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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The College of William and Mary employs 850 administrative and professional faculty in arts and sciences, marine science, business administration, education and law, compared to 1,185 non-student hourly and classified employees. The work that faculty members do is well known within the institution, but this is less true for classified and hourly employees. Classified and hourly employees perform a variety of roles, ranging from housekeepers, administrative and program specialists, trades technicians and law enforcement officers, to accountants and information technology specialists. They play an important role in helping the College fulfill both its mission and six specific goals:

• To attract outstanding students from diverse backgrounds;

• To develop a diverse faculty that is nationally and internationally recognized for excellence in both teaching and research;

• To provide a challenging undergraduate program with a liberal arts and sciences curriculum that encourages creativity, independent thought, and intellectual depth, breadth and curiosity;

• To offer high quality graduate and professional programs that prepare students for intellectual, professional and public leadership;

• To instill in its students an appreciation for the human condition, a concern for the public well-being and a life-long commitment to learning; and

• To use the scholarship and skills of its faculty and students to further human knowledge and understanding, and to address specific problems confronting the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation and the world.

Comments from three Virginia Governors clearly indicate that the College is achieving its mission and goals. "William and Mary is a world-class example of excellence in higher education," says Governor James S. Gilmore III.

Former Governor and current United States Senator George F. Allen reminds us that we cannot become complacent about our success. "It is our charge and our challenge to see that this jewel in Virginia's crown is preserved for generations of young people and leaders to come. William and Mary has evolved from a royal college to a private college to a state university whose national reputation brings recognition to the Commonwealth's prestigious system of higher education."

Former Governor L. Douglas Wilder offers similar words of wisdom. "The traditions of William and Mary that count are ones many schools take for granted—like being a school where professors still teach, and teach freshmen as well as upper-class students; where professors keep their office hours; where your teachers know your names, and they care enough to hold to high standards. Those are the traditions upon which a solid education is developed."

Instructional Faculty are only one key ingredient needed to establish a world-class educational institution. Events over the last few years have reminded the College community that
hourly and classified employees play an integral role in creating the William and Mary educational experience. At the same time it has become quite evident that the College is having difficulty attracting and retaining qualified classified and hourly employees, motivating them by rewarding sustained performance and supporting management in the realization of each office’s mission and objectives.

To assess the magnitude of the problem, and respond to the concerns expressed by members of the College, on March 7, 2001 President Sullivan created the Committee on Employment Opportunity. The Committee, comprised of the Vice Presidents for Finance, Administration, and Student Affairs, seven senior faculty, two housekeepers who are members of the Black Faculty and Staff Forum (BFSF), the past President of Hourly and Classified Employees (HACE) and the current chair of HACE’s Concerns Committee was charged to develop:

- Baseline employment data that will provide a sound basis for subsequent recommendations;

- Recommendations for modifications, if any, in current wage scales for our lowest paid employees;

- Recommendations on how to support the provision of quality health care for uncovered employees and their families;

- Recommendations for employee parking policies and childcare needs;

- A blueprint for providing life-long learning opportunities and professional development options for employees; and

- Guidelines and employment practices that should be required of those who contract to provide services to the College.

The Committee utilized a variety of methods and data sources to determine the College’s level of competitiveness as an employer. The first was an analysis of the Richmond and Hampton Roads labor market. The second was an employee survey sent to 1,127 classified, hourly, part-time William and Mary employees, as well as employees of the Sarah Ives Gore Child Care Center and the employees of the auxiliary services that provide books and food. The survey asked employees to describe their level of satisfaction with their compensation, ability to grow on the job and working conditions. Third, the Committee held a series of employee information sessions. The purpose of the sessions was to learn in greater detail about the lives behind the numbers. In all of its work, the Committee focused exclusively on non-student classified and hourly employees.²

The evidence presented in this report is consistent with economic research. Paying low and below-market wages and not providing the necessary training and resources to perform the job lead to higher employee turnover, higher job vacancies, lower employee morale and finally, lower productivity. The economic expansion of the 1990s in part explains higher turnover and lower employee morale, but there is also a structural explanation for these problems.
A difficulty in attracting and retaining young employees contributes to an older work force: almost one-half of the hourly and classified employees at the College are at least 45 years of age. This has profound implications for the future. If improvements are not made before the number of retirements accelerates, it will be even more difficult to attract and retain the skilled workforce that the College needs.

The Committee learned that the College faces a large number of institutional, financial and workplace-culture challenges that it must confront in order to continue to attract and retain good employees. The Committee submits a comprehensive and aggressive set of recommendations that should be explored for feasibility.

In today’s period of fiscal uncertainty, setting priorities is a delicate process. In preparing the College for the 21st century, the College set priorities and made significant investments to improve the faculty, to support a new curriculum and to improve the campus. Recently new priorities, both short- and long-term, were established in William and Mary 2010 with little mention of supporting staff’s role in making the document’s vision a reality.

Yet, the evidence in this report strongly indicates that the College’s classified and hourly employees, the individuals that underpin the College structure, need to be placed higher on the list of the institution’s priorities.

The Committee identified three key areas in which the College should focus its efforts. The three areas in which immediate, short- and long-term investments must be made are:

• Compensation;

• Employment policies, practices and working conditions; and

• Communication and policy implementation.

Improvements in these three major areas will serve as a modest down payment—a beginning toward increasing the College’s ability to compete in today’s labor market and to maintain its position in the future. The Committee recognizes that there is no “quick fix” to the severe structural problems that have emerged over time. The Committee is also aware that in order to restore balance, the administration, faculty and students may have to make some difficult choices.

The recommendations to which we assign the highest priority for non-student classified and hourly employees are the following:

**Compensation:**

**Recommendation 1: Make hourly and classified compensation competitive.**

The Committee’s recommended target, with its components listed in order of priority, is the following:

A Effective November 1, 2001, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning $7.53 per hour or less receive the Commonwealth’s maximum allowable increase in a fiscal year of 10 percent, and all earning $7.54 to $8.28 per hour move to $8.29 per hour.
B. To address wage compression, effective November 1, 2001, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning a current wage, as of October 31, 2001, of $8.09 to $10.51 per hour receive an across-the-board adjustment of $0.21 per hour.

