

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, 4 March 2020 Meeting, 2:15 p.m.

Members Attending: Vibha Kapuria-Foreman, Economics; Heather Kissack, Human Resources; Dennis McEnnerney, Philosophy (acting chair); Robert Moore, Finance & Administration; Jazmine Newsom, Accounting; Sara Rotunno, Accessibility Resources; William Schiffelbein, Admissions; April Scriven, Mail Services; Christiane Steckenbiller, German; Lucie Tennis, ITS

Visitor Attending: Laurie Mazingo, Human Resources

1. Laurie Mazingo reported on the College's EyeMed vision coverage renewal, in order to seek feedback on the alternatives available. Fees for the vision plan will increase this coming year from the current \$5.56 for the employee only monthly rate to \$6.39 if the College simply renews. HR decided to ask for options, most of which increase benefits in return for some increase in the monthly fee. Laurie noted that the overall cost of the benefit has been quite low, though the benefit itself has been somewhat limited. A large percentage of employees enroll themselves (and their families), though exit interviews indicate that the benefit is not regarded as especially good.

EyeMed offered three options, in addition to simple renewal. Option 1 would increase the allowance for new frames from \$120 to \$135, with a monthly premium rising to \$6.65. Option 2 would give employees the option of either a very minimal program, with coverage of just one annual eye examination for an in-network copay of \$10 at a cost of 59 cents per month; or coverage largely similar to our existing coverage at a cost of \$7.71. Option 3 would reduce the in-network copay for an exam to zero, increase the frame allowance to \$135, and allow for new frames annually, rather than semi-annually, as in our current plan and in options 1 and 2. The cost of option 3 would be \$8.04 per month. Option 4 would be the same as option 3, except with a \$10 copay for eye examinations, at a rate of \$7.42 per month.

The committee discussed the options, with some concern raised about requiring employees to pay more. However, after considering the fact that the actual costs are minimal, that there have been no increases for some time, and that the overall increases in medical, dental, and vision care insurance premiums remain relatively low, the committee recommended option 3.

2. The committee then discussed concerns raised by some staff members about parking – specifically that, because of the way spaces are allocated, some staff members have to park far from their buildings. Two specific concerns were raised: safety at night and the challenge of academic staff members having to carry supplies into their buildings over relatively long distances. For the most part, committee members did not think these concerns were significant enough to warrant action at this point. Instead, the committee welcomed more specific queries from staff members, explaining what they see as the problem and, perhaps, suggesting solutions.

3. Heather Kissak responded to a query concerning the possibility of allowing employees to transfer unused vacation time, sick days, or Tiger days to other employees, when those other employees find themselves in great need, as, for example, if they lose their houses in fires, have deaths in the family, are undergoing cancer or other intensive treatments, and so on. Heather reported that she was familiar with arrangements like these at other institutions, except that in those cases donations went to a pool open to all employees. She reported that allowing transfers from one employee to another could be seen as unfair. She said that the system she was familiar with worked well, though in fact the pool of donated days often exceeded the need. The committee discussed the matter, noting that the benefits offered at CC are already quite generous and creating this kind of pool may be unnecessary. The committee was not especially opposed to the idea of a donated pool of workdays, but for now saw no pressing need to act.
4. Heather Kissak then followed up on several items related to Human Resources:
 - a. Concerning the plan to conduct a pay equity analysis, she reported that HR would likely pay for adding a module to its MarketPay program, which would allow for more effective analyses. However, HR has decided to wait until its new staff member specializing on equity and inclusion matters is hired this coming summer. Since that person would be responsible for carrying out these studies, Heather thought best to wait and make sure the new staff member concurs that adding the module is the best alternative.
 - b. Concerning the schedule for revision of the performance review process, Heather reported that no changes would be made this year because the staff member who will be responsible for that analysis has yet to be hired. The initial search for that staff member failed, and now the search is in its second round. Heather was optimistic that the hire would go well and that, once the new staff member is on campus, it should be possible to review management procedures, including both the performance review process and equity and inclusion policies and programs.
 - c. Heather also reported that HR is drafting an employee survey that, among other things, will ask employees about their experiences with and opinions about the College's family leave policy. The survey should be completed and sent out later this spring.
 - d. Heather then explained the rationale behind the move to shift responsibility for negotiations over salaries offered to new hires from the group or division leader hiring to an HR staff member. Allowing those leaders to make offers and conduct negotiations had at least two problems: inconsistency (since many lack experience in negotiations) and a lack of knowledge of pay for comparable jobs on campus. HR now has a staff member who has both expertise in negotiation and knowledge about pay for comparable jobs at the College. Heather reported that since the change, the College has made about 60 job offers with only four offers being declined – and two of those offers were for temporary positions, while another was funded by a grant that limited the pay that could be offered.

5. Finally, Heather also offered some thoughts on how to help make the Committee's work more effective. One challenge with the Committee is the turnover in its membership – something we can't do much about immediately. But Heather offered to include the Committee in HR's survey work – finalizing surveys and then reporting back on the survey to help the Committee make decisions based more on systematic data collection and analysis than on responding to problems that arise in ad hoc manners. When asked whether there would be an employee climate survey, Heather replied that one was overdue. After conducting the employee survey being drafted for this spring, HR will turn to preparing and conducting a climate survey next year.