

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate**

**Date: 9-26-2023**

**Presiding:**  **DeAnna Owens-Mosby (Instruction and Curriculum Leadership)**

**Secretary:** Jeni Loftus (Sociology)

**Senators Present:** Lynda Black (Cecil C Humphreys School of Law), Kathryn Hicks (Anthropology), Matthew Parris (Biological Sciences), William Alexander (Chemistry), Reza Banai (City and Regional Planning), Sajjan Shiva (Computer Science), Esra Ozdenerol (Earth Sciences), Leah Windsor (Institute for Intelligent Systems & English), Alistair Windsor (Mathematical Sciences), David Gray (Philosophy), Sanjay Mishra (Physics and Materials Science), Stephanie Huette (Psychology), Melanie Conroy (World Languages and Literatures), Jennifer Thompson (Architecture), Amanda Young (Communication & Film), Brian Ruggaber (Theater & Dance), Michael Anderson Schults (Rudi E. Scheidt School of Music), Patrick Murphy (Counseling, Educational Psychology & Research), Edith Gnanadnass (Leadership), Mrs. Barbara Fitzgerald, Esq. (College of Professional & Liberal Studies), Deborah Moncrieff (School of Communication Sciences & Disorders), Andrew Hussey (Economics), Mark Sunderman (Finance, Insurance and Real Estate), Frances Fabian (Management), Gensheng Liu (Marketing & Supply Chain Management), Zabihollah Raezaee (School of Accountancy), Jessica Jennings (Biomedical Engineering), Eddie Jacobs (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Rhema Fuller (Kemmons Wilson School of Hospitality), Genae Strong (Loewenberg College of Nursing), William Travis (College of Health Sciences), Fawaz Mzayek (School of Public Health), Gerald Chaudron (University Libraries), Daniel E. Millican (Military Sciences, Naval Sciences), Mihalis Golias (Civil Engineering), Gladius Lewis (Mechanical Engineering), Dursen Peksen (Political Science)

**Senator Present by Proxy**: Beverly Tsacoyianis (Scott Marler – History), Scott Vann (Brian Janz – Business Information and Technology)

**Senators Absent:** Matthew Parris (Biological Sciences), Jennifer Thompson (Architecture), Tori Cliff (Journalism & Strategic Media), Coe Lapossy (Art), Katie Norwood (School of Social Work),

**Guests:** Richard Evans (UMAR), Jeff Marchetta (Trustee), Karen Weddle-West (VP Student Success), Jin Yang (Journalism), Radesh Palakuthi (KWS), Amanda Clarkson (HR), David Russamanno (provost), Sara K. Bridges (Ombudsperson), and Tierenee Nichols (Admin Assoc).

The four-hundred-and-ninety-ninth meeting of the University of Memphis Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, September 26th, 2023, in the University Center Faculty Senate Chambers.

**09.26.23.01 CALL TO ORDER (2:41 P.M.)**

President DeAnna Owens-Mosby called the meeting to order at 2:41 pm with a quorum present.

**09.26.23.02 APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved as written.

**09.26.23.03 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the August 29th, 2023, Faculty Senate (FS) meeting were approved by acclamation as written.

**09.26.23.04 PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

President Owens-Mosby reported COACHE Survey for Faculty Satisfaction will be distributed in February 2024.

President Owens-Mosby reported that Greg DuBois is the Interim CFO.

President Owens-Mosby reported that Provost Russamanno announced that we will be adding an Assistant Provost of Academic Affairs initially focusing on microcredentials and conducting an inventory of current minors.

President Owens-Mosby reported that there will be a Safety and Security campaign which will include a poster, social, and video series forthcoming.

President Owens-Mosby reported that there are several 2023 Fall Recruitment Programs including Memphis Area College Night, Freshman Virtual Info Sessions, U of M Fall Preview Day, and Bring Memphis to You - Birmingham, Little Rock, Jackson ,TN, Jackson, MS, Nashville, Murfreesboro, Dallas, TX, and Houston TX.

President Owens-Mosby will share the Vision for the Faculty Senate 2023-2024 with the senate next month.

**09.26.23.05 REPORTS**

***Standing Committee Reports***

*Committee on Committees: Chair, Alistair Windsor*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Committee on Committees Chair Alistair Windsor who reported that the Committee on Committees has two motions on the floor today. Windsor also reported that there will be a search for an ombudsperson. There are two candidates for that position. The senate will need to fill three positions for the search committee.

*Academic Policies Committee: Chair, Edith Gnanadass*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Academic Policies Committee Chair Edith Gnanadass who reported that the committee had nothing to report.

*Academic Support Committee: Chair, Dursen Peksen*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Academic Support Committee Chair Dursen Peksen. Peksen reported that the committee’s main job was to work on replacing the Canvas observer role. The university agreed to purchase new software, Dropout Detective, to replace the role. It has not yet been implemented. The goal is to limit the information academic advisors can have as faculty have raised concerns over that issue.

*Administrative Policies Committee: Chair, Stephanie Huette*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Administrative Policies Committee Chair Stephanie Huette who reported that they have one charge which is revising and improving our faculty evaluations of deans, provost and president. They are looking into incorporating information about the administrators into the evaluation itself. They are also looking into how to increase faculty response rate and how to ensure that the results will be used for the administrators’ evaluation process.

*Budget and Finance Committee: Chair, Zabi Rezaee*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Budget and Finance Committee Chair Zabi Rezaee who presented a progress report on their development of a list of peer institutions. The committee would like the senate’s comments and suggestions on the progress report by October 4th. On October 5th the committee will meet with Bridgette Decent in Office of Institutional Research to redo the analysis. Last year the committee produced a list of peer institutions that the senate rejected due to lack of input and understanding from the senate on how the list was produced. They have met with Bridgette and discussed their concerns about how the list was initiated, prepared and approved. After that meeting the committee met to put together this progress report. Going forward they are going to make changes to the 52 variables that were used to produce the list of institutions. The committee will work with the Office of Institutional Research in the next month to create a new list that will be submitted to the senate for the October senate meeting.

