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I. Call to Order
II. Approval of Minutes
III. Announcements
IV. New Business
   a. Revised Proposals for the Faculty c/o Task Force on Undergraduate Curriculum
   b. Report c/o Task Force on Faculty Compensation
V. Committee Reports
   a. Executive Committee (Dexter Boniface)
   b. Curriculum Committee (Mario D’Amato)
   c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Eric Smaw)
Present
Agee, Sharon; Anderson, Mark; Armenia, Amy; Barnes, Melissa; Bernal, Pedro; Biery-Hamilton, Gay; Boles, Bill; Bommelje, Rick; Boniface, Dexter; Brandon, Wendy; Brown, Shan-Estelle; Brown, Victoria; Carnahan, Sharon; Cavenaugh, Gregory; Cavenaugh, Jennifer; Chambliss, Julian; Charles, David; Cohen, Ed; Cook, Gloria; Cook, Tom; Cooperman, Hilary; Coyle, Whitney; Crozier, Dan; D’Amato, Mario; Davidson, Alice; Davison, Joan; Decker, Nancy; Dennis, Kimberly; DiQuattro, Marianne; Dunn, Stacey; Ewing, Hannah; Fetscherin, Marc; Foglesong, Rick; Fokidis, Bobby; French, Todd; Gilmore, Zackary; Grau, John; Gunter, Mike; Habgood, Laurel; Hammonds, Joshua; Harris, Paul; Harwell, Jonathan; Hewitt, Scott; Homrich, Alicia; Houndonougbo, Nick; Kenyon, Erik; Kistler, Ashley; Kline, Nolan; Kypraios, Harry, N; Libby, Susan; Lines, Lee; Luchner, Andrew; Mays, Dorothy; McClure, Amy; McLaughlin, Jim; Mesavage, Matilde; Mesbah, Hesham; Miller, Robert; Moore, Thomas; Morrison, John; Mourino, Edwin; Murdaugh, Anne; Musgrave, Ryan; Newcomb, Rachel; Nichter, Matthew; Niles, Nancy; Nodine, Emily; Norsworthy, Katherine; O’Sullivan, Maurice; Ouellette, Thomas; Palladino, Derrick; Park, Ellane; Patrone, James; Pett, Timothy; Pieczynski, Jay; Pistor, Dena; Queen, Jenny; Ray, Jamey; Reich, Paul; Richard, David C.S.; Riley, Kasandra; Rogers, Donald; Rundell Singer, Susan; Russell, Emily; Ryan, MacKenzie Moon; Sardy, Marc; Schoen, Steven; Sharek, Julie; Singaram, Raja; Smaw, Eric; Stephenson, Bruce; Stephenson, Paul; Stone, Anne; Strom, Claire; Summet, Valerie; Sutherland, Katie; Svitavsky, Bill; Tillmann, Lisa; Vander Poppen, Robert; Vitray, Rick; Walsh, Susan; Walton, Rachel; Warnecke, Tonia; Wellman, Debra; Witmer, Sunni; Yu, Jie; Zhang, Wenxian

Call to Order
Faculty President Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:34 pm.

Approval of the Minutes
Approval of the CLA faculty meeting minutes from March 2, 2017.
Minutes approved by voice vote.

Announcements
Boniface: "The divisional cycle of faculty governance elections to standing committees has concluded. Congratulations to Jana Mathews, Laurel Habgood, Amy Armenia, Jamey Ray, Mario D’Amato, James Patrone, Dan Chong, Eric Smaw, Emily Nodine, and Shan-Estelle Brown on being elected!

The next cycle of faculty governance elections, including at-large positions and advisory
committees, commences today. I am issuing the call for nominations now. Nominations will be open for one week and will close on March 30 at which time the ballot will be distributed. The actual elections will take place at the Faculty Meeting on April 6 at which time nominations will also be accepted from the floor.

We are seeking nominees to the following positions: President of the Faculty, Curriculum Committee (one at-large vacancy for a two-year term), Faculty Affairs Committee (three at-large vacancies, two for a two-year term and one for a one-year term), Diversity Council (six divisional vacancies for a two-year term), the Faculty Advisory Committee to International Programs (three at-large vacancies for two-year term), Internationalization (two at-large vacancies for a three-year term), and Student Life (four at-large vacancies, three for two years, one for one year).

