

# ***Compensation and Benefits Committee***

## ***Meeting Minutes***

October 1, 2013

### **I. Call to order**

Stephen Theriault called to order the regular meeting of the Committee at 10:00 AM on October 1, 2013 at MH 110.

### **II. Roll call**

Gretchen conducted roll. The following persons were present: Stephen Theriault, Peter Bagley, Tami Potter, Jon Licht, Mary Swetich, Janie Moore, George Kleeb, Sonja Sibert, and Gretchen Skivington

Excused” Tami Gailey

The minutes were approved as posted September 10, 2013.

### **III. Open issues**

#### a) Professional Development Fund Requests

- 1) Two were submitted to Committee for consideration.
- 2) General discussion regards appropriate protocols and documentation.
- 3) It was decided that applicants had to include at a minimum the Formal Request Form and the Checklist for consideration. Each has to be complete and signed by appropriate parties before consideration will be given.
- 4) Additional conversation regards informing faculty about the funding limitations and need to submit proper and timely forms. Chair will draft an email to all faculty as an informational note to advise.
- 5) Both applications were returned to the applicants for completion.

#### b) Merit Pay Proposal

- 1) Clarification of eligible persons.
  - a. Dean and above (VP's & President), plus classified staff are not allocated from this merit pool, this does not mean they do not have “merit pay” in other forms.

b. This is also the case with salary/grant “soft” money dispersements such as contract training (MTC) or so-called “self-supporting” faculty positions.

c. ACADEMIC FACULTY EVALUTATIONS 2012

i. No faculty were deemed “unsatisfactory” All faculty were evaluated as satisfactory or above with a much smaller distribution at the “excellent” range.

ii. Caveat: There were a few evaluations not included in the totals provided for reasons unknown. List below is smaller than anticipated due to that factor and attrition.

1. Tenure Track & Non Tenure Track

a. Excellent: 5

b. Commendable: 7

c. Satisfactory: 1

d. Unsatisfactory: 0

2. Tenured

a. Satisfactory or Higher: 33

b. Unsatisfactory: 0

d. ADMINSTRATIVE FACULTY EVALUATIONS 2012

i. Current Evaluation form needs update and process improvement prior to Merit Implementation

ii. Evaluation Committee meetings with Compensation & Benefits Chair ongoing to focus on alignment with current improved Teaching Faculty Evaluation process.

iii. The goal is to remove as much of the subjective nature at the final review step by superiors and provide the administrative faculty with a variety of criteria to meet goals.

1. Administrative Faculty 2012

- a. Excellent: 2
- b. Commendable: 33
- c. Satisfactory: 4
- d. Unsatisfactory: 0

e. Chancellor Emphasis

- i. Merit awards are to be based on “meritorious” service. It is not a replacement for the step system which is no longer part of the total compensation considerations.
  - ii. Committee to present anticipated time line to the Chancellor for program development and implementation. Committee to review proposed time line drafted by Chair and respond with feedback by Wednesday evening with feedback for modifications or inclusions.
- f. Committee Member Jon Licht brought up the fact that currently, tenured faculty do not have the four categories for identification of service but rather they are rated as “satisfactory or higher” or unsatisfactory. It was discussed by committee and believed that this can be changed at the institution level so the tenured faculty’s final superior review has the four categories in alignment with the Faculty Self-Evaluation rating. Chair will confirm and advise.

2) Issue was fully address and Equity/Salary Compression implemented July 2013

**IV. New business**

- a) Merit pay plan proposal subcommittee formation
  - 1) The Chair has started to draft a proposal based on the Western Virginia CC template and it is thought by many that a couple of different

approaches to merit would be a good thing. As such, the Chair requested volunteers to form a subcommittee to review the OCR data and formulate a proposal based on this data because the new faculty evaluation form was created using this research as a foundation. Subcommittee to meet Thursday morning and present initial findings to Committee at the Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

i. Committee consists of the following members:

ii. George Kleeb

iii. Janie Moore

iv. Tami Potter

v. Peter Bagley

b. Chair cautioned regards the OCR data that there are three options presented and to keep our audience in mind. A simple, easy to understand proposal will gain acceptance and buy-in faster than a complicated one.

## **2) Adjournment**

Stephen Theriault adjourned the meeting at 11:23 AM.

Minutes submitted by: Gretchen Skivington

Minutes approved by: Stephen Theriault