

TO ALL DEPARTMENT HEADS/CHAIRS: PLEASE ANNOUNCE THIS OPEN DISCUSSION MEETING TO YOUR FACULTY AT YOUR DEPARTMENT MEETING ON TUESDAY. THANK YOU.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
Tuesday, December 2, 1986
UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>	<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>
Botwin, Michael	ArchEngr	Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Cooper, Alan	BioSci	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	AgEngr
Crabb, Charles	CropSci	Riener, Kenneth	BusAdm
Currier, Susan	English	Terry, Raymond	Math
Forgeng, William	MetalSci	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Gamble, Lynne	Library	Wheeler, Marylinda	P.E./RecAdm
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Wilson, Malcolm	Interim VPAA
Nancy Jorgensen	Cslg/Tstg	Copies: Baker, Warren J.	
		Irvin, Glenn W.	

THIS MEETING WILL BE OPEN TO ALL FACULTY TO DISCUSS THE MATTER OF SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY. ALL FACULTY ARE ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND AND PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION

- I. Minutes:
Approval of the November 18, 1986 Executive Committee Minutes will be part of the January 6, 1987 Executive Committee Agenda.
- II. Communications:
- III. Reports:
 - A. President/Academic Affairs Office
 - B. Statewide Senators
- IV. Discussion Item:

*11.18.86
minutes
removed*

SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY

(Executive Committee Members: Please bring your copy of the Developmental Paper on Separation of Rank and Salary which was passed out at the last Executive Committee meeting.)

- V. Adjournment:

FILE COPY

12.2.86 min BK EX

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1687-86/FA
November 6-7, 1986

DEVELOPMENTAL PAPER
SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University
adopt the Developmental Paper On Separation Of Rank And Salary
dated November 7, 1986.

DEVELOPMENTAL PAPER
SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY

The Academic Senate of The California State University has a responsibility to help ensure that the determination of criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure not become the subject of collective bargaining. The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act Section 3562(r)(4) gives the responsibility for determining "criteria and standards" jointly to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.

In order to meet this responsibility, the Academic Senate, after much consultation, decided in January, 1986 that when collective bargaining proposals appear to have significant academic implications or consequences or affect criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, or tenure, the Senate will address its concerns to the Board of Trustees and its appropriate committees, to the Chancellor and appropriate members of her staff, and to the California Faculty Association (CFA) leadership. The mechanism used for consideration of issues by the Senate committees and the Academic Senate has been the "developmental paper." Developmental papers are viewed as a means of crystallizing the Senate's thinking on a particular issue and of providing a point of departure for discussions with the Trustees and administration on matters of criteria and standards.

A proposal to change the structure of the faculty salary schedule in the CSU has been a major issue in the 1986 bargaining of the new Unit 3 contract. Similar changes in the structure have been proposed prior to the advent of collective bargaining in the CSU and during the bargaining of the first contract. In January 1986 the Academic Senate notified the Trustees, administration and CFA that proposals to separate rank and salary might raise issues of criteria and standards within the purview of the Academic Senate. The Senate has adopted the view that "criteria and standards" are "those things which are the basis for the personnel action or decision in question, i.e. appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure. Criteria and standards are necessarily the substantive requirements the faculty member, or prospective faculty member, must satisfy."

The Senate believes the separation of rank and salary would require the creation of two separate sets of criteria and standards for appointment. In addition it might be necessary to alter the criteria and standards for later promotion or evaluation of the faculty.

Current campus policies for appointment and retention enunciate one set of criteria and standards by which the faculty make recommendations regarding rank and salary for new hires. The separation of rank from salary would necessarily require two decisions to be made for each new hire, i.e. placement on a salary schedule and rank of appointment. Each of these decisions would necessarily be made on the basis of criteria and standards developed for that particular determination.

Similarly campus policies for promotion enunciate one set of criteria and standards for promotion. If questions of salary following promotion are uncoupled from a decision about rank, new criteria and standards must be developed for that decision concerning salary.

In the Senate's view any separation of rank and salary would require the development of policies clearly establishing the criteria and standards for rank of appointment and promotion separate from the criteria and standards for placement on a salary schedule. These policies should be developed through normal campus senate processes in consultation with the administration. To be consistent with current personnel policies, faculty recommendations would be the primary determinant of both rank and salary questions. As a matter of principle, no administrator should unilaterally determine salary upon appointment or promotion.

In addition to the questions of criteria and standards, the Senate is also concerned about the educational and academic effects of the separation of rank and salary. Those potential effects, whether positive or negative, are best examined in light of the specific proposal. While the Senate does not have the detailed proposal before it, an outline of the proposal has been provided. The separation would not affect current faculty directly. It would apply to new hires, allowing for placement on the salary schedule of approximately 20 steps separate from the assignment of rank. Once placed on the salary schedule, a faculty member would move through four additional steps. Merit step increases in salary would then stop until promotion to the next rank was granted. (As we understand it, the proposal would not alter the methodology of merit step increases for faculty under the current salary schedule.) Once promoted, new placement on the salary schedule would be determined as a separate question. Promotion could lead to a significant increase in salary over the last step achieved in the prior rank.

Such a proposal, if implemented, could permit assignment at a low academic rank coupled with a high salary, or assignment at a high rank coupled with a low salary (a salary lower than that associated with the current salary schedule for that rank). The Senate is not informed whether a new hire assigned to the rank of full professor could under the proposal be assigned a salary so low that his or her salary would be capped due to the lack of opportunity for promotion. This problem could be resolved by establishing a minimum salary for the advanced ranks.

