

Karmody
1974-75 Salary DTF

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

February 5, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: President McCann

FROM: Salary Guidelines DTF
J. L. Schillinger, Chairman

SUBJECT: Recommendations per DTF Charge of 11/12/74

RECEIVED
FEB 7 1975
THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE
VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

The Salary Guidelines DTF held numerous meetings during November, December and January in response to your request for recommendations on salary increases. The Salary DTF split into two subcommittees-- Faculty Salary Subcommittee and Exempt Administrative Subcommittee-- to review current salary policies in each area. The Faculty Salary Subcommittee undertook a review of the policies pertaining to faculty and certain counselors and librarians. This subcommittee solicited comments from the faculty for possible modifications. The Exempt Administrative Subcommittee agreed to retain a consultant to review and make recommendations on position ranges for all exempt administrative positions. This subcommittee decided it would be more appropriate to have an outside consultant recommend relative rankings and groupings than for the subcommittee itself to undertake this task. Mr. Norman D. Willis and Associates of Seattle was retained to submit a report on the groupings and rankings of all positions. A report, dated December 1974, has been submitted to the subcommittee and distributed to all exempt administrators for review and comment. After considerable input and discussion, the committee recommends the following:

1. That the total dollars received by TESC for salary increases for faculty and exempt administrative staff be distributed between the faculty salary grid and the exempt administrative schedule on the basis of percentage of total salaries in each area.
2. No modifications in the current policies for members of the faculty and for certain counselors and librarians.
3. The committee recommends that the system proposed by the consultant for grouping and ranking exempt administrative positions be adopted and put into effect at the time funds for salary increases become available, or July 1, 1975, whichever occurs first.

4. As recommended in the consultant's report, a permanent job evaluation team be identified and trained in the techniques of job evaluation to achieve long-term stability in range relationships for exempt administrators. It is further recommended that the team include the Administrative Vice President, Vice President and Provost, and a minimum of three exempt administrators chosen by the President and Vice Presidents.
5. Until such a job evaluation team is identified and trained, the recommended salary ranges (except those noted in items 6 and 7 below) be accepted as the basis for compensation.
6. By a majority position, the committee decided that where there were concerns regarding salary ranges recommended by the consultant, the alternatives would be identified and presented for appropriate administrative action. The positions where concerns were expressed are as follows:

A. Campus Physician

Concern: The consultant's report recommends a salary level three ranges below the present salary range. The incumbent and certain committee members feel this is most inappropriate--extremely low.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at the present level--Range 14.
2. Take the consultant's recommendation--Range 11.
3. Take the incumbent and certain committee members' recommendation--Range 15.

Discussion: Additional discussions with both Vice Presidents indicate that there is not a clear understanding of the level of health care services required at the college. The consultant recommended that the position in charge of the health services be placed in Range 11. The rating factors used in arriving at the total points for this range were that of a para-professional in the health care field, not an M.D. Further discussion with the consultant indicates that, if an M.D. is the minimum requirement for Health Care Services at the college, the position of Campus Physician should be changed to Range 13. The committee feels that the establishment of minimum qualifications for positions with Health Care Services is not a responsibility of the Salary Guidelines DTF and recommend that the appropriate administrator choose the level and quality of health care services for the college.

A memorandum dated January 15, 1975, to J. L. Schillinger from David Peterson states in part the following:

"In the area of knowledge and skills, according to this rating system, the Campus Physician rates at one-half the value of the V.P. and Provost and some 406 factor points below the President. Assuming that the President's lofty point factor is an unassailable optimal value, I would be more than willing to argue that the 'total amount of understanding, familiarity, with factors or information or dexterity necessary to perform the job' needed by the Campus Physician easily matches the V.P. and Provost in that category and may surpass that level. But let us not be arbitrary; certainly 640 is a very reasonable reassessment. In addition, this report rates the Campus Physician at a mere 160 factor points in the area of mental demands. I realize that a physician is little more than a well trained auto mechanic who happens to work with human beings, and for that matter, that human beings don't mean much at all (if indeed, anything) when compared to the lofty status of the institution of higher education, but I find a figure of 450 or 500 to be a much more realistic point factor for this category. Why, even to be compromising, let us say 450. Certainly, that is as objective a process of evaluation as has been done to date. In the third category, that of accountability, I find it difficult to argue with the point factor assigned, for it seems to be appropriately vague enough assessment as to be unquestionable.

"Now, to add up the correct values (640+450+160) gives us a newly assessed 'Total Points' of 1250. Looking back to 'Recommendations' we find that 1250 points corresponds nicely to Range 15, an upward adjustment of one range; most appropriate!

"In short, I refuse to attempt to justify the current range of the Campus Physician as a purely market-place value phenomenon - If the first two of the three 'components' of 'the Method' are true to what they say, then some serious thinking needs to be done about honestly evaluating the first two components in relation to the Campus Physician position."

