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(0) Introduction

Two of CFCD’s primary responsibilities are to distribute grants and fellowships to faculty in response to solicited applications, and to make a recommendation to ACRA on faculty salaries. We report on those two activities in Sections (1) and (2). As CFCD processes grant requests, it often revisits its policies detailed in the MoneyBook, described in Section (3). Finally, it is quite common for CFCD to study a variety of faculty benefits. This year we addressed long-term disability, the College tuition benefit, parental leave, and the possibility of a retirement incentive: Section (4). We attempt to include copious data, but otherwise strive for succinctness.
(1a) Financial Expenditures: Fellowships

It is not widely appreciated that CFCD disburses about $175K per year in fellowships, largely from endowments. In FY15 (2014-15), CFCD awarded $171K in fellowships.

CFCD Fellowships: FY 14 vs. FY 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowships</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY15 – FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Acad in Rome</td>
<td>$12K</td>
<td>$6K</td>
<td>- $6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>$8K</td>
<td>$1K</td>
<td>- $7K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>$12K</td>
<td>$6K</td>
<td>- $6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorius/Spofford</td>
<td>$4K</td>
<td>$4K</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnish</td>
<td>$51K</td>
<td>$42K</td>
<td>- $9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picker</td>
<td>$88K</td>
<td>$97K</td>
<td>+ $9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappaport</td>
<td>$13K</td>
<td>$15K</td>
<td>+ $2K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$188K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$171K</strong></td>
<td><strong>- $17K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1b) Financial Expenditures: Grants

CFCD annually awards grants for attending conferences (Form 1) and for research and teaching (Form 2), disbursing approximately $550K per year. This was the first year of a rather different system, including four primary innovations: (1) Form-1 and Form-2 maximum limits are no longer separately distinguished, but rather there is instead a single (Form-1 + Form-2) maximum; (2) the maximum is $5,000 over two years, allowing more flexibility; (3) we introduced Form-3 for student support, which formerly was folded into Form 2; (4) a mechanism for "exceptional supplementary" requests was instituted.

In the first year of this new system, we found the following behavior:

- 11 faculty spent their entire 2-yr max allocation of $5,000 in one year
- Only 38 faculty spent more than $2,500 in the first year
- 6 faculty requested exceptional supplementary grants (i.e., 6 of the 11 who spent $5K in one year)
- CFCD awarded only 2 of these exceptional requests, both to junior faculty
- The requests for student support (via Form 3) exceeded the previous year by nearly a factor of 3: $186K vs. $67K
- CFCD was able to award about double the previous year's allocation for students: $129K vs. $67K
- CFCD was able to award all Form-1 and Form-2 requests that fell within our policies

---

1 Approximately 320 faculty are eligible for CFCD funding (some prorated according to their FTE).
Form-2 requests were down from FY14, but as just noted, Form-3 requests were up.

In other words, only two varieties of requests could not be satisfied: Exceptional supplementary requests, and student support. In the end, CFCD awarded $36K more in FY15 than they did in FY14. We anticipate significant pressure next year, in the 2nd year of the new 2-yr system.

**CFCD Awards: FY14 vs. FY15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY15 – FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1 (Conferences)</td>
<td>$176K</td>
<td>$220K (est.)</td>
<td>+ $44K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2 (Res &amp; Teaching)</td>
<td>$255K</td>
<td>$170K</td>
<td>- $85K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3 (Student Assts.)</td>
<td>$67K</td>
<td>$129K</td>
<td>+ $62K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other$^2$</td>
<td>$39K</td>
<td>$54K</td>
<td>+ $15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$543K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$573K</strong></td>
<td><strong>+ $36K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CFCD FY15 Awards: Requested vs. Approved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>FY15 (req)</th>
<th>FY15 (appr)</th>
<th>Req-Apprv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1 (Conferences)</td>
<td>$220K</td>
<td>$220K (est.)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2 (Res &amp; Teaching)</td>
<td>$221K</td>
<td>$170K</td>
<td>- $51K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3 (Student Assts.)</td>
<td>$186K</td>
<td>$129K</td>
<td>- $57K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$63K</td>
<td>$54K</td>
<td>- $9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$690K</strong></td>
<td><strong>$573K</strong></td>
<td><strong>- $117K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2$ Subventions, Connections, Emeriti grants
(2a) Faculty Salaries: Faculty Salary Recommendation

At the recommendation of the President and the Board of Trustees, CFCD collected a wider range of data (i.e., more than salaries) from a larger pool of schools (i.e., more than the 15 peer schools\(^3\)) that we have used for more than a decade. In addition, CFCD attempted to reach a recommendation based on last year's (2013-14) salaries, because the current year salaries of our peers are not known until late January, too late for an ACRA recommendation to the Board of Trustees. CFCD settled on comparisons among the USNews Top-50 schools, but retained the parallel emphasis on the traditional 15 peer schools.

