

## Proposed request

The Budget Council is charged with “monitoring decisions concerning planning and budgeting and ensuring that allocations of resources conforms to expectations of the Faculty, Faculty Senate and University in long-term and short-term plans”. One aspect of this monitoring concerns the allocation of resources for Faculty salary support. In 2004 the [Council on Academic Freedom, Faculty Quality and Faculty Welfare](#) charged the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation “to evaluate the scope of financial compensation and benefits packages for Faculty...” A final report was accepted by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 2004. The recommendations of the Committee included the establishment of “Merit Based Compensation Plans” for all members of the Faculty. While some Colleges had existing plans and other Colleges developed new plans, the methodology for plan development and Faculty approval has varied across the University. The Budget Council is requesting that the three Vice Presidents, Dr. Barrett, Dr. Cheek and Dr. Fouke, request all colleges develop or revise their merit pay plans and that these plans conform to the guidelines accepted by the Faculty Senate. As suggested in the Committee’s report these plans can be at the College or Department level. The Budget Council is also requesting that plans are approved by a vote of the Faculty they will affect and that this vote is in either written or electronic ballot form prior to March 1 2006.

[\(http://www.senate.ufl.edu/reports/compensation/\)](http://www.senate.ufl.edu/reports/compensation/)

From: [Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation](#) (PDF)

## **Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation**

April 15, 2004

### **6. Merit Based Compensation**

The simplest and most transparent raise procedure would be to allocate all raise funds across the board, either as a constant percentage or as a constant dollar amount. We do not recommend doing this. The academic mission of the University of Florida is teaching, research, and service. Further, a stated goal of this university is to rise to the top tier of U.S. universities. To meet this goal the university must reward the faculty who excel in their mission. Therefore, faculty compensation should be merit based, and moreover, the criteria with which that merit is measured should be fair, explicit, and understood by all. Transparency does not require that the criteria be simplistic. Faculty are able to deal with complexity, as long as the rules are available and the procedures for applying them are not hidden. Moreover, part of the complexity of the university is that no rule will be suitable for all colleges and departments. Faculty in all colleges and departments, however, should have confidence that they know what the rules are, how they are implemented, and how and why exceptions are made.

Toward this goal, we recommend that there be two related methods through which faculty are involved, in an advisory capacity as defined in the Senate document on shared governance, in setting compensation. The first is in the process of allocating annual raises. The second is through less-frequent periodic review of the pattern of department compensation.

The annual process should be merit-based. We are not recommending that any department be allowed the right to grant themselves across-the-board raises year after year. After cost-of-living adjustments, raises must reward merit, based on criteria developed by faculty in consultation with administrators. To illustrate how this would work, we have developed an illustrative merit-based compensation plan employing quantifiable metrics. We are not suggesting that any plan be applied rigidly by all departments. We are instead recommending that each department have a set of criteria—mathematical or not; but explicit, detailed, written, and available to all faculty.

These metrics are based on individual faculty contributions to teaching, research, and service. The relative contribution to the academic mission is different for each faculty, department and college. Therefore, the *Merit Raise* plan is weighted by the assigned responsibilities of each faculty in meeting his or her expected relative contribution to the academic mission. In addition, direct financial contributions to the university by Clinical

and Extension faculty, and faculty heavily involved in research are compensated through the *Merit Bonus* plan.

Within each part of the academic mission we have incorporated quantifiable metrics. For teaching, these metrics include course evaluations, peer reviews and the contribution due to teaching large classes. For research, these metrics include publications and scholarly works, graduate students supervised, awards, external research support and PhD students graduated. For service, these metrics include committees, editorial responsibilities and election to a society office.

