

BC FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE (FCC)

REPORT TO FACULTY

2010-11 CALENDAR YEAR

The FCC, consisting of university-wide elected faculty members, typically meets monthly as a Committee and with administrators. The FCC is YOUR Committee. We try to represent university-wide faculty interests. Please let us have your ideas, concerns, and proposals on an ongoing basis so that we can represent you more accurately and democratically.

Changes in salary

The president has indicated that salary pool for individuals making in excess of \$50,000 will be 2.5% and for those making less than \$50,000 3.5%. The increase in salary pool reflects an aggregate with specific individuals receiving greater or lesser changes in salary as a function of assessed performance.

Changes in compensation relative to academic community

The tables on the following pages detail some salient issues relating to the level and change in BC faculty compensation over the last decade (Table 1) and last year (Table 2) as well as information on compensation relative to other AAUP Category 1 schools (Table 3). While much has remained the same since our report of last year, it is notable as indicated in Table 3 in the last year there was a compensation decline for Full and Assistant Professors in the last year and a modest increase in Associate Professor compensation relative to comparable schools. Salary data reflect similar patterns.

Changes in specific non-salary compensation elements

In this past year and in recognition of what we see as its economic significance to faculty we engaged representatives of the administration with respect to specific elements of the benefits package including two specific items:

1. Retiree health benefits
2. Changes in effective level of the employee tuition benefit
3. Increased health care costs

With respect to retiree health care benefits, BC coverage has been reduced from 100% of faculty and spouse premiums to 50%. As well, earlier this summer the administration outlined prospective changes in retiree premium coverage. We have not worked up an analysis of the costs of these changes but anticipate doing so in the coming year.

With respect to the effective level of the employee tuition benefit for children, we discussed the change in admission standards for employee children, the likelihood that significantly fewer children were gaining admission, and that the benefit had become something of a winner take all proposition with significant differential compensation implications. We advocated that the administration consider a tuition benefit that would be available to employee children not gaining admission to BC, perhaps along the lines currently in place at Georgetown and Notre Dame. The immediate reaction to our proposal was that any change was unlikely given the cost it would entail to the university from the currently enacted policy. Moreover, the administration provided information indicating that tuition remission received an “extraordinary” increase of \$2.0 million in the 2012 budget and that the plan was to increase tuition

remission \$2.0 million each year for five years. Why this increase was extraordinary and it along with the planned increase in tuition remission will bring us relative to pre-admission standard change was not discussed by the administration. As well, the administration did not provide requested information regarding the change in faculty children gaining the benefit of tuition remission before and after the change in admission standard policy

With respect to increased health care costs, the administration noted that the schools costs increased 10.5%. since we are in the midst of shifting 5% of health care costs to employees (1% per year for five year) this increase will likely be reflected in employee borne health care costs.

Budget committee / financial planning representation

The FCC asked the administration for representation in the financial planning process of the university. We were told that there was no formal budget / financial planning committee and that, moreover, the school deans on the basis of their faculty appointments and experience were well positioned to provide needed input into the budget and financial planning process.

Please let us know if you have any suggestions or topics for discussion with the Administration.

FCC members:

Martin Bridgeman (Mathematics)

Curt Dudley-Marling (LSOE)

Demetrius Iatridis (GSSW), Chair

Thomas Kohler (Law School)

Gil Manzon (CSOM), Associate Chair

Jane Regan (STM)

Judith Shindul-Rothschild (SON)

Eileen Sweeney (Philosophy)

Table 1

**Faculty Compensation from 99-00 to 09-10
Boston College relative to 20 Comparable Schools***

	Full	Assoc	Assist
	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>
\$ Change in Boston College compensation, 99-00 to 09-10	\$59.8	\$34.3	\$29.3
Average \$ change of 20 comparable schools, 99-00 to 09-10	<u>\$63.1</u>	<u>\$40.5</u>	<u>\$35.1</u>
\$ Difference, BC relative to comparable schools	<u>\$(3.3)</u>	<u>\$(6.2)</u>	<u>\$(5.8)</u>
Number of 20 comparable schools with greater increase in compensation than Boston College over the last ten years	11/20	18/20	16/20
Boston College compensation rank relative to 20 comparable schools in 1999-2000	15 th	9 th	11 th
Boston College compensation rank relative to 20 comparable schools in 2009-2010	14 th	14 th	15 th

The table above indicates that relative to comparable schools BC total compensation has remained flat for Full Professors and declined notably for Associate and Assistant Professors. The 20 schools used as comparables are identified below and were selected by the administration.

New York University	Northwestern
Duke	Dartmouth
Washington University	Emory
Georgetown	UCLA
Cornell	USC
Brown	Rice
New Jersey Institute of Tech	Vanderbilt
Notre Dame	Carnegie Mellon
Georgia Institute Of Tech	Tufts College
Wake Forest	George Washington

* Data from AAUP Compensation Survey

Table 2

**Faculty Compensation from 08-09 to 09-10
Boston College relative to 20 Comparable Schools***

	Full	Assoc	Assist
	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>
\$ Change in Boston College compensation, 08-09 to 09-10	(\$0.8)	\$2.2	\$0.3
Average \$ change of 20 comparable schools, 08-09 to 09-10	<u>\$2.9</u>	<u>\$1.2</u>	<u>\$2.4</u>
\$ Difference, BC relative to comparable schools	<u>\$(3.7)</u>	<u>\$1.0</u>	<u>\$(2.1)</u>
Number of 20 comparable schools with greater increase in compensation than Boston College last year	18/20	5/20	16/20

The table above indicates that relative to comparable schools BC total compensation has remained flat for Full Professors and declined notably for Associate and Assistant Professors. The 20 schools used as comparables are identified below and were selected by the administration.

New York University	Northwestern
Duke	Dartmouth
Washington University	Emory
Georgetown	UCLA
Cornell	USC
Brown	Rice
New Jersey Institute of Tech	Vanderbilt
Notre Dame	Carnegie Mellon
Georgia Institute Of Tech	Tufts College
Wake Forest	George Washington

* Data from AAUP Compensation Survey

Table 3

**Boston College Compensation relative to
Category 1 AAUP Schools***

	Full	Assoc	Assist	All
	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Ranks</u>
2009-2010 average BC compensation	\$182.2	\$123.1	\$102.8	\$137.8
AAUP Category 1 percentile rank	86.4	83.3	78.6	86.2
1999-2000 average BC compensation	\$122.4	\$88.8	\$75.4	no data
AAUP Category 1 percentile rank	86.3	90.0	90.0	
Change in AAUP Category 1 percentile rank	0.1	(6.7)	(11.4)	

The table above indicates that relative to AAUP Category 1 schools BC total compensation has increased modestly for Full Professors and declined notably for Associate and Assistant Professors. As well, total faculty compensation relative to AAUP Category 1 schools ranked, up from similar comparative data last year but still notably below 90%.

* Data from AAUP Compensation Survey