

Summer compensation survey for Faculty Senate Budget Committee
January 14, 2017

College

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Arts & Sciences	71.43%	15
2	Education and Human Services	0.00%	0
3	Health Professions	0.00%	0
4	Informatics	14.29%	3
5	Law	0.00%	0
6	Business	9.52%	2
7	Library	4.76%	1
8	Other - please indicate	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	21

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Arts & Sciences	71.43%	15
2	Education and Human Services	0.00%	0
3	Health Professions	0.00%	0
4	Informatics	14.29%	3
5	Law	0.00%	0
6	Business	9.52%	2
7	Library	4.76%	1
8	Other - please indicate	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	21

Q1: Under the new budget model, more decisions are being made at the college level. What do you see as the advantages/disadvantages about a summer/winter compensation policy that removes the prorations specified by the current policy and enables deans, in consultation with department chairs, to determine the sizes of classes? Under this policy, there would not be a specified minimum class size and the decisions whether to run lower-enrolled classes would be made by deans and department chairs.

I am in favor of this in that it gives more flexibility to offering lower enrollment (e.g. senior level or electives) classes the opportunity to go, if it suits program needs. This gives students more chances to complete coursework and course offerings would be driven by academic needs, rather than financial obligation.

1. This flexibility is important to protect students who need core courses to catch up or to graduate. As long as a department has a total enrollment that supports all summer courses offered, I think it's reasonable to allow some lower enrolled courses. Right now, the marketing burden is on the faculty, and that's not a productive use of their time. I suspect we would get more students enrolling in summer classes if they felt confident the classes would be held. Summer classes typically require students to adjust work schedules and/or child care. It's not worth their time and effort to make these arrangements if classes are consistently cancelled. 2. This would allow small classes to go if students need the summer course to graduate on time or get caught up in a cycle to graduate on time. An example would be BIO 151 or 304. 3. I think this is a good idea as long as the course will at least "break even" in terms of the tuition funds it brings in to the college 4. I feel that allowing chairs and deans the ability to determine whether or not a course will be taught is the most effective means of decision-making. They have a much better idea of individual students enrolled, their needs for each class, and how progression through a program will be changed by teaching or not teaching a course.

This type of model would seem to fit with the new budget model. At least in A&S, the dean's office is making many of the go/no go decisions on summer/winter courses now anyway, as it probably should be. While the department should have input, the dean has a better picture of the course offerings in the college as a whole. Another advantage is that it would be much easier to administer. The proration system is rather complex and has a "one-size-fits-all" ideal class size of 15. It is demoralizing to be penalized by 1/15, 2/15 for being short of 15 while receiving no additional compensation for enrolling more than 15.

Advantage: Fits with the new budget model (Colleges make decisions). Could potentially make decision making for whether a class is offered more clear cut for a particular college/department. Decisions for whether a class is offered would match the needs of the college/department more specifically.

I think this is a good change. Deans and department chairs should be able to make intelligent decisions about how low is too low for a summer class to run (or be cancelled, as the case may be)

Advantage: you might get more tenured/tenure track faculty to teach in the summer if they thought there was a chance of their courses making. You could also make it worthwhile for an adjunct to teach a

lower-division course. Right now the prorating means that they can't even pay for gas to come here and meet the classes.

This is something that we strongly approve of. The issue of meeting a particular class size has been especially troublesome for Geology where they need substantial lead time to prepare for summer field classes.

We are in support of leaving this to the college deans and chairs

Disadv: We have had summer classes canceled in spite of faculty being willing to accept a pro rated salary for teaching them. If a faculty member is still willing to teach a course in spite of a reduced salary, I do not understand why the course would still be canceled. I believe if we go strictly by minimum enrollment, we will find even more classes being canceled. I really see no advantage at all to removing the pro rating of allowing a faculty member to teach a course when the course does not have adequate enrollment unless the administration is willing to allow either exceptions, for instance because the course is a required course, or allows more flexible decision making, say at the chair level rather than at the dean level.

I am in favor of this if there is some guidance given on how best to make these decisions.

We should not complain about summer enrollment decreasing when we choose to cancel classes a week before they start. Whether students were 'supposed' to rely on summer courses to graduate or not it is irrelevant because they have relied on them. When the university cancels them it sends the message to not use summer classes for graduation purposes. Then your only students in the summer are students who have failed Fall and Spring classes or are trying to make up deficiencies. If we want summer course schedules to be successful, then the decision to teach the class should be left to the faculty member. If the faculty member accepts the lower pay, then so be it.