C. Effective July 1, 2002, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning $7.72 per hour or less receive the Commonwealth’s maximum allowable increase in a fiscal year of 10 percent, and all earning $7.73 to $8.49 per hour move to $8.50 per hour.

D. To address wage compression, effective July 1, 2002, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning a current wage, as of June 30, 2002, of $8.31 to $10.75 per hour receive an across-the-board adjustment of $0.20 per hour.

- **Recommendation 2: Adjust the College’s minimum hourly equivalent wage.**
  The Committee recommends that when the adjustments in Recommendation 1 occur, $8.29 per hour becomes the College’s minimum hourly equivalent wage for non-student classified and hourly employees and for FY03, $8.50 per hour becomes the College’s minimum hourly equivalent wage.

- **Recommendation 3: Urge contractors of auxiliary services and the Parent Board of the Child Care Center to offer competitive compensation.**
  A. The Committee urges contractors that provide auxiliary services to the College and the Parent Board of the Sarah Ives Gore Child Care Center to reevaluate their wage scales in light of the market data provided in this report.

  B. When evaluating future bids for auxiliary services to students, faculty and staff, such as food, books, and child care, the College will take into consideration whether employers offer compensation consistent with the values and practices recommended in this report.

- **Recommendation 4: Convert “long-time” hourly employees to classified employees.**
  To move toward a reasonable balance of hourly and classified employees, the Committee recommends converting long-time hourly employees to classified employees (with benefits).

**Employment policies, practices and working conditions:**

- **Recommendation 1: Provide employees with access to lounges and public spaces.**
  The Committee recommends that the College identifies and provides employees with safe and pleasant places where they can take breaks and eat lunch.

- **Recommendation 2: Create a revenue neutral and fair parking fee structure.**
  The Committee recommends that the College develop a revenue neutral parking fee structure that is sensitive toward an employee’s level of family income and employee classification.
**Recommendation 3: Create employment training, development and educational programs.**
The Committee recommends that the College work with the Peninsula Alliance for Economic Development (PAED), a public/private organization, to identify the educational and training needs of employees and implement a comprehensive life-long educational and training program.

**Communication and policy implementation:**

**Recommendation: Retain the Committee on Employment Opportunity.**
A major concern of employees is that these recommendations will not be implemented, either because of the College's past inaction or today's current budget crisis. To be responsive to these concerns, the Committee on Employment Opportunity should become a standing College committee, and be given the following charges:

- Provide insight and advice regarding the data collection, policy and program development of the recommendations presented in this report;

- Monitor the College's progress as it works to implement the recommendations;

- Provide the President and the community with an annual report that describes the progress toward implementation of the recommendations contained in this report; and

- Alert the President of new issues facing other employee categories, such as non-instructional faculty.

During the Committee's work, it identified some very sobering and disturbing employment practices, that extend well beyond the issue of low compensation. At the same time the Committee observed extremely strong bonds among employees, between employees and faculty and students, and between employees and some supervisors. These bonds have kept and currently keep people coming to work each day. These strong co-worker relations have to date offset the negative impact of: wages that are persistently low on both absolute and relative scales; the persistent lack of resources to perform the job; the persistent lack of advancement opportunities; poorly trained supervisors; and the current budget crisis.

The Committee is deeply concerned and believes that these positive relationships cannot indefinitely outweigh the administrative and structural barriers that this report documents. Combining these barriers with the Commonwealth's budget problems, the Committee fears that the College's current approach to doing business by relying on the good will of its employees cannot succeed much longer. Continuing to ask over two-thirds of the College's employees to do more and more with even fewer and fewer resources and rewards is truly putting the College's ability to achieve its mission, specific goals, and vision as presented in William and Mary 2010 in jeopardy. Furthermore, placing the Committee's evidence in the broad context of the unprecedented prosperity that most Americans experienced during the 1990s further amplifies and supports the need for change.
SECTION I: Introduction

A. Compensation Goals and Objectives

The major goals of compensation systems might vary from one organization to another, but they all share common threads. They are to attract and retain qualified employees, and motivate them by rewarding sustained performance. In fact, these are the consensus points in the professional human resource literature and in the practice of modern compensation. At William and Mary, the compensation goals and objectives of the Office of Human Resources are no different from those in the human resource literature as practiced in most workplaces. The office’s goals and objectives are “to provide comprehensive human resource services which facilitate the College’s ability to recruit, employ, train, retain and promote a high quality and diverse workforce.”

B. Committee Charge

Anecdotal evidence has emerged over the last few years that the College’s Office of Human Resources is having difficulty fulfilling its mission. Many members of the College community also raised these same issues. To assess the severity of the situation and recommend changes if needed, on March 7, 2001, President Sullivan created the Committee on Employment Opportunity. The Committee is comprised of the Vice Presidents for Finance, Administration, and Student Affairs, seven senior faculty, two housekeepers who are members of the Black Faculty and Staff Forum (BFSF), the past President of Hourly and Classified Employees (HACE) and the current chair of HACE’s Concerns Committee.

The President charged the committee to develop recommendations that when implemented would strengthen the College’s ability to attract and retain the highest quality hourly and classified workforce.

In his charge letter, the President asked that the Committee, chaired by William M Rodgers III, the Frances L. and Edwin L Cummings Associate Professor and until January 20, 2001 the Chief Economist for the United States Labor Department, to develop:

- Baseline employment data that will provide a sound basis for subsequent recommendations,

- Recommendations for modifications, if any, in current wage scales for our lowest paid employees,

- Recommendations on how to support the provision of quality health care for uncovered employees and their families,

- Recommendations for employee parking policies and childcare needs,

- A blueprint for providing life-long learning opportunities and professional development options for employees, and
• Guidelines and employment practices that should be required of those who contract to provide services to the College.

