

April 4, 2014

To: Susan Sciame-Giesecke, Chancellor

From: Faculty Senate Budgetary Affairs Committee

Chris Darr, chair
Rick Aniskiewicz
Kevin Clark
Marlene Greskamp
Linda Krause
Ria Lukes
Diana Mishler
David Rink
Julie Saam

RE: Chancellor's Salary Plan

The committee was asked to provide feedback on the Chancellor's salary plan/proposal which includes base raises for faculty below certain thresholds, an increase of promotion stipends, and a merit system. The committee respectfully provides the following response.

1. The committee supports the plan to raise the salary of all faculty to the proposed minimums (Lecturer \$40,000; Sr. Lecturer \$43,000; Assistant Prof. \$50,000; Associate Prof. \$55,000; Prof. \$62,500), with the following exception:
 - a. These minimums need to reflect the differences between 10 month faculty vs. 12 month faculty who don't hold an administrative position, such as clinical faculty rank and library faculty rank. For instance, with summer teaching, a 10 month faculty member making the new assistant professor minimum of \$50,000 will gross \$60,000 for the year. This should mean that a 12 month faculty member (no administrative appointment) who is at the assistant rank should be raised to a minimum of \$60,000.
2. The committee supports the plan to raise promotion stipends (\$3,000 for promotion to Sr. Lecturer; \$5,000 for promotion to Associate Prof.; \$7,500 for promotion to Prof.)
3. We understand that you want to set a precedent and create a clear merit system. We respectfully suggest the following:
 - a. We cannot fully support a merit system when we do not know specifically how merit is defined; merit standards have not been clearly defined for some time.
 - b. Likewise, we are concerned that deans are evaluating faculty at the present time without clear standards.
 - c. Given these limitations, we suggest that this year all faculty be awarded a 1.5% raise, with 0.5% of the raise pool set aside for merit raises (assuming the trustees approve a 2% raise pool).

- i. We understand that time is limited, and therefore strongly suggest that this particular formulation not become binding precedent.
 - ii. Moreover, we are strongly opposed to a system where merit raises are limited to one per school, as has been the case in the past.
- 4. Given the above concerns, we propose to work with administration to create a more specific and permanent merit system over the next year. This system would address the following:
 - a. The concept of merit needs to be defined clearly and operationalized transparently such that faculty understand what standards they need to achieve in order to be found “meritorious.”
 - i. We believe that clearly defining merit would be more impactful on faculty morale than small differences in raises (such as \$100 for a “meritorious” faculty member).
 - b. The value of a ranking system versus a criteria-based system needs to be discussed. At this point, we prefer a criteria-based system.
 - c. Standards and criteria for merit need to take into account the different needs of each academic unit (for example, the Library and the Humanities Dept. have different missions and merit should be defined differently for each of these).
 - d. Standards and criteria for merit need to take into account the differences among the various faculty designations, such as lecturers, tenure track faculty and clinical faculty, as these have different assigned duties.

In closing, the committee applauds your willingness to address faculty salaries and appreciates and supports the plan you have presented. In particular, points 1 and 2 above are significant steps. We request that you work with the faculty over the next year to create a fair merit system that can be used moving forward.