Do you work Full Time or Part Time?

- **Full Time**: 141, 88%
- **Part Time**: 19, 12%

Total Responses: 160

Are you TIAA-CREF benefit eligible?

- **Yes**: 140, 87%
- **No**: 11, 7%
- **Unsure**: 9, 6%

Total Responses: 160

Do you contribute to the Supplemental Retirement Account?

- **Yes**: 71, 45%
- **No**: 71, 44%
- **Unsure**: 18, 11%

Total Responses: 160

I prefer the total compensation pool to be...

- **Direct to Salary**: 73, 45%
- **Direct to TIAA-CREF**: 41, 26%
- **Split Between Both**: 46, 29%

Total Responses: 160

I prefer the compensation pool to be split:

- **75% to TIAA-CREF/25% to Salary**: 12, 27%
- **50% to TIAA-CREF/50% to Salary**: 29, 64%
- **25% to TIAA-CREF/75% to Salary**: 4, 9%

Total Responses: 45

As of: 3/28/2011
Please include any additional comments you may have about this matter.

- While I appreciate the consideration of forward-thinking compensation, i.e. retirement, right now my family and I are most concerned with paying our everyday bills - and I would rather it be my choice whether to put my compensation toward retirement (my IRA) or use it to pay my bills. Thank you.
- My fear with upping the TIAA-Cref contribution is that in a year or so, the contribution could again be reduced. Although I'm far from retirement, it seems silly to me to not take a salary increase that would maybe turn into a salary freeze rather than losing the increase entirely.
- Perhaps employees who do not have a benefit package should receive a larger salary increase. It is the right and proper thing to do.
- I don't believe that anyone making over $100,000 should get a raise at all. Every person I say this to agrees with me. Instead, those who make less than $50,000 should get a larger raise.
- I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback.
- I think salary gives the most flexibility. As long as someone hasn't hit the maximum they are legally allowed to save each year ($16,500 or $22,000 for age 55 and up) then they can choose to put their salary increase in a Supplemental Retirement Account. If it all goes to TIAA then those that want it in their salary can't get it. I also think it's less likely they will cut our salary in the coming years and more likely the TIAA will be cut again.
- I feel very strongly that having to make this choice is unacceptable. President Weisbuch promised us that reinstating the TIAA-CREF percentage was going to be his top priority" as soon as it was financially possible. From my perspective this promise turned out to be disingenuous as there have clearly been other things that he has chosen to do instead. This goes directly to the trust issues that have come up in several recent staff discussions and I would like to make it very clear that my vote on this survey does not indicate support of the fact that we have to make a choice like this. Thank you for the opportunity to add comments to the survey.
- It is tough to get people to think about retirement and savings. Reinstating or at least increasing the University's contribution will help employees in the long run. It is a far more strategic move.
- My answer is based on the information presented at the USA meeting I attended, which suggested if the money were directed towards salary increase, the minimum raise would be $1000. With my current salary, this is a greater sum than a 2% increase in the TIAA-CREF contribution would be.
- I would prefer the salary increase then I can decide if I would add it to my supplemental retirement account. I fear if reinstated into the TIAA-CREF contribution it could be arbitrarily taken away again sometime in the future. Thanks
- I feel that if the benefit goes only to salary, we can still direct any portion to our TIAA CREF account. AND it is less likely to be taken away in the future. Benefits are often tweaked" but salaries don't usually get taken away. It is the most flexible option for the general population.
- While I personally would prefer a salary increase, I feel that the compensation pool split between TIAA-CREF and salary wold be a good compromise.
- A few dollars in my paycheck, while appreciated, won't make a difference in my lifestyle, but some extra money in my retirement account definitely will affect my lifestyle in the future.
I would much prefer a salary increase. I most likely will not be at Drew long enough to benefit from the benefit contribution.

