

Colorado College Compensation Committee Block 5 (optional) Meeting Minutes

Wednesday February 5, 2020

Armstrong Hall Executive Board Room

2:30pm – 3:35pm

Members present: April Scriven, Sara Rotunno, William Schiffelbein, Dennis McEnnerney, Emilie Gray (chair)

***Additions in italics are clarifications on the points discussed during our meeting, provided by Heather Kissack and transcribed by Emilie.*

Pay equity

We discussed the 3 options described in the latest HR memo (Market Pay, Employers Council, Gallagher).

We are surprised that such an analysis cannot be done internally; one faculty member with data analysis expertise (of which we have many) could sign an NDA and perform the analysis. However, someone mentioned that having this done externally may help guarantee unbiased results. This, along with being EEOC compliant, could be a justification for doing it externally. Among the 3 options, it appeared that the second option seemed most logical, specifically because it provides gender and race/ethnicity analysis and is also EEOC compliant.

It seems ridiculous that we would pay 150k. It seems much more logical to run a cheaper analysis first, and reassess our options if issues emerge.

Whatever the option, we should pick one that is sustainable enough that the College can repeat every 5-10 years.

It seems particularly important that we get this done soon, in the context of the CC Antiracism Initiative.

***Heather plans to add a module to MarketPay that will enable equity analyses. We already own this program and all salary data are automatically uploaded to it. The module, which has to be purchased, could do gender and race/ethnicity analyses. It is also EEOC compliant.*

End-of-year evaluations

We are excited that HR plans to revise the performance review process. In particular, it was recommended that more regular meetings with supervisors (such as a mid-year conversation), that are formalized and documented should be implemented as part of these updates.

*** The goal of HR in the coming year is to shift performance evaluations into an ongoing process of discussions, goal setting and feedback. HR also hopes to have an offer out to a performance excellence manager this spring.*

Family / parental leave policy

As noted by HR, a recent measure was passed for federal employees that will provide 12 weeks paid leave; this will likely result in policy shifts in the private sector as well.

We recommend that an increase in parental leave be considered following consideration of costs to the college and benefits for staff and faculty hiring and retention. In our discussion it

was noted that costs to the college should be minimal as most positions will not incur a temporary hire for an extra 2-3 weeks paid leave.

It was noted that, particularly for staff among the lower pay bands, CC may be competing with local government employers and therefore the measure to be passed in October 2020 may affect CC more than colleges that are not adjacent to military facilities.

It was also argued that since the CC childcare center only accepts infants that are at least 8 weeks old, it would make sense to provide at least 8 weeks parental leave for staff and faculty.

Alternative models to consider:

- Some institutions (Claremont McKenna for example) have a “paid family leave” instead of specific parental leave; such a policy would allow employees to take paid time for a birth, an adoption or to care for elderly parents or sick family members. Additional “medical leave” could be available for birth with complications for example.
- Some institutions will pay 100% for a set duration, followed by 60% (for ex) of full pay for extra time off.

Other questions arose about reassessing the benefits package as a whole for exempt staff, non-exempt staff and faculty. Is there equity in sick leave, vacation leave and parental leave?

We are considering doing a survey for staff and one for faculty, asking directed questions such as: “Have you had need for sick leave or parental leave and what has been your experience with it?”. We intend to reach out to Lyrae Williams or Amanda Udis-Kessler (or someone else?) for assistance in developing such a survey.

*** We agreed that for the moment CC’s parental leave policy was competitive; this will obviously be a benefit to reassess in the future, as the federal policy is implemented. Concerning the benefits package as a whole, HR plans to develop a survey to assess where our strengths and possible areas of improvement are.*

Initial salary offers and negotiations for new employees

It has come to our attention that when a new employee is offered a position at CC, the task of discussing salary has been shifted to HR instead of the relevant office responsible for hiring. It also seems that turnaround from HR for negotiations have sometimes taken longer than it should have, on the order of multiple days to weeks.

This has serious negative consequences at many levels:

- We have lost candidates because we took too long to agree with them on a salary. Within a week or two, candidates may receive an offer from another employer and accept that instead of waiting for us;
- We have likely lost candidates because HR offered salaries sometimes significantly lower than what the job had been approved for;
- We are potentially wasting more time because of failed searches;
- We increase our chances of alienating strong candidates with this strategy and instead hiring suboptimal ones.

While we understand that HR is more qualified to manage salary negotiations, we would like to modify the process so that HR and the hiring party work together with the candidate at the

time of salary discussions and that the turnaround time for negotiating salary once all other boxes have been checked be on the order of 24-48 hours.

CC has a longstanding tradition of attracting and retaining talented people, and CC is financially strong; it is critical that we maintain our standards for new employees as well as our support for current ones.

***It appears that some of the concerns relating to the modified hiring process aren't necessarily supported by the data. Heather shared some numbers and also provided a rationale for shifting the salary discussion from individual hiring managers in each office to one HR staff.*

Since they have implemented the new system in September, there have been 61 offers of which only 5 were declined (temp and permanent).

The process for deciding the salary range for a candidate is the following: once a candidate is identified, HR uses the individual's experience and some other factors to decide on the appropriate salary range (the job description determines the pay band).

When hiring managers used this information to negotiate with a candidate, it was often the case that the hiring manager would begin by making an offer at the high end of the range, and negotiations were not satisfying for the candidate because there was no wiggle room. There was also the potential for biases in salary negotiations as different people were negotiating with potential hires depending on the office hiring.

One person is responsible for all negotiations now; this allows for more consistency as well as a more professional negotiation process with the candidate. The HR talent acquisition person (Jamie) typically contacts the candidate within 24-48h (as soon as she receives the salary range from other HR staff); the candidate may ask for more money, or a flex schedule or some other non-monetary accommodation. Jamie then discusses with Heather, they contact the relevant office, and get back to the candidate within 24-48h.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm