes courses that focus on helping undergraduate students to be successful in traditional college courses, and that focus on the transition and language skills. For graduate students, the program offers a 12-credit course sequence. The graduate courses are not UI courses and do not count toward a graduate degree. Rather, they are designed to help graduate students to be successful in graduate-level courses. The program has admitted two cohorts of students this year. In the fall, 13 undergraduate and 13 graduate students were admitted representing eight countries. The applicant pool was very encouraging and included students from over 30 countries. In the spring cohort, two undergraduate students and 17 graduate students were admitted. This initial reaction is very encouraging and indicates that the UI program has broad appeal in the global market. The program is currently recruiting its fall 2018 class. They have two recruiters who will be visiting 14 countries in the next three months to recruit students.

Navitas has ten university partners in North America. The goal of Navitas is to form a true partnership. The company wants to facilitate the offering of UI courses, not dilute those offerings. Each course they offered to the GSSP students is approved by the course coordinator who is a department chair. Faculty offering the courses are identified and approved by the chair. These faculty receive the same compensation as a comparable UI faculty member would receive. The course coordinator also monitors the grades in the course to ensure they correspond to UI standards and practices. Brewick pointed out that he reports to both institutions through a joint strategic management board comprised of both UI and Navitas representatives. One issue Brewick wished to clarify is that GSSP is not an English as a Second Language (ESL) Program. While GSSP offers support for language skills, it cooperates closely with UI’s ESL program – the American Language and Culture Program (ALCP).

In terms of student recruitment, Navitas has 27 country offices and over 3500 agents throughout the world. A senator asked about the list of countries in the GSSP brochure provided with the senate agenda. Brewick explained that the list is not exclusive, but instead represents those countries identified as most likely prospects for students. Another senator asked about what graduate students are told about graduate support at UI. Brewick responded that students are told they are not eligible for TA or RA appointments while they are in the GSSP. The first cohort contained two students who had some unique qualifications and subsequently were hired as TAs/RAs. However, the program is maintaining a firm line regarding eligibility for TA and RA appointments. Once the students progress out of the GSSP, they may be eligible for such appointments. In addition, all program participants are eligible for jobs on campus. The GSSP makes clear that students must be self-funded.
Brewick also explained that most of the graduate programs they are working on, are non-thesis programs that can be completed in 2 years. A senator asked how the initial GSSP programs were selected. Brewick explained that the programs were identified during the creation and launch of the project as being the most marketable. The GSSP is open to new partnerships with additional programs and are trying to identify those programs that would benefit from GSSP. A senator asked about the specific admission requirement for students from Nigeria (set forth in the brochure). He commented that the requirement was very low compared to normal college admissions expectations. Brewick explained that the students in the GSSP generally have admissions profiles that are borderline for being admitted to a US college. However, he explained that the pathway/cohort model employed in the program has proven successful in bringing these students up to the level necessary to succeed. Because the program is new, it does not have data on student outcomes. However, initial results are promising. In the first cohort of students, 85% persisted from fall semester to spring semester. Those who transitioned away did so for family reasons. Furthermore, in the first cohort of 13 undergrads, 7 were directly admissible to UI. They opted to participate in the GSSP to get the additional support. Brewick added that the delivery model employed by GSSP for a 3-credit course is to provide students with hours of contact time thereby building in tutoring, language, and writing support.

A senator asked whether students participating in the GSSP are eligible for the full range of student benefits, such as use of the Student Recreation Center. Brewick responded that they were eligible for the full range of student benefits and activities.

Another senator asked about the UI cost of the Navitas program, and whether the program is cost effective. Brewick responded that the program uses a revenue share model. Both UI and Navitas get a share of the student tuition. Moving forward, the university will capture all the tuition that is paid. The program is not currently breaking even. Navitas has made a significant investment and hopes to expand the program. Brewick reminded senators that the US has seen a 30% decline in international enrollment. In addition, it appears that visa denials have increased recently. 54% of students in the spring cohort of the GSSP were denied visas. Brewick also added that UI has provided space and paid to have it renovated. Navitas is paying the overhead and salaries. A senator asked how long the UI is committed to the Navitas partnership. Brewick answered that there is a 10-year obligation that can be reviewed in the 5th year.

