Faculty Compensation Committee April 25, 2014

Meeting began at 5:06 pm, with Devon Hanahan (chair), Zeff Bjerken, Joshua Bond, Stephane Lafortune, Bill Olejniczak, Susan Rozzi, and Deanna Caveny (ex officio) all present. Jim Posey joined us later.

I. Minutes from the previous meeting on 2/20 were approved. Devon reported on presentation to the BOT meeting. BOT members were pleased to learn that CofC had moved up from 18th to 13th position (out of 21) in relation to faculty salaries at our CUPA peers. BOT members have expressed a genuine interest about remaining in contact with faculty members and faculty committees. Devon urged the FCC to report annually to the BOT. Devon also explained that the external salary study at the Citadel essentially accomplished what our FCC does (the Citadel does not have a compensation committee). Nonetheless, the Citadel’s average faculty salaries remain much higher than ours at CofC, which merits further investigation. Jim Posey will ask for disciplinary rank averages and medians from his IR peer at the Citadel.

II. Old Business
* Tuition reduction for faculty/staff children—we should keep this issue on the agenda for next year because it is a topic that would benefit many faculty with teenage children.

* Chair compensation project—Deanna reported that we received a report from EAB, but it only focuses on 3 institutions; one reported on base salaries, another on base plus stipend (like ours). All three institutions have “step down” practices but they are hard to interpret. The Provost will review these reports before they become available to FCC. Stephane will keep the topic of chair compensation on the agenda next year.

* PTR superior rating salary bump—Deanna reported that during a Forum in February the Provost announced some changes in the PTR review process, including the option to defer a review for superior status for a year or two. Still there is no support from the Provost office to raise the PTR amount to $6,000, but perhaps a smaller amount. How can we calculate what amount this would be? Jim could provide us with some data and then we could make a formal request.

* Gym use—Stephane sent an email to Gene Sessoms, who noted that gym use is determined by the VP of Student Affairs. Devon will contact Interim VP Jeri Cabot and ask whether faculty might use the gym during morning hours.

III. New Business

Input for 2013-14 Annual FCC report. Devon will write a draft and distribute it for feedback from committee members.
Chair of the 2014-15 Committee: Susan Rozzi was nominated as chair and there was unanimous support for her chairship. Committee members for 2014-15 include:

- Joshua Bond, Theater
- Cara Delay, History
- Stephane Lafortune, Mathematics
- Cindi May, Psychology
- Ana Oprisan, Physics and Astronomy
- Jason Overby, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Susan Rozzi, Health and Human Performance

Recommendations for next year’s committee:

- Continue chair compensation project with EAB
- Follow up on proposal to increase PTR superior salary bump
- Follow up on proposal for gym use
- Follow up on tuition reduction at CofC for faculty/staff children
- Work with Faculty Welfare Committee and Budget Committee when possible

Finally, committee members thanked Devon Hanahan for her excellent work as chair of this committee. Committee members are also very grateful for the assistance of Jim Posey, whose statistics and insights have proved invaluable to the committee.

Meeting was convened at 6:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Zeff Bjerken
Meeting began at 5:05 pm with Devon Hanahan, chair; Zeff Bjerken, Joshua Bond, Stephane LaFortune, Susan Rozzi, and Deanna Caveny-Noecker (ex officio) present.

1. Minutes from the previous meeting on 1/23/2013 were approved.

2. Devon presented Sam Jones’ trend analysis of faculty compensation. The cost analysis shows that faculty salaries and fringe benefits have increased steadily from FY 2000/2005/2010 to 2013, but the percentage of the overall budget allocated to faculty salary has remained consistent (ranging from 43.67-45.35%). However, these percentage figures do not account for changes in the overall number of faculty positions, which may have increased over the past decade. We might ask Sam Jones to give us additional data based on the total number of employees and faculty. For instance, how many faculty positions have been gained and lost during a five-year period?

3. a) Regarding an external salary study, Deanna and Devon will meet on Friday February 21 to discuss the value of such a study.

   b) Regarding the “soft benefit” of whether faculty and staff will be allowed access to the new George Street Gym, Zeff is waiting to hear from Todd McNerny, chair of the Welfare Committee. If we learn that the FWC aren’t already working on this issue, then we might draft a letter to Jeri Cabot with a request for faculty/staff access.

   c) Susan generated a concise set of questions for SC institutions regarding salary increases for Post-Tenure Review. Deanna noted that some of the questions may no longer be relevant for us after the Provost’s Workshop on T&P and PTR tomorrow (2/21), but questions 3 and 4 were still relevant. We will return to this topic at our next meeting.

4. 2013-14 CUPA-HR peer data is now available and Deanna has access to all the material that she needs. She will put together a report that takes our most recent salary increases into account so that we can determine how CofC salaries now compare to our CUPA peers.

