



To & Council  
ACADEMIC SENATE

OF

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

400 Golden Shore, Suite 134, Long Beach, California 90802 • (213) 590-5578 or 5550, ATSS: 635-5578 or 5550

Office of the Chair

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Campus Senate/Council Chairs DATE: September 25, 1980

FROM: Robert D. Kully, Chair  
Academic Senate CSUC

SUBJECT: Proposal for a Revised Faculty Salary Schedule for the CSUC

The attached document is "A Proposal for a Revised Faculty Salary Schedule for the CSUC" which was presented to the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees as an information item at its September 23 meeting. At that meeting I informed the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee that there had been no consultation with the faculty in the development of this proposal. The Committee decided to continue that matter as an information item at the November meeting with probable action in January.

At its September 18-19 meeting the CSUC Academic Senate endorsed a resolution (attached, with cover memo to Board of Trustees) urging that the Academic Senate CSUC, the campus senates/councils, and appropriate faculty representatives be consulted on this matter. This is a complex proposal which includes provisions for overlapping ranks, supersteps, and annual merit step reviews with additional but smaller steps. It is important to have the faculty's responses to this proposal. In particular we would appreciate hearing from the campus senates/councils concerning the acceptability of the following elements of the proposal;

1. Overlapping salary steps.
2. Merit review for annual salary increments within rank.
3. 2½% differential between steps within ranks (current differential is 5%).
4. Annual step increase can vary from 0% to 7½%; some faculty could receive as much as 7½% while others could receive no increment.
5. Use of additional steps and merit increases to provide differential salaries for recruiting and retaining faculty currently in high demand fields, e.g., engineering, accounting, and computer science.
6. Six additional steps in ranks of assistant professor, associate professor and professor, plus three additional steps above the fifteenth step of professor for distinguished professors. (See page 3 and Table 1 of the proposals for details.)

7. Implementation of the proposal without any net increase in salary funding, meaning that A) there would be a general across-the-board decrease in the annual cost of living adjustment in order to fund the additional steps for each rank, and/or B) some faculty would receive step advances while other faculty would receive no step advances.

We would also appreciate receiving any additional comments, responses, or advice from campus senates/councils. Of course there will be a general discussion of the proposed salary schedule at the October 17 meeting of campus senate/council chairs.

I urge you to provide the Senate's Executive Committee with a response to the above request for information by November 5. We must be prepared for the November 11-12 Board of Trustees meeting. This matter will also have a high priority at the November 20-21 meeting of the ASCSUC.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

RDK/paa

Attachment

cc: Academic Senate (w/attachment)

**ITEM**

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS**

**A PROPOSAL FOR A REVISED FACULTY SALARY SCHEDULE FOR THE CSUC**

A proposed request for salary increases for the employees of the CSUC is submitted to the Trustees each year at their November meeting. Adoption of the salary request in November allows the request to be submitted to the Governor in time for inclusion in the budget which he submits to the Legislature in early January. Because of difficulties in securing data necessary to prepare the request, in the last several years the salary item has not been mailed with the other items in the agenda and some years has not been finished in time for the late mailing of the agenda. This year the staff has completed the development of a more complex proposal to revise the faculty salary schedule and provide additional ranges for each rank. It is essential that the faculty through their representatives and the Trustees, have this proposal early enough to allow for a full discussion and consideration of possible alternatives. For this reason the staff proposal has been shared with the Academic Senate and with the academic group unions. The proposal is submitted to the Trustees at this meeting as an information item. The following discusses the need for revision of the faculty salary schedule and outlines the staff proposal.

**The Need for a Revision of the Faculty Salary Schedule**

The present faculty salary schedule for the CSUC has several major disadvantages. Upward movement through the schedule has typically been rather rapid so that many faculty reach the maximum step of professor nearly two decades before they are likely to retire. When a professor reaches top step, salary increases are no longer available as a reward system or as an incentive for continued faculty renewal. Since the salary ranges of the several ranks do not overlap, those reaching the top step of a rank cannot advance in salary without being promoted. This situation places a great pressure on promotion which in turn has resulted in a rapid ascension through the ranks for large numbers of faculty. Finally, the top step of each rank is much lower than those in the institutions with whom we compete for faculty.

Two recent developments have significantly increased the limitations of the present salary scale and have made it imperative that the scale be modified. The first of these is increased competition for qualified faculty. As students move into fields which they believe will lead to jobs, we have seen a continuous increase in the number of students majoring in such fields as engineering, accounting, nursing, criminal justice, and computer science. Unfortunately, these are the very fields in which there is the most competition for faculty from business, industry, and public agencies. For instance, graduates with a B.S. in engineering or computer science are being offered starting salaries of \$20,000 to \$24,000 which is high assistant professor or low associate professor rank for which we recognize the doctorate. For these disciplines, the result has been an escalation of the salary level and rank necessary to complete for faculty. The rank escalation results in a large measure from a lack of higher steps in the rank of assistant professor. Normally, faculty newly out of graduate school with little teaching experience are initially appointed to the rank of assistant professor where they are expected to remain during their probationary period. Because of the lack of higher salary steps in this rank and because of market factors, campuses are forced in some cases to appoint either at the top step of assistant professor or to appoint at the associate professor level. In the first case no further upward motion is possible until tenure is achieved; in the latter case, the initial appointment is abnormally high causing problems in comparison with faculty initially hired at the lower steps of the assistant professor level.