Two of the most important data sources gathered by CFCD are shown in the next pages: A “box-whisker” chart comparison among our 15 peers, showing we are at best at the median, and revealing significant weakness in our Associate Professor salaries; and an 8-column table of comparisons with the USNews top-50 schools. Of particular note here is the new “wealth” data (column 6) provided by the Budget Office, which shows that our salary rankings are at or only slightly below our wealth ranking.

The final result was that CFCD recommended a range (excluding promotions) of [3.50%, 3.75%], and ultimately ACRA, the President, and the Board of Trustees approved an increase of 3.75%, of which 0.25% is reserved for promotions and new hires. This is the same increase as last year, but is effectively larger, because last year CPI was 1.50%, but this year it is half that: 0.76%.

(2b) Faculty Salaries: Merit System

The Associate Provost proposed a new merit system, where the three traditional categories – Scholarship, Teaching, Service – would each be evaluated as 0,1,2 merit-worthy, rather than the current system which amalgamates all three into merit 0,1,2. CFCD had many reservations about the proposed system. One argument in favor of the current system is that it allows faculty to focus on a particular area, say, service, perhaps compensating for other relatively neglected areas. A subsequent discussion explored eliminating merit entirely. The Provost and Faculty Council have both requested that this be explored by next year's CFCD, after the Provost has one year of merit experience behind her.

As it does annually, CFCD recommended its desired distribution of the roughly $1M increase in the faculty salary pool among various categories and ranks: promotions, Assistant Professors, merit levels for Associate and Full Professors. CFCD decided to recommend a special “boost” to Associate Professor salaries, given what it learned in peer comparisons. CFCD made a recommendation to the Provost, which she accepted.

---

\(^3\)Amherst, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Colgate, Haverford, Middlebury, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Smith, Swarthmore, Trinity, Vassar, Wellesley, Wesleyan, Williams.
# Data definitions and sources

1. Amherst: 109,662
2. Bates: 87,850
3. Barnard: 82,200
4. Bowdoin: 81,941
5. BrynMawr: 77,991
6. Carleton: 77,419
7. Colgate: 76,402
8. Colby: 75,903
9. Connecticut: 76,984
10. Dartmouth: 76,060
11. Denison: 73,270
12. Duke: 72,147
13. Duke: 72,147
14. Endowment: 78,068
15. Endowment: 78,068

# Top-50 USNews schools (15 peers highlighted; Salaries 2013-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>#USNews</th>
<th>#School</th>
<th>Full $</th>
<th>#School</th>
<th>Assoc $</th>
<th>#School</th>
<th>Endow/Sal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$184,472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,364,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$105,354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$90,819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$102,790</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$93,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$81,941</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$106,012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$80,981</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$84,222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$79,861</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$76,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$79,832</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$79,059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$79,832</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$80,786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$78,068</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$82,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$77,844</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$83,121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$77,040</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$84,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$76,997</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$85,907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$76,997</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$87,215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$76,997</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$88,321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$76,997</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$89,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Data definitions and sources

1. CDS (undergrad) student/faculty ratio, 2013-14
2. IPEDS endowment per undergraduate student, 2011-12
3. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Assistant Professor salary, 2013-14
4. IPEDS endowment per undergraduate student, 2011-12
5. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Assistant Professor salary, 2013-14
6. IPEDS endowment per undergraduate student, 2011-12
7. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Assistant Professor salary, 2013-14
8. IPEDS endowment per undergraduate student, 2011-12
9. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Assistant Professor salary, 2013-14
10. IPEDS endowment per undergraduate student, 2011-12

# Percentiles in margin: Among 15 peers. E.g., 5.87% means 5th out of 15, i.e., the 67th percentile.

**Data definitions and sources**

1. USNews Liberal Arts rankings, 2015
2. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Full Professor salary, 2013-14
3. AUPP (Sec.3) continuing Associate Professor salary, 2013-14
4. AAUP (Sec.3) continuing Assistant Professor salary, 2013-14
5. IPEDS enrollment per undergraduate student, 2011-12
6. "Wealth": Endowment + net tuition revenue per student
7. CDS (undergrad) student/faculty ratio, 2013-14
8. USNews peer reputation index, 2015 (22.5% of ranking)

