

4 A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A 20 PERCENT SALARY INCREASE FOR
5 PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS PROMOTED TO SENIOR STATUS
6

7
8 WHEREAS, following promotion to Full Professor, per the Academic Planning Data Sets, newly
9 promoted full professors' salaries would be significantly below the average of their College faculty
10 equivalent; and

11 WHEREAS, our current system guarantees promotional raises, however, merit raises are
12 provided at the discretion of the legislature, which have not been awarded since 2009; and

13 WHEREAS, to minimize faculty attrition, we need to retain valued faculty when they are likely to
14 have maximum lateral mobility; and

15 WHEREAS, the current ten percent salary increase to full professor does not raise salaries
16 enough to establish equivalency with comparator institutions; now

17 THEREFORE, in our desire to recognize the work of faculty at the time of promotion, we
18 recommend that faculty promoted to full professor, and academic professionals promoted to senior
19 status, receive a 20 percent salary increase for that promotion.

Arguments supporting the resolution to increase promotion raises to 20%:

- Equity is listed as one of the justifications for merit-based raises in all of our salary policy memos, and if we were to receive a legislative appropriation for merit raises, equity adjustments would be a priority use
- History indicates that there has not been a merit raise since 2009-10. We are in a time of fiscal belt-tightening and there is no meaningful prospect of generalized raises in the short or medium-term.
- We inhabit a system that guarantees promotion increases but relies on external variables for across the board raises.
- This proposal represents the only significant financial boost that some people are going to receive for the foreseeable future.
- There continues to be a very large salary discrepancy between Associate faculty who would be promoted to Full compared to those already at the Full Professor status within their own College, and even with the 20% raise, they would not meet the average salary. However, 20% closes the gap more so than the 10% raise. (See College Salary Comparisons table).
- The idea of increasing the step increase from 10% to 20% is to (a) recognize the work of faculty members at the moment of promotion, and (b) try to retain valued faculty at the exact time when they are likely to have maximum lateral mobility because the same outside review process that warrants promotion generates interest from other institutions.
- We need to support our colleagues who are working toward promotion, who have demonstrated excellence allowing the opportunity for promotion.
- The money for general raises comes from approval by the legislature, but the money for promotional raises is a budgeted item that comes from our CPM fund. Recommending the use of CPM funds to provide raises for all faculty will result in negative consequences to our CPM-funded positions.
- Compression, though very important, is a separate issue, and one that must be addressed, but that this plan is aimed at a different problem.

- Recommendation: Outline a plan for redressing other pay inequities with future tranches of funding (along the lines of the 2006-07 senior faculty bump) so that this isn't done on an ad hoc basis for each group in the broader academic community.

Arguments opposing the resolution to increase promotion raises to 20%:

- According to the College Salary comparisons, filling chaired professorships from outside the university can perpetuate inequity. Full professor salary averages in the comparison data include two very different populations: those promoted internally over prolonged periods of below-market salaries at prior ranks, and those hired from outside for endowed chair positions. In some colleges, the internally promoted individuals are paid significantly less than the others, and a 20% raise for their junior colleagues will create serious morale problems without actually addressing the existing inequities that potentially lead to the flight of faculty.
- Increasing salary by 20% may increase potential losses of other high-performing associates and fulls who were recently promoted under the old rules. In discussing this proposal with colleagues, one committee member identified at least two individuals, both recently named by their college's administrators as underpaid high performers, who will be on the job market if this policy is adopted at either promotion level.
- Concerns about CPM-funded positions staying vacant, as money is used to pay for the 20% increases. In addition, when a raise pool does occur, merit pay raises for those not getting promoted would be adversely affected. In other words, when a position is not filled to pay for these raises through CPM, the university will ask other faculty who get no raise and may have had no raise in 4-5 years to pick up the resulting slack to increase the reward level of a few colleagues.
- This scheme likely will not serve to prevent faculty from leaving due to most of them not qualifying for this pay increase.
- Singling out those up for promotion would further add to the gaps, especially in departments that have raised the floor for starting salaries. Associates and fulls in some departments are already paid less than those at lower rank.
- There are more equitable ways to disburse these funds to address the gaps already in existence, rather than to widen them. Some of our salaries are already 15%-20% below what new hires are paid and this measure will just maintain the salary gap.
- This will increase the compression and inversion many faculty are already experiencing,
- This may exacerbate the general frustration both teaching and support staff are currently feeling due to the prolonged lack of raises.
- A 20% pay raise for a few might further discourage the legislature from seriously considering across the board raises, not to mention remediating existing salary inequities.
- We should place our energy into resolving the compression and adjusting salaries to align better with national averages.
- The current 10% is sufficiently rewarding for those already paid equitably; a better approach would be for the provost's office to use sound reasoning and just action in dealing with individuals who are inequitably paid by using their discretion (and possible CPM funds, now and in the future), with consultation from the deans, to target merit and equity adjustments where appropriate.
- When the legislature eventually does allocate raise funds, this 20% raise, which presumably would then be paid from the raise pool rather than CPM, would significantly reduce the raise pool for anyone else who had gone through the extended pay freeze period but was not fortunate enough to be promoted during the time period.