*Faculty Policies Committee: Chair, Lynda Black*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Faculty Policies Committee Chair Lynda Black who reported that the committee has a few revisions to the faculty handbook to do this year, but rather than submitting them one at a time, they will submit them as a whole in March.

*Library Policies Committee: Chair, Frances Fabian*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Library Policies Committee Chair Frances Fabian who reported that the committee had nothing to report.

*Research Policies Committee: Chair, Debbie Moncrief*

President Owens-Mosby yielded to Research Policies Committee Chair Debbie Moncrief who reported that their charge was to review the centers and institutes policy. They have gone over the policy very carefully and now they would like senators to take the policy back to their departments and schools for review. They want to make sure everyone has the opportunity to weigh in. A draft policy will be added to the minutes. The committee would like feedback as soon as possible.

**09.26.23.06 NEW BUSINESS**

Health Insurance Mandate for International Students- Dr. Deb Tollefsen, Dean of the Graduate School (Guest)

President Owens-Mosby yielded the floor to Dr. Deb Tollefsen to discuss the issue of health insurance for graduate students. Dr. Tollefsen presented a power point presentation concerning this issue.

University of Memphis requires all students on an F1 or J1 visa to have health insurance that meets the DHS minimums. The DHS minimums are pretty minimum. All students on these visas must show proof of insurance each semester. The requirement is not ACA compliant and does not require insurance over the summer. Right now, they are pointed at a website that tells them to purchase insurance. We don’t have a university health insurance plan for students.

Church Health plan is for domestic students only. It is not insurance, it is low-cost healthcare. It is limited in a variety of ways, for instance it does not cover pregnancy.

Sept 2022 - Provost gave the dean of the graduate school the charge of securing a comprehensive health insurance option. International students need insurance that is ACA compliant and covers them over breaks and throughout the summer. Must be ACA compliant if we want to offer subsidies for graduate assistants. This is a necessary step to being able to extend subsidies. We want an affordable option for all grad students.

Oct 2022 - We received three quotes: one from Blue Cross Blue Shield, one from United, one from Wellfleet. Presented the quotes to the provost and CFO along with a plan to subsidize graduate assistants’ health insurance at 60% with a cost share plan. That 60% would be split between central administration and departments of origin. Best estimate is we have 586 full time assistants, if we subsidized them at 60%, it would be roughly $807,012 – spilt in half. This is assuming that none of them would opt out, and many will. Many will stay on their parents’ insurance, they have spouse coverage or they will stay on their marketplace plan. This also assumes none of our students are grant funded, which is false. We have many students funded by grants who would be billed for health insurance.

We moved forward with Wellfleet. It was the least expensive.

May 2023 - Received final approval of the CFO to move forward, but could not confirm subsidies at that time. Agreed to move forward to have this comprehensive health insurance plan in place because we cannot do subsidies without it. Because implementation of subsidies will take a significant amount of time, rollout was delayed until Spring 2024.

June 2023 – Established University of Memphis implementation team that meets with the Wellfleet implementation team every other week. The implementation of subsidies will require grant budget forms to be adjusted to include a line item for health insurance subsidies. Working with Grants and Accounting on that. Due to the complications with implementing subsidies, it is recommended that we would need at least one full time employee to work on this.

August 2023 – Outgoing CFO did not recommend a university level subsidy, the budget does not support it. Made the decision to move forward with implementation for international students on the waiver and domestic students who could voluntarily go on the plan. Even if there had been a university level subsidy, once they implement RCM it wouldn’t be from the university level anyway. It would happen at the college level.

As of Spring 2024 all students on a J1 or an F1 will be automatically enrolled in the Wellfleet insurance plan. They can waive the coverage.

The Wellfleet coverage is more expensive for our students, but it depends on the student, their age, their health status, their add-ons, etc. For the young and healthy, who have been purchasing the most minimal coverage, the increase is quite a bit.

They can still waive out, but they must show proof of comparable insurance. Current students that have purchased for the year, will get a waiver even its not comparable. Spring is a soft waiver for current students. International students will be automatically enrolled, but they can waive out with any coverage. But new students will not have this soft waiver option.

Tollefsen met with the deans, many are trying to find the money for subsidies. If we cannot implement subsidies, this is going to have an impact on our ability to recruit international GAs. This is crucial to our R1 status. We cannot recruit R1 students without these subsidies. Almost all other R1s offer subsidies.

Questions

Alistair Windsor – Is there a date by which you have to have already purchased insurance for the soft waver?

Tollefsen – No. There was initially, but now you can purchase insurance Januray 1st and we’ll still waive you.

Alistair Windsor – College of Arts and Sciences was looking at subsidies and there are some departments that can offer them in the spring. Will there be a mechanism to offer subsidies in the spring?

Tollefsen – You don’t need to offer subsidies now because we have the soft waiver. No, there is not a mechanism. If you want to offer subsidies, Tollefsen needs to know now so she can start working on a mechanism, but there is unlikely to be one in the spring. The aim is to get the mechanism in place for the fall. The mechanism cannot simply be to raise stipends. What would have to happen is that all GAs will have to go on a waiver and then they would have to show proof of insurance the way that international students do. If they don’t waive then they would get charged on their Tiger Express account, and spread that out over four months for an installment plan. Right now, international students cannot do that, they have to purchase either a full semester or a full year ahead of time. Most of them do not have installment plans for the companies they use. That is probably what would have to happen for us to manage it in the fall. The GAs would all move onto a hard waiver. They would have to show proof of insurance to waive out, if they did not, they would get automatically enrolled and we would add the subsidy to their account, and they would have to pay the rest.

Zabi Rezaee - International students with a GA contract are they subject to the soft waiver now?

Tollefsen – yes.

Zabi Rezaee – What’s going to happen in the fall? For example, our department pays tuition up to 6 hours, I pay out of my budget a monthly stipend, so in the future I have to pay out of my budget for the insurance as well?

Tollefsen – Yes. The provost has already asked that all new grants include insurance coverage.