B. Director of Computer Services

Concern: The consultants recommended a salary Range 10. The present salary range is 13. The incumbent and certain committee members feel a Range 10 does not reflect instruction and research responsibilities.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 13.
2. Take the consultant's recommendation--Range 10.

Discussion: Under the conditions described in Educational Computing: Evergreen and Elsewhere, we can determine the salary level for the Director of Computer Services as follows:

- a. At Range 10 if the director's role is to carry out administrative data processing functions. Research, instruction and teaching activities will be supported elsewhere.
- b. At the highest Range 13, if the director must be responsible for administrative, research, instructional functions.

Educational Computing: Evergreen and Elsewhere

Computing in colleges and universities generally falls into two groups, the tool and the subject of education. Computing as a tool serves research, instruction and administrative needs and is often typified by scientific and statistical calculations (research), simulation models and problem solving (instruction), registration and payroll systems (administrative). In a large university such as the University of Washington, these three functions are carried out in two departments, with research and instructional computing assigned to the Academic Computation Center, and administrative functions supported by the Data Processing Center.

Computing as a subject is usually taught as a special course in the School of Engineering or the School of Business, although a larger institution, such as Washington State University, offers the whole field of study out of its Computer Science Department. Most colleges and universities are not concerned with the vocational aspect of data processing (students seeking jobs in keypunching, machine operation and programming must look at alternate sources of education). In Washington, the most likely places for acquiring job related skills are the community colleges and vocational institutes.

Computing at Evergreen does not fall into these discrete categories, just as our interdisciplinary programs do not fit into different departments. Like the Evergreen faculty, which must support various modes and subjects of instruction, Computer Services has a combined staff who meet

research, instructional and administrative needs as well as sponsoring contracts in computer science and data processing. In this context, the Director of Computer Services at Evergreen must be better qualified than his/her counterparts at other institutions; the former is a generalist who must do everything well, whereas the latter are specialists who would be unable to manage the unique educational computing role here.

C. Director of General Services

Concern: The consultant recommended a salary range change from 10 to 9.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 10.
2. Accept the consultant's recommendations--Range 9.

Discussion: The current salary for the Director of General Services is and was appropriately established at Range 10. The consultant has recommended realignment downward to Range 9. The incumbent disagrees with this downward adjustment, however, since the guidelines and decision models were applied uniformly, and since the ultimate decision lies with the President, he chooses not to take singular exception. He reserves the right, however, to present justification for reinstatement of Range 10 in the event that any adjustments are made to the consultant's recommendations.

D. Director of Recreation and Campus Activities

Concern: The incumbent feels that the consultant's recommended salary change from Range 10 to Range 8 does not reflect the responsibilities now associated with the position.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 10.
2. Accept the consultant's recommendation--Range 8.

Discussion: The position requirements of the Director of Recreation and Campus Activities lacks clarity in terms of what is required at TESC. The incumbent and certain committee members indicate that this position at Evergreen is unique in the college system. Increased understanding led to the changing of this position from Range 8 to 10 several years ago. The recent change in the organization was not taken into consideration. It is recommended that the incumbent and his supervisor review the job responsibility and establish a mutual understanding of the level needed at TESC.

After clarification, the position should be placed at the appropriate level within the Willis system.

E. Director of Information Services and Publications

Concern: The consultant downgraded the position from Range 9 to Range 8.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 9.
2. Accept the consultant's recommendation--Range 8.

Discussion: The consultant has recommended a downgrade of this position from Salary Range 9 to 8. This realignment is unwarranted in view of the scope and complexity of duties. It may be that the degree of responsibility was not apparent from the job description or from discussions with the limited people interviewed, or perhaps a title comparison with private industry counterparts overlooked significant differences. In any event, the validity of the system is not at issue in this case, only the validity of informational input to the decision.

F. Director of Housing

Concern: The incumbent and certain committee members request reconsideration of position level due to commitments.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 8, and move incumbent to the top of the range when it is adjusted for cost of living.
2. Acknowledge that it was an error to give incumbent such strong assurances of salary increases, but accept the error and honor the commitment.
3. Work through some mutually acceptable compromise.
4. Change job description to include other elements and move to Range 9.

Discussion: The salary for the position of Director of Housing is contested because of circumstances unique to its history. Neither the incumbent nor the Director of Auxiliary Services disagree with the grade range recommendations by the consultant for the position. On that basis, the position as it now functions should be classified in Range 8.

There is, however, ample evidence that the incumbent has been given very strong repeated assurances of significant salary increases. Under current conditions, this would be to the top of Range 8 with frozen salary thereafter. The statements to the incumbent (as late as December 1974) more than strongly support the incumbent's contention that that increase is less than he could expect to receive. In fact, the assurances of a significant salary increase have been so strong and insistent that the current Director of Housing has twice turned down other job offers with the expectation of a raise at Evergreen.