The competition for faculty is especially keen not only in the fields mentioned above, but also if the candidates are women or minorities. In a number of professional fields the CSUC has become so noncompetitive with regard to salary that the maintenance of the quality standards necessary to retain national accreditation is threatened. The protection of accreditation is essential because graduates of nonaccredited programs are at a severe disadvantage in the job market. Since other institutions with accredited programs are also seeking new faculty, the competition for fully qualified applicants is great. Likewise, accredited programs are much better in attracting prospective students.

The second new development is the adoption by the Board of Trustees of a policy requiring the evaluation of the performance of all tenured faculty on an ongoing basis. Such evaluation is commonplace in higher education, but it is usually combined with a plan for merit salary increases. As was noted earlier, faculty at the top step of their rank cannot receive increases. The adoption of the evaluation policy increases the need for a revision of the salary schedule which will accommodate possible increases where such are indicated. Last year some 4,000 CSUC full professors (roughly one-third of the full-time faculty) were at the top salary step.

An equal problem to the competition for new faculty is the problem of retaining existing faculty. Major universities across the country as well as our own comparison institutions have salary schedules with a much larger range for each rank. Thus the top salary for professor in competitive institutions is much higher than that in the CSUC. It is even fairly common to find the top of the salary range for associate professors in competitive institutions higher than the top of our professor range. This enables our competitors to make better offers to our faculty on a selective basis, concentrating on the most competitive fields, on women and minorities, and on our very best scholar-teachers.

Discussions of the salary schedule over the last decade have been remarkably consistent in concluding that there is a need for greater range to the faculty salaries both to meet competition in order to attract and keep a qualified faculty and to recognize merit, an assistance to the implementation of the faculty review process. A revision of the academic salary schedule presented to the Trustees in July 1972 proposed the addition of three steps to the three professorial ranks. This proposal was passed by the Trustees but was never implemented through a failure to obtain funding.

*The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty — 1975* issued in revised form in December 1975, discusses both the need to have a reward system as an adjunct to the ongoing review of tenured faculty and the necessity to have additional steps in the rank of professor. Subsequent to the adoption of this report by the Trustees, they considered a proposal which provided three additional steps to the rank of professor. After much discussion, this proposal was not adopted by the Trustees in part due to concerns expressed by the Academic Senate.

Thus, for several years there have been ongoing discussions of possible modifications to the faculty salary schedule which have culminated in the present proposal. One alternative proposed was that the steps within a rank be smaller with the possibility that more than one step could be granted as the result of a single review.

#### The Proposal to Revise the Faculty Salary Schedule

It is proposed that the present faculty salary schedule be revised by inserting an additional step between each existing step thus creating merit steps of 2½ % and by increasing the upward range of

each rank. The proposed new schedule is presented in Table I. Table II presents the salary schedule of the University of California for comparison purposes. Note in the proposed new schedule (Table I) that a line is drawn dividing the first nine steps from the upper six steps. Movement into steps above the line either through initial hiring or advancement will be subject to a fiscal limitation and will require the approval of the campus president. The president cannot delegate the authority to grant this approval. Movement into the upper steps will also be subject to fiscal controls which will be discussed later.

Initial appointments at steps above the line will require that the applicant show exceptional promise as a potential member of the faculty or will be limited to cases where initial offers or salary levels from those institutions with whom we compete for faculty make the use of the higher steps necessary to remain competitive. Movement of existing faculty into these steps will be limited to faculty whose excellence of performance is worthy of exceptional reward.

Three additional steps are proposed above the fifteenth step of professor. These three steps are reserved for Distinguished Professors. Distinguished Professors are defined as faculty, either permanent or visiting, who enjoy a national or international reputation in their field and whose level of attainment is comparable to that found in the occupants of distinguished professorships or distinguished chairs at major universities. It is expected that there would be only a small number of these in the entire CSUC.

All faculty not at top step will be eligible for annual review for possible merit advancement. Following such review, a faculty member may be awarded one, two, or three merit steps or the decision could be that no merit step be awarded. This would make possible the awarding of a step increase of  $7\frac{1}{2}\%$  to those exceptionally meritorious. A further requirement will be that all faculty will have to receive their merit steps at the same time, probably in September.