Salary increases give employees more flexibility, effectively allowing each employee to choose whether he or she would like to use the money right away or save it for retirement. A salary increase allows employees to use the increase now or use it for retirement by increasing their contribution to their Supplemental Retirement Accounts by the amount of the increase. In this scenario, it appears that 100% of employees would be able to have what they want, making an individual choice about how to use the increased compensation. In addition, many employees are not eligible for the TIAA-CREF benefit. Raising the retirement benefit at the cost of not raising salaries (or raising salaries by a smaller amount) is not equitable between TIAA-CREF eligible and ineligible employees because ineligible employees would receive no change or a smaller change in compensation.

I was team TIA-CREF all the way, but if there's a possibility of it being reduced again in the future, I want the salary increase instead.

I make considerably less than 50,000/year, and while saving is important to me, it is difficult to pay monthly bills with my current salary, and any salary increase would help. For these reasons, I would prefer the total compensation pool to be allocated 50/50 between TIAA-CREF and increasing salary.

The tuition remission and reimbursement is also high on the priority list.

Since it appears that the salary increase would be minimal if split, I think it would be better to gain monetary benefit through a TIAA-CREF contribution. Thank you for requesting our input.

I think this option provides more flexibility. A staff member can opt to put the increase into his TIAA-CREF fund, if he chooses to do so.

During the US/A meeting there were concerns raised about the future budget we face and the more difficult upcoming years ahead. We (as an entire community) were told the reduction in the TIAA-Creff was a short term" solution and as per the norm the administration did not honor their word. I understand the constraints of the budget and the economy. I was not happy with Debra's response of there being no commitment or guarantee that if the TIAA-Creff is reinstated now it will not be taken away again. If there is a salary increase now the possibility of another increase in healthcare we would in essence just be covering another out of pocket expense. It would be my hope that the Admin would find a way to reinstate funds that we could actually benefit from. A no strings attached increase may go a long way to reinstate some sense of morale on this campus.

A reinstated 10% contribution level TIAA-CREF is the more valuable option for me, and I believe for all employees as well. I disagree with the idea that a majority vote in the US/A online poll should determine how we are compensated. If we can't choose individually, I would rather have the option that would cost the school the least amount of money.

With the economy the way it is, this was a very difficult decision. For many of us whom have low salaries, not receiving a salary increase can be devastating as we often look forward to some kind of assistance during our review period. Yet at the same time, we want to have the ability that when we retire there is money socked away for us that we are not living off of food stamps. For me, I understand the university is doing the best it can and I appreciate their getting my feedback on what they think I would like. Thank you for caring what I think.

A cost-of-living salary increase should be the first priority. Gasoline and grocery costs erode existing levels of compensation with out some salary increase to compensate.
• Because the budget looks to be bleak in two years, there is a chance they will reduce the TIAA/Cref contribution again if we bring it back to 10 now. Meanwhile, we would have given up a salary increase which we will not get back. there is less chance that they would reduce our salaries in 2 years. So i opt for the salary increase now.
• Although I have been at Drew for over 10 years and enjoy working here, I am very quickly approaching a point where due to the low/non-existent pay raises and increasing medical co-pays it will become economically unfeasible for me to remain a Drew employee.
• My overall preference is for the protection of jobs as compared to either increases in salary or TIAA-CREF, so when I consider a compensation pool I'd like to see employees be able to stay in their jobs.
• I like the idea of a split. It seems fair. But was wondering if perhaps the University could also make some reasonable guarantee that the TIAA-CREF contributions will be fully restored in say 2-3 years. Whether it be outright or a continued split of the compensation package.
• I want to save as much as I can towards retirement.
• We face having all of our benefits chipped away at, and I would like to see them restored as the budget allows. My understanding was that the TIAA-CREF contribution was only going to be for one year. As it goes without saying, I would like to see the reinstatement of the TIAA-CREF contribution back at 10%...I would also like to see that staff are compensated with decent raises as well. Each year we are asked to take on more and more of a workload as we add more to our student population. I'm all in favor of growing the school (as long as we keep it at Quality and not just Quantity") It seems as though the caliber of our Drew students has changed significantly and I think this is causing damage to our once good reputation. As we take on more of a workload and do not replace staff and in some cases there are departments that were never staffed properly to begin with. You have to understand that by being stretched so far that the quality of work is also at stake and morale suffers when you cant get away for lunch a day off or even a vacation because there is no one to cover for you as staff positions have come down to one person covering a department. The thing that ruffles my feathers most is that because of the improper staffing when things start to go awry it looks as if I am not doing my job that my work is suffering...seems like a catch 22. I would love for the administration to come and do a walk/talk through departments and see what is really going on instead of just making decisions from the penthouse. Another way to compensate the staff would be to give us summer Fridays off..gas prices are soaring...and although 1/2 days are very nice...it's almost not worth the effort/resources for just a few hours just to answer 1-2 phone calls on a Friday.
• I attended the meeting last week regarding this issue. After some thought, I believe that there is a net gain by taking the increase via salary. While the university TIAA-CREF 8% contribution would remain the same, the net dollar contribution would increase by 8% of that salary increase. For example, if an employee's salary is increased by $1000, the university would also contribute 8% of that salary increase to TIAA-CREF for a net gain to the employee of $1080: $1000 in salary, $80 to TIAA-CREF. The employee can then choose to contribute the original $1000 to the Supplemental Retirement Account receiving the same benefit as reinstating the TIAA-CREF contribution. This should be confirmed by the employee compensation committee and, if true, should be communicated to staff before the final decision is made.
• With the rise in fuel prices which is linked to the rise of many other necessary needs, the salary should increase a significant amount. The only way to make your employees feel
appreciated is to compensate them for the great work they do. Drew University is a well recognized school, let's keep it that way.