This report describes the extent to which the College’s employment practices for its non-student classified, hourly, and part-time employees are competitive within the Richmond-Hampton Roads, Virginia labor market, and provides recommendations for strengthening the College’s competitiveness. Solely based on a business rationale, the Committee’s general view is that the College can do much better in the compensation, opportunities for advancement, and working conditions that it provides for hourly and classified employees.

To arrive at this conclusion, the Committee utilized a variety of methods and data sources. The first was a comparison of the College’s administrative data to published data on the Richmond-Hampton Roads labor market. The second was an employee survey sent to over 1,100 classified, hourly, part-time employees, as well as employees of the auxiliary services that provide books and food, and the Sarah Ives Gore Child Care Center. The survey asked employees to describe their level of satisfaction with their compensation, ability to grow on the job, and working conditions. Over 600 completed surveys were received from William and Mary employees and approximately 10 were received from auxiliary services and child care center employees. The committee also learned much about the College’s competitiveness from a series of one- to two-hour employee information sessions.

The evidence presented in this report is consistent with academic research, which finds that paying both low- and below-market wages and not providing the necessary training and resources to perform the job leads to higher employee turnover, higher job vacancies, lower employee morale and finally, lower productivity. More important, the evidence provides solid documentation of an urgent need to adjust compensation, improve opportunities for advancement, and improve working conditions, thus increasing the College’s ability to successfully compete in today’s labor market, and in future labor markets as well.

The tight labor market of the 1990s explains some of the higher turnover and lower workplace morale, but the College’s high turnover and low morale have a structural or long-term component as well. Today, almost one-half of all hourly and classified employees are at least 45 years of age. Over the next two decades these employees will retire. If changes are not made before the retirement rate starts to accelerate, it will be even more difficult to attract and retain the skilled workforce that the College needs in order to fulfill its mission. Making the necessary changes today will place the College on a path such that it can successfully compete in future labor markets as an employer of choice.

C. Methodology

Labor Market Analysis

Researchers and practitioners have shown that turnover is a good indicator of a job’s competitiveness. Excessive turnover is typically associated with employers paying low wages, in both absolute and relative terms.

To identify the College’s job roles that are the least competitive, the Committee created three categories of labor market competitiveness. These categories are based on the wage level and the size of the wage disadvantage that College employees face in the labor market. The competitiveness categories are as follows:
(1) The job role's average hourly wage is below $8.29 per hour (the current hourly wage needed to lift a family of four out of poverty), and is below the job role's Richmond-Hampton Roads average hourly wage.

(2) Job roles in which wage compression will occur if adjustments are made to wages in job roles (1), and

(3) Other job roles in which average hourly wages exceed $8.29 per hour, but are below the Richmond-Hampton Roads average hourly wage (what we will call a relative wage gap).

Given the Committee's definition of competitiveness, we expected that category (1) would have the highest turnover, followed by categories (2), and (3) in that order. The College is having the greatest difficulty attracting and retaining employees in jobs where the pay is low in both absolute and relative terms.

To provide the most current and detailed description of classified and hourly employees' wages, we calculated the minimum, average, and maximum hourly wage rates.

Several challenges emerged in constructing the wage comparisons and turnover rates. First, the Committee lacked the data and software needed to generate precise measures of turnover. We adopted a proxy for job turnover, the requisition rate or the number of times during the FY00 when a position was vacant and the Office of Human Resources advertised in an attempt to fill it.

Second, in order to compare the College's hourly wages to a weighted average of the Richmond-Hampton Roads metropolitan statistical area we had to use 1999 data, the latest available for the metropolitan area. This entailed reclassifying the old 1999 job titles into the new FY01 state job roles. Doing this reduced the College's 363 job titles to 89 role codes. The reduction to 89 role codes leads to 26 role codes that contain one employee and 56 role codes that contain 5 or fewer employees. This reclassification has no substantive impact on our results, though it limits our ability to present detailed results. A larger drawback to the consolidation of codes is the lack of a direct match per person between the College's 1999 and the FY01 payroll data.

Even with these challenges, the Committee is confident that it identified the College's least competitive job roles.

Employee Survey

The Committee sent out via campus mail an employee survey to 1,127 hourly and classified employees. We received 647 completed surveys for a return rate of over 50 percent. This is especially noteworthy given that the typical response rate to a mail survey is approximately 25 percent. Along with collecting views on compensation, workplace conditions, and opportunities for advancement, the survey asked individuals to describe their employment status, race, sex, and years of service at the College. See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Administrative data from the Office of Human Resources on which the survey mailing list was based indicate that the composition of the over 600 surveys that were returned is similar to the employment base, supporting the conclusion that that the survey data is not skewed or biased. Figure 1 shows that 12 percent of respondents were hourly employees that have no
benefits, compared to 15 percent in the administrative database. Full-time employees with benefits comprise 86 percent of the survey, compared to 84 percent in the Human Resources administrative database. Years of service at the College are also similar across the survey and the administrative data. Just over one-half of respondents have worked at the College for no more than five years. The comparable figure in the Human Resources database is 45 percent (Figure 2).

The most interesting demographic statistic is that in both the survey and administrative data, 49 percent of hourly, classified and part-time employees are at least 44 years of age (Figure 3). The age data by themselves indicate that within the next two decades the College will face substantial retirement among its classified, hourly and part-time employees. The problem of an aging workforce is particularly acute among the low-paid housekeeping staff. The College currently employs 121 housekeepers (including 4 supervisors). Of the 114 housekeepers whose age can be verified, 32 percent are at least 55 years old, while 66 percent are at least 45 years old (Figure 4).

Finally, the gender and racial distributions in the survey are also quite similar to the distributions found in the Human Resources database.

Employee Information Sessions

The Committee initially held two one-hour sessions with members of the Hourly and Classified Employee Association (HACE), the largest College organization that represents hourly and classified employees, and with the Black Faculty and Staff Forum (BFSF), a College organization that has an historical record of raising a number of issues presented in the President’s set of charges. Both meetings attracted between 25 and 35 attendees. The Committee then held 7 employee information sessions across campus, with special meetings for housekeepers and grounds and maintenance employees. Committee members served as facilitators and recorders for all of the sessions. Attendance at these sessions ranged from 10 to 55 employees. See Appendix B for a schedule of the employee information session meetings and Appendix C for a sample protocol.

