REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION

Salaries for 2010-2011

March 31, 2010

Written by Dan Johnson (chair) on behalf of Ann DeStefano, Karen Klein, Rongson Pongdee, Chad Schonewill, Patti Spoelman, Alex Vargo, Diane Westerfield, Armin Wishard, Shaleen Prehm (ex officio), Chris Melcher (ex officio) and Barbara Wilson (ex officio)

- 1. The committee recommends that the College offer paid sick leave to less-than-12-month non-exempt part-time staff, bringing them into accordance with our sick leave policy for all other employees of the College. Further, we recommend that the College offer vacation leave accrual to our less-than-12-month non-exempt staff, bringing them into accordance with our 12 month non-exempt staff. We estimate that the cost of offering sick leave to all employees currently not covered by sick leave policy will amount to \$1701.08 per year. We estimate that the cost of offering vacation leave accrual to our less-than-12-month non-exempt staff will total \$12770.48 per year. While we would like to extend this vacation leave policy to less-than-12-month exempt staff as well, we recognize that the costs are prohibitive at this point, and there remain issues about how to deal with specific groups within exempt staff (such as paraprofessionals and interns). The Committee encourages future incarnations of this committee to consider this extension.
- 2. The committee recommends that the College adopt an official Parental Leave Policy, with two key aspects: a) parity between employees and b) creation of a new benefit rather than reliance on sick or vacation or unpaid leave. Details are being negotiated between interested constituencies, but the Committee agrees that the primary goal at this point is to create a policy, even if we need to revisit it or amend it in the near future.
- 3. The committee recommends that the College offer a 2% raise to all staff for the upcoming year, contingent upon satisfactory performance. While staff members and working groups are actively discussing the explicit inclusion of progression- and performance-based components to raises, the staff salary subcommittee feels that it is premature to act upon those discussions. The committee encourages further discussion in the upcoming year.
- 4. The committee recommends that the College implement the third alternative of the AAUP's faculty salary January proposal, replicated here:

| | | Years in | 2009-10 | Bottom of | Top of | | | 2010-11 | Bottom of | Top of |
|------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Rank | Count | Rank | Average | Bracket | Bracket | CPI | Progression | Average | Bracket | Bracket |
| Instructor | 6 | 2 | \$56,955 | \$53,229 | \$58,604 | \$604 | \$1,055 | \$58,613 | \$53,793 | \$59,567 |
| Assistant | 39 | 6 | \$64,648 | \$58,614 | \$70,550 | \$1,062 | \$1,210 | \$66,920 | \$59,577 | \$71,298 |
| Associate | 41 | 8 | \$78,610 | \$70,560 | \$85,091 | \$833 | \$713 | \$80,156 | \$71,308 | \$85,993 |
| Full | 84 | 21 | \$116,086 | \$85,101 | \$138,044 | \$976 | \$866 | \$117,928 | \$86,003 | \$139,141 |
| Total | 170 | 35 | \$93,160 | | | \$948 | \$915 | \$95,023 | | |

The faculty salary subcommittee of the Compensation Committee believes that this version adheres strongly to the current salary model that faculty clearly support, while redirecting some increases from full professors to assistant professors. In that way, we recognize that we have met our goal of raising full professor salaries to the median level of our peers, where we have not done so for associate or assistant professors. It also supports our goal to remain competitive in hiring new faculty at the lower ranks.

5. The committee recommends that the College re-examine the way in which it considers CPI adjustments in proposing salary increases. Under the current system, budget parameters are set without input from the Compensation Committee or AAUP, and proposals concerning the disposition of any increases cannot be finalized until inflation data are published by the federal government in January. This is simply too late to be useful for our new budget cycle which involves budgeting in the fall semester for presentation to the trustees in February.

We are actively discussing alternatives with AAUP, the Business Office and the Dean's Office, to come to an agreement about a version of CPI which will reflect our needs but be available in the late summer or early fall. This will permit the College to consider cost of living indices in a timely fashion when formulating the budget for salaries.

As documented in the minutes and other reports, this committee has engaged in a review of benefits, including two specific suggestions to expand or change current benefits. We have no recommendations to change coverage or benefits at this time, other than the changes to sick/vacation/parental leave policy as listed above in points 1 and 2. Our discussions have also included consideration of our official compensation philosophy, and how our priorities are (or are not) reflected in our actual policy. We encourage future incarnations of this committee to continue that discussion.

The committee intends to spend the remainder of this year's mandate discussing the suggestions of the AAUP report related to the effectiveness of ERPR and SSS programs via their ability to sustain senior faculty into retirement, and changes to the faculty salary model involving caps on progression through the faculty ranks or a fixed ratio of junior assistant-to-senior full professor salaries. We are grateful to the Business Office, and especially Barbara Wilson and Shaleen Prehm, for supplying information, expertise and patience.