At the April 6 meeting, we also anticipate a vote to ratify the proposed slate of faculty to serve on FEC. The EC has composed the slate and it will be distributed at least one week in advance of the April 6 meeting.

Rick Vitray: My recollection of the governance reform process was that we would endeavor to have a streamlined organization and that we would minimize committee work. We’re currently seeking over 20 people, not including those who are already elected. This doesn’t seem streamlined to me.

Boniface: We had an explosively large number before and we’ve shrunk it a little bit. There’s a current opportunity in strategic planning to consolidate Internationalization and FACIP.

New Business
Proposal: Revised proposals for the Faculty c/o Task Force on Undergraduate Curriculum [Attachment #1]

Mario D’Amato: I am bringing three motions to the floor. The first motion is for a deferred, deliberative declaration of major.

Rick Vitray: second

D’Amato: The only change to the proposal from what was previously discussed is that we removed RCC as one of the possible classes outside of the division. Now, students can include rFLA or competencies, but not RCC.

Thomas Ouellette: To whom does the reflection go?
D’Amato: Currently we’re thinking it will go to department chairs. I will go to the department chairs meeting to tweak the proposed form by Tiffany Griffin. We want to do this lightly and not make it burdensome.

Dave Richard: The proposal says “all students.” Does it apply to Holt students?
D’Amato: No, only CLA students.

Eric Smaw: What if a student doesn’t do the reflection?
D’Amato: When students go on Foxlink, they’ll be prompted to fill it out or they can’t select a major.

Paul Harris: Call the question.

Gloria Cook: I need to speak on this proposal from the perspective of the music department. . .
Robert Vander Poppen: There is a motion on the floor to call the question.
Gloria Cook: This proposal really impacts how the music department will recruit students. They are attracted to the music department because they want to study with certain professors and their scholarships are tied to their major declaration in the first year.
D’Amato: I’m glad you raised this. With this plan students won’t just be declared as “exploring” they’ll have the option of being “exploring—major X.” We’ve worked with development and admissions to confirm, backed up by the provost and the president as well, that scholarships tied to specific majors will still be in place. “Exploring—music” could change to “Music” as soon as the end of the first semester.
Vander Poppen: We need to vote on call the question.
Boniface: Seeing no hands, we can take the motion to a vote.
Vote: Motion passes with 67% approval.

D’Amato: Second Motion is for departmental assessment of optimum number of students.
Lisa Tillmann seconded
Jenny Queen: Is this number published somewhere?
D’Amato: Two and three really go together, but they had previously been circulated independently. This would become information for curriculum committee to use in evaluating line requests.
Queen: So if we’re not requesting a line, we don’t need to worry about it?
D’Amato: Yes.
Joan Davison: current faculty means “as of today”?
D’Amato: Yes.
Davison: “Current faculty” is totally quantitative, not given to disciplinary spread within departments. Certain people can teach topics in departments that other people can’t. How does this proposal account for that?
D’Amato: Our committee was thinking about the charge regarding the balance of majors. This question will be up to departments. Who knows best how this will work out? The departments or program directors themselves.
Maurice O’Sullivan: I’d like to speak against this because I think this is a significant movement away from the history of higher education which has always relied on peer review. Allowing the English department to decide that we need 1000 majors is irrational. This looks more like renaissance Italy than contemporary higher education.
D’Amato: I think that peer review is very much built into this and it furthers that principle. It asks departments to make a case for the size of their major, to then be looked at by curriculum committee and executive committee. Departments will need to demonstrate that they are thinking carefully about numbers and their distribution—as psychology did years ago.
Don Rogers: How does this allow us to make adjustments? We have had in the last 30 years a number of occasions where there were huge changes in the number of students in a relatively short period of time. It’s not an unknown phenomenon. How does this let us adjust?
D’Amato: You come up with different accounts at different times. We have nothing formally in place so far that says departments should be thinking about rapid growth or
loss. The principle is that it is a worthwhile exercise for departments to be asking these questions.