Zabi Rezaee – But what if my budget will not allow me to do that? Does that mean I cannot hire GAs?

Tollefsen – You would have to go to your dean and ask for money to cover it. Remember we have not decided yet that we are going to implement fully subsidies in the fall. That is right now on the deans’ desk. I don’t think it’s a good idea if some deans offer stipends and some don’t. I would like to be able to say to the college if you would like to hire a full time GA you will have to offer a health insurance subsidy. I haven’t gotten approval to say that yet.

Mihalis Golias – Why not make this health insurance optional?

Tollefsen - In order to get a health insurance plan for a group of people they need to be able to count on a certain number of people. If we make it optional it would be too expensive. The more people that sign up, the lower the price. We can’t provide an ACA plan without being able to say a certain number of students will sign up. They will not give us a policy unless they think they can make money off of it.

Mihalis Golias – Why not waive the ACA compliance? The ACA compliance is only so we can provide subsidies, correct?

Tollefsen – No. We are finding over and over students are underinsured and they are paying out of pocket costs.

Mihalis Golias - Why couldn’t we wait until we have a plan for subsidies to move to ACA? The students can’t afford it. Instead of this making us looking better for recruiting graduate students, it’s actually making us look worse. It’s a large amount of money.

Tollefsen – I agree, and I hope that the deans see that as well.

Brian Ruggaber – In anticipation of this rolling out, we held back some money in our department and there is no mechanism to distribute this for the spring?

Tollfesen – Not for the spring, and you don’t have to because the students can be on a soft waiver and do what they are doing now.

Eddie Jacobs - We will have to budget these on future grants. I have grants pending right now that I’m planning on using to fund graduate students. Is this going to impact me? Am I going to be forced to pay for insurance with an existing budget for these grants?

Tollefsen – We don’t have a policy right now. I’m not able to say that you must subsidize. But there is some moral obligation to cover students, or the deans should. Otherwise, there are going to be consequences for the students. We can stop, but we will have to renegotiate with the companies and the rates are likely to go up. Hoping there will be some momentum around this so we will eventually do what we have been trying to do for twenty years. Robin Poston probably stood in front of you within the last five years saying this needs to happen. Karen Weddle-West was probably trying to make this happen as well. I’m hoping the deans will see that this needs to happen.

Mandy Young – Just want to clarify – if a PI has a funded grant now, that they had no thought of covering health insurance with, next year, or whenever subsidies kick in, will they have to use that grant money that has already been approved by the granting agency to cover insurance? That would be a real mess.

Tollefsen – It would be a mess. I think you would have to ask your dean or your chair to cover that.

Mandy Young – Are PIs being alerted to this?

Tollefsen – You have representation on the university policy committee, you have a senator on my committee, you have college directors that I have talked to every month about this issue. You have the university council where all of your faculty have representation. This is not new. All I did was pick up what Robin Poston was talking about several years ago. It’s just puzzling to me that this is coming as new when you all have representation on many councils I talk to weekly.

Mandy Young – We also hear one thing from one person and one thing from another.

Tollefsen – Agreed. Lesson learned. I will certainly come, if you’ll have me, and present on anything big like this again in the senate.

Fawaz Mzayek – Are there any plans in the future for the university to provide the subsidies?

Tollefsen – Not that I know of, and the reason why is that we are moving to a fully implemented RCM model. The money will be going back to the colleges anyway. There will not be a university pot of money above. The deans will get their pot of money and they will have to make difficult decisions on how to fund everything.

Leah Windsor – How was this all communicated to the international students and the other graduate students?

Tollefsen – Emails went out on the 30th of August and September 14th for domestic students and Monday again to international students. Also, we have a representative from the grad student association on our council. I met with grad student association last week as well.

William Alexander – I think everyone in here would agree we want a good and fully subsidized health insurance policy for our graduate students. Can you tell us where we are in that? This is one part that is changing, can you zoom out and tell us where are we on that overall landscape of having a subsidized health insurance for all of the graduate assistants? Are we anywhere close to having it for all of GAs or research supported students?

Tollefsen – I think we’re almost there. I’m pushing hard. Help me push. We have comprehensive health insurance that is going in place for international students, we have a comprehensive plan that is optional for our domestic graduate students. What we need to do is find the subsidy funding. That is a question for the deans. Do they have the funding or not? We have to settle on the amount. 60% is good, 75% would be better. If the deans could find the money, we could implement it in the fall. I think we’re close, but difficult decisions will have to be made.

William Alexander – And that amount is something like $2300?

Tollefsen - $2319 is the cost for students.

William Alexander – That is the amount we would need for each student if we fully fund it?

Tollefsen – Yes, if we fully funded them. Let’s be honest, there is stuff that we spend money on, and there is stuff that we should be spending money on. That’s the difficult decisions that the deans are going to have to make when the money gets put back to them.

Provost Russamanno – I just came from an institution that has a policy that requires that for all full time GAs or RAs the department has to cover 100% of a health care premium. There was also a requirement that every external proposal with a 20-hour assistantship had to fully fund that health insurance. That was under an RCM environment, so 100% of that expense was borne at the unit level. That’s the environment I’m coming from and where I think we should go. It will be a step-by-step process, and I want to thank Deb for her leadership in moving this forward.

David Gray – What do you see as the major sources of money departments have available for funding this?

Tollefsen – I wouldn’t know. This should be a college level decision. Deans need to look at their budgets. They should look at their budgets overall. That’s a question for the deans.

Motion to Approve Faculty Representatives to University Committees -Alistair Windsor

Alistair Windsor reads the motion.

Call the question passes by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion is adopted by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to the Faculty Appeals Committee - Alistair Windsor

Alistair Windsor reads the motion

Discussion of the motion?

Edith Gnanadnass - what is the rank of the nominees?

Alistair Windsor – Off the top of my head I can’t tell you. I can tell you it doesn’t matter as we currently have 10 professors serving. I have that information, just not in front of me.

Call the question passes by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion is adopted by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain

Ombudsperson Update - Alistair Windsor

We need to nominate 3 people for the committee, must be faculty but that is the sole restriction.