It is expected that contributions and their impact will vary dramatically among departments and colleges. Therefore, these and other faculty contributions are multiplied by an impact factor. The impact factor differentiates the importance of the specific contribution with regard to other similar contributions (publication of a manuscript in a prestigious journal has a greater impact factor than a conference abstract, and a Nobel Prize has a greater impact factor than a best paper award) as well as the importance of that contribution criteria to the academic mission of the department (e.g., a department may decide to use peer evaluations rather than course evaluations assigning an impact factor of zero to course evaluations. In view of these complexities, impact factors will be determined on a departmental and college basis by faculty committees.

If faculty respond to these incentives and if departments implement them effectively, then department rankings should rise consistent with the stated UF goal. Therefore, the *Merit Raise* plan also includes department rankings. The quantitative relationship for this plan is presented below. The more effectively a department advances the university's goal of becoming a top ten public institution, the more its members are to be rewarded by the university.

In many colleges, another component of faculty compensation should be the direct financial resources the faculty bring to the university in excess of their expected contribution to the academic mission. This component should be in the form of an annual bonus as shown in the *Merit Bonus* plan, below.

The *Merit Raise* and *Merit Bonus* plans are intended to provide guidelines for deans and departmental chairs in their allocation of available finances. Implementation under UF's Shared Governance will require creation of a Faculty Senate Compensation Committee, under the auspices of the Academic Freedom, Faculty Quality and Faculty Welfare Policy Council. Deans and chairs will provide raise and bonus data compared against *Merit Raise* and *Merit Bonus* plans for their college and departments to the committee and explain any significant deviations from the plan and/or request modification of the plan for their colleges. The final authority for giving raises rests with the administration. But we urge that the faculty have a strong advisory role, including the right to explanations when their recommendations based on explicit criteria are not followed.

Finally, it is incumbent on the President and the University to make merit based compensation a priority budget item. When cost of living raises are limited by state budgets, other resources must be brought to bear to implement this plan fully and reward our most meritorious faculty.

## Faculty Compensation Committee

Dear Deans, Department Chairs and Directors,

The Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation has been charged with comparing UF faculty compensation with that of other AAU institutions. As members of that committee, Prof. Katovich and I have been charged with developing metrics for a merit based faculty compensation plan. As such I would value your input on the criteria your Colleges, Departments and Centers use to determine Merit Raises.

Obviously merit raise criteria should be tied to the university mission of teaching, research, and service. In this regard I would appreciate any quantifiable criteria (e.g., course evaluations, number of publications or creative works, editor or society officer, etc.) you may already employ in determining merit raises.

Further, as a stated goal of this university is to raise UF to the "Top Tier" of US universities, one aspect of merit based raises should reflect college and department rankings. An obvious, if over used, set of rankings are those provided by US News and World Report. Attached is the methodology used by US News to determine graduate school rankings (undergraduate school ranking methodologies appear to have little to do with individual faculty performance).

As can be seen in the methodology some graduate school rankings are based on faculty controlled performance criteria while others are not. Examples of what I would consider to be a ranking criteria that faculty have some control over, and thus should impact their merit raises, are in Engineering: Faculty Resources, PhD/faculty and MS/faculty ratios, National Academy members (I assume other honors should also be relevant for our criteria), and number of PhD degrees granted; and Research Activity, research dollars per faculty member. Examples of ranking criteria within the Engineering methodology that faculty would have little direct influence over are: Quality Assessment, dean or corporate recruiter assessment; and Student Selectivity, GRE scores.

Many, if not most, of the graduate school methodologies fall under the category of Quality Assessment which, unfortunately, is difficult to directly tie to individual faculty performance. In that regard, are there other college and departmental rankings that you feel are more relevant than US News and/or more quantifiable?

I would appreciate any an all input you may have on this as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

Prof. Eric D. Wachsman  
Senator, Faculty Senate  
Materials Science and Engineering

## [USNews Ranking Methodology](#)

### **Business Methodology**

All 365 accredited master's programs in business were surveyed (284 responded; 165 provided the data needed to calculate rankings based on a weighted average of the eight quality indicators described below). All schools appear in the directory. More on the methodology.