Cook: We have outside accreditors in music and I don’t know how faculty load count as governed by external bodies would be addressed by this proposal.

D’Amato: The proposal locates responsibility to make the case in the hands of departments themselves; external accreditors could be part of that case.

Vander Poppen: call the question

Marc Sardy: I’m not sure what kind of measure would be taken if a department misses its number one way or another. At the end of the day, that puts a lot of students in the college out of classrooms. If you miss a target on the low end, what happens then?

D’Amato: Regarding the low end, strategies addressing how to help smaller majors to grow would be best implemented through the new associate dean of academics and the dean’s office, in partnership with curriculum committee. If these proposals will get any traction, it’s holding departments to account during the process of approving new lines.

Vote to call the question: approved by 70%

Vote on the motion: Approved by 55%

D’Amato: The third motion is for departmental self-regulation of student numbers using autonomous curricular measures.

Harris: We’re voting on what departments should consider?

D’Amato: We’re voting on standard operating procedure for Curriculum Committee.

Call the question.

Vote: Approved by 68%

Report c/o Task Force on Faculty Compensation

Boniface: I need to ask of this body that you let them get through their presentation without stopping for questions throughout. Afterward we will have time to discuss it and there will be colloquies announced.

Stacey Dunn: Thank you for this time to present today on our process and progress toward addressing salary compensation issues. Today we will review the charge, our work to date along with preliminary results, and we will outline what our next steps are to keep this process moving forward.

Before we go further, we first want to acknowledge a few things and share some insight into this process that we think will be helpful for you to know.

First, pay is an emotional issue.

Addressing the issue of pay unleashes many psychological and logistical complexities.

Pay has been described as “a status-laden, envy-inspiring, politically charged monster. Getting it right is crucial, and that begins by not underestimating its hazards.”

We conflate how much we make with our professional and sometimes even personal worth.
We have a long history of not talking about pay. For those of us who have worked in the public sector, salary transparency was the norm and largely a non-issue, but in the private sector and certainly here at Rollins there has been a culture of privacy around pay. The more we openly talk about pay, as we are doing now, the more likely we are to have positive outcomes like fairness and equity.

With that said, I want to acknowledge your frustration. Frustration with all the hurts of the past regarding pay and frustration with our current efforts seeming too slow and too opaque. We share your frustration. It may seem that this would be a very straightforward process, but I assure you it is not. There are many complexities.

In fact, the committee spent a great deal of time just trying to figure out how to best go about addressing the charge in a way that will be satisfying for the faculty. There were many different ways we could have gone about this and for each way we foresaw potential pitfalls and criticisms.

We could have jumped right into the task of coming up with a compensation philosophy, but ultimately the taskforce moved in the direction of first doing the research to capture a picture of what our pay actually looks like. Rather than build a philosophy that is reactive to our beliefs about how we are paid with all sorts of assumptions that might be inaccurate (such as differences based on discipline or gender), it seemed like a valuable first step to provide you with the data so you can react to what actually is happening and then launch a more informed and meaningful discussion of how we would like it to be.

What may have seemed to you like a lack of transparency, was simply a difficult start into a new task for the faculty. What you missed out on was just a huge number of email exchanges regarding requests for data. And here is where I would like to acknowledge the efforts of Eric Smaw who worked tirelessly (and I mean that literally) with both Udeth Lugo in Institutional Research and Matt Hawks in HR to retrieve and organize the data we needed to answer the basic questions we will review with you today. And special thanks to Anne Murdaugh who conducted several analyses that she will present in just a moment.

Murdaugh: [See attachment #2]

Dunn: You are all invited to discussion groups, some by rank, some open. The Qualtrics survey will follow these groups.

