

**Review and Planning Committee
Minutes, November 7, 2001**

Meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

Present: Carlsen, Geffert, Hamlin, Kahn, Larson, Marotz, Morrison, Norton, Odell, Postlethwaite (chair), Solid, Sonnega, Van Wylene

Minutes for October 31, 2001 approved as amended.

SABBATICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Odell, Solid, and Geffert volunteered to serve on the subcommittee that will review sabbatical applications. Work will begin in January.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL TO CHANGE SECTION 3.VII.c.3 OF THE FACULTY MANUAL REGARDING THE NAME AND CHARGE OF THE CAMPUS MINORITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

RPC decided to green-sheet Eida Berrio's proposal. Since Berrio will miss November's faculty meeting and we feel it is important that she have the opportunity to answer questions and expand on her rationale for the revisions, we will delay bringing it to the faculty until December's meeting.

DISCUSSION OF LETTER TO PRESIDENT THOMFORDE (THIRD DRAFT) ON FACULTY SALARIES

Major revisions:

- We addressed concerns about the wording "productive members of the community."
- To reduce confusion about what we mean by "equity" or "inequity," we chose to address "inversions" in the salary schedule rather than "inequities."
- In choosing a cohort we decided to consider overall scores from U.S. News and World Report rather than reputation alone (overall score includes reputation plus other factors such as resources, class size, rate of alumni giving, etc).
- We will articulate the principle of a cohort based on CUPA data and recommend that our cohort include "at least 20-25 schools," but we will not propose a specific cohort. (Our decision to use USNWR overall scores means that our earlier draft of a cohort must be reconsidered). Given that the CUPA cohort will change over time, we will leave this task to the Standing Committee on Salary and Compensation.
- We will include an appendix explaining USNWR and AAUP standards.

- We will reference Lynn Steen and his work in the Appendix so future committees will know where to go for data.
- We will not include the graph, "USNWR Reputation in Relation to Compensation," as part of the letter. It blurs our larger points.
- We will make clear that the Standing Committee on Salary and Compensation will discuss a number of substantive issues-it will do more than merely recommend merit raises.
- A good deal of discussion centered on the question of whether we should recommend that salary improvement become the College's "number one priority." Some feared that such wording might be used to justify cuts in other areas of the budget. Others feared that anything less than "number one priority" would not adequately express our commitment to this issue. We eventually settled on "urgent priority."
- We will emphasize that the entire compensation package must be considered in discussions of salary improvements.
- We discussed concerns from a number of faculty about linking merit increases to market. We decided to recommend that merit raises should be driven in part by market not purely by market. Raises should be "informed" by both AAUP and CUPA data.
- We decided that the Standing Committee on Salary and Compensation should not be a subcommittee of RPC.
- Solid volunteered to work through another draft of the section on the post-tenure review process.
- Larson and Odell volunteered to work on the section regarding the Standing Committee's charge to examine equity issues.
- We will add a section on recommendations for next year's salary increases (see minutes for 10/31/01).

We agreed to send a nearly final copy of the letter to Linda Gregerson by Friday. We will ask Thomforde for an extension to continue working on the section regarding the Standing Committee on Faculty Salary and Compensation.

We will meet next Wednesday, November 14th to finish our work.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bryn Geffert, Secretary