Brewick closed by announcing that the GSSP is sponsoring a speaker series. The program has identified faculty colleagues around campus and asked them to share their experiences. He encouraged faculty to contact him if they are interested in participating. He also indicated his desire to secure a senator to serve on the GSSP Academic Advisory Committee. The responsibilities of the committee include evaluating the progress of the program, evaluating new program partnerships, and keeping the GSSP apprised of policy and curriculum changes at UI. Concern was expressed that senators might not be in a position to commit the additional time to the committee. Brewick was encouraged to consider to seek committee members from the faculty in general.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned (Morrison/Tibbals) at 4:55.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Faculty Compensation Task Force – Summary May 2017

**Origin:** The Faculty Compensation Task Force (F-CTF) was established by Faculty Senate in the second half of 2016.

**Charge:** The F-CTF will work with the Division of Finance and the Human Resources (HR) department to develop and implement a market-based approach for faculty compensation at the University of Idaho.

**Structure:** The F-CTF is comprised of 17 members, 13 voting and 4 ex officio members, as follows: one faculty member from each academic college and one from faculty-at-large (10); Faculty Secretary; Vice President of Finance; Executive Director of Human Resources; Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ex officio); Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation (ex officio); a representative from the Provost’s office (ex officio); a staff member from Provost’s office providing administrative support (ex officio). The F-CTF is co-chaired by Patrick Hrdlicka (Department of Chemistry; vice chair of Faculty Senate) and Wesley Matthews (Executive Director of Human Resources).

**Status:** The F-CTF met 13 times during October 2016 – May 2017 to define UI’s institutional peer group, identify and select suitable salary databases, and establish guiding principles. The F-CTF has made the following preliminary recommendations regarding the development and implementation of a market-based compensation model for faculty at the University of Idaho:

1. Use a market group that encompasses all U.S. public and private doctorate-granting institutions, i.e., R1, R2 and R3 institutions according to the Carnegie classification.
2. Define UI’s initial overall salary goal as the market average of the above-mentioned group.
3. Annually reevaluate and adjust, if appropriate, the market group definition and UI’s overall salary goals as the institution moves closer to attaining its aspirational R1 Carnegie goal.
4. In cooperation with the provost, deans, chairs and faculty members, HR will assign every faculty member a 6-digit CIP code and periodically reevaluate the assignments as appropriate. For a definition of CIP codes, see: [https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55)
5. In cooperation with the provost, deans, chairs and faculty members, HR will assign a corresponding market rate using CUPA-HR as the primary data source and the Oklahoma State University survey as a secondary data source. Whenever feasible the market rate should be based on 6-digit CIP code salary data.
6. Longevity shall be defined as years in rank plus total years at UI.
7. The longevity component of the compensation model should avoid salary compression between ranks at the time of promotion.
8. Only faculty members who “meet expectations” on annual evaluations should be eligible for progression in the longevity component.
9. The target salary of assistant professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary very close to their market average (~95%); shallow salary progression; end-in-rank salary slightly above their market average (~105%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
10. The target salary of associate professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary very close to their market average (~95%); shallow salary progression; end-in-rank salary slightly above their market average (~105%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
11. The target salary of full professors should be described as: Incoming/early-in-rank salary close to their market average (~90%); moderate salary progression; end-in-rank salary somewhat above their market average (~110%). Percentage numbers given are for illustrative purposes only.
12. The salary progression of assistant professors should be constant throughout rank.
13. The salary progression of associate professors should be steeper until approximate rank midpoint, then shallower.
14. The salary progression of full professors should be steeper until approximate rank midpoint, then shallower.
15. Assuming an equitable merit system, there should be a merit component to the compensation model.
16. Promotion raises should remain in place.
17. Promotion raises should be adjusted relative to current levels to reflect the predicted increases in target salary according to the compensation model, with a minimum promotion raise of no less than the current levels.
18. In the immediate future, funds available for salary increases should be distributed to progressively adjust the actual/target ratio. In other words, provide increases for most faculty, but give larger relative salary adjustments to those with lowest actual/target salary ratios.
19. Faculty members should not see salary decreases even if market rates dictate this.

**Going forward:** The F-CTF has not yet discussed how clinical faculty and instructor salaries will be integrated into this compensation model. The F-CTF will reconvene at the beginning of the upcoming fall semester to determine this and to provide input on a draft compensation model that will be developed by HR this summer. The first version of the compensation model (to be used for mid-year CEC adjustments) will, in all likelihood, only include a longevity component. The F-CTF will initiate deliberations to determine how to add a merit component to the compensation model later in the fall of 2017.
Target salary is the minimum salary a faculty member should receive provided they have minimally met expectations for the position that they occupy. Thus, target salary is determined by fixed measures such as the CIP (Classification of Instructional Program) code of a given position and time in a particular faculty rank. The overall market-based compensation model for faculty also includes a significant merit-based component that is reflective of a faculty member’s performance relative to other faculty in their unit and appropriately normed to the average market salaries in their field. Since merit requires an assessment that is performed annually and is variable over a career, it is not included as a component of target salary. Merit will not factor into this current mid-year raise but will be part of future CEC raise processes.