No formal explanation of the CSU proposal has been provided to the Academic Senate. We believe, however, that the genesis of the proposal was the "rank inflation" that occurred in earlier years. The separation of rank and salary could be viewed as one way to address the difficulties in hiring highly qualified faculty while respecting the traditional meaning of rank. It has been argued that hiring relatively inexperienced faculty at advanced rank in order to provide an adequate salary distorts the traditional meaning of rank. Recent statistics, however, seem to indicate that "rank inflation" is not a current problem in the CSU.

The separation of rank and salary along the lines of the proposal does present the potential for benefits and for risks and dangers to the educational mission of the system.

The potential benefits or advantages of separation include greater hiring flexibility in assigning rank and salary coupled with the possibility of increasing the number of reviews to which a faculty member would be subject. We have examined these potential advantages and do not view them as compelling when compared with the potential risks, both known and unknown.

Significant dangers and risks inhere in the separation of rank and salary. While all the potential negative effects on the educational process cannot be predicted, some can.

Such separation could lead to a devaluation of the liberal arts and sciences in undergraduate education if the salary appropriations to the CSU are distributed in a more market oriented fashion. The University must compete with private industry, non-profit organizations, other universities, and other public sector employers for the most qualified faculty in any given field. Current hiring and retention programs focus on the so called hard to hire disciplines such as business, engineering, and computer science. The future turnover and retirement of faculty may lead to hiring difficulty in many other disciplines. If the most highly qualified teachers-scholars are to be attracted to the CSU, the salaries offered by the state certainly must be competitive. However, such pragmatism should not override the University's commitment to the liberal arts and sciences. If separation of rank and salary were to lead to a marked lower salary level for professors in the liberal arts and sciences, the values of a liberal education would be denigrated. The University's public commitment to maintaining the liberal arts and sciences as the core of undergraduate education requires that we honor and recognize that value in our own internal reward systems. We must recognize the powerful message we send when we pay the professor of philosophy significantly less than the professor of accountancy.

The morale of and collegial relations among the faculty could suffer under a two-tiered salary system - one set of salaries for "old" faculty and one set for "new" faculty. As retirements lead to a large number of new hires in the future, the separation of rank and salary could lead to an unhealthy competition for salary funds if it is not accompanied by additional funding. In order to raise the salaries of some faculty, the salaries of others will have to be stabilized or increased less; furthermore, for purely budgetary reasons the use of lecturers in the CSU would probably increase. Because, as we understand it, additional funding is unlikely in the near future, a change in salary administration would mean that qualified faculty would compete against each other for limited resources. The personnel management literature emphasizes the importance of expectation of fair and consistent compensation for one's skills and efforts. If expectations of fair and equitable pay conditions are not met, adjustments in salary administration cannot make up for that lack of fairness. Suppose the faculty in two disciplines are paid different average salaries. The average workload of teaching, professional and scholarly activities, and committee work is the same. Morale and self-esteem in the lower paid discipline must suffer. Those who earn less will likely be viewed as less productive or less valued. They may also derogate the qualities that justify a higher pay scale in another discipline in order to protect the perceived value of their own contributions. Collegial decisions about curriculum, program development, resource allocation, and personnel matters become more difficult in the context of such a zero-sum game.

Other problems must be addressed as well. Any separation of rank and salary would need to recognize the importance of peer evaluation in establishing rank and salary through establishing criteria and making recommendations regarding individual faculty. Nevertheless, conflicts between faculty groups (departments and schools) competing over limited salary dollars as to where their faculty would be placed on the salary schedule following

appointment or promotion would most likely have to be resolved by an administrator such as the academic vice president or president. Any process which would assign greater authority to the president or another administrator to set individual salaries would give that administrator significant control over the direction and priorities of the institution and make him or her the arbiter of standards and criteria for appointment and promotion questions. While ultimate authority on a campus always rests with the president, that authority is exercised in the context of policies and procedures developed jointly by faculty and administration. Decisions concerning hiring of new faculty and promotion of faculty must be made in the context of collegially determined missions and goals of the campus.

Perhaps more threatening to some faculty is the view that any separation of rank and salary for new hires is only a first step to a later uncoupling of rank and salary for all faculty. This fear might appropriately be addressed by a fuller explanation of the need for rank and salary separation at this time.

Other factors need to be considered prior to any separation of rank and salary. Currently the State of California is examining the Master Plan for Higher Education. In connection with that examination, the CSU has recently proposed a restatement of its mission. Among other things, the restatement retains the centrality of teaching while affirming the public service function of the CSU. From the proposals debated in this public arena will come refinements in the character of higher education in California and in the statement of mission for the CSU. This statement will help determine the kinds of faculty that will be needed and the types of incentives to best attract and retain that faculty. Simultaneously a task force is conducting a study of the future staffing needs of the CSU in light of changing demographics of both the faculty and the population of the state. An expected bulge in retirements in the 1990's and the need to provide for the gradual turnover of faculty, necessitate a complete examination of incentives. Federal income tax reform may change the attractiveness of certain incentives as well. Financial incentives may be worth more if they lead to reduced taxation, e.g. providing benefits, which are not treated as taxable income, for health care, travel, faculty development opportunities, computer resources, books, and housing assistance in high cost areas. It seems premature to change the structure of salary administration without considering the effects of these forces over which the CSU has limited control.

We must also state that the CSU's present system of fixed salary steps within rank has clear benefits. The present system is equitable within ranks across disciplines and is a powerful factor for cohesion of faculties. Affirmative action standards and goals are furthered by our system of equal pay for equal academic status. This is regrettably rare in academe. A reasonable degree of pay equality fosters a spirit of unity and is a cornerstone of cooperation and collegiality in the academy. While equitable treatment benefits minorities and women, it also benefits disciplines and the quality of education itself. To preserve the sense of the university as a single body of academics, and to communicate these values as a counterpoint to the values generated by the marketplace, is our obligation.