5. There was some discussion about the best time to make our FCC progress report to the Faculty Senate, whether March 11 or April 1. Consensus emerged that we will report to the Senate on April 1 (March 11 falls right after spring break). We will also ask the Provost to include our data to the BOT for their March 20 meeting, with support from Devon if the Provost chooses to call on her to answer questions.

   Our next meeting will be March 13, 2014 to prepare the document that will be presented to BOT. We will also discuss Susan’s questions and the 2013-14 CUPA-HR data that Deanna assembles.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Zeff Bjerken
Meeting began at 5:15 pm with Devon Hanahan, chair; Zeff Bjerken, Stephane LaFortune, Bill Olejniczak, Jason Overby, and Susan Rozzi present. Jim Posey joined us mid-meeting.

1. Note on market/merit raises--faculty letters were sent out on time, dated 12/13/2013, with market/merit raises effective January 1, 2014.

2. Devon reported on the Committee Chairs’ meeting, which addressed the faculty survey on the President Search and merging with MUSC. Speaker Lynn Cherry will present a summary of the survey results to the BOT next week, and then it will be presented to the Senate on 2/4.

3. A) Sam Jones was asked about data trends in compensation, and especially what percentage of the overall budget goes to faculty compensation? Sam still hasn’t been able to get to this topic because he’s been busy with the market/merit raises. We will return to this topic next month.

B) Sam Hines also endorsed the value of a recent external salary study that was conducted at the Citadel by the Sibson Consulting Company. Bill noted that this is an important topic and strategy for our committee to pursue, one that is long overdue. Susan asked what extra value is gained from an external study when the salary data is often the same that is used in any internal study? Jim Posey answered that that while external salary studies often use a lot of the same data, their position as outside reviewers can add an objective perspective and lend more legitimacy to faculty committee salary studies--administrators often take external salary reports quite seriously.

4. Zeff provided an update on the Chair Compensation project. On 12/17 Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Bev Diamond and Zeff spoke with representatives from the Education Advisory Board (EAB) to request that they conduct a custom research project on the compensation packages for department chairs. EAB was provided with an extensive list of questions (similar to those used on a previous FCC survey) about compensation packages for chairs, and they were asked to contact our (CUPA) peer institutions; if it were necessary to move beyond that list to complete the research, EAB was advised to turn next to our Colonial Athletic Association cohorts. Upon receipt of the official request from Academic Affairs on 1/3/2014, EAB will provide the results of their research to Deanna in six weeks.

5. **New Business** included a review of Margaret Cormack’s letter about PTR “Superior” rating. It was pointed out that her complaint about retirement only applies to those faculty who participate in the State Plan. Her letter raised the question about whether we could pursue a comparative study of in-state institutions that conduct post-tenure review: what salary increase do faculty earn with an “outstanding” PTR?

**Action items:** Susan Rozzi will create some questions to pose to institutions in SC about salary bumps after the post-tenure review.

Devon will contact Sam Jones again about when he can share the updated salary data with Jim Posey. She will also draft a letter to the Provost endorsing the external salary study after consulting with Deanna

Regarding “soft benefits,” Zeff will contact someone on the Welfare Committee about whether faculty/staff will be allowed access to the new George Street Gym in the morning.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm. Our next meeting is scheduled for 2/20 at 5 pm in 128 JC Long.
Respectfully submitted,
Zeff Bjerken
Meeting began at 4:32 pm with Devon Hanahan, chair; Zeff Bjerken, Joshua Bond, Stephane Lafortune, Bill Olejniczak, Jason Overby, Susan Rozzi, and Deanna Caveny-Noecker (ex officio) present.

1. Minutes from the previous meeting on 10/24/2013 were approved

2. Spring 2014 Schedule: we will meet next semester on Thursdays from 5:00-6:30 pm. Our next meeting will take place on Thursday January 23rd in JC Long 128.

3. Committee Chairs’ Meeting report—Devon reported on news from the Presidential Search Committee; the Advisory Committee to the President is working on a survey about merging with MUSC, a topic of concern to many FCC committee members; the FCC chair compensation project has elicited great interest among other committee chairs.

4. Old Business
   a) Chair compensation project: Stephane, Zeff, and Deanna are reviewing questions to submit to EAB; they will finalize questions next week and then meet with EAB advisor and try to guide the EAB study towards our CUPA peer groups. We will send our questions to all committee members for input before we meet with the EAB advisor.
   
   b) External salary study: Devon has not heard from Sam Hines at the Citadel about this topic.
   
   c) PTR salary bump: we will defer this issue until the spring
   
   d) Deanna reported on how merit/market monies were distributed. Academic Affairs began with 2.8% (1% for market, 1.8% for merit) that was allocated to Deans of the schools. The 1% for market was distributed to schools based on last year’s CUPA-HR data point (the CUPA differential). The Deans were instructed to take into consideration the CUPA differentials, but they were not mandated to distribute the market funds along these lines. Revised salary letters are now in preparation, which will be dated December 13. The revised salary will become effective January 1, 2014 and they will first appear in the January 15th paycheck.

