

From: Vivian Fernandez
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 1:42 PM
To: Peter Gillett
Cc: Jon Oliver; aespos@oit.rutgers.edu; edumj@senate.rutgers.edu; Barbara Lee
Subject: FW: Senate Response to Charge S-1512 - Staff Promotion and Salary Adjustment Policy

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your follow-up and opportunity to provide clarification on the policy language. We acknowledge that, as written, the policy language did not clearly reflect the compensation practices in place to support and promote internal equity and external market competitiveness when making determinations related to compensation. I spoke to this during one of the FPAC meetings. We agree that it is in the University's best interest to promulgate and support compensation practices that are competitive within relative job markets, equitable across employee groups, and reflective of the extraordinary value our employees bring to the university mission. We believe that the perception of inequity is based upon our need to clarify the actual compensation practices in place and to remove language that suggests that exceptions to policy are driven only by "extraordinary" circumstances rather than by standard and equitable compensation practices.

The changes to the policy language sought to clarify that while there are set policy parameters related to the authority of a hiring manager to set compensation for internal promotional opportunities (i.e. up to 15% increase or the minimum for the new salary grade, whichever is higher) and for new hires (i.e. within 10% of the median salary for the pay range), that all salary offers should take into consideration peer market benchmarks (i.e., median salary within relevant job markets), internal equity, and the individual skills, knowledge, and experience of the candidate. Indeed, based on the above criteria and budget considerations, hiring unit job offers for external candidates vary from the minimum of the pay range to the maximum; not all hires are within 10% of the midpoint of range. The same criteria should be applied when considering the competitiveness of internal job offers. While both internal and external job offers are subject to specific salary parameters, exceptions may be sought given peer market data, internal equity considerations, and candidate qualifications. We amended the language to make clear that UHR can provide the necessary guidance in support of structuring a competitive and equitable job offer.

I hope that this provides further clarification and that a comparison of the old and updated policy illustrate that our focus was to address the issues raised and provide greater transparency related to our compensation practices. If you have any questions or would like to further discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Regards,
Vivian