#### Quality assessment

(weighted by .40): Two surveys were conducted in the fall of 2002. Business school deans and directors of accredited programs were asked to rate programs on a scale from "marginal" (1) to "outstanding" (5); 56 percent responded, and the resulting score accounts for a quarter of the overall score. Corporate recruiters who hire from previously ranked programs were also asked to rate programs; 26 percent responded, and their ratings are weighted by .15 in the model.

#### Placement success

(.35): This is measured by mean starting salary and bonus (40 percent) and employment rates for 2002 graduates, computed at graduation (20 percent) and three months later (40 percent). Those not seeking jobs are excluded. Salary figures are based on the number of graduates reporting data. Since not everyone who reported a base salary reported a signing bonus, mean signing bonus is weighted by the proportion who do.

#### Student selectivity

(.25): The strength of full-time students entering in the fall of 2002 was measured by mean GMAT (65 percent), mean undergraduate GPA (30 percent), and the proportion of applicants accepted by the school (5 percent).

#### Overall rank:

Data were standardized about their means, and standardized scores were weighted, totaled, and rescaled so that the top school received 100; others received their percentage of the top score.

#### Specialty rankings:

These rankings are based solely on ratings by educators at peer schools. Business school deans and program heads were asked to nominate up to 10 programs for excellence in each of the areas listed. The 10 schools receiving the most votes appear.

### **Education Methodology**

Graduate programs at 188 schools granting doctoral degrees were surveyed. Of those, 155 responded; all provided the data needed to calculate rankings based on a weighted average of the 12 quality measures described here.

Quality assessment (weighted by .40): Two surveys were conducted in the fall of 2002. Education school deans and deans of graduate studies were asked to rate program quality from "marginal" (1) to "outstanding" (5). Fifty-four percent responded. The resulting score is weighted by .25. School superintendents in a sampling of districts were also asked to rate programs. Thirty-five percent responded; their opinions are weighted by .15.

Student selectivity (.18): Uses the mean verbal and quantitative GRE scores of doctoral students entering fall 2002 and the acceptance rate of doctoral applicants (.06 each).

Faculty resources (.12): The 2002 ratio of full-time students to full-time faculty (.02); the percent of faculty holding awards or editorships among selected education journals in the past two years (.025); the number of doctoral degrees granted in the past school year (.05); and the proportion of fall 2002 students who were in doctoral programs (.025).

Research activity (.30): Uses total research expenditures (.075), expenditures per faculty member in funded research (.15), and percent of full-time faculty in funded research

(.075). Expenditures refer to separately funded research, public and private, conducted by the school, averaged over fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

Overall rank: Data were standardized about their means, and standardized scores were weighted, totaled, and rescaled so that the top school received 100; other schools received their percentage of the top score.

Specialty rankings: Specialty ratings are based solely on nominations by deans at peer schools from the list of schools surveyed. They rank up to 10 schools with top programs in each area. Those with the most votes appear here.

### **Engineering Methodology**

Programs at 185 engineering schools that granted doctoral degrees were surveyed; 169 responded; 168 provided the data needed to calculate rankings based on a weighted average of the 11 indicators described below. (All schools are listed in the directory.)

Quality assessment (weighted by .40): Two surveys were conducted in the fall of 2002. Engineering school deans and deans of graduate studies were asked to rate program quality from marginal (1) to outstanding (5); 54 percent responded. The resulting score is weighted by .25. Corporate recruiters who hire from previously ranked programs were also asked to rate programs; 29 percent responded. Their opinions are weighted by .15. Student selectivity (.10): The strength of students entering in fall 2002 was measured by mean GRE quantitative and analytical scores (45 percent each) and the acceptance rate (10 percent).

Faculty resources (.25): Based on the 2002 ratios of full-time doctoral students to full-time faculty (30 percent) and full-time master's students to full-time faculty (15 percent); the proportions of full-time faculty in the National Academy of Engineering in 2002 (30 percent); and number of doctoral degrees granted in last school year (25 percent).

