
From: Hopkins, Pam L <PAMELAHOPKINS@creighton.edu> **On Behalf Of** Wilson, Mardell A
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 1:43 PM
To: Hopkins, Pam L <PAMELAHOPKINS@creighton.edu>
Subject: 2023 Faculty Compensation Study

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
Mardell A. Wilson, EdD, RDN

Creighton
UNIVERSITY

Dear Member of the Faculty,

I hope this message finds you well as you complete the fall semester with final grades due this week. The Faculty Council has invited me to attend Thursday's meeting to introduce the methodology for the Faculty Compensation review. In consultation with the Academic Council Executive Committee, it was determined that it would be best to not only share the document outlining the methodology in advance, but to share it with the entire faculty to ensure that everyone is receiving the same information. In addition, I wanted to provide additional context regarding the rationale for the selection of the methodology.

For several months I have explored how other institutions have approached assessing faculty compensation with a desire to identify a methodology that has been developed, implemented, and replicated with positive results. Upon review and in discussions with several provost colleagues across the AJCU and Big East, the methodology at Villanova University – as an aspirant institution – was identified as a best practice.

Minor modifications to the methodology have been considered. These adjustments are primarily related to expanding to non-tenure track faculty as Villanova completes their assessment for tenured/tenure track faculty only and the inclusion of disciplinary specific data, where available and applicable, secondary to the large number of professional schools Creighton has compared to our colleagues at Villanova. The document, accessible via [this link](#), provides a comprehensive summary of the methodology.

I recognize that there is no one perfect methodology for determining pay competitiveness among faculty as there are many factors. However, utilizing a known and respected methodology provides an opportunity to best identify current pay performance with an earned degree of confidence. I am grateful that we have the expertise in our Office of Analytics and Institutional Research, under the direction of Dr. Kristin Buscher, to conduct the assessment internally.

Kind regards,
Mardell

Mardell A. Wilson, EdD, RDN
Provost
Office of the Provost
Creighton University

☎ 402.280.4076 |
780170 California Plaza Omaha, NE 68178-0170 | creighton.edu

Creighton
UNIVERSITY

Faculty Compensation Study

Methodology

For this study, a well-established methodology designed and utilized by Villanova University (VU) will be replicated. VU's methodology is utilized annually to study faculty compensation for their tenured and tenure-track faculty. This methodology uses US News rankings to identify peer institutions. VU established a set of inclusion criteria to help identify a comparison group; the criteria focus on institutions that are two-thirds above and one-third below VU's ranking, while limiting the group to 75 institutions. For VU, this strategy results in a comparison group that:

- Represents the types of institutions with whom they compete for tenured/tenure-track faculty
- Yields an overall average institutional ranking that is aspirational
- Offers consistency and significant sample sizes for all VU colleges
- Allows for objectivity in the selection of institutions because it uses an already established methodology

Once these criteria are applied and the institutions are identified, VU obtains annualized 9-to-10-month faculty salary data from CUPA-HR based on 4-digit program CIP codes, rank, and tenure status. Not all institutions report to CUPA-HR, so the comparison data is based on those that submit data. Using the mean salaries obtained by CUPA-HR, each faculty is matched with a comparison mean salary based on their discipline, rank, and tenure status. The deviation dollar amount between the mean comparison salary and each faculty salary was calculated to determine the difference.

In the most recent study, approximately 7.5% of their faculty could not be matched with comparison salary from CUPA-HR. Rather than leaving these faculty out of the analysis, the overall mean comparison salary of the faculty's home college was used as a proxy replacement value to calculate any deviation.

Analysis was conducted using the average salary gap and was disaggregated for each college by different variables, including rank, tenure, and discipline.

Villanova University's faculty compensation review methodology will be used to conduct the faculty compensation study for each school and college at Creighton University, focusing on 2022 salary data. Based on VU's methodology, comparison institutions will be identified using CU's 2023 US News ranking by focusing on two-thirds above and one-third below, limited to 75 institutions. To obtain faculty salaries by 4-digit program CIP codes, rank, and tenure status, the listing of qualified institutions will be sent to CUPA-HR. Once CUPA-HR comparison data are received, the salaries of CU faculty will be matched with the base salaries.

Select modifications will be made to the methodology. The methodology will be broadened to include non-tenured faculty versus only tenured and tenure-track. In addition, unlike Villanova who based analysis on mean comparison salaries, median comparison salary data will be used to adjust for outliers. Another modification to the methodology will be to include salary data from discipline specific organizations, including AACSB, ADEA, AACN, AAMC, and AACP. The reason for using these additional sources will be secondary to CU's academic profile which includes considerably more professional

programs. When discipline-specific salary data are available, an average of the two (CUPA-HR and discipline-specific) median salaries will be calculated. CUPA-HR data will be based on November 1, 2022, and the discipline-specific will be the most recently published data. A two percent (2%) aging factor, which is industry standard, will be applied to the analysis to represent current data.

Like VU, a proxy value will be created for faculty that do not have comparison data from either CUPA-HR. Instead of focusing only on the median salary of the discipline's school/college, rank and tenure status will also be considered, when possible.

The analysis for this faculty compensation study will be based on how CU compares to the reference group. A faculty compensation percentage will be calculated, dividing the Creighton salary by the median comparison salary. This is a standard measurement utilized in compensation studies and allows for making standard comparisons. The data will be disaggregated by department, rank, tenure, and years in rank to better identify all potential variances.

Appendix A – CUPA-HR Comparison Group by 2023 US News Rank

67-Texas A&M University	105-University of Arizona
67-University of Massachusetts--Amherst	105-University of San Francisco
67-Worcester Polytechnic Institute	105-University of Denver
67-University of Connecticut	105-Saint Louis University
67-Yeshiva University	105-Rochester Institute of Technology
72-American University	105-SUNY College of Env. Science and Forestry
72-Indiana University--Bloomington	105-University of Oregon
72-Fordham University	105-Drexel University
72-North Carolina State University	105-University of Utah
72-Southern Methodist University	105-Miami University--Oxford
77-Loyola Marymount University	115-Fairfield University
77-Michigan State University	115-Loyola University Chicago
77-Stony Brook University--SUNY	115-Creighton University
77-Clemson University	115-Rutgers University--Newark
77-The Pennsylvania State University	115-University of South Carolina
77-Baylor University	115-University of Tennessee, Knoxville
83-University of California, Santa Cruz	121-Arizona State University
83-University of Iowa	121-Chapman University
83-Stevens Institute of Technology	121-University of Kansas
83-Binghamton University--SUNY	121-University of Missouri
83-Gonzaga University	121-Temple University
83-Marquette University	121-University of Vermont
89-University of California, Riverside	127-Samford University
89-Colorado School of Mines	127-Thomas Jefferson University
89-University of Delaware	127-Gallaudet University
89-Howard University	127-Illinois Institute of Technology
89-Elon University	127-Iowa State University of Science and Tech
89-Texas Christian University	127-The New School
89-Brigham Young University--Provo	127-Clarkson University
89-University at Buffalo--SUNY	127-University of Dayton
97-Auburn University	127-University of Oklahoma
97-University of San Diego	127-Rutgers University--Camden
97-University of Colorado Boulder	137-University of Alabama
97-University of South Florida	137-University of Alabama at Birmingham
97-University of Illinois--Chicago	137-California State University--Long Beach
97-Clark University	137-DePaul University
97-New Jersey Institute of Technology	137-Drake University
97-University of California, Merced	137-University of Kentucky