MEETING SUMMARY

SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Study Working Group

DATE: 6/13/2014

ATTENDEES:

IKM: Linda Sullivan, Andre Watts, Alyssa Mullins, Zachary Merritt, Amanda Miller

Faculty Senate: Mason Cash, Tian Tian, Bridget Rubenking, Grace White

Faculty Excellence: Ana Leon

Office of Institutional Equity: Nancy Myers

Human Resources: Sarah Lovel

NOTES

- Introductions of members of the Working Group

- Reviewed direction for the study

- Reviewed initial findings from exploration
  > 5% lower salary for females than males
  > 3.5% lower salary for underrepresented minority than white
  > 3 studies used to create UCF models

- Introduced two new studies that IKM is interested in incorporating into the UCF model
  > Colorado
  > Missouri

- Questions posed by Working Group Members
  > What is the impact of a faculty member’s salary at hire?
  > Considered comparing everyone’s salary to 1990 dollars, are newer initial salaries inflated vs the longer term employees?
  > Are the awards (TIP, RIA, SoTL) going mostly to men? Are the award processes unbiased? TIP are skewed to larger departments, etc.

- Reviewed how IKM moved away from using the frozen EEO table to the new FacultyStaff table (data dictionary included within packet)
  > FacultyStaff dataset included more years
  > Included more data
  > Question regarding Race bucketing. Is Hispanic overwriting their race?
    ^IKM will check how race is being pulled by HR query
  > Question – does IKM have data on items that could actually promote changes?

- Question regarding types of Faculty employees included in study – Why are only Tenure, Tenure Earning faculty included? Are the Non Tenure Faculty being ignored?
>Response – IKM is working to develop a functional working model and will move to apply the model to Non Tenure Faculty at that point (as these two types of faculty are very different)

- Question regarding if the study will lose the importance of small samples if they are not significant

- Question regarding the Associate Professor Summary of Models by Faculty Rank graph: how the underrepresented and female is a positive while the individual values are negative (is it a union or an intersection)?

- IKM quickly reviewed the specific items the Working Group would need to provide feedback on

- IKM requested a sub group of individuals to participate in a Statistical review of the model
  > Members include: Grace White, Tian Tian, Bridget Rubenking, Sarah Lovel

- Working Group requested the Descriptive Statistics to be updated to include the N’s of the data along with the percentages

- IKM discussed the importance of adhering to a specific scope for the study while acknowledging the important role of other research questions in future studies. Suggested that working group continue to consider what is necessary and/or sufficient to answer the question at hand to make actionable recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add N’s to descriptive table</td>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up Statistics Subgroup meeting</td>
<td>Zack</td>
<td>6/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate PeopleSoft “race” issue</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on model validation and visualization ideas</td>
<td>Statistics Sub Group</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review questions posed in informational packet</td>
<td>Non-IKM Members</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>