Faculty Trustee- Jeff Marchetta

Solicited questions about or for the board. No questions.

Ombudsperson- Sara Bridges

Was recently asked if she can see chairs, deans, etc. and the answer is yes.

President Owens-Mosby solicited any other business from the floor.

Alistair Windsor pointed out a mistake in the motion passed earlier to approve representatives to university committees. Graduate grade appeals is listed twice, one should say undergraduate appeals. Culeta Byars and Ben Smith are nominated to serve on the undergraduate grade appeals committee.

Alistair Windsor calls for a motion to reconsider the original motion, Francis Fabian seconded.

Call to question.

Verbal vote – unanimous vote yes.

Motion to amend and seconded

Call to question and seconded

Call the question passes by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion is adopted by a vote of 38 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain

**09.26.23.07 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**09.26.23.08 ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 pm.

***Motion 2023.16.9***

***Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to University Committees, Committee on Committees, Alistair Windsor***

Whereas:

The Faculty Senate is responsible for appointments to various university committees. The Committee on Committees is responsible for making nominations to the Faculty Senate for faculty appointments to university committees.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate appoints the following faculty members nominated by the Committee on Committees to the following University Committees:

**Office of the President**

Policy Review Board

DeAnna Owens-Mosby

**Office of the Provost**

Honorary Degree Committee

Jaqueline Bowen Buford

Graduate Grade Appeals Committee

Stephen Karr  
Chrisann Schiro-Geist

Undergraduate Grade Appeals Committee

Culeta Byars  
Ben Smith

University Undergraduate Council

Eli Andrew Jones

University Council for Graduate Studies

Reba Umberger

**Division of Business & Finance**

Facilities & Service Committee

Leah Windsor

Robert J Seals

Faculty Sick Leave Bank Committee

Sanjay Mishra

Gladius Lewis

**Information Technology Division**

Information Security Advisory Committee

Leah Windsor

Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee

Scott Vann

Enterprise Systems Advisory Committee

Sandeford Schaeffer

**Division of Research & Innovation**

University of Memphis Research Council

Deborah Moncrieff, Chair

William Alexandar

Reza Banai

Tim Mccurdy

Jessica Jennings

Eddie Jacobs

Recipients: Faculty Senate

**M2023.26.9 Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to the Faculty Appeals Committee Originator: Committee on Committees**

Whereas:

The 2023 faculty handbook indicates the following regarding the faculty appeals committee composition:

The Faculty Appeals Committee is comprised of nineteen (19) full-time, tenured faculty members appointed to staggered three-year terms. Faculty cannot serve on the Faculty Appeals Committee if they hold an administrative appointment which exceeds 50%. At least ten (10) of the members must hold the rank of professor. Ten (10) of the members will be appointed by the Faculty Senate and nine (9) will be appointed by the president. The president will select the chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee from amongst the ten members appointed by the Faculty Senate. The chair must hold the rank of professor. The composition of the committee should reflect diversity in terms of race, gender, and academic unit. Membership is for three years with staggered terms to ensure conformity and continuity in the committee function.

Whereas:

The Committee on Committees is responsible for making nominations to the Faculty Senate for faculty appointments to Senate and university committees.

Whereas:

The Committee on Committees nominates the following faculty members to serve on the Faculty Appeals Committee as described in the 2023 Faculty Handbook.

**COC’s nominations of the Faculty Senate**

Sage Graham, English, College of Arts and Sciences

Jeff Byford, Instruction, Curriculum and Leadership, College of Education

Stephen Watts, Criminology and Criminal Justice, College of Arts and Sciences

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate approves the recommendations of the Committee on Committees and their prospective term limits as stipulated by the 2023 Faculty Handbook.

Recipients: Faculty Senate

# A Progress Report to the Faculty Senate

**Originator: Budget and Finance Committee**

**Subject: A List of Peer Institutions**

## Introduction

The sustainability of the human capital (staff, faculty, and administrators) at The University of Memphis is crucial to the continuous growth and improvement, maintenance of R1 status, and the proper implementation of the SRI/RCM model. Maintaining a high quality and enthusiastic faculty requires a sense of fairness relative to compensation levels in two respects: first, the absolute compensation levels in comparison to peer institutions and second, internally, in relation to salary compression/inversion. This requires a proper resource allocation and a robust and effective study of faculty salary comparison and inversion/compression at the University of Memphis, which addresses compensation issues and their consequences on faculty hiring, retention, and promotion. The intent of the study is to provide policy recommendations to University administrators regarding the current status of faculty salaries.

Now that the University of Memphis has achieved R1 status there is a perception within the faculty that a salary gap exists in comparison to R1 peer institutions. In addition, there is concern about the difference in salaries within the faculty regardless of the differences in rank, experience, seniority or publications. The benchmark for faculty salary levels and compression study is identifying a proper peer institutions list. Peer institutions are academic institutions that are selected to be used for comparative analysis of faculty salaries and the benchmarking of other institutional attributes. Peers usually have common attributes such as the level of resources, student headcount, strategic plans, and institutional goals. The continuous update of a university’s list of peer and aspirational institutions is necessary to reflect the change in attributes of the institution over time.

Thus, the Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) of the Faculty Senate was charged to do the following, among others, for the 2022/2023 and 2023/24 academic years:

1. “Develop a list with senior administration, Director of OIR, and associate vice provost for strategic analytics of R1 peer institutions and distribute the approved list of results to senators for approval in order to perform a salary analysis for the current term.
2. Perform a comprehensive salary comparison with peer institutions (update peer institutions to be consistent with R1 status).
3. Perform a salary comparison by rank between faculty in every department and access compression/inversion.”

