

**Personnel and Benefits Committee**  
**December 2, 2014 Minutes**

Attending: Don Morley, Gail Katz, Pam Carter, Carla Myers, Tom Zwirlein, Ceil Malek (visitor), Robyn Marschke (visitor)

The P&B committee met to review preliminary results of the compression adjustment models. The committee agreed on all issues to be resolved expect for one.

The items where the committee agreed include:

1. Everyone agreed the model giving .5% weight to years in service and more moderate adjustment for merit worked as well as any of the alternatives. So the committee is in agreement that this is the model to use.
2. The committee agreed that using department averages for merit comparisons as opposed to college averages is appropriate.
3. The committee agreed not to place caps on adjustments to salary.
4. The committee agreed to set the minimum adjustment at \$200.
5. Anyone currently in the grievance process on salary is not eligible for a compression adjustment until the grievance has been resolved.

The committee disagreed on whether, faculty who in a given year, are also going through a promotion should also be eligible for a compression adjustment. Anyone who receives a promotion also receives a salary increase. In the most recent year the promotion increases were:

- |  |         |
|--|---------|
| 1. Promotion from instructor to senior instructor            | \$3,348 |
| 2. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor | \$5,742 |
| 3. Promotion from associate professor to full professor      | \$7,354 |

The bottom line question is whether these promotion increases are intended to relieve salary compression or are granted as a reward for meritorious effort in being promoted. The committee had an extensive discussion on the issue:

- Some felt the promotion money is a reward for effort and merit in achieving promotion.
- Some felt the promotion money is payment to relieve compression while in a rank.
- Some felt it was both.

In order to obtain clarification Tom corresponded with the Chancellor and met with Mark Malone, Education to discuss the issue after the meeting.

The Chancellor stated that the promotion increases were designed to be merit based, and that this merit rationale was approved by the Regents.

Mark Malone was President of Faculty Assembly when the promotion raises were implemented and worked with a former chancellor to implement the initial promotion increases for faculty. Thus, he has a

historical perspective on the issue. Mark worked with the former chancellor the first year raises came with promotions. Since it was the first year anyone received a raise for being promoted there was no policy about what to do in the next year. Mark and the former chancellor agreed that in order to avoid more compression issues the promotion increases would continue after this first year. So his interpretation was that the promotion raises were more to avoid future compression problems.

Other arguments for exempting tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty from the compression pool because they are being reviewed for promotion include:

- Some felt that comparing a pre-promoted salary to the adjusted comparison salary was not a fair comparison for anyone expecting to receive the promotion increase. Is it double counting?
- Some felt it would be unfair to leave these people in the pool.
- Should any compression adjustment be reduced by the amount of the promotion adjustment or some portion of the promotion adjustment?
- Some felt receiving a compression adjustment, a promotion adjustment and a regular merit adjustment might lead to a salary increase that would cause salary imbalances within some departments. For example, if a newly promoted associate professor of chemistry ends up with a higher salary compared to another associate professor in chemistry with equivalent merit and more years in rank, it would be divisive.
- One individual noted that during the compression analysis, faculty up for promotion were in “rank purgatory” in that they are up for promotion and institutional research won’t know what their rank will be and can’t model them. Their rank will be known next year since the promotion decision will be made in the spring. Next year the model should catch any inequities created by their exclusion this year. Some faculty have waited decades to see their exclusion from meaningful promotion raises corrected. There should be no qualms about asking younger faculty to wait a year.

Other arguments for leaving tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in the compression pool when they are being reviewed for promotion include:

- It is not fair to consider future rank for one group and not others. If both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty who are eligible for promotion in 2015 are removed from the pool then, in fairness, any others whose rank may change during 2015 (e.g. retiring faculty) should also be removed from the pool.
- If the committee holds potential salary increases for 2015 against one group (those going through promotion) then it is only fair to hold potential salary increases for 2015 (including merit raises) against anyone eligible for a compression raise.
- If salary compression adjustments are reduced by the amount of the promotion adjustment or some portion of the promotion adjustment for faculty members going up for promotion then, to be fair, compression adjustments for all individuals must be reduce or adjusted against any potential raises they are eligible to receive in 2015.

- Some felt receiving a compression adjustment, a promotion adjustment and a regular merit adjustment might lead to a salary increase that would cause salary imbalances within some departments, however it was pointed out that anyone receiving a promotion would likely still have a compressed salary under their new rank.
- It was argued that during the compression analysis, faculty up for promotion were in “rank purgatory” in that they are up for promotion and institutional research won’t know what their rank will be and can’t model them, however this is untrue. We are able to obtain information regarding all faculty members’ rank as of December 2014. It is unfair to perform a compression analysis for one group based of what their rank is as of Dec. 2014 (e.g. all of those in the compression pool who are not going up for promotion in 2015) and another based off of what a faculty members rank *may* be in the future (e.g. those in the compression pool who are going up for promotion in 2015).
- It was argued that pool of money was granted to address current compression issues, not salary, merit, and promotion inequities from the past 50 years. Removing faculty members who are going up for promotion in 2015 from this year’s pool simply because faculty were not awarded promotion or merit increases in the past is a punitive measure that perpetuates past inequities.
- It was suggested that the amount of money granted to a faculty member receiving a compression adjustment, a promotion adjustment and a regular merit adjustment in 2015 may be perceived as “unfair” by someone who receives less of a salary increase because they are only receiving a compression adjustment and a merit raise in the same year. The truth of the matter is that, given the formulas being considered, compression adjustments will vary, with some individuals receiving approximately \$200 and others receiving as much as \$9000. That some faculty members will be receiving more money than others under this model could also be perceived as unfair. If the *perception* of raise equality is the most important issue then compression raises should be a set amount for everyone, rather than a variable amount.

A vote was taken at the end of the discussion, and the committee voted 4 to 1 to remove both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members going up for promotion in 2015 out of the compression pool for this year. The committee requested that Robyn find out the faculty eligible for promotion this year to determine how the promotion increase affects the results of the compression analysis and whether a modification to the model is warranted. At the end of the day, the chancellor may have to make a decision on this issue.