Merit-based Salary Increases

The fundamental principle for salary recommendations is merit. …Neither time in service nor time in rank, however, can drive salary recommendations. The expectation in a merit system is that salary recommendations will be differential, with a true range of recommended salary increases. No portion of the allocation may be applied “across-the-board.”

Provost’s Memo to VPs and Deans
Merit Process and Salary Pools

• All staff have an annual performance evaluation, based on their job description and annual goals.

• All faculty have an annual performance evaluation, based on previous record of performance and cumulative contribution.
  – Some schools use a clearly defined point system (15 points in A&S; 20 in SoE) with decanal review.
  – Others rely on record alone and decanal review.

• Provost reviews all recommendations from VPs and deans.

• Salary Pools
  – Faculty: 4.5%
  – Operational and Professional Staff: 2.0%
  – Classified Staff: mandated by State policy
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Frequency vs. Salary Increase
MSOB Faculty Merit Raises, in %

Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Increase</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-0.99%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%-1.99%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%-2.99%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%-3.99%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%-4.99%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%-5.99%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%-6.99%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%-7.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%-8.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%-9.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOE Faculty Merit Raises, in %

Frequency

Salary Increase

- 0.00%
- 0%-0.99%
- 1%-1.99%
- 2%-2.99%
- 3%-3.99%
- 4%-4.99%
- 5%-5.99%
- 6%-6.99%
- 7%-7.99%
- 8%-8.99%
- 9%-9.99%
- ≥10%
Law Faculty Merit Raises, in %
VIMS Faculty Merit Raises, in %

Frequency

Salary Increase

- 0.00%
- 1% - 1.99%
- 2% - 2.99%
- 3% - 3.99%
- 4% - 4.99%
- 5% - 5.99%
- 6% - 6.99%
- 7% - 7.99%
- 8% - 8.99%
- 9% - 9.99%
- ≥ 10%

- 9.4%
- 12.5%
- 9.4%
- 42.2%
- 18.8%
- 4.7%
- 1.6%
FY 16 Faculty Raises

One More View:

• A scatterplot reveals just how much differentiation occurs above and below the average.

• Chart Orientation:
  – The horizontal axis is the individual FY 15 salary.
  – The vertical axis is the percent raise for FY 16.
  – The gray dashed line is the avg. (4.5%).
FY 16 Faculty Merit Raises
FY 16 Staff Merit Raises, in %

Salary Increase

- 0.00%: 13.1%
- 0%-0.99%: 3.1%
- 1%-1.99%: 28.6%
- 2%-2.99%: 24.6%
- 3%-3.99%: 10.4%
- 4%-4.99%: 7.9%
- 5%-5.99%: 4.9%
- 6%-6.99%: 2.8%
- 7%-7.99%: 1.7%
- 8%-8.99%: 1.2%
- 9%-9.99%: 0.7%
- ≥10%: 1.1%
**Estimated FY 16 Comparisons**

- Private peers assumed at 2.4% increase in FY 16, public peers at 2.3% as reported by the Chronicle of Higher Education.

- Final FY 15 salary data still has not been published in IPEDS. FY 15 and FY 16 values are estimated based on FY 14 data, the most recent year available.
W&M Avg. Faculty Salaries, FY2009 to FY2016* (est.)

College of William and Mary
60th Percentile Goal (SCHEV method)
W&M Pctl. Rank (SCHEV method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Avg. Faculty Salary</th>
<th>Percentile Rank among SCHEV Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>$88,800</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$86,204</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>$85,638</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$90,452</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>$88,587</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>$92,277</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015*</td>
<td>$96,741</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016*</td>
<td>$112,226</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 60th Percentile Goal: Cutting the Gap through the W&M Promise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Difference/Gap</th>
<th>Reduction in Gap since FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>$16,888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>$15,208</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015*</td>
<td>$12,893</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016*</td>
<td>$11,132</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 60th Percentile Goal: Cutting the Gap through the W&M Promise

- FY2013: $16,888
- FY2014: $15,208 (9.9% reduction)
- FY2015*: $12,893 (23.7% reduction)
- FY2016*: $11,132 (34.1% reduction)
The SCHEV Peer Group

- Public Institutions (10)
  - UC-Irvine
  - UC-Santa Barbara
  - Univ. of Connecticut
  - Univ. of Delaware
  - Univ. of Georgia
  - Univ. of New Hampshire
  - Rutgers University
  - SUNY at Binghamton
  - UNC-Chapel Hill
  - Clemson University
The SCHEV Peer Group

• Private Institutions (15)
  Boston College
  Boston University
  Brandeis University
  Brown University
  Dartmouth College
  Emory University
  Georgetown Univ.
  Marquette University
  Syracuse University
  Tufts University
  Univ. of Notre Dame
  Vanderbilt University
  Wake Forest University
  Washington U.-St. Louis
  Yeshiva University
W&M Avg. Faculty Salaries, FY2009 to FY2016* (est.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>$88,800</td>
<td>$86,204</td>
<td>$85,638</td>
<td>$90,452</td>
<td>$88,587</td>
<td>$92,277</td>
<td>$105,258*</td>
<td>$107,679*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th Percentile (Public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th Percentile (Private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated values.