5. Jim Posey, VP of Institutional Research, joined us:
   1) We asked Jim to help us to prepare the spring report to the Faculty Senate in April 2014 on the progress made for faculty salary studies. Because of the government shutdown, the IPEDs data has also been unavailable. It usually becomes available in January. What Jim needs are very clear instructions from Devon about what we need for this comparative study, which will cover the period from 3/2013-4/2014.
   
   2) Discussion of Historical Trend Analysis of Select Financial Data. AVP Sam Jones put a lot of work into this report, but we will ask him to itemize it so that “personnel costs” be disaggregated by type: faculty/instructors, staff, and administrators. Jim will present committee members with this soon, perhaps even by next week.

6. New Business:
   CUPA-HR is now doing a “contingent faculty” survey; e.g. numbers of faculty, number of courses, and other factors to determine average pay.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Zeff Bjerken
Meeting began at 4:34 pm, with Devon Hanahan (chair), Zeff Bjerken, Bill Olejniczak, Susan Rozzi, and Deanna Caveny (ex officio) all present. Joshua Bond and Stephane Lafortune joined later.

1. Report on meeting with the Provost
   Devon reported that the Provost was very receptive to the Compensation Committee’s recommendations, and that he appreciated that the Committee did not suggest too many restrictions on his office. The good news: The Board of Trustees voted to designate 1.8% for merit; 1% for market increases (about 1.03 million). We can ask Jim Posey in Institutional Research to crunch the numbers to see how this will improve our CUPA “debt.” We might note in our Annual Report that there are problems with the salary increases taking place so late in the fiscal year (e.g. December or January).

2. Devon reported that the Committee Chairs meeting with Lynn Cherry, speaker of the faculty, was productive. We should think of topics that we might share with the other committee chairs, such as the Faculty Welfare committee.

3. A faculty member’s concern about the salary bump of $3,000 for a “superior” post-tenure review (PTR) is half of what one receives for promotion to full professor ($6,000) was addressed. Deanna noted that the promotion to professor is a promotion, not a renewal review. Also, there was a significant increase from $2,500 first PTR/ $500 subsequent PTRs to $3,000 first PTR/ $3000 subsequent PTRs made in 2012. Committee members agreed that rather than making a recommendation to the Provost at this time, we should wait until spring 2014 to see the numbers from salary adjustment. Then we will revisit the question of whether we can recommend an increase in the PTR “superior” salary bump, which might help address the salary compression for those at the professor rank.

4. External Salary study—we’re still waiting to hear from Sam Hines at the Citadel about the details of the external salary study that the Citadel underwent a few years ago.

5. Chair Compensation project—EAB has a huge library with best practices report and so we have access; Deanna will help Stephane and Zeff to gain access to these EAB reports and they will meet soon to analyze this data.

6. The next meeting scheduled for November 21 had to be rescheduled since neither Devon nor Zeff could be in attendance. Devon will send an email to committee members with a tentative December 5 date for our next meeting.

Action items for next meeting: report on November Senate meeting; Sam Hines perhaps; Perhaps we can work on a developing a calendar for future Compensation Committee members. We adjourned at 5:47 pm. ZB
Faculty Compensation Committee Minutes, 9.26.2013

Committee members present: Devon Hanahan, chair; Zeff Bjerken, Joshua Bond, Jason Overby, Susan Rozzi; Deanna Caveny-Noecker, ex officio

The meeting began at 4:33 with a review of the agenda:

1. Spring Schedule— if you are unable to meet on Thursday afternoon at 4:30-6:00 pm send Devon your spring schedule. If necessary, Devon will send a Doodle calendar to set up a schedule for the spring semester
2. No items were suggested for addition to our terminology list
3. Faculty feedback, pt. 1: Did Brian McGee miscalculate the 4.5%, as our anonymous faculty member suggested? No, says Deanna, because in summer 2012 we had a 3% increase added to August salary letters, and later 1.5% was then distributed in November 2012 in merit raises. The note by the anonymous faculty member may have misunderstood this process; the lack of any merit increase in August 2013 is due to the fact that the merit/market increases have yet to be calculated by Academic Affairs, Deans, and Chairs, but they are forthcoming.

In response to Meg’ Cormack’s note that the post-tenure review (PTR) “superior” salary increase is less than the salary bump for promotion to full professor: some departments have a higher requirement for promotion to Professor than the College’s requirement; in general the promotion review process for Professor is much more rigorous than the PTR review. For example, promotion to Professor requires a review by all tenured faculty (rather than the Chair alone reviewing the packet for PTR); there is no external review of research, or alumni teaching evaluations. Moreover, there has been a lot of improvement in the salary bump for PTR superior ratings increase.