Two additional sessions were held at the Virginia Institute for Marine Science (VIMS) in Gloucester Point, which is a 20 to 30 minute drive to Williamsburg. One-fourth to one-third of the College’s classified and hourly employees work at VIMS. A total of approximately 30 employees attended the sessions, providing a wide cross-section of the Institute’s classified, hourly and temporary services staff.

D. Labor Market Analysis Findings

This section describes the College’s job turnover among its classified and hourly employees, reliance on “long-time” hourly employees, and presents the findings of the “labor market competitiveness” analysis.

Job turnover among classified and hourly employees

During the past fiscal year, the College’s turnover rate among hourly and classified employees was 29 percent. The hourly turnover rate was 59 percent, compared to 23 percent for classified positions. Although not directly comparable, the University of Virginia’s turnover rate
for all of its classified workers at a similar point in time was 13 percent. However, they too had higher turnover rates in their lower paid classified jobs. The turnover rate for salary grades 1, 2 and 3 (old job codes) was 35 percent in 1998. The University of Virginia made salary adjustments on October 25, 2000. For the period October 25, 2000 to April 13, 2001, turnover rates fell to 9.5 percent for salary grades 1, 2 and 3 and 11.6 percent for housekeepers. Officials attributed the decline to the salary adjustments.

A description of “long-time” hourly employees

In FY01, William and Mary’s hourly employees comprised 16 percent, or 170 of the 1,060 classified, part-time classified, and hourly employees at the College. Compared to other employers, this share appears to be high. A greater concern is the extent to which many of these hourly employees consistently work the maximum number of hours and have been doing so for a prolonged period of time. From the College’s standpoint it signals a structural imbalance in the number of hourly positions relative to classified positions. From an employee’s standpoint, working as a long-time hourly may signal a path to become a classified employee. If both are the case, then efforts need to be made to convert long-time hourly employees to classified employees, such that they can be afforded all of the benefits that the College’s classified employees receive and that the College can utilize hourly employees in the most efficient way. Between 40 and 50 percent of hourly employees have been with the College for at least 3 years. During the most recent fiscal year, 28 (of the 170) hourly positions had regular hours of 1,500 or more. Eight of the 28 also were paid for additional overtime hours.

Labor market analysis

Several preliminary notes must be made prior to discussing the findings of the Committee’s labor market analysis. The findings are presented in summary form because many job roles only have a few employees in them, making identification of individuals easy.

Figure 5 shows the number of employees in each labor market competitiveness category. The wages of job roles in group 1 are the least competitive. They are below both $8.29 per hour and the Richmond-Hampton-Roads average hourly wage. There are 7 job roles with 124 employees in this category. Our second group consists of the 243 employees who are in the same job clusters as employees in group 1, but who have higher skills or are managers. We include them for two reasons: first, because their average wage is below the Richmond-Hampton Roads average hourly wage and, in some cases the minimum wage is below $8.29 per hour; and second, because adjustments to the wages of employees in group 1 will cause wage compression and possibly wage inversion. Our final group of job roles in which wages are not competitive are job roles where the average wage exceeds $8.29 per hour, but a substantial relative pay gap exists. Almost 600 employees are in this group.

Table 1 and Figures 6 to 8 provide summary statistics of the wage levels, absolute and relative pay gaps, and turnover rates for the three “competitiveness” groups. As expected, the turnover rates are highest in group 1 and lowest in group 3. For group 1, the 1999 average wage was $7.31 per hour, putting them at a $0.50 per hour or 9 percent disadvantage relative to the Richmond-Hampton Roads average. The turnover rate for this group was 30 percent. Distinguishing employees in this group by employment status reveals that hourly employees
have dramatically high turnover rates. During the year, the Office of Human Resources had to advertise 81 percent of the hourly job roles, compared to 42 percent of the classified job roles.

The average wage for group 2 was $11.08 per hour in 1999, 12 percent below the Richmond-Hampton Roads average wage. The turnover rate for the group is 41 percent, but because of the sample sizes within job roles, it is more instructive to disaggregate by employment status. The turnover rate among group 2 hourly employees is lower than the turnover rate among group 1 hourly employees, but still in excess of 50 percent. The turnover rate for classified employees in group 2 is also lower than the turnover rates of classified employees in group 1, but still quite high at 31 percent.

The average hourly wage in 1999 for our final group was $15.48 per hour. This was $1.85 or 14 percent below the Richmond-Hampton Roads hourly wage. Of our three groups, its turnover rate is the lowest, but at 26 percent we still consider it to be quite high (using the University of Virginia as a rough benchmark).

Although compelling, critics might argue that the previous analysis is too aggregate in nature. For example, what do the wages in Richmond and Norfolk have to do with the wages in Williamsburg? If the wages in Williamsburg are lower than in Richmond and Norfolk, then the Committee’s analysis overstates the College’s disadvantage in the labor market.

In an effort to anticipate this criticism, the Committee compared the wages paid in the College’s six least competitive job roles to a local state employer. We found that the average wages paid to William and Mary employees were lower in five of the six job roles, ranging from $1.13 to $4.31 per hour below the wages in comparable jobs.

In summary, the labor market analysis demonstrates the adverse impact of paying low wages in absolute and relative terms. The job role group with the highest turnover rate, particularly among hourly employees, appears to be the group with the lowest wages in both absolute and relative terms, followed by job roles in which wages are relatively low. In all of the “competitiveness” categories, the turnover of hourly employees exceeds the turnover of classified employees, suggesting that benefits play a key role in the attraction and retention of employees.

E. The consequences of paying noncompetitive wages

Researchers and practitioners cite higher training costs to employers, lower morale among the remaining employees, increased workplace hazards and greater workplace stress as consequences of paying noncompetitive wages. In an attempt to identify whether William and Mary is paying these avoidable costs, we turn to evidence collected from the survey and information sessions.