Rick Fogle song: Gee. I'm a little disappointed. I'm a little disappointed that after this subcommittee took so very long that they did not come forward to recommend the big raise for us that I think we deserve. I think we deserve it after five years of being asked to accept little or no salary increases. I'm also disappointed in process, where in the future we'll be splintered into small groups before coming back to vote instead of an exchange of the full faculty. I'm trying to be understanding. The most telling part of the
presentation was the charge. This was a charge to be part of management and to figure out a salary policy for the college. If I was president of the college, I can see why that would be appealing. It’s probably what they teach over in the Crummer School. As I read this report, I thought of how it would be different if it were prepared by a labor union bargaining committee. If I were serving in that role, my first question would be: what are you going to do to compensate for the meager pay we have received for the past five years? That would be the first question and that would be the leading question for our representative. The second question would be about the ratio of faculty salaries to senior administration salaries. The third question would be the faculty salary pool, budgeting for it, protecting it against dilution, hiring too many faculty at wages too high. We have a problem with our governance system. This is the first time I have said this publically. Marx called it Foremanism. We think we’re part of the administration and we’re not. We think our interests are the same, and on issues of money, they’re not. I’m for equity, but we need to address the salary pool more broadly. I think 4 is a good number. I think we should have a 4% pay increase with adjustments made for gender equity. I plan to introduce a motion at the next meeting to that effect and I hope it receives a second.

**Dunn:** In the steps moving forward, one of the recommendations we have is to include an external reviewer to work with Matt and Udeth to preserve interests of confidentiality.

**O’Sullivan:** I want to thank you. This is the fullest explanation we’ve had of salaries in a long time. I haven’t consulted with SACS in a long time, but when I did, one of the things committees looked at was a kind of shorthand: they would combine student tuition and endowment spent per student. To determine whether our resources were being spent appropriately, I would recommend looking at a similar measure.

**Dunn:** The way the benchmark group was determined took account of many of those factors.

**Sharon Carnahan:** I’d like to start by adding my thanks to the committee. One of the questions you asked earlier was about our tolerance for discipline-based differences in base pay. I have a great deal of tolerance for differences among disciplines, within normal limits. However, I have very little tolerance for outliers. Along those lines I would add to Rick’s ask for 4%: anyone who is below two levels of standard deviation in base pay by years of service deserves an immediate meeting with administrators. I also want to ask, how was the data at rank influenced by outliers?

**Murdaugh:** That data wasn’t given to me. You’ve seen what I’ve seen.

**Susan Singer:** One of the things you might consider in small group discussions is your openness to whether a small group of faculty could be empowered to see some of that more confidential data. The tension is between transparency and confidentiality. Grant and I have no interest in keeping secrets about pay, but we want to respect faculty concerns about confidentiality. It might be that a small group—perhaps FAC—could examine those data.

**Adjournment**

Dexter Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:47 pm.
1. Deferred, deliberative declaration of major

Conceptual underpinnings:
- Students should experience a variety of classes at Rollins College before declaring a major.
- Major declaration should be accompanied by a thoughtful reflection by the student.

Goals:
- Students will choose majors more effectively and change them less frequently.
- A more committed student choice of major will improve the ability to predict faculty needs.
- Students will be more cognizant of the nature and benefits of a liberal arts education.

Plan:
- All students enter Rollins with their major listed as “Exploring.” For those students who express a preference for a major, their major will be listed as “Exploring—x.”
- Students who need to be coded for specific purposes (e.g.: scholarships) will be coded based on preference forms.
- To declare a specific major, students must:
  - Take two classes from the desired major’s major map.
  - Take one class from two other divisions of the college—these courses can include competencies and neighborhood classes.
  - Fill out a declaration of major form that requires a reflection on why the major is being chosen.

Motion:
That all students be required to defer the declaration of a major until they have taken two courses from the major map and one course from two other divisions of the college. At that point, they will complete a reflection explaining their choice.

2. Departmental assessment of optimum number of students

Conceptual underpinnings:
- Departments best understand the rhythms of their major and the needs of their students. They also best understand the pressures on their faculty in terms of advising and teaching.
- Therefore, individual departments are best able to determine the ideal number of students to whom they can provide a quality, mission focused, liberal arts education.
- Each department should determine an optimum number range of students in their department based on current tenure and tenure-track faculty (and permanent lecturers, artists-in-residence, etc.). The department should take into consideration its contribution to interdisciplinary majors.

Goals:
- To realistically engage departments in a conversation about the optimum number range of students in a major in terms of staffing classes and advising.
- To lay the groundwork for a distribution of students across majors that is philosophically, pedagogically, and institutionally reflective of the mission and goals of Rollins College.