Research activity (.25): Based on total research expenditures (60 percent) and research dollars per faculty member engaged in research (40 percent). Expenditures refer to separately funded research, public and private, conducted by the school, averaged over fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

Overall rank: Data were standardized about their means, and standardized scores were weighted, totaled, and rescaled so that the top-scoring school received 100; others received their percentage of the top score.

Specialty rankings: These rankings are based solely on nomination by educators at peer schools. From the list of schools surveyed, deans nominated up to 10 schools for excellence in each area. Those with the most votes appear here.

### **Fine Arts Methodology**

The master of fine arts program rankings are based solely on the results of a peer assessment survey. Respondents were asked to rate the academic quality of programs on a scale of 1 (marginal) to 5 (outstanding). Scores for each school were totaled and divided by the number of respondents who rated that school. The response rate was 48 percent. Surveys were conducted by Synovate.

Note: Lists of schools, persons surveyed at each school, and specialty concentrations were developed in cooperation with the Slane College of Communications and Fine Arts at Bradley University in Illinois.

### **Health Methodology**

The health rankings are based solely on the results of peer assessment surveys sent to deans, other administrators, and/or faculty at accredited degree programs or schools in each discipline. All schools surveyed in a discipline were sent the same number of surveys. Respondents rated the academic quality of programs on a 5-point scale: outstanding (5 points); strong (4); good (3);

adequate (2); or marginal (1), based on their assessment of the curriculum, faculty, and graduates. They were instructed to select "don't know" if they did not have enough knowledge to rate a program. Scores for each school were determined by computing a trimmed mean of the ratings of all respondents who rated that school; scores were then sorted in descending order. Only fully accredited programs in good standing during the survey period are ranked.

In the fall of 2002, surveys were conducted for 2003 rankings of community health programs and schools of public health accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health (response rates: 67 percent and 68 percent, respectively); health services administration programs accredited by the Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration (61 percent); master's programs in nursing accredited by either the Commission on Collegiate Nursing or the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (48 percent); graduate nurse anesthesia programs accredited by the Council of Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (54 percent); graduate nurse-midwifery programs accredited by the American College of Nurse-Midwives Division of Accreditation (71 percent); physician assistant programs accredited by the The Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (70 percent); rehabilitation counselor education programs accredited by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (59 percent); and veterinary schools accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association (67 percent). Nursing specialty rankings are based solely on ratings by educators at peer schools. From the list of nursing schools surveyed, nursing educators nominated up to 10 schools for excellence in each area. Those with the most votes appear here.

In the fall of 2000, surveys were conducted for 2001 rankings of doctoral programs in clinical psychology accredited by the American Psychological Association (response rate: 20 percent) and graduate programs in occupational therapy accredited by the American Occupational Therapy Association (57 percent). In fall 1999, surveys were conducted for 2000 rankings of audiology programs and speech-language-pathology programs accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (response rates: 57 percent and 45 percent, respectively); physical therapy programs accredited by the American Physical Therapy Association (52 percent); and master of social work programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (53 percent). Peer assessment surveys were conducted by Synovate.

### **Law Methodology**

The rankings of 177 accredited law schools are based on a weighted average of the 12 measures of quality described here. Specialty rankings are based on nomination by legal educators at peer institutions. More on the methodology.

Quality assessment (weighted by .40): Measured by two surveys conducted in fall 2002. The dean and three faculty members at each school were asked to rate schools from "marginal" (1) to "outstanding" (5); 70 percent voted. Their average rating for a school counts for a quarter of its overall score. Lawyers and judges also rated schools; the response was 34 percent. Their rating is weighted by .15.

Selectivity (.25): Combines median LSAT scores (50 percent), median undergrad GPA (40 percent), and proportion of applicants accepted for fall 2002 (10 percent).