Employees reported dissatisfaction with their pay. The survey reveals that 55 percent of respondents were dissatisfied with their level of compensation, and the dissatisfaction is worst among the lowest paid employees. The dissatisfaction with compensation stems from it being below the market. Magnifying this dissatisfaction is that work loads and job descriptions are not consistent with pay and the College has difficulty compensating employees for additional work. The focus on faculty salaries, combined with the absence of formal acknowledgments of the staff’s important role as a contributor to the College’s mission disturbs many hourly and classified employees.

Most employees said they were dissatisfied with recent pay increases. Employees believe that compensation has become a political tug of war. They feel that hourly and classified
employees are always at the mercy of the General Assembly. Fifty-six percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with pay increases over the past three years. Again, the level of dissatisfaction was greatest among the College’s lower paid classified and hourly employees.

Internally, employees voiced frustration that there still appears to be no process, mechanism or funding in place for advancement or pay raises based on merit. Most employees expressed dissatisfaction with the rating system designed to supplement the pay of employees who attain an ‘exceptional’ on their evaluations and with their ability to get promotions. The perception was that ‘exceptional’ ratings are impossible to get, a result of pressure from Human Resources on supervisors not to give such ratings. Even if there is no money to pay for merit increases, employees felt that if deserved, a good evaluation should be given. “It’s as much a morale/respect problem as it is pay.”

The following are some comments voiced by employees on this issue. They serve to illustrate the level of frustration and erosion in employee trust and loyalty. Whether or not these perceptions are true, their existence damages the work climate and may decrease the effort that employees display on a daily basis. Failure to address these perceptions can do nothing but exacerbate an already unacceptable situation.

• The College prefers to look outside to fill vacancies.

• Supervisors’ lack of administrative training creates indifference toward management.

• Additional skills and certifications are not recognized in the form of higher pay.

• Compensation and practices communicate the College’s low value and respect for staff.

• The College does not recognize staff as a valuable part of the College community.

• Employees think that there are no incentives to continue performing at exceptional levels knowing there will be no reward.

• The result of lack of funding, external promotion and an evaluation system that is not respected has created serious morale problems.

We would note that while the Commonwealth of Virginia has recently revised its compensation plan for classified employees, it does not appear that changes to date provide sufficient flexibility and funding to address these issues.

F. Additional Issues

This section highlights several major issues that emerged during our research. The College seems to rely too much on hourly employees, especially “long-time” hourly employees. Hourly and classified employees want to be a part of the College’s community of learners. Hourly and classified employees perceive that many employment decisions are arbitrary. There is no William and Mary-specific employee handbook. The College’s role as both employer and provider of childcare must be resolved. Working conditions are creating stress and strain. All of these issues amplify employee’s frustration about pay, creating even greater turnover and further
Weakening morale. We have no direct measures, but given existing academic research, we are confident that these high turnover rates and low morale are preventing the College from getting the most out of its employees, which in turn causes it to operate well below its maximum capabilities. The positive relationships that employees share among themselves and with students has kept the ship afloat.

The College’s use of Long-Term Hourly Employees

Over one quarter of hourly employees in the survey have William and Mary job tenures of 3 or more years, compared to 50 percent of classified employees. Yes, some of these hourly employees like the flexibility of an hourly position and some receive benefits via a spouse or another family member. But the fact that they have been employed for such a long period without reaping the benefits of access to health care and the various types of leave concerns Committee members. How many hourly employees are in this situation? In FY01, there were 170 hourly employees and 77 had worked at least 3 years for the College.

Hourly employees experience greater stress when a child gets sick. They cannot simply take work home or bring their child to work, and they get no time off to help get children ready to go back to school. For long-term hourly employees that responded to the survey or participated in the information sessions, this prolonged stress appears to have reached or will soon reach its maximum.

Employees want to be a part of the College’s Community of Learners

Current training practices appear to be hurting the College’s productivity and thus competitiveness. The general consensus is that opportunities exist, but funding, structure, content and knowledge about opportunities for employee training and development should be improved. Some employees feel that the lack of funding and weak infrastructure signal that the College does not value training, development and continued education or life-long learning for hourly and classified employees.

More specifically, employees cite the absence of funding, release or flex time for seminars and/or courses off-campus as major barriers to training. Supervisor attitudes are also viewed as a barrier to training. The requirement that courses are restricted to job-related curricula acts as an additional barrier. Employees argue that the College is a “liberal arts” university, thus believing in “general enlightenment.” This means that the culture of learning should apply to all employees.

Distance serves as a barrier to participation, especially for VIMS employees. Taking a William and Mary undergraduate class is not a reasonable logistical option. The true costs of taking the course are not just the “hour” for the class, but also the transit time and extra parking cost.

The lack of a central contact with information on all the education/training opportunities available at William and Mary, Christopher Newport University (CNU), Thomas Nelson (TNCC) and Rappahannock (RCC) Community Colleges serves as a barrier to training, development and life-long learning. Regular William and Mary classes often intimidate employees, whereas classes at CNU and TNCC and RCC provide less threatening environments and offer courses of greater relevance and interest. Further, there are virtually no evening courses available at William and Mary whereas CNU, TNCC and RCC often cater to part-time students.
with full-time jobs. Employees at William and Mary and VIMS comment that a reciprocal agreement with CNU, TNCC, and RCC would be beneficial.

Opportunities for training that are available at William and Mary are sometimes viewed as too advanced, or as missing the needs of employees. Some employees feel that Information Technology training should cover more of the basics. Many employees feel that the Information Technology training is adequate, but courses in time and stress management training would be useful.

The training that is offered does not usually provide much opportunity for upward mobility within the organization. Some employees are sent to classes, but the classes are not really structured to educate or train them for a better job here. As a result, employees question whether a payoff or return really exists. The perception is that no real opportunities to improve skills exist, and even if opportunities did exist, there would be no chance for advancement. The perception is that there are few opportunities to use what you do learn. In short, there appears to be no coherent plan or commitment by the College for employee training, development or lifelong learning.

Overall, the College’s low level of investment in its classified and hourly employees appears to have created the following perceptions:

- Employees most often learn about opportunities by asking co-workers.

- Housekeepers have tremendous difficulty getting training that would enable them to change occupations. (“No one in housekeeping has ever moved up.”)

