

The University of Western Ontario
Report of the Career Trajectory Adjustment Committee 2008

Background and Mandate:

The Career Trajectory Adjustment Committee (CTAC) was established as described in the 2006-2010 Collective Agreement between The University of Western Ontario (the Employer) and The University of Western Ontario Faculty Association (the Association). Under the provisions of Clauses 11 and 41 to 41.4 of the *Compensation and Benefits* Article of the 2006-2010 Collective Agreement, a Career Trajectory Adjustment Fund has been established. The value of this Fund in 2008-09 is \$700,000 less a negative carry forward of \$9,400 spent early, as part of the 2007-08 adjustments, with the consent of the Employer and the Association.

The CTAC is charged with distributing the Career Trajectory Fund in the manner described in clauses 41 to 41.4 of the Article on Compensation and Benefits. In particular, the Collective Agreement requires that this Fund be used to adjust the salaries of eligible Probationary, Tenured and Limited-term Members whose salaries are determined to be below a trajectory appropriate to their career stage, compared to similar faculty at comparator institutions, based on factors including, but not limited to, years of service, years since highest degree, and highest degree. (See the Article for details). The provisions for Limited Term faculty also apply to Basic Scientists in Clinical Departments who are in Externally Funded appointments.

Summary of Recommendations:

The CTAC reviewed relevant data, developed a systematic model and, following a case-by-case review, recommended systematic adjustments to the salaries of Probationary, Tenured and Limited-Term faculty. For those faculty members affected, the Career Trajectory Committee recommended salary adjustments that range in value from 1% of a faculty member's salary to as much as \$7,500 (Limited-Term faculty) or \$5,000 (Probationary and Tenured faculty). With the approval of the Provost, these adjustments were made to the 2008-09 salary following the application of the Scale Increase of 3%, any Performance-Linked Career Progress increase and any market increases. Adjustments were effective July 1, 2008. Of the approximately 1020 Probationary and Tenured faculty in the bargaining unit, 32% received an adjustment. Similarly, of the 182 Limited-Term faculty, 19% received an adjustment.

2007-08 Committee Membership

In accord with Clause 41.2 of the Article on Compensation and Benefits (C&B), the CTAC consisted of five members, with two appointed by the Association, two appointed by the Employer, and a Chair chosen jointly by the Employer and Association. The committee membership was:

Chair:

Martha Karen Campbell (Professor and Chair, Epidemiology and Biostatistics)

Association Appointees:

James Davies (Professor, Economics)

Ann Bigelow (Lecturer, Management and Organizational Science Program)

Employer Appointees:

Alan Weedon (Professor of Chemistry and Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Policy, Planning and Faculty)

David Wardlaw (Professor of Chemistry and Dean of Science)

Resource Persons:

Allan Heinicke (appointed by the Association), Emeritus Professor, Mathematics (until his death in December 2007)

Ruban Chelladurai (appointed by the Employer), Associate Vice-President (Institutional Planning and Budgeting)

Jimmy Chien (Analyst, Institutional Planning and Budgeting) assisted Ruban Chelladurai and the Committee

Deadlines

Based upon agreement between the Association and the Employer, the committee recommendations were made in time for the Fund to be distributed non-retroactively (i.e., in the July 2008 pay of faculty).

CTAC Meetings

The dates of the CTAC meetings were as indicated below.

September 19, 2007

October 16, 2007

December 3, 2007

January 22, 2008

February 5, 2008

March 18, 2008

April 18, 2008

April 22, 2008

May 6, 2008

May 20, 2008

June 3, 2008

June 17, 2008

June 24, 2008

July 3, 2008

Process

Initial data inspection:

The Committee reviewed available salary data for probationary and tenured faculty at Western and at the Universities of Waterloo, McMaster and Queen's. These data are available in aggregated form from Statistics Canada, which undertakes an annual survey of salaries in post-secondary institutions (this is the *Universities and Colleges Annual Survey of Salaries*, usually known as UCASS). Examination of these data to identify patterns by YHD for various disciplinary groups revealed reasonably consistent trajectories among disciplinary groups, provincially, with some minor disciplinary variation.

In the 2006/07 academic year, the committee concluded that, beyond examination of trajectories, more detailed comparisons of Western to comparator institutions using provincial data would be hard to interpret for a variety of reasons indicated in the 2007 CTAC report. The decision was made, again in this cycle, to use the UCASS data for overall trajectory comparisons but to develop regression models using the Western data so we could understand the components of the trajectories in salaries.

The Committee undertook a detailed regression analysis of Western data seeking to define the relationships between an individual's salary and determinant variables (years from first degree, years from highest degree, nature of highest degree, rank, years in rank, years at Western, department¹, and performance as measured by PAI relative to the average PAI in the individual's department). Then the committee considered the placement of individual salaries relative to what the salary is projected to be given individual characteristics and given adjustment of Western's trajectory to that determined from available data for suitable comparator institutions in Ontario (as detailed below).

Adjustment:

The adjustment process was conducted separately for Probationary/Tenured faculty and Limited-Term faculty with \$609,200 and \$81,000 allocated, respectively, for adjustments in each group, which is proportionate to the relative salary mass of each group.