Placement success (.20): Employment rates at graduation for 2001 graduates (30 percent) and nine months after (60 percent), and bar passage rate (10 percent). Employed graduates includes those reported as working or pursuing graduate degrees; for the ninemonth

rate only, 25 percent of those whose status is unknown are also counted as working. Those not seeking jobs are excluded. Bar passage rate indicator is the ratio of a school's rate in the cited jurisdiction to the overall state rate, computed for first-time test takers in summer 2001 and winter 2002. The jurisdiction cited is the state where the

largest number of 2001 grads first took the test.

Faculty resources (.15): Based on average 2001 and 2002 expenditures per student for instruction, library, and supporting services (65 percent); student/teacher ratio (20 percent); average per-student spending in 2001 and 2002 on all other items, including financial aid (10 percent); and total number of volumes and titles in library (5 percent).

Overall rank: A school's score on each indicator was standardized. Then scores were weighted, totaled, and rescaled so that the top school received 100 and other schools received a percentage of the top score.

Specialty rankings: Legal educators nominated up to 15 schools in each field. Those voted the top 10 appear.

### **Law School Diversity**

Law schools rich in racial and ethnic diversity are thought to offer their students a chance to encounter ideas and experiences different from their own, which can be good practice for the life of a lawyer.

To identify institutions where students are most likely to encounter classmates from different racial or ethnic groups, U.S. News has created a diversity index based on the total proportion of minority students—not including international students—and the mix of racial and ethnic groups on campus. The data are drawn from each law school's 2002-2003 student body, including both

fulland part-time students. The groups forming the basis for our calculations are African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, and whites. Our formula produces a diversity index that ranges from 0.0 to 1.0. The closer a school's number is to 1.0, the more diverse is the student population. Schools that have a large proportion of one ethnic group, even if it is a minority group, don't score high in this index.

To be included in the table, a law school must be accredited by the American Bar Association. Because student-body ethnic diversity data are not consistently compiled and reported as yet for other types of graduate schools, U.S. News has prepared a diversity table for law schools only

### **Library Science Methodology**

U.S. News ranked the 48 master's degree programs in the United States that are accredited by the American Library Association. The rankings are based on the results of a fall 1998 survey sent to deans, program directors, and faculty of accredited graduate programs. The questionnaires asked individuals to rate the academic quality of programs at each institution as distinguished (5); strong (4); good (3); adequate (2); or marginal (1). Individuals who were unfamiliar with a particular school's programs were asked to select "don't know." Scores for each school were totaled and divided by the number of respondents who rated that school. The response rate was 60 percent.

### **Medicine Methodology**

The 125 medical schools fully accredited by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education plus the 19 schools of osteopathic medicine fully accredited by the American Osteopathic Association were surveyed for the ranking of research medical schools; 117 schools provided the data needed to calculate the research rankings based on the indicators used in the research model. The same medical and osteopathic schools were surveyed for the primary-care ranking; 117 schools provided the data needed to calculate the primary-care ranking. Both rankings are based on a weighted average of seven indicators, six of them common to both models. The research model factors in research activity; the primary-care model adds a measure of the proportion of graduates entering primary-care specialties.

Quality assessment (weighted by .40): Peer assessment surveys were conducted in the fall of 2002, asking medical and osteopathic school deans, deans of academic affairs, and heads of internal medicine or the directors of admissions to rate program quality on a



scale of "marginal" (1) to "outstanding" (5). Survey populations were asked to separately rate program quality for both research and primary-care programs on a single survey instrument. The response rate was 53 percent. A research school's average score is weighted .20; the average score in the primary-care model is weighted .25. Residency program directors were also asked to rate programs using the same 5-point scale. The residency program directors surveyed were a geographically balanced selection from the American Medical Association's Graduate Medical Education Library 2002-2003 and a list of primary-care residency program directors from the American Osteopathic Association. The response rate for those sent the research survey was 32 percent. The response rate for those sent the primary-care survey was 25 percent. Residency directors' opinions are weighted .20 in the research model and .15 in primary-care.

