

Compensation Committee
Block 2, 2013 Meeting Minutes
Wednesday October 2

1. Introductions

Present: Tass Kelso, Susan Ashley, Sam Williams, Chad Schonewill, Nathan Raugutt, Kathy Butler, Kelley Mathers, Brenda Soto, Robert Moore, Barbara Wilson, Kristine Lang (chair)

2. Overview of this year's agenda

There has been a request from a committee member to change our meeting time to accommodate a conflicting meeting. The chair will send a calendar around to attempt to find an alternate meeting time.

Fall will be dedicated to discussion of allocation of salary pools. In our previous meeting we discussed staff salaries as a full committee. This meeting we will discuss faculty salaries as a full committee. Then we will meet separately as faculty and staff sub-committees toward the end of this meeting and another time during block 2. When we come back together at the beginning of block 3, both sub-committees should have drafts of their salary proposals. Both sub-committees should consider an increase to the TIAA-CREF contributions together with salary allocation. The Board meets Nov 8 and budget committee needs to consider our recommendations before that.

We will postpone exploratory discussions regarding potential issues for Spring semester until after the salary allocations are done. Three additional topics were suggested by committee members and will be added to the list of potential topics to explore:

1. changes in choices in the TIAA-CREF options
2. health savings account option
3. title change for staff categories

3. Summary of last year's compensation philosophy and outcomes for faculty

The three documents sent with the agenda

Faculty Salary Proposal from the 2012-2013 Compensation Committee

Response to the above Faculty Salary Proposal from the AAUP Committee

Presentation regarding next FY Faculty Salaries made by President Tiefenthaler in spring 2013

nicely summarize what happened last year. In addition, Robert Moore handed out the following document.

Overview of Faculty Salary Increases

Colorado College 2013-14

AAUP Comparative Data

| | CC | Peers | Difference |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Full Professor | \$ 126,600 | \$ 118,447 | +6.9% |
| Associate Professor | \$ 85,000 | \$ 87,218 | -2.5% |
| Assistant Professor | \$ 67,300 | \$ 69,935 | -3.8% |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| 2012-13 Total Expenditures | \$ 17,110,000 |
| 3% Salary Pool Increase | \$ 526,000 |
| “Turnover” Funds | \$ 34,700 |
| Total Available Funds | \$ 17,670,700 |

Percentage Changes in Colorado College Faculty Salaries

| | Inflation | Merit | Total |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Full Professor | 2.0% | 1.0% | 3.0% |
| Associate Professor (15+years) | 2.0% | 1.0% | 3.0% |
| Associate Professor (10-15 years) | 2.0% | 2.5% | 4.5% |
| Associate Professor (less 10) | 2.0% | 4.5% | 6.5% |
| Assistant Professor | 2.0% | 6.5% | 8.5% |

4. Discussion regarding faculty compensation

Clarification that “merit” and “progression” are synonymous. Extraordinary merit is anything beyond cost of living adjustment and merit/progression. Provided documents do not address how much extraordinary merit was awarded. This information is needed.

Mechanics of the faculty salary pool were discussed. Cost of living moves the bottom and top of the brackets for each rank. Progression is supposed to be funded by retirements. However...

1. If new faculty lines are added the money for those salaries must be added to the pool plus an additional amount (\$2000?) to ensure the pool model is self funding. This may not have happened for all new lines in the past years.

2. The pool model assumes a certain time in each faculty rank and retirement at a certain age. Faculty used to be required to retire at 65 thus ensuring the self-funding pool; however there is no longer a mandatory retirement age which can lead to insufficient money in the pool.

CC does not currently have differential salaries by field which means new hires in some fields (computer science, econ, and possibly others) are offered salaries below market. Some compensation for this may come at the full professor bracket when salaries are not compressed (as they would be at other schools for those hires making more than average at time of hire). Completely inadequate start up funds in the sciences can also make us non-competitive for hires. We may discuss the issues of differential salaries by field and start up funds again in the spring.

The full committee meeting was ended and the faculty and staff sub-committees met separately.

5a. Meeting of the faculty subcommittee

The following issues of allocation need to be considered:

- Should we continue to advocate matching our peer institutions by rank?
 - Differential salaries by field paid at other schools may raise their averages by virtue of a few outliers. Thus, it may be appropriate that our assistant professor salaries do not match the averages at institutions that pay differential salaries.
- Should we advocate an increase in the TIAA-CREF retirement contribution?
 - If we do, it should be the same for faculty and staff.
- Should extraordinary merit be paid to base or as a bonus? How large an amount should this be?
 - History of this is that before about 2006 extraordinary merit was paid as a bonus. Then the faculty voted to pay it to base, which was done for two years until the economic crisis in 2008. Then there was no extraordinary merit paid at all for some years. How it is paid now is not known by the committee. It has not been (perhaps until this year) a substantial amount of money in any case.

We need to collect the following data in order to properly address the issues above. We will send an email to Sandi Wong and Robert Moore to request this information.

All the below questions regard the 2013-2014 salaries.

- Questions about merit/progression
 - How is merit/progression related to performance? Is the purpose of merit/progression to move faculty through the salary brackets for anyone performing adequately? Or is it tied more strongly to performance?
 - How many faculty did not get any progression? How many faculty did not get full progression?
 - Were the progression increases fixed size steps for a given rank or was progression calculated as a percent of the faculty member's salary?
- Questions about extraordinary merit
 - Was extraordinary merit paid to base or as a bonus?
 - How much is the total extraordinary merit pool and how many people were awarded extraordinary merit?
 - Did extraordinary merit payments come from the faculty salary pool?
- Statistics on faculty salaries
 - What are the average salaries by rank for our 17 peer institutions?
 - What is the total of all salary paid to faculty?
 - How many faculty are there at each rank?
 - What was the top salary in each bracket? What was the bottom salary in each bracket?
 - Ideally we'd like a histogram of faculty salaries by rank.
- Questions about retirement contributions
 - What is the institutional contribution to retirement funds at comparable institutions?

We also need to know what the AAUP is planning and we will send an email to find this out.

5b. Meeting of the staff subcommittee

Notes provided in form of draft salary report from staff committee.

Respectfully submitted by

Kristine Lang

Chair of the Compensation Committee