The decision that must be made depends on which of two priorities are considered dominant.

- 1) The open acknowledgment that we are subject to our needs for order, organizational efficiency and external pressure to the degree that none can assume that commitments can be trusted.
- 2) Even when circumstances place severe burdens on fulfilling commitments, we either negotiate a mutually satisfactory alternative with those to whom commitments are made, or we honor our commitments and the human relations issues that are implied.

G. Coordinator of User Services

Concern: The original position Head of User Services was positioned in Range 10. The present position Coordinator of User Services has similar responsibilities but different emphasis. The consultant recommended a Range 9 for this position.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position at its present level--Range 10.
2. Accept the consultant's recommendation--Range 9.

Discussion: The consultant report recommends the position be placed in Range 8. The Dean of Library Services brought to the committee's attention additional responsibilities. Based on this information, the consultant recommends a Range 9 for the position. The Dean of Library Services requests that this position be retained in Range 10, as it has the responsibility of coordination and control of circulation, inter-Library loan, reference cataloging and acquisition.

H. Affirmative Action Officer

Concern: The consultant recommended a salary range change from 10 to 8. The contention of the incumbent and certain committee members is that it does not reflect the true responsibilities of the position.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the present salary level--Range 10.
2. Accept the consultant's recommendation--Range 8.

Discussion: 1) Given the climate of social change in our society today, especially as it pertains to minority rights, it appears on the very face of it that the employment of a traditional, white, and "well established" firm, headed by a white male, cannot be regarded as an acceptable evaluator of the position of Affirmative Action Officer at TESC. We need to know what Willis and Associates' own affirmative action policies have been.

2) Assuming that Mr. Willis did not know that the present incumbent of the AA position was a black female, and was therefore unbiased and uninfluenced by way of personal contact or knowledge, it remains true that his information was available from two other basic sources: a) the college president, to whom the AA officer is directly responsible, and b) the college's own affirmative action statement as presented in the Evergreen Administrative Code (EAC 174-148-).

In the first instance, it seems doubtful that the president can be regarded as the very best possible evaluator or source of information as to the AA officer's duties and responsibilities. This would be due primarily to the press of his many other responsibilities. However, there is some direct evidence to support the contention that his concerns for the position just do not go that deep. When the Willis report was released and the change in the AA officer's position was noted, he remarked to the officer in so many words that there was "nothing to worry about" since her salary would not be affected. This manifests something very much less than a profound concern for the welfare of the Affirmative Action program to which TESC is committed, and which forms an essential part of its educational philosophy. Surely the issue is more significant than the current salary of the incumbent and cannot have been so dismissed.

As to the second source of information, the Evergreen Administrative Code, it must be assumed that Mr. Willis did not avail himself of this source at all. There are twenty pages here of detailed description of the duties and responsibilities of the AA officer, something considerably more than the "hill of beans" epithet with which he dismissed the total array of Evergreen job descriptions.

If Mr. Willis has, however, actually read this document and still dismisses it with all the other job descriptions, then serious doubt is cast on the acceptability of the job he has done for the Salary DTF. If he has not read it, the same applies.

3) Why a larger number of exempt administrators was not interviewed has not been convincingly explained, especially given the pointed uniqueness of TESC, and the presumed effort made to evaluate it by its own standards. It may well be argued that there was insufficient time to interview each individual affected. Surely ranking administrators could have been contacted in greater numbers. Certainly more than eight very busy people with widely dispersed responsibilities. For the additional reasons given or implied above, this would apply particularly to the advisability of consulting directly with the Affirmative Action Officer.

I. Administrative Secretary to the Vice President and Provost

Concern: The incumbent and certain committee members believe the position should be increased from present and recommended levels.

Alternatives:

1. Retain present and recommended position level--Range 3.
2. Accept incumbent and certain committee members' recommendation--Range 5.

Discussion: The Willis report recommends that the Administrative Secretary to the Vice President and Provost remain at a Range 3 level. The incumbent believes that the position should be upgraded to a Range 5 level, based on the responsibilities of the position. It is the belief of the incumbent that the decision as to the level of the responsibility of the position should be made by the Vice President and Provost, and that the salary level be set accordingly.

7. The committee recognized that there were concerns on positions which were not prompted by the consultant's report. The majority of the committee agreed that the alternatives would be identified and presented for appropriate administrative action. The positions where concerns were expressed are as follows:

A. Dean of Library Services

Concern: The present incumbent questions the inclusion of this position in the exempt administrative schedule, as her present employment arrangement with TESC is a faculty contract.

Alternatives:

1. Leave the position in exempt administrative schedule.
2. Place the position in faculty salary grid.
3. Leave position title in exempt administrative schedule, recognizing that it currently is filled by a member of the faculty. This leaves the option open in the future to fill the position by either method. Leaving the position title in the exempt schedule does not mean that it must be filled. It is a point of future reference.

