

COMPENSATION & EQUITY COMMITTEE Minutes

Friday, January 19, 2024 | 9:00 a.m.

In Person: 239 Tigert Hall (Provost's Conference Room)

Via Zoom: [Click here for link](#)

Meeting ID: 994 4780 2574 Passcode: 971618 Dial in: +1 305 224 1968

Present: Sean Trainor, Chair, Carolyn Kelley, Vice-Chair, Margaret Fields, Anna Gardner, Brent Goodman, Chris Hass, John Kraft, Melody Royster, and Kenya Williams.

1. 9:00 – **Call to Order**
 - Meeting was called to order by Sean Trainor, Compensation and Equity Committee Chair.
2. **Introductions:** New Human Resources Liaison: Kenya Williams (replacing Brent Goodman)
3. 9:05 – **Approval of November 17, 2023 minutes**
 - Minutes were approved.

4. 9:05 – **Chair's report**

– Reminder to members: Sign up for university-wide committees and encourage colleagues to do the same. Complete a [nomination form](#) for university-wide committees; more details [here](#) including the list of [open seats](#) this election cycle; view the Compensation & Equity Committee roster and terms [here](#).

-Update on rolling multi-year contracts (Hass): Dean of COE is still examining this plan's value for faculty – no decision yet. PPHP model uses multi-year contracts, but they are not rolling. Other colleges' decisions? Hass will follow up for status updates for next meeting.

5. 9:15 am: **Update on proposed Appendix A changes** [Appendix A, UF T&P Guidelines](#)

Hass: Met with Associate Deans (AD) from all 16 colleges in two groups. First Group: They were okay with drafted changes except for the phrase: "with whom they share significant assignment." Second group: Felt language could hurt NTT faculty or possibly remove privileges from NTT faculty. They appreciated the idea of new TT faculty not voting on promotions for Master Lecturer/Instructional Professors (IP). ADs reached no consensus. Hass will

follow up with ADs for status update. CEC has until July to refine language of Appendix A.

--Committee workshopped some possible ideas for language changes:

Trainor: Would quantifying the "share significant assignment" help?

Example: "Share 25% of same assignments."

Hass: Consider language that focuses on roles: EX: TT vote on TT line, NTT vote on NTT line and clinical votes on clinical lines. One problem: What about departments that employ only a few NTT lines? Possible solution: No vote: only chair letter in unit then goes to college level and university level and only NTT faculty votes for NTT promotions?

Hass: Consider language that referenced amount of time in a position to avoid issue of 1st year TT faculty (with little teaching experience) voting on IP promotions (that rely heavily on extensive teaching experience/expertise). EX: first-year faculty cannot vote on promotions?

-Trainor suggested he and Hass could keep refining language.

6. 9:25 am: **Review/propose revisions of Exit Survey Questions**

Goodman provided UF Exit Survey (Revised March 10, 2023) pre meeting via email. Paper copies handed out to committee members in attendance. Trainor read aloud all survey questions with reminder to keep focus on language of questions instead of yielding to temptation of looking at the data produced by each question.

Goodman confirmed that every faculty member receives the same survey. Staff receive different survey. Goodman will generate Exit Survey for Staff for next meeting. (*Post Meeting NOTE: Staff Exit Survey emailed to committee members on Fri Jan 26*).

Committee Issues Observed and Related Questions/Suggestions per Issue:

Issue 1: (Gardner) Last Survey Question: Q6.5: 54% detractor seems high based on the other answer results. How does 10-point Likert scale align with the present three "buckets" of results: detractor/passive/promoter? For example, if survey takers answer 7 on the 1-10 Likert Scale, does this answer become part of Detractor? Passive? Promoter?

Suggestion: (Kraft) Reframe Q6.5 with the three "buckets" in mind: Give 3 choices instead of using a 10-point Likert scale.

Suggestion: (Hass) Obtain comparative data: Ask same question of faculty still employed and then compare results.

Suggestion: (Hass) Split results of Q6.5 between people who were dismissed and people who voluntarily separated.

Comment: (Williams): Possible reason for Q6.5 being so low: Survey fatigue

Question: (Kelley): Would responses to Q6.5 be higher if it were the first instead of last question asked?

Question: (Committee in general): Is Q6.5 weighted more heavily than other questions?

Issue 2: (Kelley): Likert Scale arranged from most negative to most positive response. Most Likert Scale Survey Questions are arranged from most positive to most negative. Perhaps this arrangement is skewing the Exit Survey more negative than if the Likert Scale was reversed for each question.

Issue 3: (Trainor): Overall Survey Effectiveness: Does the survey capture info that UF wants to know? Does UF have an action plan in place to improve based on responses in the survey?

Suggestion: (Trainor): Add an open text ? : What could UF have done to retain you?

Issue 4: (Kraft): Overall Survey Effectiveness: instead of one faculty survey for everyone, can Exit Surveys be designed for different situations?

Issue 5: (Fields): Q 3.2: Needs to be more specific than "what you needed to perform your job effectively." This wording doesn't address if lack of staff is the issue. UF has hired many new faculty (Faculty 500 initiative), but staff hires have not proportionately increased.

Issue 6: (Fields): Q 3.5: Actual tasks performed. Question needs more detail about the task categories. Survey respondents could interpret "actual tasks" as administrative, research, and/or teaching loads. How do we capture which combination of these tasks are creating the responses?

Comment: (Trainor): The use of word "expectations" in Q3.5 is vague.

Comment (Fields): Faculty letters have descriptions of expectations. Trainor agreed.

Goodman: Committee should talk to Audrey Gainey, Director of Talent Acquisition about the survey design (its logic and if it can filter out different

positions and reasons for leaving). Gainey also can provide info on when survey is sent out: How soon before the respondent leaves position?

For next meeting:

- Extend invitation to Audrey Gainey to attend
- Reflect on Questions
- Hass will ask Cathy Lebo about [COACHE](#) Questions and report her response.

7. 9:50 am: Other Business

Goodman: Report on staff turnover that committee requested during Nov 23 meeting. All data is for staff who left UF completely: Data does not include staff who moved to new assignments: 12 – 13% FY turnover average

- FY 22/23: 15 – 16% turnover
- FY 23/24 YTD: 7.4 % turnover (turnover was 8.3% at this time (January) last year)

Question: (Fields): Is this data consistent for CLAS? Goodman to sent out survey results (sent on Jan 26).

8. 9:57 am: Adjournment

Minutes Submitted by Carolyn Kelley, Compensation & Equity Committee Vice-Chair