#### **Fiscal Implementation of the New Faculty Salary Schedule**

The plan calls for implementation of the new salary schedule beginning the fall of 1981. The final decision to implement cannot be made by the Board of Trustees before the July meeting of 1981. This means that the 1981-82 budget will have to be submitted in its usual form using the present salary schedule as its basis. Nonetheless, it is possible to implement the new schedule if there is agreement with this from those who deal with our funding.

Each year the Trustees request three separate funds for increasing faculty salaries, one for merit steps for all faculty not on fifth step, one for promotions, and one for a general salary increase. It is recommended that promotion funding continue to be reserved for promotions so that there will be a consistency in the number of promotions under the new salary plan. It is further recommended that the funding requested for merit advancement for those not on top step continue to be reserved for use for this purpose:

Funding for the additional steps for each rank which are above the present ranges offer a greater problem. Certainly a request for new money will raise difficulty in securing funding for the program. One alternative would be for the Trustees to request an additional sum from the Governor for implementation of the additional steps for each rank with a corresponding decrease in the funding requested for across-the-board faculty raises. The result would be that the size of the faculty salary increase request would be the same with or without the implementation of the new salary schedule. A second alternative would be to request the usual across-the-board increase and request additional

funds for the new salary steps. The funds requested for the implementation of the steps above the present salary ranges would be limited to use for that purpose and, conversely, any movement into the new ranges would be limited to that which can be funded by the amounts budgeted specifically for that purpose.

If the new faculty salary schedule is implemented for the year 1981-82, then a new technique will have to be developed for generating a budget request for 1982-83 and subsequent years. The amount produced by the new budget approach would continue to be determined by the estimated number of faculty not at the top step (i.e., as more faculty achieve top step, the amount available for step adjustments would be reduced). This is the same concept used in the faculty promotion funding formula. For 1982-83 and subsequent years the amount for faculty merit adjustments would have to be estimated and negotiated since the new budget approach would not automatically project 5% for all positions not at top step.

New and precise financial controls would have to be instituted to insure campuses utilized only the amount allocated for merit salary adjustments resulting in new flexibility in merit increase decisions, but reduced flexibility in the total amount utilized for this purpose.

### Consultation

The complex, technical nature of a salary schedule makes it desirable that an initial proposal be developed by staff. Obviously in developing the proposal, staff have drawn on long-standing discussions by the Trustees, Academic Senate, administration and others. Consultation on the present proposal has begun with the faculty, and it is essential that consultation with all appropriate groups continue. The final proposal will be brought to the Board at its November meeting as part of the salary increase package.

Table I

Faculty Salary Proposal

1980-81 Salary Structure		Proposed Salary Structure	
		Distinguished Professor	42,672 41,664 40,692 39,732 38,808 37,896 37,008 36,144 35,304
			34,476
			32,892
Professors	31,380	31,380	31,380
		30,648	30,648
	29,940	29,940	29,940
		29,244	29,244
	28,560	28,560	28,560
		27,900	
	27,252	27,252	
	26,004	26,628	
Associate Professors	24,828	26,004	
		25,404	
	23,700	24,828	
		24,252	
	22,620	23,700	
		23,148	
		22,620	
		22,104	
	21,600	21,600	
Assistant Professors	20,616	21,096	
		20,616	
	19,692	20,148	
		19,692	
	18,804	19,248	
		18,804	
Instructors	17,964	18,384	
		17,964	
	17,160	17,556	
		17,160	
	16,392	16,776	
		16,392	



ACADEMIC SENATE

OF

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

400 Golden Shore, Suite 134, Long Beach, California 90802 • (213)590-5578 or 5550, ATSS: 635-5578 or 5550

Office of the Chair

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MEMBERS,  
CSUC BOARD OF TRUSTEES

DATE: September 22, 1980

FROM: Executive Committee  
ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC

SUBJECT: A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SALARY SCHEDULE FOR THE CSUC

Attached is a copy of a resolution from the Academic Senate CSUC urging the Board of Trustees to return the draft document ("A Proposal for A Revised Faculty Salary Schedule for the CSUC") to the Chancellor with the instruction that he consult with the Academic Senate CSUC, the campus senates/councils and appropriate faculty representatives regarding the need for such a proposal.

Because the Academic Senate was not consulted during the development of the proposal and because the proposal was not transmitted to the Chair of the Senate until less than a week before the Senate met, we are unable to provide a systematic commentary on its specific details. It is clear, however, that massive changes are proposed, the impact of which is not easily ascertainable. The proposal may create as many problems as it is intended to solve.

The new schedule is not a simple answer to a simple problem. It is a complex proposal which includes provisions for overlapping ranks, supersteps, and annual merit step reviews with additional but smaller steps. The implications of these provisions need to be explored fully and, probably, separately. No evidence has been presented that the proposed solutions will solve the problems, some of which are not even very clearly defined.

A proposal of this magnitude demands careful consideration and extensive discussion. The Executive Committee therefore urges the Board of Trustees to withdraw this item from its agenda and to provide for consultation as called for in the attached resolution.