

To: Great Basin College Faculty Senate:

From: Compensation and Benefits Committee

Subject: Merit Pay Proposal Introduction

Date: January 17, 2014

Fellow Faculty:

The Faculty Senate Compensation and Benefits Committee have been working diligently on research, creation, and review of a Merit Pay Award Proposal for Great Basin College. To that end, we have crafted a Merit Award Plan proposal attached, and shared this with every academic and administrative faculty member possible during the month of November for the purposes of gaining your input, feedback and ideas to ensure we had a plan that addressed as many of our needs as possible.

At the same time as the Compensation and Benefits Committee have been undertaking their duty, the Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee has also been hard at work on a major overhaul of the Administrative Faculty Evaluation System. The two Committees have been working in parallel on these key areas but also with mutual communication and consideration. The Administrative Faculty formed a sub-committee to create a new evaluation system that incorporates many of the elements found in the Academic Evaluation today such as the 5 point scale and ranges of overall composite rating (OCR), an increased emphasis on evaluating what and how they do their jobs rather than the skills sets criteria in their previous system, and clear ways to quantitatively and/or qualitatively evaluate their performance with inclusion of evidence. Much of the subjectivity of the previous system is being stripped away and the end result will be one that both Academic and Administrative Faculty have confidence in going forward.

Each of you had the opportunity to attend a Merit Pay Presentation, provide the Committee with your ideas, considerations, and feedback as this process was developed. Additionally, as the Chair, I requested that anyone with ideas or additional plans contact me privately should you not be comfortable doing so in the public forum of the presentation or if you came up with these ideas subsequent to the meeting. Several of you contacted me. We spoke at length, and I shared your feedback with the committee. Thank you for getting involved in our shared governance.

All who attended the presentations were asked three questions at the conclusion of each presentation. And whenever possible, we had other Committee members attend the presentations too so they could provide you with additional insights into the process. The questions are as follows:

1. Where should Great Basin College Faculty establish the foundation or base, as taken from our current evaluation format for merit award consideration?
2. Should we have a transition allocation in July 2014 or immediately implement merit pay awards based on the final plan approved?
3. What type of distribution plan do you believe would be the best “fit” at Great Basin College based on your knowledge of our culture?

The Committee took each of your comments and personal choices under consideration and a final clear mandate was voiced with a strong consensus achieved for each of the above questions. Although each faculty member had their own personal reasons for choosing to answer the key questions above in a particular way, the faculty confirmed the following would be the best “fit” at GBC.

1. The foundation, or base level, for merit award consideration should be “**Commendable**” based on the overwhelming majority of faculty responses. Although “Satisfactory” was considered by some so all who were not “Unsatisfactory” earned some salary increase, it was deemed that Satisfactory did not meet the definition of “meritorious” and that Satisfactory was the minimal expectation by the college as our basis of employment.
2. With respect to the second question, the overwhelming majority thought it would be unfair to Administrative Faculty to implement changes to Merit while they are working so hard to overhaul their evaluation process. Although a few faculty thought that immediate implementation would set the bar at the college, the vast majority again believed that it would be so "aggressive" as to do Admin Faculty a disservice. Whereas Academic Faculty’s Evaluation system was revamped over the course of a six year span, Administrative Faculty has but a few short months to accomplish this herculean task. Basing their merit award on criteria that they were not aware of at the beginning of the academic year was deemed unfair and uncollegial. The Administrative Faculty are doing a wonderful job of creating an evaluation system that is comparable to the Academic Faculty in rigor and parallel in scale. The **Transition Plan** was the choice of the vast majority who attended the presentations.
3. Lastly, the distribution Plan. Much discussion and consideration from many perspectives went into this decision. Although there were a few advocates for each of the proposed plans, and there were two additional plans suggested, and the overwhelming majority of faculty at GBC believe the **Moderate Distribution Plan** fits our collegial culture better than any other. In fact, the large distribution plan was considered as highly divisive and a de-motivator for the vast majority.

An Example of Payout Calculation follows

The following are the OCR category ranges in our Faculty Self-Evaluation System in place today That will be carried forward into the Administrative e Faculty Evaluation System for the year

2015 – 2016. The example provided here uses the following parameters.

OCR ranges:	Excellent:	4.60 - 5.00
	Commendable:	3.80 - 4.59
	Satisfactory:	3.00 - 3.79
	Unsatisfactory:	< 3.00

Pool Size: **\$10,000**

Number of faculty in the “state funded” pool: **10**

Moderate Distribution Calculations

With eligibility set at Commendable (3.80), that becomes the base. Those who do not earn at least a 3.80 OCR are excluded from merit award consideration. That reduces this example pool to eight faculty members from the original ten.

Professor Smith (E)	4.67	Professor Thomas (C)	4.10
John Jones (S)	3.25	Professor Woods (S)	3.70
Professor Cole(C)	3.88	Ellen Sanchez (C)	3.99
Professor Greer (C)	4.29	Annie Ames (E)	4.71
Janet Alexander(C)	4.45	Professor Kafik (C)	4.17

Divide the Total Merit Funds Pool by the Total the OCR for all qualifying faculty (Ranking points) = Merit Unit Amount (MUA)

$\$10,000/34.25 = \$291.88 = \text{MUA}$

Take MUA and multiply it by OCR score for total cash award of merit (Not mathematically correct Example (I am off by \$1.42 out of \$10,000)

Prof. Smith (E)	$4.67 \times 291.88 = 1363.07$	Prof. Thomas (C)	$4.10 \times 291.88 = 1196.71$
John Jones (S)	3.25	Professor Woods (S)	3.70
Prof. Cole (C)	$3.88 \times 291.88 = 1132.49$	Ellen Sanchez (C)	$3.99 \times 291.88 = 1164.60$
Prof. Greer (C)	$4.29 \times 291.88 = 1252.17$	Annie Ames (E)	$4.71 \times 291.88 = 1374.75$
Janet Alexander (C)	$4.45 \times 291.88 = 1301.78$	Prof. Kafik (C)	$4.17 \times 291.88 = 1213.01$

Merit Award Results: Becomes part of salary for the coming year

Prof. Smith (4.67)	\$1363.07	Ellen Sanchez (3.99)	\$1164.60
Professor Cole (3.88)	\$1132.49	Annie Ames (4.71)	\$1374.75
Professor Greer (4.29)	\$1252.17	Professor Kafik (4.17)	\$1213.01
Janet Alexander (4.45)	\$1301.78	John Jones (3.25)	0
Professor Thomas (4.10)	\$1196.71	Professor Woods (3.70)	0

One final item of consideration is the timeline required for timely senior administration review of the evaluation scores and ratings. The Faculty Senate Chair and the Compensation and Benefits Chair met with the President and VPAA to discuss the need for timely review for merit pay inclusion in the July 2015 contracts to avoid a rewrite and additional investment of time by HR and the VPBA. There was an initial timeline in our proposal but it would not provide faculty nor senior administrators with the needed assurance that the reviews could be completed in a timely manner. So two alternative solutions have been included here for the Senate to discuss, and provide a Sense of the Senate to the Compensation and Benefits Committee.

The first option is to move the IDEA evaluations for the spring Semester up from Week 14 or 15 in the course, to Week 9 or 10 in the course. This should allow the time required for senior administration to complete their reviews.

The second option, would be move the annual evaluation from our current Fall/Spring combination to a calendar year of Spring /Fall combination. This would allow senior administration four full months to collect the student IDEA ratings and review the completed faculty evaluation prior to the July contract signings. The move would make the first evaluation cycle either a single semester or three semesters in length.