Probationary/Tenured salaries:

The regression models were developed using Probationary/Tenured UWOFA Members' salaries for 2007/08. The resulting regression equation had an adjusted R^2 of .903, indicating that just over 90% of the variance in the probationary and tenured salaries at Western is explained by the regression equation.

The adjustment recommended by the committee had the following key components. First, the Western regression model was used to generate a projected salary for each individual based on experience (years at Western, years in rank, years from

¹ In the case of Faculties without departmental organization, the "department" variable is the Faculty, except for the Ivey School of Business and the Faculty of Law, as explained below.

highest degree, years from first degree, etc), department and performance (as measured by the most recent PAI score, relative to the average in the unit). Second, these projections were adjusted to match the Western salary trajectory to the trajectory of mean salaries from McMaster, Queens and Waterloo combined (MQW). This was done by multiplying the projection by a "projection multiplier". The projection multiplier for each value of YHD was based on the ratio of the MQW Target to the Projection. The multipliers ranged from 1.001 to 1.041, depending on each individual's years-from-highest-degree, with those in mid-career experiencing a higher factor than those who with higher or low years from highest degree.

For each faculty member whose actual salary was below the projected salary, the difference was calculated, and these differences were summed. The number of dollars in the Career Trajectory Fund was then divided by the sum of the differences to yield a fraction. This fraction was then multiplied against each individual's negative variance from the regression line to yield a salary adjustment. In this way it was ensured that the sum of the salary adjustments was equal to the size of the Career Trajectory Fund, while each faculty member whose salary was below the regression projection received an equal percentage of the gap between his or her actual salary and that projected by the regression. In making a salary adjustment the following two conditions also had to be met: one was that the adjustment to any one individual could not exceed \$5,000 and the other was that for an adjustment to be made it could not be lower than 1% of an individual's actual salary.

As agreed in the last academic cycle, special priority was given to the Richard Ivey School of Business. Ivey salaries had been excluded from last year's analysis because they did not correlate well with the projections from the regression equation and the Committee was not certain it could correctly adjust those salaries in a systematic way. In the 2007/08 academic year, the Committee met with an Associate Dean from the Ivey School to ascertain the appropriate "field" groupings for faculty and to ascertain appropriate external comparator data sources. With the appropriate data, the Committee was able to include Ivey salaries in this year's regression models and the salaries were adjusted using the same process as for other academic units.

The 2007 report of the Committee concluded that salaries of faculty in Engineering lagged significantly below those of faculty with similar years since highest degree at McMaster, Waterloo and Queen's. In order to address this problem \$3,000 was added to each faculty member's projected salary in the Faculty of Engineering in determining the 2007-08 adjustments. This resulted in some closing of the gap with the comparator institutions, by approximately \$1,000 per person. In making our recommended adjustments for 2008-09, we therefore continued to make an addition to projected salaries in Engineering, but only by \$2,000 in view of the partial correction achieved last year.

In this academic cycle the Committee also gave special attention to the Faculty of Law, where concerns had been expressed regarding the salary significance of the highest degree and a perceived shortfall of salaries relative to comparator institutions. The Committee responded by meeting with the Dean of Law, considering carefully the special characteristics of Law and its faculty members, and examining the available data on salaries at Western vs. appropriate comparator institutions. (Unfortunately, Law is not treated as a separate discipline in the UCASS

data, so that it was necessary to work with other, less reliable, data sources in this case.) It was decided that in determining the highest degree and years since highest degree variables in Law the LLM should be used, even in those cases where an individual was in possession of a PhD. Subfields in Law were also identified and used as indicator variables in our regressions. Finally, salary comparisons with other law schools in Ontario showed a larger gap for associate professors than is generally found in comparisons of Western vs. appropriate comparators (i.e. across all disciplines). In view of this special gap, the projected salaries of associate professors in Law were increased by \$3,000 each.

Salaries of Limited-Term faculty:

The regression models were developed using Limited-Term faculty salaries for 2007/08. The regression equation had R^2 of 0.878, indicating that almost 88% of the variance in the limited term salaries is explained by the regression equation. The regression model included the factors: rank, years of full time service, years since first degree, relative PAI, and disciplinary group (BMOS, Business, Computer Science, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Health Professions excluding dentistry, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Nursing, Science, Basic Scientists in the Schulich School). Externally funded Basic Scientists were all in the Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry.

A similar procedure was then followed as in the case of Probationary and Tenured faculty. That is, the regression model was used to generate a projected salary for each individual. For each faculty member whose actual salary was below the projected salary, the difference was calculated, and these differences were summed. The allocated number of dollars was then divided by the sum of the differences to yield a fraction. This fraction was then multiplied against each individual's negative deviation from the regression line to yield a salary adjustment. In making a salary adjustment, the following two conditions to be met were again: that the adjustment to any one individual could not exceed \$7,500; and that for an adjustment to be made it could not be lower than 1% of an individual's actual salary.

Case-by-case review:

Following systematic allocation of the salary adjustments using the algorithms as described above, individual adjustments were scrutinized using a spreadsheet that provided an anonymous case-by-case listing of all variables in the regression equation, salary, projected salary and projected adjustment. These spreadsheets were sorted by department. The committee reviewed all cases to make sure that individual adjustments appeared reasonable relative to the salaries of other Members in the home unit.