(3a) Policy Adjustments: Subventions

The cost of subventions continues to increase, largely in response to the changing publishing environment. Last year’s CFCD revised its commitments, recognizing that (a) the more money that is spent on subventions, the less is available for research and teaching support---it is all one “pot,” and (b) that authors sometimes receive royalties. CFCD excluded support for editing, indexing, and proofreading, tasks that can be done by the author. We indicated that support for image and copyright permission fees would generally be reserved for junior faculty. CFCD this year reviewed every request that fell out of our guidelines, and in general confirmed those guidelines. In particular, CFCD reiterated its stance that we cannot pay for translations of a work from its original language, as such translations would increase the reach of almost any work, rendering differentiation between requests problematical.

At the Provost’s request, CFCD analyzed six years of subventions disbursements. The chart (next page) show that Div 1, 2, 3, 4 received 52%, 12%, 27%, 9% of subvention funds respectively, which seems roughly appropriate given the size of the divisions (e.g., Div 1 is 45% of the faculty) and the difference in disciplines.

(3a) Policy Adjustments: 5-day Conference

CFCD made a minor change to allow per diem for up to five days at a conference, to accommodate those disciplines that regularly hold annual 5-day conferences. The current policy allows per diem for up to four days.

(3b) Policy Adjustments: FAQ

CFCD created an FAQ focused on its faculty grant programs to support transparency and ongoing communication with faculty. The FAQ is posted to our website (http://www.smith.edu/deanoffaculty/facdevfaq.html) and will be updated as necessary.
CFCD Subvention analysis:
Grants awarded 2009-10 through 2014-15 (6 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Awards</th>
<th>Amt Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Div I</td>
<td>$48,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div II</td>
<td>$11,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div III</td>
<td>$25,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div IV</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 60  $93,256
Average per year = 10  $15,543  or avg $1,554 per grant

![Pie chart of # of Awards](chart1.png)

![Pie chart of $ Received](chart2.png)
(5a) Benefits: Long-Term Disability (LTD)
CFCD started the year with a presentation at the first Faculty Meeting of the policy changes surrounding medical leave and the transition to LTD. Now all employees will transition from medical leave after 6 months to LTD. There will no longer be a supplemental premium, but instead employees will receive 60% of their salary, non-taxable, while under LTD. Further details of our presentation can be found with the materials for the 10 Sep 2014 Faculty Meeting.

A question arose about the duration a faculty member’s position should be held open (i.e., not filled permanently) after entering LTD. CFCD recommended to the Provost that she follow the LWOP 2-year policy: the position should normally be held open for up to two years after the faculty member enters medical leave.

(5b) Benefits: College Tuition Benefit
At the request of Faculty Council, both HR and CFCD revisited the college tuition benefit, which had been tabled by last year’s Cabinet. CFCD reiterated its three principles: (1) The two-tiered cap should be eliminated; (2) We should restore the connection to Smith’s tuition (rather than the current flat cap); (3) We should improve the benefit to be more generous at low-tuition schools. CFCD reiterated these points in a memo to Cabinet.

(5c) Benefits: Tuition Exchange Program
At the request of a faculty member, CFCD discussed the College’s Tuition Exchange Program, and learned it supports scholarships for 6 students per year for 2 years each, whereas our peers support 3 students per year for 4 years each. The program is “costed” at ~$400K annually. Given the relatively small number of employees affected and the already substantial cost, CFCD decided to make no recommendation at this time to change the benefit. CFCD plans to revisit the issue next year.

(5d) Benefits: Parental Leave
At the request of a faculty member, CFCD analyzed the faculty parental leave policy, especially in regards to (1) the difference if the birth/adoption occurs in early summer, outside of 8 weeks of the fall semester, and (2) whether the two-course reduction could be spread out over two semesters. CFCD made a recommendation to the Provost to create a flexible but consistent year-round policy.

(5e) Benefits: Retirement Incentive Program
At the request of the Provost, CFCD briefly considered this topic. CFCD examined Mount Holyoke’s recent successful retirement incentive program, which offered faculty a lump-sum one-year’s salary and participation in their group health insurance program to age 65, among other details. We reexamined our faculty age distribution: 62 faculty (21% of the faculty) are over 65; average retirement age of 70. The Chair predicts about 54 retirements in the next five years without an incentive program. CFCD will revisit our retirement program in depth next year, with the goal of suggesting a revised ongoing retirement program that is attractive to faculty and minimizes curricular disruption.