- There is no real guidance or internal document specific to the College about training.

- It is felt that you only advance if you know someone.

**Child and Elder Care**

The Department of Labor’s recent study entitled *Futurework* forecasts several major demographic shifts over the next 40 to 50 years. There will be a continuation of women entering the labor force, both from single and dual households. Baby boomers and their parents will retire. The former will continue to create the need for quality and affordable childcare and the latter will generate the need for quality and affordable elder care. Both will require greater flexibility in the workplace.

To explore whether child and elder care are of major concern to hourly and classified employees, we asked survey respondents and participants in the information sessions to describe whether these and other work and family issues are important. A dichotomy emerged. Classified employees are generally satisfied with policies that provide greater workplace flexibility, such as leave policies. Hourly employees are not satisfied because they do not receive benefits; nevertheless, many have been working for the College for at least 3 years.

Upon first inspection, access to childcare does not seem to be a major concern. Thirty-five percent of respondents who said that childcare was a relevant concern were dissatisfied. Yet when the sample is restricted to employees less than 45 years of age, the level of dissatisfaction jumps to 50 percent.
The major complaint is that the Sarah Ives Gore Child Care Center is inaccessible to employees due to its costs, location and the perception that slots are not available to them. Some respondents felt that a sliding scale should be reinstated, but one that is more realistic, not going all the way up to $75,000. The absence of a sliding scale hurts families earning between $25,000 and $35,000. (The lowest income families are most likely eligible for public assistance.) The perception exists that employees cannot even get their children in the Center because slots are used to entice both faculty and graduate students to come to William and Mary.

VIMS employees noted that they do not have a campus-supported childcare facility and can only use the Center if they live near Williamsburg. They also noted that summer programs for school-age children are not feasible for VIMS employees who do not live near Williamsburg. The distance precludes participation in William and Mary offerings.

More generally, employees appear to know very little about the summer programs for children, and when they do learn about the programs, they find out that they are unaffordable.

Even with these criticisms, employees want the College to play a major role in the provision of childcare for its employees. Many employees feel that the College sends mixed messages about its support for the Center’s employees and children. Teacher’s salaries at the Center are extremely low and they receive few benefits. Yet, one teacher received the College’s prestigious Duke Award several years ago. A variety of departments utilize the Center as both a teaching and research tool.

Many employees do not understand why the College does not tap the Office of Development for funds to help finance the Center, especially given that the Center is the only local major childcare center that does not have high-yield annual fundraisers. For example, Child Development Resources (CDR) has an annual auction, which has recently raised $50,000. They have a $100 a plate dinner called Plantation Sensation. Board members donate and CDR receives funding from the United Way. They also have a photography contest fundraiser. The YMCA, which runs Colonial Williamsburg’s childcare center receives United Way funds and has a golf tournament. Montessori has an auction, yard sale, a golf tournament and sells wrapping paper. Williamsburg Parent Cooperative Preschool has an auction.

At this stage, access to care for an elderly parent does not appear to be a major issue, but given the College’s demographics, this should become more of a reality over the next two decades. The College should be poised to provide support when needed.

Access to Workplace Amenities

Working conditions covering access to lounge, telephone, restrooms, computers and parking are major areas of concern for hourly and classified employees. The Committee found that some workspaces lack any dining or lounge facilities. As a result, employees eat lunch in cars, hallways, closets with potentially toxic chemicals and mechanical rooms. The Committee was also told that Aramark does not allow employees to eat lunch at their facilities, which are technically the College’s property.

Access to computers received mixed reviews. Often the housekeeping and grounds employees do not have computer access or if they do it is very limited. On the VIMS campus, these employees are the only persons without computer/e-mail accounts. The supervisor’s argument that employees would waste time while using the computer might be valid, but this argument must be applied to all employees that have access to a computer. As the amount of official and unofficial correspondence that is distributed electronically continues to grow, it is
imperative that all employees have training, access to computers, and e-mail. It is also important that the College resists the temptation to commit “on-line bias”, relying too heavily on the Internet to dispense information.

The absence of places to eat lunch, take breaks and the lack of training and access to computers has created a tiered structure of employment, lower morale and our own digital divide.

Access and Costs of Parking

Consensus emerged that parking fees are too high, especially for the lowest paid employees. Parking fees are a major sore point, especially since they have gone up and pay has not. Regardless of income, respondents to the survey felt that charging the same parking fee for a housekeeper and a person making $50,000 or more is problematic.

At VIMS, the number of parking spaces is not usually a problem though many individuals are upset with the cost of parking as there are no alternatives such as public transportation and no other employer in the area charges for parking. Some parking lots are unpaved and need but do not receive frequent maintenance. A significant problem exists in the case of persons who have a VIMS only parking sticker (about $30 less than a “full” William and Mary including VIMS sticker) and need to go to the main campus where they have to buy a temporary pass that allows them to look for a space. Even being able to obtain the pass at VIMS, saving the extra stop at the College’s Parking Services Office would help.

Workplace Stress

Our final observation concerns the high level of workplace stress. The tight labor market has exacerbated the problems that low pay and poor working conditions create. As a result, the College has both labor and skills shortages. Job demands have increased while support staffing has not responded. While more faculty have been hired, the number of classified employees has not grown proportional to the increased job demands. Moreover, no new staff have been hired to service the College’s new buildings. This has placed greater demands on hourly and classified employees, resulting in absenteeism/missed workdays and increased health risks, both on and off the job. All of these factors lead to lower productivity.

G. Why do Employees stay at the College?

The previous analysis carries with it a very sobering story about being a classified and hourly employee at the College. We have painted a picture that suggests employees are being pushed to the brink. If so, then why do they stay at the College? Simply put, the positive relationships with their co-workers, students and some supervisors offset the low pay and adverse working conditions. The survey reveals that the most positive responses deal with the relations between co-workers and supervisors. Employees said that they enjoy the people that they work with more than anything else about their job. Personal relationships are the highlight of being at the College. These positive relationships are holding together many departments and/or offices.