## The BFC Work in the 2022-2023 Academic Year

To effectively fulfill the above charges and responsibilities, the BFC in the 2022-2023 academic prepared and presented a motion entitled “**Motion to Recommend Approval of New List of Peer and Aspiration Institutions”** to the FS in its 2/28/2023 meeting (Please see the attached Appendix A). This motion failed by a vote of 3 for, 26 against, and 3 abstentions. Parliamentarian Marchetta moved to refer the items in the failed motion back to the BFC to work with the provost’s office in preparing an acceptable list of peer institutions. There was not enough time for the BFC to prepare a new list in the 2022-2023 academic year, and thus was deferred to the 2023-2024 academic year. The BFC did not perform a complete and comprehensive analysis of faculty salary comparison and compression in the 2022-2023 academic year. However, a verbal report of the preliminary faculty salary comparison was given by the chair of the subcommittee of BFC in the April 2023 meeting of the FS, which suggests that in comparison with the OIR peer institutions list: (1) the University of Memphis ranked 8th out of 9, for overall full-time faculty salaries across all ranks; (2) at the level of Assistant Professor ranked 5th out of 9th.: (3) at the level of Associate Professor ranked 7th out of 9th.; and (4) at the level of full Professor the average ranked 6th out of 9th. The chair of the faculty salary compression subcommittee of the BFC gave a verbal report in the April 2023 meeting of the FS indicating that there is no evidence of between and within Rank Salary Compression for faculty on average at the University of Memphis. In contrast, compression issues were identified at the college level between rank faculty.

## The BFC Work in the 2022-2023 Academic Year

The president of the FS(DeAnna Owens) and the chair of the BFC (Zabi Rezaee) met with Bridgette Decent of the OIR on September 7, 2023, to discuss how the list of peer institutions was initiated, processed, and approved. The Attached Appendix B summarizes the methodology used in the Fall 2022 Peer Selection process in conjunction with the launch of the strategic plan development. In summary, as a part of the strategic planning process in August 2022, it was determined that the institution’s peers and aspirants list needed to be updated. As such, a statistical analysis looked at all higher education institutions that met the criteria of National, Public, Large, Carnegie R1/R2, and 4-year institutions (excluding HBCUs and 13 highly residential institutions). This analysis yielded 132 institutions. OIR performed a cluster analysis using 42 data points to determine those institutions most similar to the University of Memphis, thus creating a base peer list, to which the President and strategic planning consultant added a few other hand-selected institutions. The cluster analysis also yielded a pool of institutions that scored significantly higher on the medians of the 42 data points, and this pool was used as the base of the aspirants, with a few hand-selected institutions added.”

## Moving Forward

The Institutional peer list posted on the OIR website is intended for the development of the strategic plan for the University of Memphis and is thus designed to serve at the institutional level and not the departmental level. It is not feasible for the OIR or the FS to prepare a unit-level peer institutions list. However, if it is viable and desirable, each department can prepare its list of potential peers. The BFC encourage all colleges and academic affair units to tailor the institutional level peers to their departmental/unit-level peer institutions for the purpose of determining research, teaching, and service expectations and related resource allocation. The BFC met on September 13, 2023 to review the selected institutional level peers that are available on the OIR website: <https://www.memphis.edu/oir/about/peer.php> to determine whether it can be used as a benchmark in performing analyses of the faculty salary comparison in the fall of 2023. The BFC discussed many important issues and challenges related to the OIR institutional peer list including how the list was initiated, processed, prepared and approved. and decided that the BFC should have input, oversee and influence the process of developing the UoM’s institutional Peer list. The BFC suggests the following;

1. Reorganization of the 52 variables/factors used in the preparation of the OIR peer list (please see Appendic D.
2. The use of multicollinearity and factor analysis to reduce data dimensions to 42 data poits.
3. The use of factor analysis to identify factors as independent variables for the cluster analysis or the original variables after dropping the ones that did not load in any factor.
4. Identification of the original pool of institutes on which the cluster analysis was done for the comparative analyses of state information including as mean income of the state, or percent of persons with college degree in the state.

The BFC of the FS is planning to work with the OIR in the next month to reexamine the institutional peer list and submit a refined list to the FS for voting in October meeting of the FS. Below is the list of current peers and aspirational peers.

# List of Peer Institutions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspirational Peers** |  | **Current Peers** |
| [**Colorado State University**](https://www.colostate.edu/) |  | [**Boise State University**](https://www.boisestate.edu/) |
| [**Kansas State University**](https://www.k-state.edu/) |  | [**East Carolina University**](https://www.ecu.edu/) |
| [**Louisiana State University**](https://www.lsu.edu/) |  | [**Kent State University**](https://www.kent.edu/) |
| [**Oklahoma State University**](https://go.okstate.edu/) |  | [**Mississippi State University**](https://www.msstate.edu/) |
| [**Oregon State University**](https://oregonstate.edu/) |  | [**Texas Tech University**](https://www.ttu.edu/) |
| [**University of Alabama**](https://www.ua.edu/) |  | [**University of Nevada-Reno**](https://www.unr.edu/) |
| [**University of Arkansas**](https://www.uark.edu/) |  | [**University of New Mexico**](https://www.unm.edu/) |
| [**University of Mississippi**](https://olemiss.edu/) |  | [**University of North Carolina-Greensboro**](https://www.uncg.edu/) |
| [**University of Texas-Dallas**](https://www.utdallas.edu/) |  | [**University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee**](https://uwm.edu/) |
| [**Washington State University**](https://wsu.edu/) |  | [**West Virginia University**](https://www.wvu.edu/) |

# Appendix A Failed Motion to Recommend Approval of New List of Peer and Aspiration Institutions February 2023 Meeting of the FS



Faculty Senate

**Motion to Recommend Approval of New List of Peer and Aspiration Institutions  
Originator: Budget and Finance Standing Committee**

Whereas,

Peer institutions are institutions that are selected to be used for comparative analysis and benchmarking of institutional qualities. Peers usually have common qualities such as level of resources, student headcount, and institutional goals. It is periodically necessary to update a university’s List of Peer and Aspirational Institutions to reflect the change in qualities of the institution over time.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the attached List of Peer and Aspirant Institutions proposed by the Office of Institutional Research.