Mark Del Mastro’s letter was discussed—Jason seconds Mark’s suggestion that we have an outside agency to review our compensation practices on a 4-5 year cycle to address salary compression. In future meetings we might study the efficacy of external reviews. Perhaps we can ask Mark how they did this at the Citadel—what was the process? We also might ask Jim Posey to help us with this. What leverage would an external agency review buy us?

4. There is nothing to report on the Chair compensation project. Deanna will work with Zeff and Stephane on this in October.

5. After reading the draft composed by Devon and Susan on the “Proposal for Salary Distribution 2013-14” these changes were made:

Proposal for Distribution of Salary Adjustment Funds

Given that the College of Charleston Board of Trustees approved that 1% of our salary pool be made available to address faculty and staff market adjustments and 1% be used to
address faculty and staff merit adjustments, the Faculty Compensation Committee proposes that:

• the market 1% be distributed to each school based on its departments’ proportions of the differential from the CUPA-HR means.

• any portion of the $840,000 surplus that the Board approves for faculty raises be distributed in the same manner proposed for the 1% market adjustment.

• This recommendation is made based on the data analysis for the Compensation Committee’s April 2013 resolution, approved by the Faculty Senate, to raise salaries over a period of five years to meet the CUPA-HR means of our peer institutions. The committee would like to make this data available to the deans of all schools to aid in this distribution.

Note: Don’t forget to date this version! Let’s present this information with visual data—pie charts will help the Deans and Chairs to understand what the CUPA-HR differentials are.

Committee members agreed to strike the language in the draft proposal:

• “The Provost’s office encourages the Deans of the schools to be attentive to individual cases in which faculty members with competitive salaries deserve a raise due to superior merit.

This part of the proposal is really not necessary because the revised proposal above only addresses market adjustments, and it could be misinterpreted by the Provost.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Zeff Bjerken
Committee members present: Devon Hanahan, chair; Zeff Bjerken, Joshua Bond, Stephane Lafortune, Bill Olejniczak, Jason Overby, Susan Rozzi; Deanna Caveny-Noecker, ex officio

The meeting began at 4:30 with the approval of minutes from May 7, 2013

I. Discussion of glossary of terms for committee members

What distinguishes compression vs. conversion? Deanna Caveny-Noecker will send some information to Devon about this distinction, which can be fuzzy. Deanna will also look at past reports and find what criteria were used to explain how we developed our list of CUPA-HR peers.

II. Update on Salary Proposal

How can we keep this proposal on the agenda and in the awareness of the Board of trustees (BoT)? Last year we got some traction from BoT on merit increases in salary. A presentation was made to the Academic Affairs committee; there wasn’t a great response to the report in that committee meeting. Subsequent to that meeting, the College initiated a study of staff salaries, and in June the BoT approved a budget that included a 1% merit increase for faculty and staff, a 1% market increase for faculty and staff, and approximately $840K to meet a potential 1% state-mandated cost-of-living (COLA) increase. Since there was no COLA in the final state budget, it remains uncertain whether the BoT will commit the $840K to salary increases this year; they will revisit this topic at their October meeting.

Zeff asked whether we should recommend to the Provost that the merit/market increases be made in light of CUPA-HR data? Deanna explained why it would be timely to make such a recommendation soon. Bill suggested that we review the language used in past proposals from 2011-13 to help us craft the language for the renewed recommendation to the Provost. The committee considered whether we want to modify our proposal to take into consideration faculty rank, not just discipline; proposal should include specific language on market percentage based on proportion of associate and full professors. We can also request that the Provost make recommendations to Deans about how they distribute the funds. Devon and Susan will schedule a meeting with the Provost, Bev Diamond, and Deanna.

Four Year Faculty Salary report

Deanna decoded it for new members of the committee; data is generated every February.

There was also some discussion of the merit review process, which was implemented by President Benson. Deanna reported on the Provost’s workshop last spring that addressed whether to return to a 3-year rolling evaluation cycle
for certain faculty; proposals resulting from this workshop will be developed in consultation with appropriate faculty committees sometime this fall.

III. Projects for 2013-14

**Chair compensation:** Stephane and Zeff will work with Deanna on the Chair compensation project, which will involve collecting more data from the CUPA peer institutions, perhaps by contacting those institutions with phone calls.

Devon raised the topic of **Soft Benefits**, which might include parking benefits, reduced tuition for faculty children, faculty/staff tuition reimbursements for children, complimentary tickets to sporting events; access to work out facilities.

Josh raised a concern about **additional cost expenditures, e.g. health insurance**, which are mandated by the State, and whether there some way to bring this to administration's attention. Also, regarding 403B, could institution match our contributions? We will revisit this subject in future meetings.

Respectfully submitted,

*Zeff Bjerken*