With respect to employee-supervisor relations, much depends upon the supervisor. The supervisor who takes an active interest in advancing her or his employees makes all the
difference. Too many “faculty” supervisors are passive managers and do not serve as advocates for their employees. There is a perception that supervisor skills are not evaluated and that skill varies considerably across supervisors. When a supervisor’s actions are unsatisfactory, it is not clear what the employee can do, and several responded to the survey saying that they receive little support or action from the next higher level. There is a general feeling that complaining is futile.
SECTION II: Detailed Recommendations

In the subsequent sections, the Committee presents recommendations that when implemented will strengthen the College’s ability to attract and retain the skilled employees that it needs to achieve its mission, not only today, but also in the future. The recommendations are aggressive, comprehensive in scope, and designed to restore the College’s footing as an employer of choice.

The recommendations respond to the President’s charges. They are categorized into four areas: (1) wages and salary, (2) employment policies, (3) employment practices and working conditions, and (4) framework for life-long learning. We also provide a timeline for implementation: immediate (4 to 6 weeks), short-term (6-8 weeks to 3 months), medium-term (3 to 6 months) and long-term (1 to 2 years).

Finally, the Committee urges the College to ensure the community that these market adjustments will not have adverse or unintended consequences, such as job losses, increased workloads for classified employees or incentives to hire cheaper and lower skilled employees.

The Committee must also note that the recommendations only apply to non-student hourly and classified employees that work at the William and Mary and VIMS campuses. All jobs that the College staffs for special events, such as ticket takers are exempt from these recommendations.

WAGES AND SALARY SCALES

Immediate and Short-term Actions:

• Recommendation 1: Make hourly and classified compensation competitive.

  The Committee’s recommended target, listed in order of priority, is the following:

  A. Effective November 1, 2001, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning $7.53 per hour or less receive the Commonwealth’s maximum allowable increase in a fiscal year of 10 percent, and all earning $7.54 to $8.28 per hour move to $8.29 per hour.

  B. To address wage compression, effective November 1, 2001, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning a current wage (as of October 31, 2001) of $8.09 to $10.51 per hour receive an adjustment of $0.21 per hour.

  C. Effective July 1, 2002, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning $7.72 per hour or less receive the Commonwealth’s maximum allowable increase in a fiscal year of 10 percent, and all earning $7.73 to $8.49 per hour move to $8.50 per hour.

  D. To address wage compression, effective July 1, 2002, all non-student hourly and classified employees earning a current wage, as of June 30, 2002, of $8.31 to $10.75 per hour receive an adjustment of $0.20 per hour.

Performing the above market adjustments will lessen the disadvantages that the College has been experiencing over the past few years. If these adjustments have their desired effect of improving the College’s competitiveness, then turnover should fall.

In building the estimated cost for the remainder of FY02 and all of FY03 the Committee used last year’s actual turnover as a guide for future turnover. Again, if the
proposed adjustments have their desired effect and lower turnover, then the estimated costs presented in this report should be viewed as upper bounds. Further, even though the unemployment rate still remains low by historical standards, it is well known that economic growth has slowed considerably since the beginning of this year. If this trend continues for the remainder of FY02 and into FY03, then turnover rates will most likely decline, further lowering the recommendation’s estimated costs.

The impacts of the Committee’s recommended target are as follows:

A. 147 employees receive a market adjustment, with a cost to the College of $131,800. In FY03, the cost to the College is $237,724.
B. 24 employees earning from $8.09 to $8.29 per hour would receive a market adjustment and 143 employees earning $8.29 through $10.51 would receive a market adjustment. The cost to the College of implementing these market adjustments is $41,744 in FY02 and $62,616 in FY03.
C. 147 employees receive a market adjustment, for a total cost of $93,962.
D. 24 employees earning from $8.31 to $8.49 per hour would receive a market adjustment and 166 employees earning $8.50 through $10.75 would receive a market adjustment, for a combined cost of $42,715.

**Recommendation 2: Set the College’s minimum hourly equivalent wage at or above $8.00 per hour.**

The Committee recommends that when the market adjustments in Recommendation 1 occur, $8.29 per hour becomes the College’s minimum hourly equivalent and for FY03, $8.50 per hour becomes the College’s minimum hourly equivalent wage.

Our labor market analysis showed that the lowest paying job roles in absolute and relative terms have the highest turnover rates. Setting an entry level hourly equivalent wage to $8.29 and $8.50 should restore some of the College’s ability to attract employees.

**Recommendation 3: Urge contractors of auxiliary services and the Parent Board of the Child Care Center to offer their employees competitive compensation.**

A. In light of the market data provided in this report, the Committee urges contractors that provide auxiliary services to the College and the Parent Board of the Sarah Ives Gore Child Care Center to re-evaluate their wage scales.

B. When evaluating future bids for auxiliary services to students, faculty and staff, such as food, books, and child care, the College will take into consideration whether employers offer compensation consistent with the values and practices recommended in this report.

Inaction on the part of these employers will drive a sizeable wedge between their employees (many of whom have long-term tenures on the College campus) and the College’s employees.

At the Bookstore, three-quarters of the part-time employees earn less than $8.29. In dining services, as of August 2001, 46 percent of the full-time employees earn less $8.29 per
Another 4 percent of full-time employees earn between $8.30 and $8.50 per hour. For part-time employees in dining services, 93 percent of part-time employees earn below $8.29 per hour. No employees earn between $8.29 and $8.50. At the Child Care Center, almost one-half of the full-time non-student employees earn below $8.29 per hour.

Short-term:

- **Recommendation: Help employees identify additional sources of income.**
  The Committee recommends that the College provide tax preparation assistance to ensure that employees are receiving the income support (e.g., Federal Earned Income Tax Credit) and subsidies in which they are eligible.

  For example, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a refundable Federal income tax credit for low-income working individuals and families. The credit reduces the amount of Federal tax owed and can result in a refund check. When the EITC exceeds the amount of taxes owed, it results in a tax refund to those who claim and qualify for the credit.

