

## COMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION

### Block 2 Minutes

October 11, 2010

Present: Peggy Berg, Marion Hourdequin, Karen Klein, Chris Melcher, Shaleen Prehm, Chad Schonewill, Patti Spoelman, Alex Vargo, Diane Westerfield, Barbara Wilson, Armin Wishard, and Dan Johnson (chair)

We opened the meeting with Barbara's report that the Mountain States Employers Report projects an average 2.2% rise in compensation for Colorado Springs. The official CPI value to be used by the Compensation Committee this year will be 1.48%, according to the method we adopted in the spring.

A faculty member had requested that our committee discuss the way in which teaching loads are evaluated here at the College, relative to our peers, specifically with respect to lab sessions. We discussed the issue, but concluded that it could not be discussed in isolation, and should really be within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Executive Committee to consider alongside thesis supervision and enrollments. Dan will communicate that recommendation promptly to the faculty member who requested consideration.

We continued our discussion of offering additional compensation to same-sex domestic partners, looking at approximate data on vision/dental/health insurance benefits. They are complicated because their treatment depends upon whether children are the natural or adoptive children of a parent, and which parent is a College employee. We also naturally have incomplete information on current partners, as this is not an issue upon which we require disclosure to the College. Naturally, we also have no information on the specific tax rates that individuals or families face, so cannot precisely calculate the tax penalties incurred. We have new appreciation for the reasons behind the simplicity of the fixed-dollar solution that one peer institution has implemented. We sent the data back to Human Resources for further clarification on the precise costs to the College of offsetting the tax penalties (or grossing up the salaries) taking into account the marriage tax penalty that would be incurred if same-sex couples were allowed to, and elected to, marry within our state.

We had a long discussion about the potential for vacation leave for less-than-12-month, non-exempt staff, a proposal which we made last year but ranked second in priority behind securing sick leave for all employees. We have cost estimates, but these are upper bounds because they presuppose that we replace staff on vacation time with a replacement. We might talk to supervisors (VPs and directors, academic chairs, Faculty Executive Committee) about the potential for time-shifting to permit choice in vacation time without incurring financial costs for the costs. Accrual rates will probably depend on longevity as well as employment status (i.e. prorated for less-than-12-month employees to match 12-month employee rates).

Dan will forward a copy of the official Compensation Philosophy Statement, so that we can all read it and contemplate rewording. Barbara will send the final report of the Reclassification Working Group to the whole committee as well, for our consideration.

The major item of business ahead of us this month is the formulation of salary proposals for both staff and faculty. The faculty version will be shared privately with the AAUP, and then with the faculty as a whole at a public forum in Block 3 or 4. The staff proposal will go directly to Barbara Wilson and Robert Moore, with a report to Staff Council.