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| Purpose of today’s discussion | Present the concepts  
Present aggregate findings |
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| Agenda Items                  | • How did we get here?  
• What did we learn?  
• What comes next? |
How did we get here?

- Need to assess our competitiveness -- how Mines’ total compensation positions us within our relevant peer people “markets”

- Assess how our total compensation approach aligns with recruitment and retention of high quality academic faculty

- Help assess and assure that our compensation resources are allocated properly and effectively across campus

- Create purposeful and systematically obtained data upon which decisions can be based – a process that can be repeated into the future
How we got here - Background

- Mines engaged Sibson Consulting ("Sibson") to conduct an assessment of total compensation competitiveness for Academic Faculty and Administrative Professionals.
- Two Steering Committees, one each for Academic Faculty and Administrative Professionals, and an Oversight Committee to help guide the competitive analysis.
- Steering Committee:
  - Stephen Pankavich
  - Becky LaFrancois
  - Angus Rocket
  - Bill Navidi
  - Chuck Stone
  - Ramona Graves
  - Tracy Camp
  - Dan Knauss

- Oversight Committee:
  - Tom Boyd
  - Peter Han
  - Kirsten Volpi
  - Dan Fox
  - Mike Kaufman
  - Mike Dougherty
IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS

- The “right” comparison
  - Salary vs. Total Compensation
    - Base salary + Insurance Premiums

- Where to compare – what surveys are available and relevant

- Identifying the comparison group(s)
EARLY WORK - Methods

- Compensation Philosophies drafted with the Steering Committees
  - Accepted / approved by the Oversight Committee
  - Purpose:
    - Align the total compensation program to the school’s mission, vision, and values
    - Support consistency
    - Target – at or above median

- Academic Faculty Peer Groups identified -- input from the Academic Faculty Steering Committee, the Oversight Committee, the Interim Provost, and the Deans
  - Three peer groups were created:
    - CASE & CECS – 44 Institutions
    - CERSE – 19 Institutions
    - HASS & EB – 57 Institutions (combination of CASE, CECS, & CERSE)
EARLY WORK - Methods

- Discipline Code Mapping: The Provost and the Deans provided the appropriate Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes upon which comparisons could be based

- Sources of Salary Data:
  - Reliable, published surveys
    - CUPA-HR National Faculty Salary Survey
    - ASEE Faculty Survey
    - Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey
  - Data reported separately due to differences in how data is captured and reported

- Benefits Data – identifying what’s available
Competitive Assessment – Summary

- Mines’ salary data from fall 2017
- Survey data “aged” forward to July 2018
- Survey data adjusted for Denver / Boulder “cost of labor”
- Initial findings discussed with Steering Committee

Steering Committee:
- Requested revisions in the presentation
- Requested that the Oklahoma State University Survey results be removed from final analysis

Sibson revised the findings based on the Steering Committee’s review
Benefits - *Relative Value*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Mines</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Per Employee</td>
<td>Annually Per Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
<td>$16,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,492</td>
<td>$17,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**

- Sibson assessed Mines’ weighted average payment for premiums – health and dental
- Mines’ paid premiums roughly add about $5,200 to salary over our competitors
- Retirement not included in calculations - not possible consistently to capture the mix of employee contributions and employer contributions levels
  - too many options and levels in plans of our peer group
  - no ability to obtain participation levels by plan
  - Social Security participation not consistent as well
- Retirement very rough estimate of median peer group employer contributions is about 14%
## Competitive Assessment

### Salary Survey Comparison Data & Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CUPA-HR</th>
<th>ASEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE + CECS</strong></td>
<td>CASE + CECS Custom Peer Group Median</td>
<td>CASE + CECS Custom Peer Group Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERSE</strong></td>
<td>CERSE Custom Peer Group Median</td>
<td>CERSE Custom Peer Group Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E&amp;B and HASS</strong></td>
<td>Combined Peer Group (CASE, CECS, and CERSE) Median</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Faculty Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CUPA-HR</th>
<th>ASEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-tenure track Faculty comparisons by Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coverage by Survey Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CUPA-HR</th>
<th>ASEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented Faculty</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Represented</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Note:** Comparisons to Mines’ Academic Faculty were conducted using 4-digit CIP Codes for CUPA-HR. ASEE Surveys comparisons were conducted using department mapping.
Competitive Assessment – Summary of Findings

All ranks, all disciplines for which data could be obtained

- Sibson Standard: +/- 15% of target to be competitive

- In aggregate, overall falls within the competitive range - for both total compensation and for base salary

- In both CUPA-HR and ASEE, total compensation is about 93 - 94%

- Salary alone in both is about 89%

- Compensation Philosophy – At or Above Market
Competitive Assessment - Total Compensation
Market Competitiveness for Faculty by Survey Source

Total Compensation Distribution at Median – ASEE

- Percentage Distribution:
  - <70%: 1%
  - 70-85%: 11%
  - 85-100%: 99%
  - 100-115%: 15%
  - 115-130%: 3%
  - >130%: 1%

Average Percent to Market 50th:
- 93%

Total Compensation Distribution at – CUPA-HR

- Percentage Distribution:
  - <70%: 2%
  - 70-85%: 18%
  - 85-100%: 55%
  - 100-115%: 18%
  - 115-130%: 4%
  - >130%: 3%

Average Percent to Market 50th:
- 94%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
Competitive Assessment - Total Compensation

Competitiveness by Faculty Member – ASEE
Competitive Assessment - Total Compensation
Competitiveness by Faculty Member – CUPA-HR
Next Steps

• Complete build out of data file / assure current
• Complete development of protocol to address findings
• Build and convey guidelines / parameters
• Budget:
  • Separate line item for implementing results – currently $750,000
  • Annual increases – currently 3% pool
  • Promotion increases – funded @ 8% separate from annual pool
• Communicate
Questions?