I think a flat rate (with Dean/Chair discretion about whether the class happens) is best. Pro-rating implies that there is less work involved when teaching fewer students. That is rarely the case, and it is definitely not the case on a 1-to-1 student to effort ratio.

Advantages: Flexibility to colleges that do not have high enrollment but students need the classes to graduate earlier. Disadvantages: Sometimes subjective evaluations can take place, and it can remove consistency in offering classes.

I believe it is better for the Deans (but, more importantly, the Chairs -- who have a closer grasp of the unique situations surrounding classes in their departments) to have the most say in determining minimum class size and whether to run lower-enrolled classes. I believe that the Chairs should have more say than even the Dean in this regard.

Deans and chairs should have authority to pay full compensation in the case of "must offer" classes. It is ridiculous that they currently cannot.

The advantages to changing the compensation policy is that, hopefully, more classes will be run with slightly low enrollment. The disadvantage is that it may cost NKU slightly more to respect the workload that professors have by taking on a course, no matter how many students are enrolled.

I think this policy already exists to some extent.

I would not be in favor of eliminating this policy. I am a full-time faculty member who teaches both Winter and Summer Session courses, so I speak as one impacted by this policy, for better or for worse.

While I believe that the deans certainly should have more localized control in these decisions, I also know that when we start to talk about course offerings in terms of a product, and faculty in terms of hired help, the bottom line can quickly become the sole determinant in how these decisions are made. As we know, full-time faculty are paid much more than adjuncts for these courses. I can envision a situation where adjunct-taught sections are given much more leniency in terms of enrollment, and full-time sections are scrutinized more heavily on account of how "profitable" the section is when the faculty member is paid. For this reason, I believe we need a standard of some sort, and not leave it up to arbitrary discretion, even if the person making the decision is fully informed of the financial and academic impact of the course in question.

I think that allows for more flexibility for certain classes that can be helpful for students to take in the summer/winter sections. I also feel that not docking instructor's pay is important for this, too. Despite the number in a class, many of us go above and beyond. I know that in smaller classes I am able to do more extensive assignments/projects than I can with fuller sections. This is work on my end just as much as a normal size class.

My department wants to see summer class and compensation determined at the college level

Fairness to faculty.

Q2: What do you see as the advantages/disadvantages of paying TIAA retirement benefits on summer/winter compensation?

The obvious disadvantage is higher costs, but as a limited sample set, my view is that NKU is in the very small minority in terms of not paying retirement benefits on summer classes. The advantage would be attractive more faculty to offering outside of the norm classes, as well as being easier to comprehend. Our calculations are really complex - there's a cap, there's a percentage, there's a prorated percentage, there are minimums, and then there's a part of our salary that gets benefits and does not get retirement benefits - why?

1. I'm not a financial counselor, so it's tough for me to answer this one. If at all possible, an "opt-in" system makes the most sense to me. Younger faculty might need the extra summer income v. those nearing retirement. 2. It would possibly help faculty out who are closer to retirement age. 3. The advantage is more money in retirement accounts, but if you already spread your yearly pay out over 12 months I'm not sure you actually gain a whole lot more. 4. I really see no disadvantages to this compensation.

TIAA benefits should be paid on summer/winter compensation. Maybe faculty could be given the option of opting out. The disadvantage is that faculty would have additional monies withheld, but the advantage is that they would be getting additional retirement savings.

Some faculty may pick up summer/winter teaching to supplement income and do not wish to pay into retirement.

• Obvious advantage: increased retirement savings • Disadvantage: given that tax withholding is at the maximum rate on these earnings, paying TIAA benefits might well mean there'd be nothing left to deposit in the bank. For faculty seeking greater discretionary income, this would be a problem.

Advantage: employees gain additional contributions to their retirement benefits outside of what they get during the standard academic year Disadvantage: costs more

This makes sense to us. One thing that we should also consider is that whatever we do for summer/winter classes should be same thing that we do for grant sponsored summer salary.

Yes we are in support of TIAA retirement benefits

Adv: Obviously for faculty willing to teach during these terms, it is an added benefit and it might encourage more faculty to teach during these terms. Disadv: The money will be moved from somewhere else in our budget and at this point, that could mean real harm. Although in the past, I was an advocate for offering retirement benefits for summer courses taught, I'd rather not pursue this until our budget is in better shape.

This certainly is advantageous to faculty.

The advantage is continuity. If you are paid to teach, you make contributions. I see the benefit of being able to opt out, but I think consistency is a good reason to have contributions.

TIAA benefits: It would encourage people to teach over the summer. Disadvantages: faculty who choose to do research over the summer would be disadvantaged.

I believe it would be good to pay TIAA retirement benefits as a part of summer/winter compensation. They are being paid for the regular academic year. Why can they not be paid for summer/winter periods?

Need more info to comment.

It will retain more professors and raise moral to pay in to TIAA, but it will cost the university a little more money.

I don't see it as important to actual compensation for faculty.

Supporting TIAA benefits is an indicator that the institution recognizes winter and summer teaching to be equitable to teaching during the school year. The disadvantage, however, is that this extra compensation may serve as an underlying incentive for deciding how profitable a course is and when it should be canceled.

I think since we get taxed so heavily in the summer that I prefer to NOT have retirement benefits taken out of my paycheck.

Incentive for faculty to teach summer sessions

Advantage: Retirement funds accrued from ALL working experience.

Q3: The current summer/winter compensation policy calculates faculty salaries based on a percentage of total salary, up to a maximum of \$85,000. Another possibility is to establish a flat per credit hour rate for each rank. Please identify possible advantages and disadvantages of this option.

A flat credit hour rate that deviates towards the average would be a severe dilution of summer school pay for the COI/COB. It would have a direct influence on how I view the total compensation package and opportunities at NKU; in light of how few pay raises we have received. I'm in favor of a market driven approach. Simplify the formula and remove the cap.

1. This probably makes budgeting and staffing courses simpler. I have no objections if that's the overall goal of the modified policy. However, the pay should be significantly more than the standard adjunct pay and based on average of what current summer salaries would be under the old pay schedule. 2. A negative would be for faculty teaching labs because they are worth 1 credit hour but could be 2 to 3 contact hours. That would be a pay reduction for summer faculty. 3. It's hard to comment on flat rate vs. percentage when we don't have a dollar amount for the flat rate. This could drive a lot of faculty away from teaching in the summer if their time is "under-valued" by the university. 4. I think this is an excellent idea as pay for summer/winter is strictly for teaching and all faculty (full-time) should be treated equally. It never made sense that Charles got paid more for teaching Ecology lecture in the summer when we shared our materials and taught the same stuff. I also think this might encourage more NTRR faculty to teach during the summer, currently it just isn't really worth the effort. 5. I assume that both of these calculations would be very close to each other. With the lack of raises, I would be most in favor of a flat rate for each rank.

A flat rate would seem to be more fair to all faculty. It would likely also be more cost effective, as faculty with higher base salaries might be less incentivized to teach summer/winter classes while lower paid faculty might be more incentivized.

This would make decision making for offering the class (cost effective) and teaching the class (worth faculty's time) a much easier decision. This would keep from contributing to issues of compression/inversion.

The current system seems to encourage departments to hire PT/adjunct faculty because they are cheaper, and discourage FT/tenure/tenure-track faculty because they are more expensive. While a flat per credit hour rate still has different pay levels, and thus people at higher ranks would get paid more than lower ranks, I think it would be a simpler and fairer way to do things

_____ This
 sounds really egalitarian until one factors in human nature. • Faculty in highly paid colleges (informatics and business) would prefer the percentage b/c they make a lot more money that way. So the only way they'd go along with this is if the per credit hour rate earned them about the same amount of money. • If the credit hour rate were high enough to attract Info and Bus faculty, individual humanities faculty would earn more money than they would the old way, BUT it would mean fewer classes in the humanities b/c Arts and Sciences would not be able to fund as many classes, and we'd have another have vs. have not situation within the college as well the already existing one within the university as a whole. • IF the administration thinks students come in the summer mostly to pick up gen. eds. and make up other basic stuff that they didn't get during the regular year, then the per credit hour rate will not be high enough to attract informatics and business faculty, and there would be no

advantage for humanities faculty other than a possible increase in the number of sections available. Short answer: more people can teach but for less money. • IF the administration set the credit hour rate high enough to lure in the Info and Bus faculty, fewer low-end faculty would be able to teach, and the likely result is that A&S will force the hiring of adjuncts, because that would be the least expensive alternative. Short answer: hardly any full-time humanities faculty teach in the summer.

We are generally neutral on this, but we can see how it would be useful to have a flat per credit hour rate.

Keep the percent and raise the cap to \$100,000

Well, given that I'm at the high end of the salary range, I much prefer it to be a percentage of total salary. If the flat rate is a good deal lower than what I currently am paid, I will be far less interested in teaching a summer course. I will be doing the same amount of work for less pay. Additionally, I have a higher salary in part because I'm in a higher demand field and my department is one of the largest on campus. Reducing the potential summer pay would probably result in fewer summer classes which would harm our students. It seems improper to make this change when it has the potential to harm students of two of the biggest majors on campus (CSC, CIT).

A flat rate might encourage younger faculty to teach summer courses.

Well, since faculty who make more money than their counterparts with the same degree and experience has been identified as a problem at NKU, setting a flat rate would address part of the salary disparities.

Disadvantages: The university may have difficulty to find in areas where faculty gets paid better.

Advantages: equality for everybody.

I like the idea of paying a flat per credit hour rate for each rank (however, I would have to know what the rates are for each rank before making a decision on it). I am grateful for the summer pay that I receive because it is very much needed given the salary compression we have at NKU. A flat per credit hour rate might also save the university money (assuming the highest rate per credit hour does not exceed what a person makes at the \$85,000 limit of the current system).

Unable to comment without knowing flat rate. Honestly, I am happy with the percentage and believe it should not change.

Advantages are to limit the income disparity between male and female faculty members by going to a flat rate, and it would promote more early faculty to take on the extra workload of a winter/summer course. The disadvantage is that it could lower the pay for some established faculty members, so I am unsure if they would agree to teach extra any longer.

Flat rate establishes a more equitable plan for faculty. Otherwise, faculty who make more may be discouraged from teaching summer courses in favor of cost reduction and junior faculty.

I do not support a flat credit hour for each rank. We do not assign flat salaries to teaching during the contract period, so why should teaching in summer or winter demand less or more in terms of compensation? I see no advantages to this proposition.

If it is fair, then I don't see why that would be a problem. I think it is important for positions like mine to not go lower than where we already are, since we do not make as much as tenured faculty.

Should be a college decision under the new budget model

Flat per credit is fair.

Q4: Please provide any other comments/suggestions/questions that you believe should be considered in revising NKU's summer/winter compensation policy.

1. It might be appropriate to consider an incentive plan for faculty who routinely teach summer/winter courses. I know we've had some issues staffing summer classes in the past, so those who help year after year deserve a bump in the base if #3 is approved as a flat rate. 2. Priority should always be given to courses required for a student's major or admission into a program (e.g. Bio208) when deciding which classes to cancel or keep. The long-term goal would be a fixed, predictable schedule of summer/winter courses that reduce time to degree. The second priority should be for unique courses (e.g. study abroad; study away) that could never be taught during the regular academic year. 3. While I am sure that there is some relevance to limiting the number of credit hours that can be taught during either Winter or Summer sessions, I would like to see this left up to the discretion of the chairs. There are three teaching sessions during the summer, but a limited number of contact hours that can be taught across all three of those sessions.

It is time to change this policy. The current policy has led to (a) morale issues, e.g., the 1/15, 2/15 salary reductions are a bit demeaning to faculty, particularly when no additional compensation is given for teaching class with many more than 15 students and (b) dysfunctional decisions (e.g., cancelling classes with 12 or 13 students).

It would interesting to know what the break even point is for most classes. Is that where the minimum student number is coming from?

As much as I don't like the pro rated salaries idea, it had for a few years allowed us to teach under enrolled summer classes. I don't know if there is a better solution but moving back to a hard limit is probably the wrong step to make. At least faculty now have a choice of not teaching a course if they would receive less money. Like I said earlier though, in some cases that decision is being taken away from us as the Dean can still cancel a course that has enrollment below a desired level (I had a course canceled that had 6 students in it but was still willing to teach it for 60% pay). Years ago, the university allowed chairs to control summer courses as long as the net amount being brought in was a positive. For instance, if 2 out of 10 courses do not make, but the net result is a profit, the chair could still allow those 2 courses to run. With the new budget model, I think we should again move control back to the chairs who can ensure low enrolled courses run as long as it makes a profit. Add to that the pro rating of salaries and it probably gives us the best situation we can expect to have at this point.

I think consideration should be given to the Summer fellowship policy of not allowing additional summer work for pay. That may be more of an issue for the Benefits Committee.

I would like to see faculty be able to teach up to 3 courses in the summer months (I think 2 is limiting for some faculty, especially for those who may not earn as much as in higher-paying departments).

Flat rate is actually the most reasonable. But a lot of our faculty seem to think they are owed compensation above their salary - they are not but if they want to offer classes for students then there is the opportunity to earn additional salary. Particularly in a lean budget year this is good way to keep morale.

I appreciate the review of this process, etc.

