

**FCBC  
MINUTES  
October 18, 2018  
3:30  
Room 156 University Hall**

Attending: Corinne Reczek, Stephanie Seveau, Dana Renga, Brent Sohngen, Crichton Ogle, Chris Penrose, Harold Moellering, Smita Mathur, Stephanie Schulte, Joanne McGoldrick, Kay Wolf.

Guests attending: Joyce Chen, Ben Givens, Brian Newcomb, Pam Doseck.

Motion to approve minutes: Joanne McGoldrick. Second by Harold Moellering. Approved unanimously.

1) Salary Committee (Stephanie Seveau)

Professor Joyce Chen made a presentation on her latest results about gender equity, salary increases, and compression.

- The powerpoint will be included in pdf version of minutes
- The presentation included expanded analysis from what was in the report last year by including medical center and clinical and instructional faculty.
  - Results show an increase in gender gap relative to earlier report.
  - Suggestion from Harold Moellering: Could consider using a median regression without logs to wash out outliers
- The results confirm that the two critical factors affecting pay disparity are department and rank.
- Dr. Chen decomposed the results into annual effects. The results show a large increase in the pay gap between 2011 and 2012. This means that there is an observed overall downward trend in the salary gap. Many noted that this result is not expected. We need to spend some time figuring out why the gender gap suddenly increased in 2012.
  - Two factors were suggested: retirements and semester conversion, but it is not clear why these two factors would work this direction.
- Stephanie Schulte: Is there any way to see if initial salaries are lower for females versus males? Professor Chen indicated she not done this, but will consider.
- Promotion data: The results show lower promotion rates for females from assistant to associate. But the data on promotion is not actually promotion, it is whether the individuals remain at the university over time, around the 6<sup>th</sup> year review. So the parameter is more like "left university". Women who left university have lower salary on average than men.
- Dr. Chen noted that she would like to include other productivity measures, such as those that Academic Analytics provides, but it is tough to match this data to the salary dataset.
- Dr. Chen provided the results by college. She could break A&S into the sub-units, given its size. But cannot then look at departments in most colleges due to data limitations (size of departments too small).
- Results for average salary change per year, as well as compression, and inversion are similar to the results presented last year.
- Dr. Chen provided a few policies/situations from other universities to consider. See handout.
- Overall there was lively discussion about the data and results, in particular the result that the gender gap has potentially worsened.

Kay Wolf discussed the composite rate (see attached letters)

- Three letters were provided that illustrate efforts by the Provost to address gender equity and other equity issues through the AMCP process, including the composite rate savings.
- In 2015, Provost Steinmetz provided 1% funding for equity (see 2015 letter).
- In 2016, the composite rate fell and an additional amount was made available for equity adjustments (see letter).
- In 2018, equity adjustments were included in the discussion as something individual units could do.
  - The 2.5% change was the average pool. Deans can make adjustments above and beyond that. For example, the A&S Dean made the average 2%, and used 0.5% for equity adjustments, so that the college-wide average at the end was 2.5%.
- There was some discussion about how to follow up on this to see how these were implemented. Kay and Joanne suggested that the best way to follow up on this is to start with the 2016 composite rate savings, and ask Kris Devine (deputy CFO) and Brad Harris (assistant Provost) whether they have data to track that money. Then can follow up with individual Deans. They recommended having only one data request come from the committee and go to Kris and Brad, e.g. through Stephanie Seveau.

Discussion about Teaching Support Program (Tabled)

## 2) Benefit Committees (Stephanie Schulte and Smita Mathur)

Stephanie reported on meeting with Susan Basso and Joanne McGoldrick

- Had a very productive meeting with Susan and Joanne regarding how we can work with them on health benefits planning.
- The effort to narrow the network will continue to move forward, as pushed by the health plan.
- Crichton: Asked about whether there was a quality of care analysis. Joanne pointed out that they have to rely on the health system to provide that, and she recognized that this is a conflict of interest (Crichton also pointed that out).
- Joanne notes that it would be very useful to have an outside analysis of quality of care done by a consultant, but this takes time, and is expensive.
- Crichton asked who should ask for that analysis? Joanne pointed out that this committee can ask for that and if the committee believes that such data were useful, it would be a good thing to ask. She pointed out that it would be best to have a request sooner rather than later. They will be working on design issues for 2020 in January/February and the health plan for 2020 will largely be completed in May. Because it takes 2-3 months to complete such an analysis, the request really needs to come sooner rather than later.
- The committee generally agreed that such data provided by an outside consultant would be a great set of data to have.

Brief discussion about any significant changes to the 2019 health plan (Joanne and Pam Doseck)

- Discussion on 2019 plan
  - Plan information is going out now
  - Rates went down this year. Dental stayed the same. Basic vision stayed the same, while premium vision increased. Copays and deductibles stayed the same this year (a couple small changes noted).

- Reasons for reductions: Managing the claims, healthier participants, greater participation in programs. Your plan for health credits went up this year, so can earn more this year.
  - Any changes in other procedures/practices? No other changes seem to be on the horizon.
  - Pharmacy is going up due to specialty medicines. Joanne seemed to expect that ultimately this will be about half of total cost of care (a general trend, not an OSU only trend).
- We will come back to discuss 2020 plan in spring.
    - Note that the timing of getting this done is really tight.
    - The narrowing the network issue will be the biggest issue. With the plan that came forward in 2018 for consideration in 2019, there would have been 13,000 people on specialties that would be affected, and yet concierge services would have been offered to a very small fraction of those who met a threshold of number of their providers who would not have been in the prime network. It would be really useful for this committee to play a role in that.

Informal discussion on other benefits to gauge faculty interest and concerns

- Smita raised question about medical care for ARP post-retirement. Need to examine this in more detail.
- There did not seem to be a lot of interest amongst committee members for assessing a broader array of benefits.

Brian Newcomb from HR introduced himself as the data person who will be working with us on data, and in particular the data we use for the annual report. He stated that the level of support that they are able to provide will be lower than in the past. They will provide data, but they will not summarize it as they have in the past, for example with the end of the year report that they have provided for many years that provides 10 years of salary comparisons between OSU and benchmark institutions. Concerns were raised about the form of the data, how consistency could be provided year-to-year, etc. Brent will follow up with Brian about this.

Meeting adjourned 5:05.