- Will there be any efforts made to bridge the salary gaps (salaries that are below national average), even with the salary increase and/or pension reinstatement?
- While some employees may prefer reinstating the TIAA-CREF contribution, others may have financial needs that would lead them to prefer a salary increase. Why not direct the pool to a salary increase, letting each employee decide how to allocate the additional funds? Those who would like to see the money go to their retirement fund can do so through the supplemental retirement program, while those who are more concerned about present-day financial obligations need not do so. The University could not claim to have increased their contribution to 10%, but the bottom line is that each employee could decide how best to allocate the money in a way that fits their needs.

- NO MATTER HOW THE PIE IS SLICED, THE SITUATION FOR THE STAFF AT DREW IS: LOTS OF WORK TO DO FOR VERY LITTLE RENUMERATION. WHATEVER THE OUTCOME OF THIS SURVEY, THE STAFF WILL STILL BE BELOW PROPER SALARY LEVELS.
- Perhaps a 0.5% increase in TIAA-CREF for 4 years until the level is restored, with the rest going to compensation.
- I don't think employees should have to wait 2 years to be eligible to TIAA-CREF. It should be lowered to 1 year.
- Since the administration is unable to guarantee that they will not once again cut the TIAA-CREF contribution in a few years, I believe putting some of the money toward it while we can is a good idea...But most of the money should be given to us so that we can use it as needed (for increased health care expenses, savings, or even to put into the retirement fund ourselves).

- I think both should be reinstated.
- One size does not really fit all. For those who plan to spend years here the pension contribution is probably the better option with time to grow the retirement account. And it has no tax consequences. The immediate increase would be taxed in line with income so less than 2% would be realized. Too bad it cannot be apportioned according to preference.
- I think it's probably better for all if the money goes toward raises. Those who want to boost their retirement can do so by increasing their supplemental.
- The best long-term advance to working in an institution of higher education is the accumulation of wealth through TIAA-CREF for a comfortable retirement. In an age where Americans are criticized for not saving enough for their retirement, this ensures that Drew is doing its share assist in the long term sustainability of its employees. Please reinstate this most critical benefit.
- The true question is not how the 2.5% should be allocated. The true question is why new programs and centers, all with director level positions, are weighed so favorably in the University budget leaving a meager pool indeed for faculty and staff compensation. I don't believe the cost to benefit ratio for many of these initiatives is really turning out as anticipated. The University should focus on what it's good at, not whatever shiny new ideas come along. Then this issue would be much easier to deal with.