



## *Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) Report*

*February 19, 2013 Fox Lawson Personnel Meeting*

Mark Toor, Vice-Chancellor for Human Resources, brought together at the HEPC Office, on February 19, 2013, community college and four-year HR representatives from across the State, as well as representation from the Advisory Council of Classified Employees and the Advisory Council of Faculty, all **charged with giving guidance to the Fox Lawson market study** that will enable the classification and compensation provisions of SB 330, the personnel bill, to be fully implemented. Fox Lawson was engaged over a year ago to conduct the market compensation study required by SB 330. Changes in the staff at the office of the Vice Chancellor led to insufficient involvement of affected stakeholders and a lack of direction to Fox Lawson in their efforts. **The goal of the February 19 meeting was to bring clarification and transparency to personnel issues involving faculty, classified, and non-classified staff, all of whom will be affected by the Fox Lawson report and recommendations.** Ultimately, the goal is to close the gap between employees, which the Fox Lawson study will facilitate; however, Mr. Toor and the group acknowledged the complexity of salary issues associated with particularly the faculty and the non-classified staff. The meeting thus focused attention on the three employee groups, as Mr. Toor attempted to challenge Dr. Fox to restrict and reframe the Fox Lawson market study, which should consider the following:

**I. Classified Staff:**

Ninety-eight job descriptions are being used in the study, though more than 200 jobs exist. Mr. Toor requested the list of jobs with descriptors be studied carefully by the committee and that geographic differentials be included among the variables.

**II. Faculty:** The College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) (<http://www.cupahr.org/>) lists twenty-nine faculty disciplines, though Fox Lawson initially used only 15 of the most typical in the preliminary portion of the study. The consensus was to broaden this number in order to include a larger range for faculty, and in particular to include medical and law school faculty. The increase to 29 faculty disciplines should succeed in reaching the professionally-recognized standard of achieving a match of 75% of jobs. Though SB 330 made allowance for relative market equity by institution, the ranges of faculty pay is complex, both by discipline and by rank. For this reason, a salary schedule would not be appropriate for faculty. Likewise, the peers being used in the study for institutions is outdated and in some cases inappropriate at this point in time. Another missing component which the group brought up is adjunct staff; however, as the law defines faculty as "full-time," adjuncts will not be part of the Fox Lawson study. Mr. Toor did promise, however, to gather and share some internal, system-wide comparative data about adjunct staff that would provide some general guidance concerning fair adjunct pay rates, since reliance on this segment of the faculty is particularly heavy in West Virginia at some institutions.

**III. Non-classified Staff:** Here an essential problem is the lack of consistency in terms of job titles across the system. Several possible options include using WVU benchmarks or CUPA benchmarks in matching job descriptions. There are more than a hundred non-classified jobs across the state. Mr. Toor asked the group to study the CUPA list of jobs and job descriptions and determine inappropriate categories, as well as to exclude and/or to revise titles that are inappropriate or that don't have representation across the WV system. Rather than matching job titles, HR staff will match CUPA summary job descriptions in order to achieve consistent reporting of similar jobs.

**IV. Time Line and Summary:** In two weeks, by March 8, 2013, a progress report will be due concerning the market study. Mr. Toor challenged Dr. Fox to be mindful of flexibility among the institutions and consider their individuality, to consider geographic cost of labor and make adjustments in the study accordingly, and to be mindful of the relative market status (where the classification of the employee stands relative to the market median) and the relative market equity (within 5% of other employee groups at a single institution) as the study is improved and prepared for implementation.

V.