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FINANCE AND SERVICE COMMITTEE

MINUTES:
Mar 15, 2016 in CSS 119
Approved: March 15, 2016

Attending:
Faculty: Ashley Kistler, Chair; Bobby Fokidis, Secretary, Zhaochang Peng, Daniel Myers, Udeth Lugo, Michele Boulanger, CPS representative, Tom Thomason, Staff; Students: Ansh Jain, Elizabeth Patz

Guest: Craig McAllaster, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Minutes from Jan 19, 2016, meeting were approved.

Announcements:
None

Old Business:

Faculty Salary Study: McAllaster describes the current discussion regarding the compensation process started with dean, provost and HR in attendance to develop a compensation philosophy. Currently the dean along with HR decides upon salary and compensation is not discussed until up for promotion. “We ultimately want to put in a system that will monitor itself” with regard to compensation. New employees are hired with salaries at about 90-95% of those at benchmark schools, with the idea that by the time they go up for tenure they would be 100-110% of the salaries at these benchmark schools. Associates would be at about 94-95% of market of benchmark with about the same for full professor. Question for the full professor is at what point do their salaries “mature”? Asked HR to see how much we would be “out of alignment with this philosophy” and not all faculty do well. Associate professors do not always come to market, but full professors in particular take a “big hit”. Would need about $50,000 to fix the associates and about $200-$250,000 to adjust everyone to the proper brackets, but the idea is that small changes over time can correct the amounts.

Big issue is how to pick the benchmark schools. Currently, ACS or CUPA is used (we are 90+%), and US news and World report at the national level was used for benchmark, but here we are about 75% of market at similar schools. Currently 250,000 would be needed to implement philosophy.

Any Questions? Kistler: What about inequities between departments, would compensation philosophy address these issues? Also, what about inversion and compression due to lack of raises for faculty in the last three years? Can we do this now, or must we wait? McAllaster: When dean finds major inequity, we address this immediately, but we want a system that can do this automatically. Myers: Is determining the market rate done by department or by which level?
McAllister: The dean’s office usually handles this. Kistler: Is the benchmark discussion going to be part of the strategic plan? McAllister: This is part of it, but the concept is a philosophy has a system in place that tends itself, with no one falling through the cracks. Kistler: What about negotiations for new hires? McAllister: HR assists with decisions be they will already be above the goal. Fokidis: Would we compare to the strengths across schools? Schools that are better at certain programs may pay more to those faculty. McAllister: No this will all average out with many schools being examined. The other issue is compensation for rFLAs, RCCs and overloads? Implementation of stipend for compensating these is unsustainable, rFLA alone at $3500 per class, so it’s about $350,000 total per year. The Mellon grant provides $700,000 over five years to support rFLA for salary adjustments and events related to rFLA. Kistler: The old Gen Ed systems required no compensation. Maybe you get paid for the first time you teach it. The strategic plan is something we cannot do with current governance as it must be endorsed by faculty.

**Academic Space Survey:** Fokidis presented the rationale and basic structure of the academic space survey (attached) to be sent to department chairs. Fokidis: The goal of the survey is to obtain information across campus regarding space availability for teaching, offices (for faculty at all levels), and general building concerns, such as needed repairs etc. Fokidis: Although faculty have previously expressed concerns about limitations on space, there is little understanding of the degree to which this is a systemic issue. Discussion ensured and survey was endorsed and expected to be sent out in a couple of weeks.

**Revised Sabbatical Policy:** Electronic copies were previously circulated. Peng: Todd French has joined effort to develop a new proposed sabbatical policy. Obtained data on sabbaticals from the dean’s office. These include: (1) 40% of sabbaticals are full-year, with about 15 sabbaticals are taken per year; (2) the FYRST grant is essentially “guaranteed” benefit (however: McAllister interjects concerned about this wording choice, stating that its guaranteed now because financial resources are there, but if it becomes unsustainable this “guarantee” will be removed); (3) The number of replacement hire are pretty low (< ½, about 14% of total sabbaticals. (4) Despite the low percentage of hires the average cost is pretty high with it increasing over last few years (amounting to perhaps $66,000 to $110,000 per year). Peng: I met with Dean Cavenaugh and she appeared supportive of idea of financing sabbatical, but thought discussion should be part of the strategic planning stage. Our intention was to prioritize the full year paid leave in college mission. We got impression that Cavenaugh was supportive but unsure where funding would come from. Kistler: In a recent conversation, Cavenaugh was apparently not supportive of proposal as is, but suggested that if we wanted to offer a full year sabbatical, we might have a conversation about whether or not to continue issuing the FYRST grant to all and possibly reallocate this funding to provide a more competitive venture for full year. Peng: To address the financial concerns we propose three possible solutions.

1) As part of the mission of Rollins, we should promote research in a liberal arts setting and make it pragmatic to implement into classroom. A full year funded sabbatical could be on a completely competitive basis with limited number provided.

2) Voluntary course overload, although small departments can have issues implementing this solution. Professors are paid an overload comparable to now, but to get an expanded FYRST grant need to have done this at a time prior. Both Kistler and McAllister reiterated that a delayed compensation is an IRS issue, and is not possible.

3) A smaller number of expanded FYRST grants can be given which results in more compensation, but also will encourage more competition.
McAllaster: Full year sabbaticals are too expensive and departments can figure out a single semester, but a full year is hard. The number of FYRST grants is sometimes 8, sometimes 14 so might be hard to predict the financial impact. Myers: What about an external grant to supplement funds? McAllister: A FYRST grant does not allow you to work at another institution. Kistler: No schools that I know offer full-year sabbatical, even Research One institutions, and Rollins offers a generous package. Kistler: Is this what we want to do? We give a 2/3 salary now, but this might be taken away if we start to look into it too much? McAllaster: Currently about $70-$80,000 is available for FYRST, but we would have a hard time finding money. Kistler: Also what about the message being sent? People come here to teach, not to get a full-year sabbatical. Peng: We could have a survey about current sabbatical policy. How many would choose a full-year leave? Kistler: Questions about why are we so generous, etc. could be raised with this. Also could lose trust of the BoT. Myers: Can this be brought in for the strategic planning process? Kistler: This could be included as part of the discussion concerning compensation. Kistler: Should we recommend that Peng present this at strategic planning but without official endorsement or just vote now to move on to EC for discussion. Peng: Bring up at strategic planning.

New Business:

Book Buyers: Kistler: I discussed with Pat Schoknecht and she says this is an illegal activity. They should be escorted when it happens.

Other New Business? None called.

Meeting adjourned 1:33 pm.

Prepared and submitted,

H. Bobby Fokidis, Ph.D.,
Secretary