

COMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION

Block 5 Minutes

January 31, 2011

Present: Marion Hourdequin, Karen Klein, Dianne Knight, Jay Maloney, Chris Melcher, Chad Schonewill, Patti Spoelman, Diane Westerfield, Barbara Wilson, and Dan Johnson (chair)

The meeting opened with a brief discussion of the faculty proposal to change progression-based salary raises at the full professor level. There is a sense that some faculty are committed to changing the current system, a system which provides disincentives to retire since a faculty member's salary increases every year (given performance that is sufficient to earn progression). The AAUP tasked this committee last year with finding an alternative that might appeal to faculty, and informal polling at the Special Faculty Meeting in the fall seemed to indicate a preference for a diminishing progression structure. For example, in the first year after promotion to full professor, the faculty member would be eligible for a full progression raise. In the following year, they would be eligible for 95% of a full progression raise. By the 21st year, they would be eligible for no progression-based raise. Raises for any other reason would not be affected by this proposal, and progression at other ranks would similarly not be affected. An alternative to this proposal would be full progression eligibility for the first ten years after promotion, with diminishing eligibility amounts after that time. We would still remain committed to parity with our peers, so might have to adjust full-progression amounts, but the spirit of the proposal is to decrease the disincentives to retire, with the purpose of encouraging a refreshing of the faculty pool with younger faculty. Any proposal would go into effective during the 2012-13 academic year at the earliest.

Salary proposals have been submitted to VP Finance Robert Moore and Dean Susan Ashley. Barbara Wilson, Shaleen Prehm and Dan Johnson have had an ancillary meeting with CIGNA/Great West to clarify some concerns about health insurance coverage protocols for employees holding more than one health insurance policy.

The committee engaged in lively discussion of the relative merits of two proposals to increase benefits: one to offer vacation leave accrual to less-than-12-month non-exempt staff, and the other to offer grossing-up pay to offset the federal tax on same-sex domestic partner dependent health insurance benefits. Both proposals would cost the College approximately \$23000 to \$28000 per year, and the committee is unanimous in asserting that both address a moral statement that we would like the College to make. If we could afford to do so, the committee would encourage the College to commit to both proposals. However, if we have to prioritize, we would suggest implementing the vacation leave accrual policy first, based on two premises:

- a) It has been proposed by this committee for several years in a row, including last year when it was our second priority (after a proposal which has now been implemented); and
- b) We are currently the only ACM institution which does not offer this benefit, and we wish to assert our goal of competitiveness within that market.

These arguments do not serve to diminish the importance that we attach to the same-sex domestic partner proposal, and should there be insufficient funds to pursue it this year, we encourage the College to commit to phasing it in over the next few years instead. We also agreed that to split our current funding between the priorities, to partially fund each, might serve to diminish the message that we wish to impart.

Next, we discussed the compensation philosophy of the College. We used as our template the current statement (which all agree is not compelling or implemented in its current form), samples from other colleges and universities, and the priority statements crafted for our staff by our compensation consultant Sibson. We agreed to spend some time looking over the materials as 'homework', sending to Dan for compilation those aspects of each that we find compelling, or original pieces that we would like to see included in a statement. Crafting a draft version will be our first order of business in the Block 6 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5pm sharp.