  Income and family size determine the amount of the EITC. To qualify for the credit, both the earned income and the modified adjusted gross income for 2000 must be less than $27,413 for a taxpayer with one qualifying child, $31,152 for a taxpayer with more than one qualifying child, and $10,380 for a taxpayer with no qualifying children.

  For 2001, some employees with at least one child living with them may be entitled to receive advance EITC payments in their paychecks. The employee must file Form W-5, Earned Income Credit Advance Payment Certificate, with an employee to receive the advance payments. The employer then pays part of the credit to the employee in advance throughout the year. The taxpayer claims the rest when filing the 2001 Federal tax return.

  The EITC does not affect eligibility for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), food stamps, or low-income housing.

Long-term:

- **Recommendation 1: Convert “long-time” hourly employees to classified.**
  The Committee recommends converting long-time hourly employees to classified (with benefits) employees. This action will move the College distribution of hourly and classified employees toward a reasonable balance.

  In FY01, William and Mary’s hourly employees comprised 16 percent, or 170 of the 1,060 classified, part-time classified and hourly employees at the College. Compared to other employers, this share appears to be high.

  Between 40 and 50 percent of hourly employees have been with the College for at least 3 years. During the most recent fiscal year, 28 (of the 170) hourly positions had regular hours of 1,500 or more. Eight of the 28 also were paid for additional overtime hours. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the College’s Maximum Employment Level (MEL) count, mandated by the State helped to create the College’s over reliance on hourly employees.

  The following approaches should be investigated to determine whether they could be used to create classified positions for long-term hourly employees.
• As long as a diverse pool of applicants can be assured, before job openings in classified positions are advertised externally, they should be advertised on-campus and available to long-time hourly employees.

• Hourly employees seeking classified positions should be considered prior to when the positions are opened to temporary agency employees.

• Recommendation 2: Strengthen the College's overall hourly and classified compensation structures.

The Committee recommends that over the next 1 to 2 years, the Office of Human Resources identify the highest turnover job roles, identify the cause and make the necessary adjustments in wages, benefits and working conditions.

The Committee's labor market analysis identified a host of job roles in which turnover during the recent year was exceedingly high. The Committee attributes the high turnover to the low relative wages paid in these job roles and absence of benefits. Priority for analysis should be based on a job role's turnover. Appendix Table D presents a list of these job roles based on the Committee's analysis. Making the compensation in these job roles more competitive will not only reduce the College's turnover, search and training costs, but it will also restore effort and loyalty among employees.
EMPLOYMENT POLICIES:

Immediate to short-term:

• **Recommendation: Strengthen the ability of employees to express their concerns.**
The Committee recommends the implementation of mechanisms for employees to discuss their concerns.

Proposed adjustment(s):

• Departmental administrators and staff hold regularly scheduled meetings. The purpose of the meetings is to identify and develop solutions for concerns and issues that arise.

• Create more opportunities for contact between senior administrators and departmental staff. Senior administrators should be encouraged to hold an annual (or once a semester) "town-hall" meeting open to all College staff to discuss staff concerns and issues.

• The President and senior administrators should further develop their communication channels with organizations such as HACE and BFSF.

Short-term:

• **Recommendation 1: Add more structure to the promotion process.**
  A. Clearly state the criteria that are used in the selection process for hiring and promotion.
  B. Offer advising sessions for employees who want to seek promotion or advancement through a new position.
  C. Institute a system for current employees, giving preference to those already working for the College when their abilities and training are equivalent to those of an outside applicant.

The employee survey indicated that over one-half of employees were dissatisfied with the College's evaluation processes for raises and promotions. During the information sessions, employees consistently said that it was difficult for any current employee to get a promotion or to change jobs (strictly speaking career-advancement). More specifically, employees do not feel that the criteria for promotions are clearly stated. Employees in the lowest paid job categories stated that it was virtually impossible for them to move to another position. In several sessions people stated that it was easier to get a (better) position if you came from the outside than if you were already at William and Mary.

• **Recommendation 2: Improve employees' knowledge and understanding of their benefits.**
Identify gaps in understanding by studying the usage of employee benefits (e.g., using pre-tax dollars to pay parking fees and participating in flexible medical reimbursement plans).
Proposed adjustment(s):

- Assess employees' knowledge and understanding of the benefits available to them, with a special focus on benefits in which participation is low.

- Have round-table discussions with new employees after their first few months on the job.

- Have in-depth interviews with randomly selected employees and supervisors throughout the year.

**Recommendation 3: Upgrade current methods of educating employees about their benefits.**

The Committee recommends the evaluation of current procedures for communicating benefits to the College community.

Proposed adjustment(s):

- E-mail, list serves and the Internet are used to distribute new and revised leave policies, information about the College's annual Benefits Fair, and revised human resource forms. Because of this, every employee should have access to a computer with a printer, an e-mail account, and instructions in how to use e-mail and the Internet. Until this occurs, paper copies of announcements should be distributed through individual offices where access is limited.

- Use surplus computers to create multiple information stations for departments.

- Make departmental supervisors accountable for distributing benefit information in a timely manner.

- The College currently has an annual Benefits Fair at which all benefit vendors attend and provide information. The Committee seeks more frequent, yet casual employee orientation program on benefits, policies, and procedures.

- All communication should be in plain language, not insurance jargon.

- Communication should be frequent and timed to occur when employees are likely to listen.

- The College should have an on-going evaluation process in place to assess the effectiveness of its efforts to communicate with the College community.
• **Recommendation 4:** Create William and Mary and VIMS specific orientation programs and employee handbooks, including one for hourly employees.

**Proposed adjustment(s):**
- The handbook should include information about VIMS, William and Mary, and the general community (lists of doctors, hospitals, childcare, schools, community services).

• **Recommendation 5:** Establish an evaluation policy and procedure for hourly employees.

**Proposed adjustment(s):**
- Provide hourly employees with useful feedback that might be used to secure a classified position at the College.

• **Recommendation 6:** Improve supervisor's ability to be advocates for their employees.

**Proposed adjustment(s):**
- Fully educate faculty, department chairs, and supervisors on the State's Employee Handbook, with a special emphasis on the new Compensation Plan.