Recipients:

Faculty Senate

Abby Parrill-Baker, Interim Provost

Raaj Kurapati, EVP, CFO, COO

Jasbir Dhaliwal, EVP, Office of Research and Innovation

Helen Johnson, Office of the Provost

Bridgette Decent, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Analytics, Director of OIR

University of Memphis

# Peers and Aspirants

As a part of the strategic planning process, it was determined there was a need to update the institution’s peers and aspirants list. As such, a statistical analysis was conducted that looked at all higher education institutions that met the criteria of National, Public, Large, Carnegie R1/R2, and 4-year institutions (excluding HBCUs). This analysis yielded 132 institutions. From those 132 institutions, a cluster analysis using 52 data points was performed to determine those institutions most similar to the University of Memphis, thus creating a peer list. The cluster analysis also yielded a pool of institutions that scored marginally higher on the 52 data points and this pool was used to determine the aspirants.

**Peer List (7 R1 and 3 R2):**

Boise State University (R2, Ntl. Rank 299)

East Carolina University (R2, Ntl. Rank 213)

Kent State University (R1, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 212)

Mississippi State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 196)

University of Nevada-Reno (R1, Ntl. Rank 227)

University of New Mexico (R1, Ntl. Rank 196)

University of North Carolina, Greensboro (R2, NSSE Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 239)

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (R1, Urban 13 Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 249)

West Virginia University (R1, Ntl. Rank 234)

**Aspirants (all R1):**

Colorado State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)

Kansas State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)

Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 172)

Oklahoma State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 187)

Oregon State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)

University of Alabama (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)

University of Arkansas (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)

University of Mississippi (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)

University of Texas-Dallas (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 136)

Washington State University (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 179)

**Variables for Analysis**

**Note**: University of Memphis is R1, an Urban 13 institution, and nationally ranked 249  
This is based on a cluster analysis using the following 52 variables.

1. Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degree

2. Average alumni giving rate

3. First-Year Freshmen Average High School GPA

4. Cost of Room and Board

5. Percent of First Year Freshmen in the top 10% of high school class

6. Average indebtedness of Graduating UG Class

7. Percent of applicants accepted

8. Six-year graduation rate

9. First-Year Freshmen One-Year Retention Rate

10. Educational expenditures per student

11. First Year Freshmen Enrollment

12. Number of Full Time Faculty

13. Cost of In-State Tuition and Fees

14. Need-Based Financial Aid Awarded to First-Year Freshmen

15. Cost of Out of State Tuition and Fees

16. Student to faculty ratio

17. UG % Black or Hispanic

18. UG % Female

19. UG % International

20. UG % of students with financial need

21. Percent of classes with 50 or more students

22. Percent of classes with 20 or fewer students

23. Percent of faculty who are full-time

24. Four Year graduation rate

25. Academic Support Expenditures

26. Average percent of UG needs met

27. Bachelors degrees awarded

28. Campus size in acres

29. Institutional support expenditures

30. Masters degrees awarded

31. Number of freshmen with Need fully met

32. Public services expenditures

33. Research expenditures

34. Student Services Expenditures

35. Total enrollment

36. Percent UG In State

37. Percent UG On Campus

38. Endowment

39. Professional degrees awarded

40. Average federal indebtedness of UG Graduating class

41. Doctoral degrees awarded

42. Number of graduates with federal loans

43. Average faculty salary

44. Percent of UG with Pell grants

45. Percent of faculty who are minorities

46. Percent of First Year Freshmen with Pell grants

47. Six-year graduation rate gap between Pell/nonPell

48. Carnegie Classification

49. Coalition of Urban Serving Institutions flag

50. Research expenditures in Non-science and Engineering

51. Average ACT score of first-year freshmen

52. Percent of classes offered online

# Appendix B The Process of Preparing the List of Peer and Aspirational Institutions The University of Memphis

**The University of Memphis 2022 Peer Selection Process**

The University of Memphis began the Strategic Plan development process in August of 2022 to establish university goals and objectives, and to create a pathway for their achievement. President Hardgrave hired a strategic planning consultant, who began by meeting with campus constituents and looking at institutional data from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). One of the consultant’s first requests was for a list of institutional peers for use in the strategic planning process. Looking at data from peer institution groups allows administrators to evaluate university inputs and outputs in the context of comparable institutions, an exercise that is critical for understanding not only where the University has been but also where it is headed. At that time, the peers listed on the OIR website were the Urban 13 institutions, and a peer selection exercise had not been done in at least fifteen years. As such, a more targeted and updated list was requested in support of the strategic planning process.

Given the short turnaround for the request, OIR followed the methodology used by Austin Peay State University and East Tennessee State University, which consisted of three parts:

1. Narrow the population of institutions from whom a list of peers could be selected based on institutional mission, scope, and governance.
2. Use IPEDS, HERD, and US News Academic Insights variables to perform a cluster analysis
3. Present the final list of institutions within the same cluster as UofM to executives for final peer selection

For step one, OIR used IPEDS, HERD, and US News Academics Analytics datasets to compile a list of 132 US institutions that were public-4year, large institutions with R1 or R2 Carnegie status, ranked in the US News National Universities survey, predominantly non-residential, and excluding HBCU’s.

For step two, OIR used cluster analysis on 52 variables covering student characteristics, student outcomes, instruction and faculty, and institutional finances and characteristics (Appendix C). Cluster analysis provides a way to classify and organize data into meaningful clusters, groups, or taxonomies by maximizing the similarity between observations within each cluster. The data were first analyzed for missingness and missing values were imputed with medians. Then data were standardized to ensure all variables were on the same scale. Finally, data were tested for multicollinearity and ten variables with a VIF factor >10 were dropped. The remaining 42 variables were then used in a series of cluster analysis models. Three different clustering algorithms were used: K-Means, Ward’s Method, and Hierarchical Centroid Method. The models resulted in a list of 47 institutions that shared a cluster with the University of Memphis in all three models.

To find Aspirational Peers, the original dataset was further limited to R1 institutions only. The imputation, standardization, multicollinearity check, and cluster analysis were repeated, and the three clustering algorithms were used to find the clusters immediately above the cluster housing U of M. There were 30 institutions in common in all three of the models for Aspirational Peers.