In developing a target salary based on years in rank, the Provost’s office and the Faculty Compensation Taskforce (FCT) considered market realities that constrain the longevity schedule as well as career milestones for tenure track faculty that we wish to support and reward. A key constraint is the size of the promotion raise typically seen in the market versus our current promotion raise methodologies, which will not change as part of this new compensation model. Thus, moving a sixth-year assistant professor salary from 100% of market levels for assistant professors within a specific CIP code to 95% of market levels for an associate professor within a specific CIP code, most closely mimics the salary changes seen upon promotion under our current promotion policy. A similar analysis for the associate to full professor promotion suggests that a full professor should start at 83% of the market level for a full professor.

The FCT and the Provost agree that we must assure that long-term faculty members who meet minimal levels of performance are compensated at the market rate. Thus, target salary at all ranks does reach 100% after an appropriate time in rank. In some positions such as instructors, there is an immediate move to 100% of market but in others, most notably full professors, the attainment of 100% requires a significant number of years of service. Each position type has some underlying attributes that support the proposed longevity tables. The assistant professor progression starts at 90% of the market average. This starting rate is reflective of our current hiring salaries, which are competitive in the market. The salary takes a significant increase to 100% of market at year 3, which is intended to reward those faculty for successful third year reviews. For associate professors, target salary progresses gradually and then plateaus after six years. This timing reflects the first opportunity for an associate professor to be considered for promotion to full professor. Thus, the intent is to motivate associate professors to focus on achieving this promotion as soon as possible as a means to move up to the next level of compensation. For full professors, the salary data includes faculty with a broad range of “years in rank”, from newly promoted professors to professors who have been in that rank for 30 or more years. Thus, the average salary for full professors represents a broad range of experience and 17 years was deemed an appropriate timeframe to meet the 100% of market target. As a reminder, the longevity progression does not include merit raises and we fully anticipated that many faculty will experience much faster progression toward (and above) their target salary due to performance-based raises.

The average market rate for instructor and senior instructor positions are currently linked to the tenure-track associate professor rank for a given CIP code (65% and 70% respectively). More work is likely ahead for the FCT for this employee group but the initial analysis suggest a starting target salary below 100% might render the institution at a competitive disadvantage for hiring new instructors. Thus, the initial longevity schedule starts instructors and senior instructors at 100% of their market salary and remain there unless additional compensation for merit is provided.

Non-tenure track faculty such as clinical and research faculty were assigned a market rate that is 85% of the salary of like-rank tenure-track faculty within that CIP code. This ratio (as well as the ratio for instructors and senior instructors) is based on an average of the institution’s current practice. The FCT
and the Provost anticipate that we will continue to fine-tune these market rates since there is a broad variability in current compensation philosophies. Faculty senate will also consider alternative career tracks for our faculty, such as full-time but non-tenure track instructional faculty with assistant, associate, full professor ranks.

Finally, joint appointments have not been consistently and clearly documented or delineated in the past. Most appointments are “buy-outs” of time from a home department, but a handful of cases involve appointments intended to be shared or joint appointments. Thus, for this initial assessment, we have opted to simply apply market-based salaries on the faculty member’s current home (majority appointment) department’s CIP code. Again, the FCT and the Provost’s office will continue to refine our approach for appointments involving more than one academic department.

In closing, this market-based compensation approach is a work in progress. The Faculty Compensation Taskforce and the Provost’s office have worked diligently to get these faculty data compiled and analyzed so that we can launch this effort for the faculty, to complement the good work of HR in dealing with staff compensation. We have done our best to initiate this process in a fair and transparent manner and will continue to refine and improve it going forward.

**LONGEVITY SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Years Completed</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Distinguished Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100% ongoing until end of service for all ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Market Salary % Before and After Mid-Year Faculty Increases

Market Salary Before, Average 89.55%

Market Salary After, Average 90.82%
Distribution of Target Salary % Before and After Mid-Year Faculty Increases

Target Salary Before, Average 94.94%
Target Salary After, Average 96.27%
Distribution of Market Salary % Before and After Mid-Year Staff Increases

- Market Salary Before, Average 87.57%
- Market Salary After, Average 89.75%
Distribution of Target Salary % Before and After Mid-Year Staff Increases

Target Salary Before, Average 91.14%
Target Salary After, Average 93.36%