Discussion: The present incumbent was recruited and hired on the basis that this position would be a faculty position. This follows the recommendation in the Library Report. A memo from Ed Kormondy to J. L. Schillinger dated December 30, 1974 states in part: "I respectfully request the Salary DTF to remove the position of Dean of Library Services from the exempt scale and position it on the faculty scale." The present incumbent requests that the position be removed from the exempt administrative schedule.

B. Administrative Assistant to the Vice President and Provost

Concern: The present duties do not qualify for exemption under the HEPB rules. The exempt administrative subcommittee recommends classification of the position.

Alternatives:

1. Retain the position in the exempt administrative schedule at Range 7, recommended by the consultant.
2. Remove the position from the exempt administrative schedule and classify the position in the appropriate HEPB classification.

Discussion: Although the consultant's report treats the position of Administrative Assistant to the Vice President and Provost as exempt, there remains question as to whether this position should be classified. This question should be resolved through consultation among the incumbent, her immediate supervisor (the Provost), and the academic deans with whom she is currently assigned, not later than March 1 of this year.

C. Associate Director of Recreation

Concern: This position has never been recognized in exempt administrative salary listings. The exempt administrative subcommittee recommends this position be classified.

Alternatives:

1. Establish this position on the exempt administrative salary schedule at the appropriate range.
2. Classify the position into the appropriate HEPB classification.

Discussion: The position of Associate Director of Recreation, due to a recent organizational change, is in the "optional" category under HEPB regulations. The appropriate Vice President, Director and incumbent should come to a mutual understanding, resulting in placing this position in one of the recognized groups--exempt or classified.

D. Director of Laboratory Facilities

Concern: At the present time, this position is neither exempt, classified or faculty. It should be placed in one of the three recognized groups of employees.

Alternatives:

1. Establish this position in the exempt administrative schedule at the appropriate range level.
2. Classify the position into the appropriate HEPB classification.
3. Establish this as a faculty position on the faculty salary grid.

Discussion: Since this position is neither a vice president nor a division director, the position does not technically qualify for administrative exempt status under current HEPB guidelines. On these grounds, it is argued that the position be converted to classified staff.

On the other hand, it is argued that to place the Director of Lab Facilities in a civil service position ignore the recognition of certain unique organizational structures and functions at Evergreen (EAC 174-112-660). This administrative position, like several others, functions with an unusually high academic component and the result of placing it in a classified position would severely weaken its service to the school.

The position has been the source of serious debate for three years and this committee recommends that its importance to the institution be determined now. If it is to be a position through which students may contract and from which grants to the college are funded, then it should be retained in its exempt administrative position by exception until such time as it is determined that it will not become a position through which the faculty will rotate (similar to the possibility of Director of Counseling Services). If it is to be accepted in its more traditional function, then it should be realigned to classified staff.

E. Chief of Media Services

Concern: This position currently is not on the exempt administrative salary schedule, nor is it classified. The previous salary DTF recommended classification of this position. No action was taken, therefore this position "officially" does not exist.

Alternatives:

1. Establish this position into the appropriate HEPB classification.
2. Return this position to the exempt administrative salary schedule at the appropriate range level.

Discussion: The incumbent recognizes this position does not qualify for exempt under HEPB regulations, therefore agrees with classification into an appropriate classification.

8. While it is recognized that most exempt administrative positions are involved, to some extent, in instructional activities, it is recommended that where heavy involvement takes place and is part of the total job responsibilities, the position be prorated between the faculty grid and the exempt administrative salary schedule. When rotation from faculty to exempt administrative or vice versa takes place or is contemplated, the determination of salary schedule (faculty or exempt) must be determined at the time of appointment or employment.

9. The adjustment from present position ranges to recommended ranges become effective at the time funds become available for salary increases or July 1, 1975, whichever occurs first. Positions outside of the recommended salary ranges shall be treated as follows:

- a. Position incumbents whose current salary is below the lowest step of the recommended range shall be raised to the lowest step (A).
- b. No incumbent whose current salary is above the recommended range will have his or her salary decreased. The salary will be frozen until the range catches up with the incumbent's paid rate.

Position incumbents whose current salary is within the recommended range shall be moved to the nearest step above the current step, if the current and proposed steps are not identical.

10. At the time of employment, all permanent positions, including appointments to externally funded grants and contracts, be included in one of the three recognized groups of employees--faculty, exempt staff and classified staff--depending upon position responsibilities.
11. The following priorities be established on funds available for exempt administrators:
 - a. Adjust all salaries to the first step of the recommended range and adjust current steps to proposed steps.
 - b. One half of the remaining to adjust salary grid for cost of living.
 - c. One half of the remaining to provide for merit increase.