Plan:
- Moving forward, the Curriculum Committee will require this information when departments request positions.
Motion:
That all departments determine an optimum number range of students that should be enrolled in their major in order to most effectively staff and advise them given current faculty.

3. Departmental self-regulation of student numbers using autonomous curricular measures

Conceptual underpinnings:
• That several departments have successfully used curricular tools to limit and control the numbers of students in their majors.
• That each department knows best which courses or other curricular tools could reduce student numbers.

Goals:
• That majors where the optimum number is greatly exceeded by the actual number of students implement curricular measures to bring the two numbers into better alignment.

Plan:
• Departments that have considerably more students than they have determined to be ideal will create a plan to rectify this situation using autonomous curricular measures.
• The Curriculum Committee will review and advise on these plans.

Motion:
That a department with substantially more students than it considers desirable for effective instruction and advising will determine autonomous curricular measures to reduce the numbers. The plans will be brought to the Curriculum Committee.

Mario D’Amato
Claire Strom
February 3, 2017

Endorsed by the Curriculum Committee
February 7, 2017

Proposal 4 removed after further conversation during colloquy
March 6, 2017
CLA Faculty Salary and Compensation Taskforce
Abridged

Unabridged presentation is available on Blackboard

Taskforce Members: Provost Susan Singer, Eric Smaw, Stacey Dunn, Sharon Agee, Anne Murdaugh, Udeth Lugo, and Matt Hawks
Outline of Presentation

• Review charge
• Progress to date
• Results
• Next steps
Committee’s Charge:

- What would a transparent, rational, and fiscally responsible set of guidelines look like that would enable us to steward compensation in a way that keeps it fair and competitive?

- What do rigorous benchmarking analyses reveal about our current faculty salary structure as compared to a set of benchmark colleges and universities, objectively derived?
Continuation of Charge

- What is the faculty disposition regarding a merit based system of rewarding salaries increases?  
  (Next Step)

- Are there merit based systems used by our benchmark institutions that are more or less attractive?  
  (Next Step)

- Do our current practices of course releases and stipends optimize fairness and reward?  
  (Ongoing)
Taskforce Communication Structure:
Timeline Part 1: Preliminary Work

1. Done
   Identified guiding committee principles based on charge

2. Ongoing
   Discussions with individuals and groups

3. Done
   Endorsed methodology for identifying benchmark schools
Timeline Part 2: Gather Data on Rollins and Benchmark Schools

4  Done  5  Ongoing  6  Ongoing
External analysis against benchmark schools
Internal analysis
Present analysis to FAC, EC, administration, and faculty
Comparing Faculty Salaries at Rollins to our Benchmark Institutions

What do rigorous benchmarking analyses reveal about our current faculty salary structure as compared to a set of benchmark colleges and universities, objectively derived?

Question for the Faculty: What is a competitive but fiscally responsible salary philosophy with regards to our benchmarking group?
About AAUP Data

• AAUP Data includes all full time faculty at a given US institution

• All graduate and certificate programs are included in the averages for a given institution

• This analysis also does not control for:
  — Discipline
  — Time in Rank

https://research.aaup.org/survey
Benchmark Comparison

• Are Rollins’ faculty salaries commensurate with our benchmark group?
  – Average base salary by rank
  – Total Compensation by rank
  – CLA salaries vs. Baccalaureate Institutions

• Is there a gender discrepancy in base salary at Rollins and/or our benchmark institutions?
  – Average base salary by rank and gender
Rollins Average Base Salary - Spread

Assistant
Average $67,200 (± $9,800)
$65,100

Associate
Average $79,000 (± $12,500)
$78,800

Full
Average $102,200 (± $16,100)
$98,700
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bryant University*</td>
<td>102,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pacific University*</td>
<td>88,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manhattan College*</td>
<td>80,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emerson College*</td>
<td>72,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>72,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Macalester College</td>
<td>71,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sarah Lawrence College</td>
<td>71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St Lawrence University</td>
<td>71,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dominican University of CA*</td>
<td>70,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hobart William Smith Colleges</td>
<td>68,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>68,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wagner College*</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>St Olaf College</td>
<td>66,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>65,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rollins College*</td>
<td>65,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rhodes College</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Susquehanna University</td>
<td>64,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>64,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>63,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Eckerd College</td>
<td>62,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University*</td>
<td>62,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Roanoke College</td>
<td>61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>60,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>59,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>58,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
<td>56,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>55,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>55,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median:

15 Rollins College* 65,100

*Master’s Colleges and Universities
## Associate Average Base Salary – Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bryant University*</td>
<td>127,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emerson College*</td>
<td>95,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manhattan College*</td>
<td>92,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacific University*</td>
<td>91,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St Lawrence University</td>
<td>89,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Macalester College</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hobart William Smith Colleges</td>
<td>84,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>84,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>83,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sarah Lawrence College</td>
<td>80,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dominican University of CA*</td>
<td>79,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rollins College*</td>
<td>78,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Olaf College</td>
<td>78,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rhodes College</td>
<td>77,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>75,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>75,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Susquehanna University</td>
<td>72,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>70,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Roanoke College</td>
<td>69,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>69,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wagner College*</td>
<td>68,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University*</td>
<td>68,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Eckerd College</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>65,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median: 78,700

*Master’s Colleges and Universities
# Full Average Base Salary – Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bryant University*</td>
<td>157,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pacific University*</td>
<td>122,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emerson College*</td>
<td>120,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hobart William Smith Colleges</td>
<td>116,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>116,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>116,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Macalester College</td>
<td>115,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Manhattan College*</td>
<td>115,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St Lawrence University</td>
<td>113,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>108,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sarah Lawrence College</td>
<td>107,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dominican University of CA*</td>
<td>102,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>100,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rhodes College</td>
<td>100,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>99,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>99,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>St Olaf College</td>
<td>99,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rollins College*</td>
<td>98,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Susquehanna University</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>91,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
<td>90,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>89,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>89,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eckerd College</td>
<td>88,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wagner College*</td>
<td>87,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Roanoke College</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University*</td>
<td>85,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>82,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>82,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean ± St. Dev

Median: 99,600

*Master’s Colleges and Universities
# Benchmark Group Comparison

## Total Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>± Mean</td>
<td>-$2,100</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>-$200</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>-$3,500</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SD?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College of Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>± Mean</td>
<td>+$2,600</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7/23 (70%)</td>
<td>-$400</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11/23 (52%)</td>
<td>-$7,300</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SD?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Olin and Visitors excluded
Survey Question to the Faculty:

• What is a competitive but fiscally responsible salary philosophy with regards to our benchmarking group?
  – Should we meet, lag, or lead the benchmark group?
  – Different criteria for each rank?
  – Other ideas?
Basic Gender Analysis: CLA and Benchmark Group

• Is there a gender discrepancy in base salary at Rollins and/or our benchmark institutions?
  — **Average base salary by gender and rank**
    • **Limit to CLA and Baccalaureate only**
  • The limits of the data do not allow for current analysis of:
    — **Time in rank**
    — **Discipline**
    — Factors that affect average base salary such as prior experience, starting salary negotiated, awards, merit pay, etc.
• Rollins strives to achieve gender equity
2015/2016 Faculty by Division, Rank*, and Gender

*Not years of service

Excludes librarians
Average salaries for CLA# and Baccalaureate Colleges only. Genders are connected by solid line.

*Certificate offered, #Visitors and Olin Excluded
Basic Gender Analysis: CLA and Benchmark Group

• Is there a discrepancy in the average base salary of men and women at Rollins and/or our benchmark institutions?

—Yes. However, our analysis does not control for time in rank and discipline. Further analyses are needed.
Basic Gender Analysis: Rollins CLA Faculty

• Is there a discrepancy in the average base salary of men and women in the CLA at Rollins?

—Average base salary by gender and rank
Average Base Salaries by Gender at Rollins: Full Professors

- **Full Professors with Business**
  - Men: 93,350
  - Women: 87,922

- **Full Professors without Business**
  - Men: 92,720
  - Women: 86,403
CLA salary averages include all CLA Divisions: Expressive Arts, Social Sciences, Applied Social Sciences, Humanities, Science, and Business
CLA salary averages do not include: Visitors, Artists in Residence, Olin Faculty, and Lectures
Average Base Salaries by Gender at Rollins: Associates

**Associate Professors with Business**

- Men: $80,592
- Women: $72,852

**Associate Professors without Business**

- Men: $72,701
- Women: $71,280
CLA Salaries vs Years in Rank: Associates

CLA salary averages includes all CLA Divisions: Expressive Arts, Social Sciences, Applied Social Sciences, Humanities, Science, and Business
CLA salary averages do not include: Visitors, Artists in Residence, Olin Faculty, and Lectures
Average Base Salaries by Gender at Rollins: Assistants

Assistant Professors with Business

- Men: $68,771
- Women: $64,578

Assistant Professors without Business

- Men: $61,301
- Women: $60,150
CLA Salaries vs Years in Rank: Assistants

CLA salary averages includes all CLA Divisions: Expressive Arts, Social Sciences, Applied Social Sciences, Humanities, Science, and Business
CLA salary averages do not include: Visitors, Artists in Residence, Olin Faculty, and Lectures
Basic Gender Analysis: College of Liberal Arts

• Is there a discrepancy in the average base salary of men and women at Rollins?
  – Based on a simple aggregate analysis, there are disparities between the average base salaries of the men and women at different ranks
  – In part, the disparities are related to discipline and time in rank, but this is not the complete story
Basic Gender Analysis: College of Liberal Arts

– Further analyses of discipline, time in rank, prior experience, starting salary negotiated, CDFA and other factors that affect the average base salaries of faculty are needed to determine the nature of the disparities, if they are statistically significant, and/or if they are related to systematic gender inequities.

– Question for faculty: What is your tolerance for interdisciplinary differences in average base salaries?
Basic Gender Analysis

Survey question to the faculty

• If inequities are identified, what do you perceive as possible solutions?
  – On the Qualtrics survey there will be space for you to suggest solutions and provide comments.
CLA and Benchmark Group Comparison, COL

• Does cost of living (COL) play a quantifiable role in determining the average base salaries at our benchmark institutions?
  – Compare COL of the zip code of the institution to base salary of Assistants

  (Rationale: Assistants’ salary most likely to reflect current COL)
Cost of Living

COL for zip code of the institution
CLA and Benchmark Group Comparison, COL

• Does cost of living play a quantifiable role in determining the average base salaries at our benchmark institutions?
  
  – Cost of living is not linearly related to base salary
  
  – Numerically adjusting salaries at our benchmark institutions to compensate for cost of living is not advised
Question for the Faculty:

– While cost of living should not be used in conjunction with our benchmark group comparisons, should Rollins consider cost of living in Orlando area as part of the compensation philosophy?

– Consider cost of living in the surrounding area varies significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>% Cost of living above national average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32814</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32789</td>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32804</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32751</td>
<td>Maitland</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32792</td>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Questions to Consider

What constitutes an externally competitive but internally equitable compensation philosophy?
  • Are there minimum salaries we wish our colleagues to have?
  • What is our tolerance level for discipline disparity in average base salary?
Timeline Part 4: In Progress

10
In Progress

Present preliminary findings to faculty

11
Next

Small group discussions followed by Qualtrics survey for faculty input
Faculty Group Discussions

Tuesday, April 4 | 12:30-1:45pm | Professors | Faculty Club

Wednesday, April 5 | 4:00-5:15pm | Associate Professors | Bush 176

Thursday, April 6 | 4:00-5:15pm | Assistant Professors | Faculty Club

Friday, April 7 | 4:00-5:15pm | All CLA Faculty | Bush 176

(Qualtrics Survey emailed after the last meeting)
Timeline Part 5: Toward Project Completion

13 Future
Synthesize and incorporate faculty responses

14 Future
Articulate answers to questions in charge to committee

15 Future
Submit to outside consultant(s) for review
Timeline Part 5: Project Completion

15 Future
Present to FAC, EC & Faculty

16 Future
CLA Faculty Salary and Compensation Taskforce submits proposal to the Executive Council