Research activity (.30 in research model only): measured as the total dollar amount of National Institutes of Health research grants awarded to the medical school and its affiliated hospitals, averaged for 2001 and 2002. An asterisk indicates schools that reported grants only to their medical school.

Primary-care rate (.30 in primary-care model only): the percentage of M.D.'s entering primary-care residencies in the fields of family practice, pediatrics, and internal medicine, averaged over 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Student selectivity (.20 in research model, .15 in primary-care model): three components, which describe the class entering in fall 2002: mean composite Medical College Admission Test score (65 percent), mean undergraduate grade-point average (30 percent), and pro- portion of applicants accepted (5 percent).

Faculty resources (.10 in research model, .15 in primary-care model): The ratio of fulltime

science and clinical faculty to full-time students in 2002.

Overall rank: The research-activity indicator had significant outliers; to avoid distortion, it was transformed using a logarithmic function. Indicators were standardized about their means, and standardized scores were weighted, totaled, and rescaled so that the top school received 100; other schools received their percentage of the top score.

Specialty rankings: The rankings are based solely on ratings by deans and senior faculty at peer schools. Medical school deans and senior faculty identified up to 10 schools offering the best programs in each specialty area. The 10 receiving the highest number of nominations appear here.

### **Public Affairs Methodology**

Rankings of master's programs in public affairs, are based on a survey of 259 programs nationwide. The list was provided by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration and the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management. Schools surveyed confer the M.P.A. (Master of Public Affairs or Master of Public Administration), the M.P.P. (Master of Public Policy), and the M.P.M. (Master of Public Management).

The associations provided contacts, typically the program director, dean, or department chair responsible for the program. Two responses were solicited from each program—one from the contact and one from a nominee made by the contact. Respondents were asked to rate the academic quality of programs as distinguished (5 points); strong (4); good (3); adequate (2); or marginal (1), based on their assessment of all factors bearing on excellence, such as curriculum, record of scholarship, and quality of faculty and graduates. Individuals who were unfamiliar with programs were instructed to select "don't know." Scores for each program were averaged across all respondents who rated the program. The response rate was 46 percent. The surveys were conducted by Market Facts Inc.

## **Sciences Methodology**

Rankings of doctoral programs in the sciences are based on the results of surveys sent to academics in each discipline during the fall of 2001 (or, in the case of geology, during the fall of 1998). The questionnaires asked individuals to rate the quality of the program at each institution on a 5-point scale: outstanding (5), strong (4), good (3), adequate (2), or marginal (1). Individuals who were unfamiliar with a particular school's programs were asked to select "don't know." Scores for each institution were totaled and divided by the number of respondents who rated that school. In the biological sciences, chemistry, computer science, and physics, survey respondents were also asked to nominate programs that had excellent offerings in certain specialty areas. Those programs that received seven or more nominations are published, ranked by the number of nominations received.

Surveys in the biological sciences, chemistry, computer science, mathematics, applied mathematics, and physics were conducted by T. E. Systems Inc. The National Science Foundation report "Science and Engineering Doctorate Awards: 1999" was the source for the lists of programs surveyed in each of these disciplines. In the biological sciences, graduate programs may be offered in a university's medical school as well as its college of arts and sciences. In those cases where the NSF report showed two separate program listings at a university, the U.S. News survey did also. Otherwise, schools were listed only once on the survey, even though they may have programs in the biological sciences that are housed in separate institutional units. Questionnaires were sent to the department heads and deans or directors of graduate studies at each program in each discipline. In each discipline surveys were sent to two individuals associated with each program listed on the questionnaire.

Response rates were as follows: For the biological sciences, 31 percent of those surveyed responded; for chemistry, 46 percent; for computer science, 57 percent; for mathematics, 43 percent; for applied mathematics, 40 percent; and for physics, 50 percent.

The survey of graduate programs in geology was conducted by Market Facts Inc. For geology, the survey covered all schools that had granted a total of five or more doctorates in the field during the five-year period from 1992 through 1996. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed responded.

## **Social Sciences & Humanities Methodology**

Rankings of doctoral programs in the social sciences and humanities are based on the results of surveys sent to academics in each discipline. Each school (or, in the case of psychology, each institutional unit) offering a doctoral program was sent two surveys. The questionnaires asked respondents to rate the quality of the program at each institution as distinguished (5); strong (4); good (3); adequate (2); or marginal (1). Individuals who were unfamiliar with a particular school's programs were asked to select "don't know." Scores for each school were totaled and divided by the number of respondents who rated that school.

Surveys were conducted in the fall of 2000. Questionnaires were sent to department heads and directors of graduate studies (or alternatively, a senior faculty member who teaches graduate students) at schools that had granted a total of five or more doctorates in each discipline during the five-year period from 1991 through 1995, supplemented by programs that appeared on the 1998 Survey of Earned Doctorates. The surveys asked about Ph.D. programs in economics (response rate: 38 percent); English (43 percent); history (36 percent); political science (43 percent); psychology (20 percent); and sociology (45 percent).

As noted in the psychology table, some schools are listed more than once because separate doctoral programs are offered in different university units. Surveys were sent to the department chair or dean of the school of psychology and the director of graduate studies in each institutional unit that offered a doctoral program. Unless otherwise noted in parentheses, the psychology program ranked is located in the department of psychology. Accredited doctoral programs in clinical psychology are ranked separately in the health professions section.

## Faculty Compensation Committee Charge

The Faculty Senate  
218H Criser Hall  
P.O. Box 114010  
Gainesville, Florida 32611-4010  
Tel: (352) 392-2025  
Fax: (352) 392-3987  
<http://www.senate.ufl.edu>

Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation  
Convened on December 12, 2003

By

Prof. Anthony B. Brennan, Faculty Senate Chair

Committee Charge:

Whereas, the University of Florida aspires to achieve a “top ten” ranking among the American Association of Universities and Colleges Research Institutions with regard to our academic mission,

And the University of Florida has identified that the strength of any institution of higher learning is the quality and productivity of the Faculty,

And the University of Florida Board of Trustees has demonstrated a vision that includes a commitment to a Strategic Plan that identifies the need for improving our Faculty retention rates,

I hereby commission, the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation to evaluate the scope of financial compensation and benefits packages for Faculty of the at least, but not necessarily limited to the following top ten ranked AAU institutions:

University of California System (e.g., Berkeley, UCLA, UCSD)

University of Virginia

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

College of William & Mary (VA)

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Georgia Institute of Technology

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

And in addition:

Ohio State University

University of Minnesota

And where these institutions do not adequately represent the equivalent academic mission of the University of Florida, those institutions deemed equivalent in this sense should be included in the analysis.

Furthermore, the committee should determine to the best of its ability based upon time and resources, the diversity of Faculty compensation that may exist at each of the institutions and any particular programs, plans or processes that may have been implemented or planned to ensure both equity and quality of compensation for all Faculty based upon quality and level of performance that contributes to the overall academic mission.

**The committee should submit a report to the Faculty Senate no later than April 8, 2004 for inclusion on the Faculty Senate April 2004 Meeting Agenda.**

Committee Chair: Prof. David Denslow, Members: Prof. Barbara Barletta, COM; Prof. Frank Bova, COM; Prof. Maryann Eaverly; CLAS; Mr. Larry Ellis, Human Resources; Prof. Jesse Gregory, IFAS; Prof. Mike Katovich; COM; Prof. Kurt Kent JOU; Prof. James Klausner, ENG; Prof. David Richardson, CLAS; Dean Jill Varnes, HHP, Prof. Eric Wachsman, ENG.