



had said that the place of the mention of compensation in the plan was not meant to be indicative of its priority or rank in priority – that compensation was, in fact, a top priority. A member of the administration agreed that this was correct.

Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #3, referring to his/her handout [see Attachment A], recalled the last year of the FPPC (Financial Policy and Planning Committee), when cost sharing for health care was added. S/he had heard at the time that savings realized by cost sharing would be directed to GSA. (S/he asked that everyone keep in mind that the staff is worse off than the faculty, and that “faculty-staff” be heard if he said “faculty.”) Referring to the “Real GSA” (GSA – inflation) column of his handout, S/he noted that cost sharing had not been deducted from this column. S/he estimated the net loss, due to inflation and cost sharing, of the average Skidmore salary to be approximately \$2000 for 2005. S/he then referred to the comparison group rankings, and noted that we have lost ground. How are we going to make up the lost ground and re-attain the 9<sup>th</sup> out of 17 ranking target? Optimization [in effect a workload increase] amounts to a decrease in our hourly wage rate. When are we going to accomplish our targets? The situation is demoralizing – some faculty members are [financially] OK for various reasons, some families are totally dependent on Skidmore salary.

A member of the administration noted that last year the college had allocated \$500,000 on top of GSA primarily to enhance the Assistant Professor rank (some of this was used for equity adjustments). Next year \$400,000 is in the budget for similar enhancements elsewhere. In addition, two scheduled increases in cost sharing percentages have been deferred. The ranking of 9<sup>th</sup> out of 17 was not a reality three years ago; perhaps it was a reality much longer ago. Finally, the 3% GSA for next year [without optimization] has been set, but this may not be the final figure, as various items (e.g., new initiatives) remain unsettled.

A Professor in the Social Sciences observed that the decrease of 1% of salary in annual contributions to retirement represented a significant loss to young faculty.

An Associate Professor in the Sciences observed that the Full Professor rank has been badly managed for 20 years. Some faculty have been in the Associate rank for 25+ years. We are out of whack on the Associate/Full ratio. We’re almost at the bottom of our new cohort. Overall compensation is falling as well; in the past, overall compensation used to be a plus for us. Lip service has been paid to these problems for years. S/he said s/he wasn’t blaming Mike West – he’s new.

A Professor in the Arts returned to the question of optimization by asking: What are the impacts? Additional students cost money in additional beds, food, computers, etc. S/e requested that these incremental costs be broken out, along with the additional work on the backs of the faculty. S/he expressed his hope that the additional dollars be allocated to salaries, after the incremental costs are covered. How many students *can* we handle? Why are these numbers not available?

A member of the administration stated that the cost of 130 additional students “is a step function.” One additional student generates little additional cost other than financial aid and food. There were 100 students housed in triples last year. The discussion [of incremental costs versus (largely) faculty compensation?] has not yet occurred.

Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #4 returned to Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #1's question, and asked a member of the administration [I believe] about the Strategic Plan and its independence (or not) from the incremental funds raised by optimization. In response to a question, A member of the administration stated that Skidmore's target (financial aid) discount rate is 30%.

Full Professor in the Humanities #1 asked: What is to become of the \$2.8 million in additional funds? S/he stated that he would be disappointed if these dollars were not allocated to the academic program, and that academics needed to lay claim to these funds. There are different academic targets for these monies; S/he stated that he thought they should be dedicated to compensation.

Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #3 asked about the issue of tradeoffs. S/e suggested that we revisit course releases: 90 releases = 15 FTE. Some releases are necessary, but... We should critically examine existing structures and practices, and not simply live with them.



appointed interim VPAA-DOF and it was a turbulent time. Later in the meeting Chuck spoke directly to this question.

The Full Professor in the Arts expressed support for a resolution, for a task force, and for an action if we're not satisfied.

Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #4 returned to her/his question to a member of the administration: Full Professor in the Humanities #2 and the Associate Professor in the Sciences had suggested that the Board is unaware of our needs, but a member of the administration had stated that the Board *is* aware. Is the Board asking us to change next year's budget? A member of the administration responded by saying that discussions regarding the relative priorities of new positions, new initiatives, and salaries had not yet occurred, and that there are tensions among these competing goals on IPPC.

A member of the administration noted that departmental operating budget increases were capped at 2% this year. Supplies and services represent a major portion of the budget. One must recall these needs in the discussion.

Full Professor in the Sciences #2 (who had only recently entered the meeting) asked if anyone had mentioned the Faculty Salary Committee of yore, on which s/he had served early in his career. The late 1970s were a time of double-digit inflation and (at Skidmore) merit increases. The salary committee had proposed that no merit increases be awarded until cost-of-living had been covered, and the college accepted this proposal. Full Professor in the Sciences #2 stated that one's level of compensation directly affects one's efforts (for example, he teaches at XXX in the summers in part because the pay is better).

Chuck Joseph recalled that he had asked the faculty to "back off" [of a motion/protest] at the time of the 0% GSA, and that he hadn't forgotten. He stated that in his view the Board has "moved" over the past three years, partly due to their trust in the current administration. He urged the faculty to look at the final optimization report before drafting motions, and to think carefully about the purpose of a resolution.

Associate Professor in the Social Sciences #5 seconded the call for a task force, and asked the appropriate committees to consider its creation. S/e could use help in weighing what is fair.

The announced ending time of 5:30 having been reached, Tim Burns thanked those present for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Huibregtse



**Attachment B:** Document presented by Associate Professor in the Humanities #2

I think the overall point is that compensation has lagged too far behind other college goals and that this is the time to say that it needs to be a priority. As you can see below, compensation is a part of the Strategic Plan, but at this point I think we could say that it must be the priority – that none of the other initiatives will work without a fairly compensated staff.

"Goal IV – Independence and Resources

We will preserve Skidmore's independence by developing the resources required to realize our aspirations.

Priority Initiatives

- Ø Develop and enhance our key financial resources and our capacity to manage them.
- Ø Achieve and maintain competitive compensation for Skidmore faculty, staff, and administrators; enhance our ability to support their professional development.

The task force will have to consider how to redistribute funds – which programs, initiatives, and even positions should be curtailed or cut in order to fund compensation?

If we agree to a short-term goal of a market adjustment, then by when do we want to implement the results of the task force? How do we ensure that the task force report and recommendations are heeded, in the short- and long-term? Does the faculty wish to discuss strategies that might encourage administration to respond effectively? (I have heard ideas that range from a one-day strike to boycotting graduation.)

#### Compensation issues (1)

##### Staff Salary

- comparison with peers

##### Faculty Salary

- comparison with peers
- ratio to staff salaries
- disciplinary differences
  - ethical considerations
  - external vs. internal market forces
- pay scale for former administrators?

##### Administrators' salary

- comparison with peers
- ratio to staff salaries
- ratio to faculty salaries

##### Benefits

##### Distribution of research monies

- Ad hoc grants – to whom, by discipline, and how much?
- FDG – ditto

##### Course Release

- course releases function as compensation – are they equitably distributed? (I realize that FEC is looking into this)

#### Compensation issues (2)

##### Benefits

##### Distribution of research monies

- Ad hoc grants – to whom, by discipline, and how much?
- FDG – ditto

##### Course Release

- course releases function as compensation – are they equitably distributed? (I realize that FEC is looking into this)