For step three, OIR sent the lists of 47 potential current peers and 30 aspirational peers to the strategic planning consultant, and he reviewed them with Dr. Hardgrave. Based on their objectives for the strategic plan, they selected the Current Peers and Aspirational Peers that are currently on the OIR website.

Certain limitations come with this methodology of peer selection. The datasets from which the variables for cluster analysis were drawn are all institutional-level datasets, which means college or departmental comparisons within institutions are not possible. The data lagged between one and three years, depending upon the timing of the published data updates. Finally, cluster analysis is simply a way to classify and organize institutions into meaningful groups, and the results should be reviewed with other quantitative and qualitative criteria.

# Appendix C Variables Used in the Peer Selection Process

| **Student Characteristics** | **Student Outcomes** | **Instruction** | **Finances** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Year Freshmen Average High School GPA | Six-year graduation rate\* | Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degree | Cost of Room and Board |
| Percent of First Year Freshmen in the top 10% of high school class | First-year Freshmen One-Year Retention Rate\* | Number of Full Time Faculty | Educational expenditures per student\* |
| Percent of applicants accepted | Four-year graduation rate | Student-to-faculty ratio | Cost of In-State Tuition and Fees |
| First Year Freshmen Enrollment | Bachelors degrees awarded | Percent of classes with 50 or more students | Need-Based Financial Aid Awarded to First-Year Freshmen |
| UG % Black or Hispanic | Masters degrees awarded | Percent of classes with 20 or fewer students | Cost of Out of State Tuition and Fees |
| UG % Female | Professional degrees awarded | Percent of faculty who are full-time | Academic Support Expenditures |
| UG % International | Six-year graduation rate gap between Pell/NonPell | Percent of faculty who are minorities | Campus size in acres |
| UG % of students with financial need | Doctoral degrees awarded | Average faculty salary | Institutional support expenditures |
| Average percent of UG needs met\* | Average indebtedness of Graduating UG Class | Percent of classes offered online | Public services expenditures |
| Number of freshmen with needs fully met | Average federal indebtedness of UG Graduating class\* |  | Research expenditures\* |
| Percent UG In State | Number of graduates with federal loans\* |  | Student Services Expenditures |
| Percent UG On Campus |  |  | Endowment |
| Average ACT score of first-year freshmen\* |  |  | Research expenditures in Non-science and Engineering |
| Percent of UG with Pell grants |  |  | Average alumni giving rate |
| Percent of First-year Freshmen with Pell Grants\* |  |  | Carnegie Classification |
| Total enrollment\* |  |  | Coalition of Urban Serving Institutions flag |

\*Indicates VIF>10, variable was dropped before cluster analysis
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**Using Algorithms to Find University of Memphis Peers**

Using IPEDS, HERD, and US News Rankings data, OIR narrowed a list of US institutions to public-4year, large institutions with R1 or R2 Carnegie status, ranked in the US News National Universities survey, primarily non-residential, and excluding HBCUs.

From this list, OIR used cluster analysis on 42 variables covering student demographics and finances, institution finances, faculty, enrollment, and selectivity. Cluster analysis provides a way to classify and organize data into meaningful clusters, groups, or taxonomies by maximizing the similarity between observations within each cluster. Three different clustering algorithms were used: K-Means, Ward’s Method, and Hierarchical Centroid Method. These models resulted in a list of 47 institutions that shared a cluster with the University of Memphis in all three models.

## The R1 institutions in the list are:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **DISTANCE (Cluster Model 1)** | **US News National University Rank** | **Carnegie** |
| University of Nevada--Reno | 3.81060606 | 227 | R1 |
| Old Dominion University | 3.872264472 | 263 | R1 |
| University of Louisiana at Lafayette | 4.046108555 | 323 | R1 |
| University of Nevada--Las Vegas | 4.243055236 | 249 | R1 |
| Kent State University | 4.468599364 | 213 | R1 |
| Wayne State University | 4.770486841 | 249 | R1 |
| Virginia Commonwealth University | 4.971097405 | 172 | R1 |
| University of Southern Mississippi | 4.982748283 | 334 | R1 |
| University of New Mexico | 5.022788958 | 196 | R1 |
| University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee | 5.027139062 | 313 | R1 |
| University of Memphis | 5.147292581 | 249 | R1 |
| University of Alabama at Birmingham | 5.793645821 | 148 | R1 |
| University of Illinois--Chicago | 7.355876672 | 103 | R1 |
| University of Colorado Denver | 8.919015896 | 227 | R1 |

## The institutions that are closest to the UofM in the clusters are:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **DISTANCE (Cluster Model 1)** | **US News National University Rank** | **Carnegie** |
| Wayne State University | 4.770486841 | 249 | R1 |
| Cleveland State University | 4.915184366 | 323 | R2 |
| Virginia Commonwealth University | 4.971097405 | 172 | R1 |
| University of Southern Mississippi | 4.982748283 | 334 | R1 |
| University of New Mexico | 5.022788958 | 196 | R1 |
| University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee | 5.027139062 | 313 | R1 |
| UNC Greensboro | 5.069518582 | 239 | R2 |
| East Tennessee State University | 5.124196672 | 288 | R2 |
| University of Memphis | 5.147292581 | 249 | R1 |
| University of Akron | 5.193070811 | 299 | R2 |
| Indiana University-Purdue University--Indianapolis | 5.365846739 | 196 | R2 |

To find Aspirational Peers, the original dataset was further limited to R1 institutions only. Three clustering algorithms were used to find the clusters immediately above the cluster housing U of M. There were 30 institutions in common in all three of the models:

## The institutions that are aspirational peers are:

| **Institution** | **US News National University Rank** | **Carnegie** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Binghamton University--SUNY | 83 | R1 |
| University at Buffalo--SUNY | 93 | R1 |
| University of Delaware | 93 | R1 |
| Auburn University | 99 | R1 |
| University of Oregon | 99 | R1 |
| University of Tennessee | 103 | R1 |
| Iowa State University of Science and Technology | 122 | R1 |
| University of Kansas | 122 | R1 |
| University of Missouri | 122 | R1 |
| University of Oklahoma | 127 | R1 |
| University of Nebraska--Lincoln | 136 | R1 |
| University of Texas at Dallas | 136 | R1 |
| Colorado State University | 148 | R1 |
| University of Alabama | 148 | R1 |
| University of Cincinnati | 148 | R1 |
| University of Mississippi | 148 | R1 |
| Kansas State University | 162 | R1 |
| Oregon State University | 162 | R1 |
| University of Arkansas | 162 | R1 |
| University of Hawaii--Manoa | 162 | R1 |
| University of Maryland--Baltimore County | 162 | R1 |
| Louisiana State University--Baton Rouge | 172 | R1 |
| Washington State University | 179 | R1 |
| Oklahoma State University | 187 | R1 |
| Mississippi State University | 196 | R1 |
| Texas Tech University | 213 | R1 |
| University of Nevada--Reno | 227 | R1 |
| Utah State University | 249 | R1 |
| West Virginia University | 249 | R1 |
| Montana State University | 263 | R1 |

**Appendix D**

**Reorganization of 52 Variables**

**Student Characteristics**

**Academic Quality**

1. First Year Freshmen Average High School GPA
2. Percent of First Year Freshmen in the top 10% of high school class
3. Average ACT score of first-year freshmen\*
4. Percent of applicants accepted
5. First Year Freshmen Enrollment (maybe a better metric would be a percent of accepted applicants enrolled)
6. Total enrollment\*

**Demographics**

**Gender and Ethnic Diversity**

1. UG % Black or Hispanic
2. UG % Female

**Geographic Diversity**

1. UG % International (Could go here or in the above diversity category)
2. Percent UG In State

**Current Housing**

1. Percent UG On Campus (This could be useful if contrasted with UG living off-campus but not at home and/or commuter vs. non-commuter)

**Financial Need**

**Total**

1. UG % of students with financial need
2. Percent of UG with Pell grants
3. Average percent of UG needs met\*

**First Year**

(Should there be a parallel of 12? First-years with financial need?)

1. Percent of First-year Freshmen with Pell Grants\*
2. Number of freshmen with needs fully met. (Should this be a percentage? Again, to parallel 14?)

**Student Outcomes**

**UG Graduation Rates**

1. Four-year graduation rate
2. Six-year graduation rate\*
3. Six-year graduation rate gap between Pell/Non Pell
4. First-year Freshmen One-Year Retention Rate\*

**Degrees awarded** (Perhaps 21-24 should be adjusted per number of programs)

1. Bachelors degrees awarded
2. Masters degrees awarded
3. Professional degrees awarded
4. Doctoral degrees awarded

**UG Debt**

1. Average indebtedness of Graduating UG Class
2. Average federal indebtedness of UG Graduating class\*

**Post Bac Debt**

1. Number of graduates with federal loans\*

(We probably should have equivalent variables to the UG debt category above)

**Instruction**

**Faculty Characteristics**

1. Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degree
2. Number of Full Time Faculty
3. Percent of faculty who are full-time
4. Percent of faculty who are minorities
5. Average faculty salary (This should be cut)

**Classroom Characteristics**

1. Student-to-faculty ratio
2. Percent of classes with 50 or more students
3. Percent of classes with 20 or fewer students
4. Percent of classes offered online

**Finances**

**Revenue Streams**

1. Cost of Room and Board
2. Cost of In-State Tuition and Fees
3. Cost of Out of State Tuition and Fees
4. Endowment (Might be useful to know how much of the endowment is allocated for expenditures)
5. Average alumni giving rate 5% (Annual alumni giving is probably more important for us, 35M)

(State Funding is missing) 30% of operating costs/ 150.9M

(Local Funding from Memphis, Shelby County, and Corporations is missing)

Expenditures

1. Academic Support Expenditures
2. Institutional support expenditures
3. Public services expenditures
4. Student Services Expenditures
5. Educational expenditures per student\*
6. Research expenditures\*
7. Research expenditures in Non- science and Engineering
8. Need-Based Financial Aid Awarded to First-Year Freshmen
9. Campus size in acres (I’m not sure what work this is supposed to do. Should it be changed to campus operating costs or campus operating costs per student & faculty?)

**Miscellaneous**

1. Carnegie Classification (I’m not sure this should be a variable as opposed to a standard for inclusion (R1) or exclusion. If this is a more precise classification, such that it precisely indicates incoming Grants, it can be moved to Revenue Streams (but that might require a few other variables).
2. Coalition of Urban Serving Institutions flag. (I’m not sure what this tracks as I don’t think it is a requirement for urban state institutions to join, nor would any school claim they are not working at least partially towards the same goals).[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fall 2021** | **Fall 2022** | **Fall 2023** | **Fall 2024** | **Fall 2025** | **Fall 2026** | **Fall 2027** |
| **State Support^** | $123.7 | $133.5 | $150.9 | $165.3 | $181.9 | $200.1 | $220.1 |
| Advancement: | FY2021 | FY2022 | FY2023 | FY2024 | FY2025 | FY2026 | FY2027 |
| Alumni Giving Rate | 5.6% | 4.9% | 5% | 5.75% | 6.5% | 7.25% | 7.75% |
| **Annual Giving** [in millions] | $36.7 | $54.5 | $35 | $75 | $75 | $70 | $70 |
| **Market value of endowment** [in millions] | $284.0 | $256.5 | $277.1 | $319 | $363.3 | $405.3 | $449.8 |
| Alumni Donor Count | 6,024 | 5,869 | 10,725 | 11,261 | 11,824 | 12,415 | 13,036 |
| Revenue from **Other Sources** ($) - corporate ed, cont ed, etc.^ | $2.3 | $2.4 | $2.7 | $3.1 | $3.5 | $4 | $4.2 |
| Expenditures Per Student FTE (instructional) | $8,164 | $8,569 | $8,700 | $8,909 | $9,100 | $9,300 | $9,400 |

1. <https://www.usucoalition.org/about-3> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)