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The committee met numerous times throughout the fall and spring semesters with our primary focus being the development of a new faculty salary plan. While we were unable to complete our task this year, we're confident that a proposal will be forthcoming early in the fall semester for faculty comment. Our goal is to have a new 3-year salary plan approved next year that will determine salary increases beginning in the academic year 2019-20.

Our discussions with President Hanno, Provost White, and Executive VP for Finance and Administration Douglas this year were strongly influenced by two overarching economic realities: the “below market” salaries of Wheaton faculty (at all ranks and as a weighted average) and the continuing large budget deficits that the college is experiencing. The good news is that last year we made significant progress toward our goal of reaching the average salary of our comparison group. (See attached comparison salary data and list of schools in our comparison group.) The 4.1% shortfall in the weighted average salary for all faculty is the smallest shortfall in the past four years. Similar improvements from four years ago can be seen for Assistant and Associate Professors. Full Professors, however, have not made such progress, and have fallen further behind during the past four years.

Partly in response to this situation for Full Professors, President Hanno has agreed to increase the “bump” from Associate to Full from $2,500 to $5,000 beginning this year. And in keeping with the approach utilized to implement the tenure “bump” increase in 2016, faculty promoted to Full Professor within the prior two years will also receive an increase on a sliding scale.

The less good news this year is that progress on the salary front will likely come to a standstill as the raise for this year will equal just the cost of living raise of 2.1%, with no additional amount for equity. This is surely disappointing but it highlights the other economic reality of the college’s persistent budget deficits in light of a difficult financial environment for small liberal arts colleges.

Going forward, a brief description of the salary plan that we have been working on this year and that will be proposed in the fall for faculty consideration currently consists of two parts:

1. a CPI floor
2. a share of the college’s net resource growth above CPI
In years when the faculty salary pool increase will be above CPI, the additional funds will be distributed in three ways:

- an equity component
- a merit component
- an additional across the board component.

While we believe that the equity component should be given top priority in this ranking, the ordering of the other two components and the process by which merit would be determined needs much further discussion within our committee before bringing it to the faculty for comment. The topic of annual evaluations will also have to be addressed as an integral part of this discussion. As mentioned above, our goal is to have a draft of a salary plan circulated amongst the faculty early in the fall semester.

Finally, since part of the charge of this committee concerns faculty workload, we have given some comments and suggestions to Provost White concerning the Workload Survey that she will be circulating in fall. The sole purpose of this survey at this point is to simply document all of the things that faculty do in their day to day work for the college.

In closing, the committee would like to thank President Hanno, Provost White and Vice President Douglas for their collaboration this semester and for their shared commitment to improving the economic status of the faculty.

Respectfully submitted,
Committee on Faculty Workload and Economic Status
Clustered Database
Faculty Salary Comparison

$ (Thousands)
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Wheaton College
Weighted Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wheaton College</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27 School Comparison Group

Wheaton
Allegheny
Bard
Bates
Bryn Mawr
Colby
Connecticut College
Denison
Dickinson
Franklin & Marshall
Gettysburg
Hamilton
Hobart William Smith
Illinois Wesleyan
Kenyon
Lawrence
Mount Holyoke
Muhlenberg
Reed
Sarah Lawrence
Skidmore
Spelman
St. Lawrence
Trinity
Ursinus
Washington & Jefferson
Wofford